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Abstract
Shortly after the establishment of the independent and modern Republic of Croatia, more specifically after the second presidential term, the custom was introduced for each new Croatian president to deliver an inaugural address. The paper analyzes the rhetoric of four speeches delivered by the three Croatian presidents at the presidential inauguration ceremonies: Franjo Tuđman (1997), Stipe Mesić (2000; 2005), and Ivo Josipović (2010). The rhetorical analysis examines the content, style and delivery in order to determine and describe the elements specific for inaugural addresses and the epideictic genre. The results show which values and figures of speech are common and which are specific for each president. The common values of all three Croatian presidents are freedom, democracy, peace, prosperity and patriotism. Tuđman emphasizes the values of nationality, independence and sovereignty; Mesić emphasizes the value of equality and the international relations, and for Josipović the most important values are justice, equality, law; human rights: rights to health and rights to work, knowledge, education and science. The most frequently used figures of speeches are metaphor and figures of speech based on repetition. The uniqueness of the inaugural addresses of the three Croatian presidents is instilled in following words: history for Tuđman, president citizen for Mesić, and justice for Josipović.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Presidential inaugural address between epideictic and deliberative genre

The custom of delivering an address on the occasion of presidential inauguration day drew its roots from the history of the US, starting with the very first inauguration of George Washington in 1789. Since the establishment of the independence of the Republic of Croatia and its acceptance as an independent state, presidential inaugural ceremonies have traditionally been held since 1992 in St. Marko's square in Zagreb. The first Croatian President, the late Franjo Tuđman, started the tradition of the presidential inaugural addresses, not in his first term of office in 1992, but right after, at the beginning of the second one in 1997. Each successive president continued the tradition and delivered a speech after taking the oath. This was done twice by president Mesić in 2000 and 2005, once by president Josipović in 2010, and once by Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović in 2015.¹

The inaugural address is a distinct rhetorical genre within the epideictic genre. The adjective *epideictic* comes from the Greek word *epideiknumi*, which means “to tell”, “to reveal”, “to display” or “to show off” (Too, 2001: 251) and it was translated into Latin as *demonstrative*. According to Aristotle (1358a36-58b20) epideictic (demonstrative, ceremonial) oratory differs from symboleutic (deliberative, political) and from dicanic (forensic) oratory in speaker, subject and audience. Epideictic speech mostly refers to the present, but may invoke the past or the future. Aristotle refers to the unspecified recipient of the epideictic speech as the “spectator”. The epideictic style is the one that is the most literary, and includes more ornamentation or figurativeness than others. Kopperschmidt (1999) summarizes the main characteristics of the epideictic rhetoric as “affirmation of the world”, “affirmation of existing order”, “renunciation of reflection”, “exposing discursive clarification and decision constraints” and temporary “suspension of everyday life”. Today, epideictic oratory is hard to distinguish from political and advertising genres (Too, 2001: 256).

Inaugurals are those speeches which are delivered on the occasion of accepting or undertaking new positions, functions, administration or office, whether of a state hierarchy, church structure or other system. However, the most powerful type of speech and surely the most politically and socially influential is the presidential inaugural address. Campbell and Jamieson (1990: 14-15) mention eight genres of presidential statements, among them the inaugural address. According to them an inaugural address:

“seeks to unify the audience by reconstituting its members as the people, who can witness and ratify the ceremony; rehearse communal values drawn from the past; set forth the political principles that will govern the new administration; and demonstrate through enactment that the president appreciates the requirements and limitations of executive functions; finally, each of these ends must be achieved through means appropriate to epideictic address.”

The authors state that presidential inaugurals are epideictic rhetoric “because they are delivered on ceremonial occasions, link past and future in present contemplation, affirm or praise the shared principles that will guide the incoming administration, ask the audience to gaze upon the traditional values, employ elegant literary language, and rely on heightening of effect by amplification and reaffirmation of what is already known and believed” (ibid.: 28). Inaugural addresses are first and foremost located in the field of political administration, but they additionally play a role in the fields of formation of public attitudes and opinions.

While the inaugural speech is a ceremonial address, it is also deliberative in nature and therefore a discussion of relationships is part of the occasion marking an inaugural. The inaugural is not only a speech focused on national topics. Instead, as the global village shrinks, as the world community becomes more connected through technology, and as the inaugural becomes more important to the world, the genre needs to take international affairs into account too. Rowland (2002, according to Dudash, 2007: 14-15) suggests there are four elements of an inaugural address: to be formal and ceremonial, to commit values, to tell where the nation places itself in the context of history, and to address international relationships.

¹ The inaugural address of Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović was delivered about one year after the study was, and therefore it is not included in the corpus of this paper.
Each presidential inaugural is subject to interpretation based on the era in which it occurred, the passing of time, or the specific rhetorical situation (Bitzer, 1983 according to Dudash, 2007: 47). The inaugural can be viewed as an introduction to a rhetorical period brought on by new leadership in the office of the presidency.

“In the US, where political speeches play a more important role than in most European democracies, the inaugural address of the president is one of the central ‘speech events’ in the national political culture. The highly ritualized event is characterized by an elaborate and conventionally scripted orality rich in metaphors. Under the influence of audiovisual mass media like radio, TV and Internet, these speeches have become syntactically less complex and more colloquial in the past few decades” (Herget, 2005: 762-763 according to Reisigl, 2010).

Croatian politics is traditionally polarized into two main wings, left and right, so each new president with his rhetoric of the inaugural speech represents the introduction of a new political era. We assume, therefore, that each inaugural is distinct in the use of the prevalent words and values typical for the related rhetoric (discourse) of the political party, although some common values are expected to be equally present in all speeches. The delivery of the inaugural speeches is tied to the individual charismas and the art of public speaking of each of the three analyzed presidents.

1.2 Virtues, loci and other common values

In epideictic rhetoric the emphasis is on the values and on high language style. Value can be defined as “an individual’s beliefs about desirable conduct or goals in life” (Rokeach, 1973, according to Kinnier et al., 2004: 128). Specific values are related to ethos, logos and pathos, and they can be ranked from collective to personal values (Meyer, 2010: 413). Virtue is, according to Aristotle “a faculty of providing and preserving good things; or a faculty of conferring many great benefits, and benefits of all kinds on all occasions (1366b). The forms of Virtue are justice, courage, temperance, magnificence, magnanimity, liberalty, gentleness, prudence, wisdom.” Perleman as “general places” of argumentation indicates loci.

“When a speaker wants to establish values or hierarchies or to intensify the adherence they gain, he may consolidate them by connecting them with other values or hierarchies, but he may also resort to premises of a very general nature which we shall term loci” (Perelman, 1969: 83). Furthermore, he classifies loci into several general categories: loci of quantity, quality, order, the existing, essence, and the person. Human values are the research object in different disciplines, sociology, psychology, theology, law and others. Schwartz and Bardi (2001: 270) offered the general classification of values, naming the main motivational types for value clusters. Beyond the striking differences in the value priorities of groups, they demonstrated a consensus in pan-cultural hierarchical order of values: benevolence, self-direction, and universalism are consistently most important; power, tradition, and stimulation values are least important; and security, conformity, achievement, and hedonism are in between.

Analysis of the values of the overall corpus of American presidential inaugural addresses (Kinnier at al. 2004: 129) shows that the most frequently mentioned values were liberty, belief in God, patriotism, justice, personal responsibility and peace (mentioned by more than 90%), prosperity, caring for others and domestic tranquility were mentioned often (by more than 80%), and the least mentioned values included truth/honesty, courage, equality and happiness (about 70%). Within the analysis of the Croatian presidential speeches, the authors specify which values are the most emphasized as well as what are the differences between the speeches of the three Croatian presidents in salient values.

1.3 Language style, figures of speech and proverbs

The feature of all epideictic genres is an elegant literary style, boosted with high style words and elegant constructs, with no lapses and no self-corrections, constructed on the usage of figures of speech. The special feature of the presidential inaugurals is its vast audience; therefore, the resonant ideas, based on the figures of speech, are often richly quoted. As Mieder (2001: 153) claims, “(as they) wanted their words to be remembered, presidents have also attempted to structure their memorable
phrases on common proverbs, literally assuring that some utterances have become sententious or even proverbial." Some sentences known worldwide, both Bible and folk proverbs, play a major role in inaugural speeches delivered by American presidents, for instance: Thomas Jefferson’s “All men are created equal!”, Eisenhower’s “The winds of change”; “To turn the back on someone”; “To pay the price”, Kennedy’s “Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country”; “Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate”, Johnson’s “For every generation, there is a destiny”; “To work shoulder to shoulder”; “To reopen old wounds”, Nixon’s “Nothing is more simple than greatness”; “Washington knows the best”, Roosevelt’s “We have nothing to fear but the fear itself”, Bush’s “To have more will than wallet”, Clinton’s “To march to the music of our times” (ibid.).

Written text of the epideictic speech is preceded by meticulous preparation and includes good composition (dispositio), checking on content (accuracy of facts and data, grammatical correctness, language style - elocutio) and is followed by performance practice (pronunciatio, actio). Epideictic text incorporates many elements such as humor, anecdote, quotation, figurativeness, emotion. This paper will reveal which thoughts were captured in the figures of speech, and whether those phrases from Croatian presidential inaugurals have entered the collective memory.

1.4 The aim of the study

The analysis included verbal elements of the inaugural address and description of the presidential delivery which contributes to the festive atmosphere of the inauguration ceremony. The aim of this paper is to analyze the values, the language and the delivery style of four inaugural addresses by three Croatian presidents – Franjo Tuđman, Stipe Mesić and Ivo Josipović. From this, the following research question arise: Which values are emphasized?; Did the speeches capture the main ideas in memorable phrases?; Which figures of speech do they use?; Do they meet the expectations of ceremonial speeches in delivery style? The overall goal of this study is to determine the uniqueness of the text and delivery style in inaugural addresses of three Croatian presidents.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Corpus

The corpus for our study consisted of the four inaugural addresses that were given by three Croatian presidents at the ceremony of presidential inaugurations: Franjo Tuđman’s (1997), Stipe Mesić’s (2000 and 2005), and Ivo Josipović’s (2010). Franjo Tuđman at his first presidential inauguration in 1992 did not give inaugural address. Since the inaugural addresses were given in Croatian, we used transcripts in Croatian for textual analysis and the audiovisual recording broadcast on Croatian Television for delivery analysis. For quotation of textual examples in this article we used the official translations¹ of inaugural addresses.

2.2 Elements of analysis and procedures

To answer the research questions we analyzed the text and the delivery of the selected speeches. Rhetorical analysis included the content analysis of values, the analysis of language style, and the analysis of the delivery. The authors independently read the addresses looking for references to each value and marking the examples. In order for a value to be considered “present” it had to be explicitly stated or strongly implied at least once. The values list used for the analysis was a combination of the two lists. The primary list of values was the 14 values listed by Kinnier et al. (2004: 129): liberty (freedom), belief in God, justice, patriotism, personal responsibility, peace, prosperity, caring for others, domestic tranquility, truth/honesty, courage, equality, happiness, lower taxes. This grid was complemented by Aristotle’s Virtues: temperance, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, prudence and wisdom (Aristotle’s virtues “justice” and “courage” have already been put on the primary list). During the analysis we added other values to the list which were explicitly mentioned in the corpus, such as democracy, knowledge, education, science, creativity, culture and others.

¹ English translation of inaugural addresses given by I. Josipović and S. Mesić have been provided by the Office of the President of the Republic of Croatia, and the translation of inaugural address given by F. Tuđman is stored in Croatian State Archives.
Language analysis was based on some stylistically marked words and figures of speech. The procedure applied for the values analysis was also applied for the analysis of the figures of speech. The primary list of figures of speech was based on Skarić's (2003) description and categorization. The results of values and style analysis will be presented by listing the examples and citing the most characteristic thematic units for values and the stylistically most striking phrases.

The acoustic analysis of the delivery is based on the audio recordings and includes the acoustic-phonetic aspects of speech, such as fundamental frequency and speech rate. The measurements of the acoustic aspects of speech, fundamental frequency in Hz and speech rate in syllable per second, were made in Praat (Boersma and Weenink, 2005), the program for phonetic analysis of speech.

To determine whether some selected parts of inaugural addresses are specific for each president and how the prominent values and rhetoric figures of speech excerpted by the authors can be perceived by a larger group of people we conducted an perceptual assessment.

Four passages from one inaugural address of each Croatian president were selected for the textual analysis and the presidential recognition test, the total of 12 randomly numbered passages. The criteria for selection were that each passage contains at least one value specific for the president and at least one stylistically marked expression or figure of speech specific for the president.

The analysis of the delivery and audio assessment was made on the one-minute audio samples taken from presidential inaugurals, so each president was represented by the same audio sample and played back through sound channel only. The criterion for selection was that the text was as neutral as possible, i.e. not too loaded with emotions or with prominent rhetorical figures.

70 participants (N=70) assesses presidents' texts and deliveries: students aged from 18 to 28 (average age 20.9); 80% female, 20% male. Some of the participants were students of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb and some of the Zagreb School of Economics and Management. The assessment experiment was carried out in April 2014.

The first task in text assessment was to evaluate the clarity, solemnity and emotiveness of each passage on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale. The second task was to answer the open question: *Can you recognize the president, and which one, based on the text you have read?* Participants' task was to read the text of each passage and to underline the words they associate with a president or to mark the lines from which they recognized the words, the style or the value, spoken by Tuđman, Mesić or Josipović. The assessment of delivery included the following categories: expressiveness, pleasantness of voice and clear articulation 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale. Basic descriptive statistics was done in MS Excel. We are aware that the results of the identification of each president include historical knowledge, and could be different if the samples were assessed either by professionals, by another age group or other social subjects. However, it is believed that the assessment of style (clarity, solemnity and emotiveness) and delivery (expressiveness, pleasantness of voice and clear articulation) are more universal.

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 Values extolled in Croatian inaugural addresses

One of the most important features of Croatian inaugural addresses is the promotion of values and virtues. The most frequently mentioned values by all Croatian presidents were freedom (independence, sovereignty), democracy, justice, patriotism (nationalism), peace and prosperity (wealth). The least mentioned values, i.e. the values mentioned only once or twice, are personal responsibility, caring for others, domestic tranquility, belief in God, truth/honesty, courage and happiness. In the next paragraphs we will give examples for each value, in order to see the quantity and the context of the value for a certain president and discuss the similarities and differences among the presidents.
3.1.1 Freedom

In the inaugural addresses of the first Croatian President F. Tuđman (1997) the most evident value is freedom of the homeland. It is elaborated by the terms independence, sovereignty and democracy. The term independent or independence appears more than ten times, freedom five times, and sovereign or sovereignty four times. The contexts in which the concept of freedom appears are: “we have achieved our highest national and freedom-loving goals for which Croats have lived and died”; “We have won our freedom, the independence of our State”; “our millennial dream about our freedom and our own State has become reality”; “the achievements of its truly extraordinary struggle for its freedom and its State”; “a country of democratic human freedoms”; “the remarkable independence of Croatia”; “in the development of the independent and democratic Croatian State” etc. For other presidents the concept of freedom appears in other contexts: for Mesić (2000) the “freedom of the media” is important, as well as the “development of local self-government, and the freedom of initiatives from all the parts of Croatia” while for Josipović (2005) the value to reach is “religious freedom”. We think that the value the speaker decides to emphasize is the value which is considered to be compromised or under-recognized, and it is therefore understandable that the first president emphasizes sovereignty, while subsequent presidents mentioned this value only in a historical context: “From the Croatian Spring to the Croatian independence” (Mesić, 2000), and in the context of the homeland war “when the foundations for the independent and sovereign Croatia were created” (Josipović, 2010).

We can conclude that each president refers to a completely different semantic field when he mentions the value of freedom: Tuđman emphasized the freedom of the homeland, the state independence and sovereignty, Mesić the freedom of media and Josipović religious freedom.

3.1.2 Democracy

Democracy is a specific value that is highly represented in the inaugural addresses of all Croatian presidents: Tuđman (1997) mentioned democracy nine times, Mesić (2000) 15 times, or two times (2005), and by Josipović (2010) 11 times. Although democracy, as system of government through elected representatives, is not on the list of 18 most common values extolled in the inaugural speeches of American presidents (Kinnier et al., 2004), it can be considered a form of freedom and self-direction. The value of democracy in the US does not appear in inaugural addresses so often because it is associated to the Democratic Party, while in Croatia it is a common value, equally stressed by all three presidents.

3.1.3 Justice

Justice is a value mentioned by all Croatian presidents, but it is the most important value advocated by Josipović (2010): “My key motivation was that of JUSTICE, the moral and legal foundation of a better society”; “Courage triumphs over injustice and realizes a more just and a better society in which each citizen has equal rights and an equal chance to get education, employment and a decent living for him or herself and their entire families, and has the right to live in a state that respects and protects human and other rights of its citizens.” The value of justice was mentioned by Josipović (2010) for more than ten times, while Tuđman and Mesić mentioned it only once, in the context of incorruptible social justice. Josipović’s characteristics is the emphasis he puts on law and justice, especially on religious and minority rights: “Democracy and the human rights doctrine include religious and minority rights. Croatia is a country of religious freedom. Religious belief, or absence of it, is the right of every citizen.” (Josipović, 2010). Elaborating human rights, Josipović is the only Croatian president who emphasizes the importance of “not only the fundamental human rights, but also the advanced-generation rights such as the right to health, to education and to work” (Josipović, 2010). We can conclude that justice is the value most specific for president Josipović.

3.1.4 Knowledge

Knowledge, education and science are values which Josipović pointed out: “society which is based on work, knowledge and creativity”, “to invest into knowledge”, “make our homeland a developed European country with our knowledge, determination and vision”, “strengthening knowledge and sustainable development”, “a country based on knowledge, new
technologies and the concept of sustainable development”, “Youth is our greatest wealth. Investing into their education makes the best investment.” (Josipović, 2010). “The new, postmodern state will have to accept climate change, strict standards of environmental protection, global introduction of information technology, new understanding of human rights, recognize science, education and culture as generators of progress and preservation of own identity in a global and multicultural society.” (Josipović, 2010). Knowledge is a value mentioned only by president Josipović.

3.1.5 Patriotic nationalism

The term patriotism appears explicitly for the first time in Josipović’s speech: “to pursue true justice and patriotism. It is justice without exception and patriotism that does not rely on personal interest, and does not remain in words only, but patriotism that is confirmed in deeds and reflected in results” (Josipović, 2010).

The value of patriotism is not mentioned in Tudman’s inaugural address (1997) as a word, but nationalism, which is the set of concepts closely related to those of patriotism, is the most prominent value, referred to more than 20 times in the speech. The contexts in which Tudman refers to the nation as a value are: “protect Croatian national and State interests”, “national revival”, “Croatian national being”, “the national and State independence”, “nationally individualized”, “unknown and no recognized nations”, “that national and State subjects”, “one of the oldest nations”, “nationhood and statehood we preserved”, “through national harmony”, “national interests” etc. Josipović mentions national values as a challenge: “The EU also represents a challenge to preserve our own national identity, so that a small nation within a large multinational community will remain recognizable for its Croatian identity and that of its national minorities” (Josipović, 2010).

Levinger and Lytle (2001) argue that the crucial pillars of nationalist ideology are the rhetorical triad: idealized images of the past, depiction of the degraded present and a utopian future condition. The most prominent constituent of this rhetorical triad in Tudman’s speech is the glorious Croatian past and long history:

“For the fact that the Croatian people is one of the oldest nations in present-day Europe (...) having resurrected and defended the sovereignty of our State – which we had from the 7th to the 12th centuries, and whose nationhood and statehood we preserved even if in an impaired way (...) the Croatian people has given a huge contribution to the defense of Western civilization from the Ottoman onslaught on Europe, but also to the development of European culture (...) The Croatian people has credible testimonies to these contributions in its written documents and documents in stone, in its towns and cities, in its literature and art from the period of European Humanism and the Renaissance, created in the fourteen centuries of its existence in this region, between the Drava the Danube and the Adriatic Sea” (Tudman, 1997).

Tudman accuses the communist system and the politics of multinational States for the undermined integrity of the Croatian national community: “having freed itself from the communist-totalitarian and Yugoslav yoke, Croatia resolutely rejects any possibility of a new political integration within a Balkan or any other Southeast-European framework”. Tudman is very explicitly blaming the international community for the degraded present: “We are now faced with the pressing task of convincing the uninformed and conceited world of the truth about our past and present”; “Many people in the international community and global policy have drawn surprisingly biased or simplified conclusions out of the essential features of present-day humankind”; “The national and State independence of the Croatian people has sometimes been followed by some influential global factors with lack of understanding, and even with distrust and disinclination” (Tudman, 1997).

Developing the model by linking the forms of the rhetoric of national mobilization Levinger and Lytle (2001: 186) argue that underlying the nationalists’ rhetoric is the call to action “in which the appropriate action is defined by the nature of the loss”. Tudman (1997) is naming loss of territory, loss of external markets, territorial division, internal political division and the division of Croatian people. By diagnosing the nation’s decline and by identification of agents that are threats to the community Tudman (1997) defines the appropriate objectives of collective struggle: “in order to develop, in Croatian national harmony, our Homeland into a country of democratic human freedoms, economic and cultural prosperity,
well-being and happiness of all its citizens; in order to make Croatia a powerful factor of peace, cooperation among nations and stability of the new international order in this part of the world."

We can conclude that patriotism is explicitly emphasized as a value only by president Josipović, while Tuđman stressed national values and the content of his speech embodies rhetorical elements of nationalist ideology.

3.1.6 Equality

Mesić and Josipović mention “national” in the context of a value concept of equality: "All our citizens must be equal before the law, regardless of age and sex, nationality, religion or political belief"; “Croatian national minorities in other countries” (Mesić, 2000); “Any discrimination: national, religious, based on gender or sexual orientation, social or regional origin or any other grounds, is inadmissible” (Josipović, 2010).

3.1.7 Peace

Peace is a value that is moderately represented in the inaugural addresses of all Croatian presidents: It is mentioned five times by Tuđman, three times by Mesić (2000), 5 times by Mesić in 2000 and five times in 2005, and three times by Josipović. The context of the value of peace is most often the international stability, security and a good relationship with neighboring countries: “the establishment of peace and the new international order” (Tuđman, 1997); “Croatia wants to live in peace and cooperation with its neighbors” (Mesić, 2000); “a region of peace, security, cooperation and mutual understanding” (Mesić, 2005); “Good neighborly relations guarantee peace, security and stability” (Josipović, 2010).

3.1.8 Prosperity

Prosperity is a value mentioned two to three times by each president and the contexts are: “prosperity of all our citizens”, “prosperity of all classes of society and of all its citizens”, “economic and cultural prosperity” (Tuđman, 1997); “common values of peace, democracy and prosperity” (Mesić, 2000); “Croatia will defeat the crisis and in time become a country of work and prosperity” (Josipović, 2010).

3.1.9 Other values and virtues

From all forms of Virtue named by Aristotle only justice and courage seem to be the universal values extolled in presidential inaugurals, while other virtues, such as temperance, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, prudence, wisdom are not mentioned at all. There are other values mentioned rarely or only by one president, such as happiness, honor, truth, sincerity, caring for others, equality, belief in God, personal responsibility, unity, trust, friendship, solidarity, reputation, resoluteness, wives, mothers, children, families, young people and other virtues and values.

3.1.10 Value Hierarchy

The most explicit statement about values, especially the value hierarchy, can probably be found in Josipović’s speech (2010):

“I shall insist on the development of a state based on the values of responsibility, integrity, trust, respect and equal opportunity, non-discrimination and evaluation through knowledge and work, in a nutshell - on justice. I shall insist on developing a system that will motivate citizens to uphold, embrace and live these values and principles, and not to feel as losers if they do so. In other words, I shall insist on a system in which it will be crystal clear that corruption and crime hold no reward. Property and social status gained in such way will not last long. We shall restore to people dignity and faith that honesty and responsibility are worthwhile.”

3.1.11 Conclusion

The common values for all three presidents are freedom, democracy, peace, prosperity and patriotism. By the value of freedom each president refers to a different semantic field: Tuđman emphasized freedom of the homeland, state independence and sovereignty, Mesić freedom of media and Josipović religious freedom. The most characteristic values for Tuđman are nationality, independence and sovereignty, for Mesić equality and building international relations, and for Josipović justice, law, human rights, equality, knowledge, education and science. Josipović in his inaugural address emphasized a large number of common values as well as the value hierarchy important for the Croatian society.
3.2 Language style/figures of speech

Style is built on the specific choice of words, figures of speech, archaisms, proverbs, and some elements of grammar contributing to high language style. Both authors analyzed the text looking for figures of speech that contribute to the speech, as well as for the expressions that lower the style and diminish the poetic impression. Škarić (2003: 109) defines figure of speech as “an expression when something is told in an unusual or non literal way”, and their main traits are to be affective and poetic.

All three presidents and their four speeches are not as figurative as we expected them to be at an inauguration ceremony, which is one of the most solemn state events. The figure of speech used most often is metaphor, tightly followed by figures of speech based on repetition. For all of them we can say they use the administrative style, though Mesić’s second inaugural speech turns out to be the most poetic one. Administrative style is described as “a functional style of Croatian standard language that includes the discourse within the office, industry, commerce, politics, army and advertising. For the most part it is nominal (nominal is when the important role takes an object, a noun), and less is verbal (verbal is when the important role takes an action). Its other features are: simplicity, clearness, conciseness, integrity, balance, explicitness (it is fully expressed), shortness, determinateness, use of concept, stylistically unmarked, and patterned.” (Silić and Pranjković, 2007). Gasdžić-Alerić (2009) 687 phrases in the analysis of the Croatian political speech corpus, and thereby she disapproves the frequent claim about the nonexpressiveness of the administrative style. She assumed that the political substyle of the administrative style has its own phraseology, but the research showed that there are no phrases that can be linked to the political substyle of the administrative style exclusively, at least when referring to spoken discourse.

The most common figure of speech that Tuđman used in his inaugural address from 1997 is the repetition of words national, Croatia, our, freedom, independence. As for grammatical figures, he used anaphora, the repetition of the beginning of the phrase, e.g. “in order to develop (...), in order to make Croatia (...)” etc. Tuđman’s common metaphors are dream and revival

"History has awarded our generation the fulfillment of the Croatian dream nine centuries old, ‘As the general political revival of the Croatian people continues - a revival during which our millennial dream about our freedom and our own State has become reality’). Tuđman also marked his speech using emotion arousing words (defend, protect national and state interests, homeland war, independence, war, refugees, bribery, corruption, territory, democracy, God, history, communist-totalitarian, yugocomunist, serve the people, Yugoslav yoke). Tuđman’s style is also recognizable by the use of some archaic Croatian words, some expressions specific for him (e.g. the Croatian national being) and by frequent use of terms and concepts as subject and factor, specific to the administrative style (“that national and State subjects remain to be the irreplaceable components of the global community”, “Croatia is an important and unavoidable factor”).

Tuđman’s epideictic rhetoric in 1997 is not significantly different from his rhetoric in the period preceding the war until the establishment of the independence of the Republic of Croatia (1989-1991) as described by Kišček (2013). Tuđman’s persuasive appeal to ethos and pathos has the same strategy, namely the strategy of building ethos through “glorifying his nation”, “fighting for independence and preserving the long wanted dream”, and to “appealing to angry emotions” (ibid.: 83). At the beginning of his second presidential term, 1997, five years after the Croatian independence was internationally recognized in January 1992, Tuđman was angry with the international community and he expressed his attitudes inappropriately for the ceremonial, epideictic situation: “we are now faced with the pressing task of convincing the uninformed and conceited world”, “many people in the international community and global policy have drawn surprisingly biased or simplified conclusions” (Tuđman, 1997). The fear of international interference is evident through a lot of negativism (“they want to prevent such phenomena”, “they tend to impose their exclusive will”, “Croatia resolutely rejects any possibility of a new political integration within a Balkan or any other Southeast-European framework”). We can conclude that Tuđman’s epideictic rhetoric six years after the Homeland war, still contains some elements of the rhetoric of war (as named by Kišček, 2013).
Mesić’s first inaugural address, from 2000, is less figurative, although the authors find antimetabole (“I will be a President of all the citizens of this country. I will be a citizen President”), several metaphors (“Let us join forces and create such Croatia, as we, its citizens, dream and deserve”; “Croatia has always been a country of promise and opportunity”; “In the new, post-election Croatia, there is no room anymore for such a ‘sin of the government institution’”; “Let us set off on this journey together and go for this task without any delay”). Mesić used references to the past (“From the Croatian spring to the Croatian independence, from the first democratic elections to the present day”), but the history mentioned by Mesić is recent, compared to Tudman who evoked the seventh century.

Figuratively richer, Mesić’s second inaugural address from 2005 brings many metaphors (“My message to those who cast their ballot for me at the polls”; “I dream of the Croatia where the people will have a good standard of living, where people will live from their work and from the fruits of their labor, a Croatia where skills and qualifications will be valued rather than stratagem and deception”; “Together with you – I am sure – this dream can come true”; “Equally so, I shall not tire in my efforts to assist in shedding light on the destiny of those who are still considered missing today”; “The region I dream of is a region of open borders where nobody will feel free or will be allowed to feel either privileged or discriminated against on whatever ground…”). Mesić’s metaphor of the dream, as well as the rhythm based on the repetition, strongly resembles figures in Martin Luther King’s speech I have a dream (Liker, 2007). Mesić (2005) uses the repetition of sentences (“Together – I am sure – we can make this dream come true”), the repetition of the words world, Croatia, dream and the repetition of the sentence beginning, anaphora (“The world I dream of is world where war will not be rule and peace will not be the exception, a world where development will not be a privilege, but rather a right, a world where the great and the mighty will prove their power by helping the small and the weak instead of dominating them”;

“I am addressing all citizens (...) I am addressing our neighboring states (...) I am addressing the international community (...) I am sure that we can”). Mesić’s most famous and best remembered figure is antimetabole (“President of citizens, citizen President”).

Almost the only figure of speech in Josipović’s inaugural address from 2010 is metaphor and the authors find many of them (“The fruits of antifascism and the Homeland War today signify patriotism”; “Courage triumphs over injustice and realizes a more just and a better society”; “Croatia will defeat the crisis and in time become a country of work”; “fighting corruption and crime”; “fighting for a fair and just society”; “We shall write a new page in history together”; “We embark on a new path, that of a more stable, safer, and economically more developed country, the path of democratic and cultural progress and social welfare”; “We shall be the force changing the aspect of this country, undermining the foundations of injustice, creating a new Croatia”; “House of democracy and human rights; Croatia is nowadays chained by the economic crises”). Josipović had the powerful use of repetition of the words justice and Fight.

As we stated before, the most frequently used figure of speech in the presidential addresses is metaphor. The persuasive power of metaphor in politics is explained in Charteris-Black (2011: 28) saying “metaphor can be, and often is, used for ideological purposes because it activates unconscious emotional associations (...) politicians use metaphor to tell the right story.” Also, “many political issues are complicated and abstract – about which the majority of people have only a partial understanding (...) If occurs often during time that such cognitively accessible metaphors that become conventionalized” (Charteris-Black 2011: 33). Similar to the graffiti on the walls which point out who rules the district, metaphors used by a given political milieu provide clear signals of the unity of their attitudes to the members. On the other hand the metaphor addressed to the external world serves as a visible and convincing presentation of a given topic. Naturally, most often the same metaphor performs both functions simultaneously” (Kampka 2014: 103).

Figures of speech in a political discourse are explained by Ivas (1998) distinguishing poetical ones and colloquial figures: “About the figure of speech we can talk also as a deflection of a common. Small but visible shift regarding the main rule or symmetry evokes an esthetical impulse, so this is why we call figures exornatio – adornment of the speech. The beauty is the purpose for the poetical figure, and only an instrument for a colloquial
one." (Ivas, 1998: 195). Colloquial figure “doesn’t have the element of surprise because it is a former shift. It is not used for the speech to be clearer but to fill the framework and express the values” (ibid.: 196).

We can conclude that the metaphors use by Tuđman, Mesić and Josipović (dream, journey, path, house, to write a page, etc.) are not surprisingly poetic, they are conventionalized and can be seen a part of political jargon. The most recognizable are Tuđman’s metaphors subject and factor which leave the impression of administrative style and do not contribute to the solemn, poetic, festive, dignified style in the epideictic oratory.

3.2.1 Assessment of language style: clear, solemn and emotional

Figure 1 shows the results of language style assessment based on written passages from Croatian inaugural addresses given by the three presidents.

![Bar chart showing assessment of language style in presidential inaugural addresses in categories clear, solemn and emotional (N=70)](image)

The category clear (easily understandable) in which Josipović’s speech was assessed as the best (average 4.57; sd 0.63) is related to the logical sequence and relatively short sentences, typical for the administrative style. Mesić’s speech is very close to the Josipović’s (average 4.45; sd 0.65) and it is considered easy to understand and logical. Tuđman’s text is loaded with history, long sentences, and a lot of archaic words and students assessed estimated it as less clear than two other texts (average 3.64; sd 1.06).

Solemnity (dignified, festive, formal, elegant, poetic style) is mostly evident through high language style and figures of speech. All speeches were mid-scored for this category (average is about 3.58 – 3.69), which can be interpreted as if the speeches did not meet the high expectations of ceremonial speeches which are expected to be dignified, festive and formal, which are characteristics of elegant language style.

Emotiveness relates to affective traits of figures of speech, values, and of course to verbalizing of emotions. In the assessment of emotiveness Josipović and Mesić’s speeches are mid-scored (average is about 3.67 – 3.58), while Tuđman’s speech is assessed as very low in the same category (average 2.97; sd 1.02). We have to stress that only the text was assessed, not the delivery, which could, in the case of Tuđman bring the contrary results. The results for the category clear, but not solemn and emotional, support our interpretation of language style as having features of the administrative style.

3.2.2 Recognizability of Croatian presidents based on text

When we asked the participants an open question: “Can you recognize the president based on the text you read?” some of the students dared to answer it, and as answer they underlined the part of text, the whole passage or they wrote a comment on how they recognize each president. The results are: 34% of students wrote they recognized Tuđman, 18% wrote they recognized Mesić, and 43% wrote they recognized Josipović. For Tuđman and Mesić about half of them were right and the passages or the phrase they recognized really “belonged” to the person, while only the third recognized Josipović correctly. It seems that the students who assessed the speeches were too young to remember Tuđman and his inaugural. Although the inauguration happened before or shortly after they were born, the rhetoric and the political discourse of the late president Tuđman are still very much
alive in memory. This is mainly because the members of the political party Tudman belonged to, and still belongs to, keep his memory alive. Their efforts are visible in the restoration of his rhetoric, present in every public performance of each member of the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) from the nineties to the present day. His discourse, words and values have found their place in the inaugural speech of the recently elected president, Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović, also a member of the Croatian Democratic Union. The role of the first Croatian president was crucial for the birth and independence of Croatia; therefore, his rhetoric is well known regardless the time gap.

Specifically, students said they recognize Tudman by the word national, by the word history and by notions related to history. Sometimes this was right, sometimes wrong, because all presidents talk about history and about national interests. The difference is that Tudman mentions those values or those topics more frequently and in different contexts compared to other presidents. Passages or phrases in Tudman’s speech on which the correct recognitions were based are: “Having taken the oath as the Head of the Croatian State, I have undertaken to faithfully serve the Croatian people and all Croatian citizens. This means, first and foremost, that I shall worthily defend and protect Croatian national and State interests”; “Having resurrected and defended the sovereignty of our State – which we had from the 7th to the 12th centuries, and whose nationhood and statehood we preserved even if in an impaired way.”

Mesić is known by his figure of speech (ontimetabole) “I will be the President of all the citizens of this country. I will be a citizen President.” Just 18% of the examined persons think they recognized Mesić by his words. And only half of them were right. He was mostly recognized by the following sentences: “Together with you, I will do my utmost to fulfill our common task of transforming Croatia into a truly democratic and just society”; “Let me share with you my sense of hope and optimism that now with the will, capability and work of all the citizens of our country we can open a new road for Croatia. Croatia as a democratic and successful state in the decade and in the century which are beginning. (...) Let us set off on this journey together and go for this task without any delay.”

The inaugural address of president Josipović has been positively assessed in the media and it was praised in general. Butković (2010) summarizes the main four characteristics of Josipović’s rhetoric as “a sense of historical and political context, modernism, liberalism, and social justice”. Josipović, like his predecessor, calls himself a president citizen. His inaugural sublimates his campaign rhetoric, saying that he would be fighting for equality in society. Notions such as “law”, “justice”, and “social equity” are highly recognized as part of his rhetoric, and he is easily identified from those words whenever they are brought up in a conversation within the political context. Interestingly, 43% of persons think they recognize Josipović by his words but he is the least accurately recognized president of the three. Some students recognized Josipović by the notion of absence of religious belief: “Croatia is a country of religious freedom. Religious belief, or absence of it, is the right of every citizen”. There was a repeated recognition of the word citizen within Josipović’s rhetoric, sometimes confusing Mesić’s and Josipović’s speeches. “The common sense of such practical wisdom expressed in quotable phrases or proverbs definitely adds to the communicative and emotional quality of presidential rhetoric. Inaugural addresses are meant to be timely and timeless, and a memorable phrase or a traditional proverb represents reformulated and commonly known bits of wisdom that underscore the value system and mentality of the people.” (Mieder, 2001:168).

The uniqueness of the inaugural addresses of the three Croatian presidents is instilled in following words: history for Tudman, president citizen for Mesić, and justice for Josipović. Josipović is also recognized as president citizen, so although this figure were created by Mesić, we still can’t be sure that Mesić will be remembered as the author of this proverbial figure of speech.

3.3 Analysis of the delivery
The voice, speech tempo, articulation, expressiveness, emotions and other elements of delivery are very important for solemn performance of epideictic speech. Since the inauguration is the most solemn national
event, the delivery of the speech should also be meticulously prepared. According to the study (Pletikos Olof and Poropat Darrer, 2012: 250) the best epideictic speeches have "properties that are difficult to combine: on the one hand the text has to be prepared (choice of words, figures of speech, originality, telling stories, humor), on the other hand, in the delivery the most expected is spontaneity (honesty, emotion, personality)".

3.3.1 Acoustic analysis of presidential speeches

The average fundamental frequency (average tone) is 170 Hz (sd 26) for Tudman, 161 Hz (sd 44) for Mesić, and 143 Hz (sd 37) for Josipović (see Table 1). Josipović has the lowest average tone and the slowest speech tempo. Its slower tempo (speech rate) results from longer pauses lasting up to one second.

Table 1. Analysis of the acoustic aspects of the delivery of inaugural addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Croatian presidents</th>
<th>Average fundamental frequency (standard deviation)</th>
<th>Speech tempo in syllables per second</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Tudman</td>
<td>170.6 Hz (26.3)</td>
<td>4.44 syll/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Mesić</td>
<td>161.1 Hz (44.2)</td>
<td>4.71 syll/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Josipović</td>
<td>142.5 Hz (37.0)</td>
<td>5.58 syll/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average fundamental frequency, as well as a long term average spectrum (LTAS), are the acoustic elements of speech which are tightly connected with the assessment of the speaker, primarily with the perception of pleasantness of voice. Human voice that has a lower fundamental frequency is perceived as more pleasant than voices with a higher tone (Varošanec-Škarić, 1998; Varošanec-Škarić, 2005). The voice qualities expressed by the results of acoustic analysis (fundamental frequency, long-term average spectrum, jitter, shimmer and intonation) in the delivery of one of the most influential speeches in the 20th century M. L. King's "I have a dream" was shown by Liker and Vurban Zrinski (2003). Elements of prosodic structure of speech may contribute to the overall impression the speech makes on listeners, and affect their perception of the speech as "determined, persuasive and able to capture the attention of the audience" (Pejčić, 2012). The recent sociophonetic research by Kisiček (2012) also relates the prosodic elements of speech (such as voice, word accent, articulation) with attitudes toward the speaker, such as assessment of social status and psychological characteristics. Therefore, the voice can be very important factor for the credibility and charisma of the political leaders. We can conclude that Josipović's delivery, with slow speech tempo and fundamental frequency, was the most appropriate for a solemn national event.

3.3.2 Assessment of inaugural addresses delivery

In the perceptual, subjective voice analysis (see Figure 2), the objective results were confirmed: Tudman's voice, which has the highest fundamental frequency is perceived as the least pleasant, i.e. the average pleasantness of voice for Tudman is 2.93 (sd 0.75), for Mesić 3.23 (sd 1.00) and for Josipović 3.51 (sd 1.03).

Figure 2. Assessment of the delivery of the inaugural addresses in the categories of expressiveness, pleasantness of voice and articulation (N=70)
Although low fundamental frequency contributes to pleasantness of voice and it has one of the most powerful influences on speech expressiveness (Vlašić Duić and Pletikos Olof, 2015), this analysis shows that Mesić's results differ because his speech does not have low fundamental frequency but he is assessed as the most expressive (average 3.90), and his articulation is assessed as very clear (average 4.10). Mesić's speech delivery has greater intonation range of intonation (which can be seen from the higher standard deviation of the fundamental frequency), and certainly his prosody has other qualities that make his speeches more expressive.

Intonation patterns and rhythm are prosodic elements that were included in the analysis, although they are extremely important for political speeches since they influence the audience motivation. Chaïda et al. (2012) found that politicians in Greek in most cases did not use rising tone structures at phrase boundaries, deviating from an average speaker. The analysis of the rhythm in Martin Luther King's speech "I have a dream" shows that it is "not only the most interesting aspect of the speech, but also the decisive one in achieving the most important goal in public speaking: influencing the audience" (Likier, 2007: 152).

3.3.3 Assessment of presidential political activity
A control question has been set in this paper regarding the overall political service of each president. This results are similar for Josipović's (average 3.63, sd 0.87) and Tudman's political service (average 3.40, sd 1.01) with Josipović's slight advantage, while Mesić's political service is assessed quite low (average 3.14, sd 0.79).

Stylistic and content analysis of the speeches as well as the analysis of the delivery show that in spite of the higher scores for expressiveness, the category Mesić was assessed the best, the values expressed by Tudman and Josipović, as well as the language style used in expressing their messages, are sufficient to ensure their acceptance and understanding by the audience. Their messages reach the audience with whom they share the same values and political beliefs without major barriers caused by the delivery drawbacks. Recipients of the messages are aware of the delivery advantages such as pleasantness of the voice, expressiveness, good articulation, clear logical sequences of the speakers with whom they do not share the same values just as well as they are aware of the delivery drawbacks of the speakers they worship, but they are capable of detaching the content stratum from the delivery stratum. To what degree do the verbal as well as the nonverbal cues affect the audience's attitude towards each politician is beyond the limitations of this paper. However, the authors would like to note the potential existence of such an impact. This interpretation implies a conclusion (at this point it is just a presumption), that better delivery and higher language style could help the speakers to gain higher rate of acceptance by the audience and to build a better reputation.

4. Conclusion

The aim of ceremonial speech is to enrich the momento and the audience, to connect the people in goodness and beauty, and elicit positive feelings of happiness, pride and belonging. The main characteristics of ceremonial speeches are high language style that includes carefully chosen words, well thought sentences, figures of speeches and the specific slow and solemn delivery. This paper examines some of those characteristics in four Croatian presidential speeches assessing the values, language style, and delivery.

The values found in the analyzed speeches are freedom (independence, sovereignty), democracy, justice, patriotism (nationalism), peace, prosperity (wealth), knowledge, equality and other. The most frequently used one by all three presidents is democracy. Specifically, the values used by Tudman are freedom of homeland relating to the notions of independence and sovereignty as well as democracy, and nationalism. For the value of nationalism, the rhetorical triad combining past, present and future is typical and also present in Tudman's speech when he refers to the glorious Croatian past, the Croats as the oldest nations of the modern Europe and the main factor in developing the European culture. Mesić uses
the common values moderately in comparison to the other presidents. However, he brings up the need for collaboration with neighbors, for building international relationships and opening to the world. There is a more accurately elaborated hierarchy of values in Josipović’s speech. The most prominent one is the value of justice followed by the value of law and human rights. When he speaks about human rights he mentions minority rights, right to health and right to work. The other values are knowledge, education, science, responsibility, integrity, trust, respect, equal opportunity and non-discrimination.

The most used figures of speech that are contributing to solemnity by all three presidents are metaphor and repetition. Tudman, Mesić and Josipović used metaphors as *dream, journey, path, house, to write a page,* etc., which are not poetic. These metaphors are conventionalized and can be seen a part of political jargon. The most recognizable of Tudman’s expressions are *subject* and *factor* which leave the impression of administrative style and do not contribute to the solemn, festive, dignified style in epideictic oratory. Mesić’s second inaugural address, in which the metaphor *dream* was highly repeated, reveals itself to be the most poetic one. Tudman can be recognized by the use of the word history and notions related to history, Mesić’s figure of speech is the antithese of *President of the citizen, citizen President,* and Josipović is known by his repeated use of the words justice, law, social equity, religious right and fight. All of the three presidents are not as figurative as we could expect, owing to their use of administrative language style. Josipović’s style is found to be the clearest, owing to his logical sequences, friendly tone and short sentences. The clarity results for Mesić are very close to Josipović’s. Tudman is assessed as the least clear because of his long sentences, the use of archaic words and the text loaded with history.

This paper gives an insight into the Croatian presidential inaugurals, concluding that there are more elements of ceremonial speeches in them, such as common values in content, metaphors and repetitions in language style, slow tempo and good articulation in delivery, but there is room for further improvement in style and delivery. Epideictic genre are considered solemn, emotional and expressive, but this doesn’t seem to be characteristics of the Croatian inaugural addresses, which are a genre in between epideictic and deliberative.

References


Bibliography of textual corpus


Mesić, S. (2005). Inaugural Address of the President of the Republic of Croatia Mr Stjepan Mesić (18 February 2005). Office of the President of the Republic of Croatia (provided by e-mail Danja.Silovic.Karic@predsjednik.hr).


Websites
