DIPLOMARBEIT / DIPLOMA THESIS

Titel der Diplomarbeit / Title of the Diploma Thesis

„The Use of Rhetorical Devices in Selected Speeches by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump during the Electoral Campaign 2016"

verfasst von / submitted by

Larissa Wolf

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

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, 2017/ Vienna, 2017

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt / degree programme code as it appears on the student record sheet:	A 190 344 353
Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt / degree programme as it appears on the student record sheet:	Lehramtsstudium UF Englisch UF Spanisch
Betreut von / Supervisor:	Univ.-Prof. PD Mag. Dr. Gunther Kaltenböck, M.A.

DECLARATION OF AUTHENTICITY

I confirm to have conceived and written this Diploma Thesis in English all by myself. Quotations form other authors are all clearly marked and acknowledged in the bibliographical references, either in the footnotes or within the text. Any ideas borrowed and/or passages paraphrased from the works of other authors are truthfully acknowledged and identified in the footnotes.

Signature

HINWEIS

Diese Diplomarbeit hat nachgewiesen, dass die betreffende Kandidatin befähigt ist, wissenschaftliche Themen selbstständig sowie inhaltlich und methodisch vertretbar zu bearbeiten. Da die Korrekturen des Beurteilenden nicht eingetragen sind und das Gutachten nicht beiliegt, ist daher nicht erkenntlich mit welcher Note diese Arbeit abgeschlossen wurde. Das Spektrum reicht von sehr gut bis genügend. Die Habilitierten des Instituts für Anglistik und Amerikanistik bitten diesen Hinweise bei der Lektüre zu beachten.

Acknowledgements

I am endlessly proud to have finally completed my final thesis. However, I could not have accomplished this without the help of many invaluable supporters:

First and foremost, to my parents, who have been continually backing and encouraging me in all my endeavours. I cannot thank you enough for the love and support that you have given me. To the rest of my family: my sweet sister Johanna, my lovely grandmother Hermi and Franz, my cool aunt Julia, and the rest of the "Wolf-gang".

Naturally, a special thank you to my supervisor Prof. Kaltenböck for his helpful guidance and advice. You always found the right words to nudge me into the right direction.

A big thank you also to my boss Hilda who granted me time off almost whenever I asked for it so I could progress and work on my thesis.

Furthermore, to all my friends who have stood by my side throughout this process. Especially to my flatmates Christina and Michelle: you have become as dear as sisters to me and I appreciate how much we manage to motivate each other also concerning our studies. To my beloved girlfriends Ute and Vanessa – I know that friendships like these will last for a lifetime and, of course, you have also had my back in difficult times when I did not believe in myself anymore. To Marcus, my dear friend: thank you for your endless and everlasting support. You always manage to put a smile on my face, no matter what. And, finally, to everyone else who supported me on this journey: Caro, Andrea, Lisa, Teresa, Julia, Karin, Magda, … and many other friends; you know who you are.

Thank you all for believing in me, I would not have managed this without you!

Rhetoric, it seems, is a producer of persuasion for belief,

not for instruction in the matter of right and wrong.

It is the art of ruling the minds of men.

– Plato

If your actions inspire others to dream more, do more

and become more, you are a leader.

– John Quincy Adams

List of abbreviations

B.C.	Before Christ
C1/2/3	Clinton 1/2/3 (speech number)
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
CMA	Critical Metaphor Analysis
DHA	Discourse Historical Approach
i.e.	id est (that is)
PDA	Political Discourse Analysis
pp.	pages
T1/2/3	Trump 1/2/3 (speech number)

List of tables

Table of contents

1. Introduction

The US presidential election campaign 2016 has been one of the hardest fought electoral battles in history, especially with regard to the two top candidates Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. The fierceness and overall characteristics of this epic battle also showed in the candidates' language use, which has been widely discussed by the media. Particularly Trump's rhetorical skills have been met with repeated criticism. So far, there has been no extensive scientific study on this subject, which renders it extraordinarily intriguing to analyse.

In this thesis, six selected speeches (three per candidate) by Clinton and Trump will be analysed in detail with regard to the speakers' manifestation of rhetorical devices. The following research questions are going to be answered: Which rhetorical devices were employed throughout the speeches? Which features were the most prominent? In which context and for which purpose were these devices used? Hence, are there discernible distinctions between the three different political speech types and, as a result, the rhetorical devices that have been employed? Consequently, which conclusions can be drawn concerning the speakers' individual rhetorical strategies?

As a result, the analysis will render insights into whether there is a difference between the speakers' used rhetorical devices and to what extent their ideological positions are expressed in contrasting ways. Moreover, the analysis will show whether the outcome confirms or opposes the strict father or nurturant parent model of conservative and liberal language proposed by Lakoff (1996).

The first and theoretical part of this thesis will define political rhetoric and, thereby, establish a connection between politics and language. In this chapter (chapter 2), the characteristics of political terminology are going to be related to their cultural and historical context. Further, the categorisation of political discourse into various concepts will be illustrated according to ideological viewpoints.

The following and third chapter focuses more specifically on political speeches. A brief introductory part will regard political speeches from their origins in classical rhetoric to the wide-reaching mass events as they are perceived today. This will also explain why language and eloquence has become partly overshadowed by paralinguistic

features and the overall representation by the media. Hence, the purpose of this thesis is also to draw the audience's attention towards this problematic and to observe political speeches and the orators' claims from a critical viewpoint despite what is being stated in the news. In addition to political speeches overall, this chapter will describe the distinct types of speeches and how they differ. This will also give reasons why certain speeches were chosen for this analysis. Moreover, another essential part of political speeches and persuasive rhetoric in general, namely the three Aristotelian persuasive modes ethos, logos, and pathos, which will be explained in relation to Clinton and Trump's speeches.

In the next and fourth chapter, critical discourse analysis will be closely examined. Special consideration will be devoted to the approach by Charteris-Black (2014), which will also provide the foundation for the analysis of Clinton and Trump's speeches. However, also other principal stances to critical discourse analysis will be investigated, which will offer answers to the question why a certain approach was pursued in my analysis. These methodologies include the political, the discourse historical, the cognitive, the pragmatic, and the critical metaphor analysis approach. Additionally, benefits and drawbacks to CDA and its diverse notions will be clarified. In this sense, I will also explain how different ideologies should be dealt with by focussing on the aforementioned strict-father and nurturant parent model by Lakoff (1996).

The final and fifth chapter of the theoretical part is devoted to rhetorical devices. Hence, rhetorical figures will be defined according to classical rhetoric. The most important figures with regard to the speeches to be analysed will be further elaborated on, which comprises three-part list, antithesis, simile, hyperbole, repetition, metonymy, and metaphor. Undoubtedly, the most thorough scrutiny will focus on metaphor encompassing its functions, subtypes and categorisation by means of conceptual metaphor theory by Lakoff & Johnson (1980). Apart from rhetorical figures and predominantly metaphor, another essential component in analysing political discourse is pronouns. I will demonstrate why pronouns play a significant part particularly in the English language system and explain how they are used to refer to the speakers themselves, to create contrast, or to allude to someone else. Thereby, advantages and disadvantages of singular and plural and distinct cases of pronouns will be shown.

Concerning the second and empirical part, the aforementioned rhetorical devices will be analysed via critical discourse analysis following Charteris-Black's approach (2014), which was already referred to before. Thereby, frequency and contextual occurrence of all of these devices are going to be determined.

Chapter 6.1. will provide overall insights regarding speech circumstances, more precisely, situational, cognitive, and process circumstances. I will explain why exactly these six speeches by Clinton and Trump were chosen and present corresponding facts and figures (such as length, lexical density, location, audience, and purpose) of each oratory. In the next step (chapter 6.2.), I will showcase all selected rhetorical figures in a collective table. Presumably arising questions such as how the devices were identified and, subsequently, investigated will be answered. After that, the following section (6.2.2.) is completely devoted to the quantitative and qualitative analysis and interpretation of all individual figures of speech: three-part list, antithesis, simile, hyperbole, repetition, metonymy, and metaphor. Lastly, pronominal analysis (also with regard to frequency and context) is conducted in part 6.2.3.

The final chapter (6.3.) comprises an overall discussion of the findings of rhetorical figure and pronominal analysis, which summarises the most important conclusions altogether. Aspects of liberal and conservative language will be collectively compared with regard to Clinton and Trump's rhetorical devices. Furthermore, I will exemplify to what extent differences between the three speech types could be observed in terms of the calculated frequencies and contextual results. As a result, all initially raised questions are going to be answered respecting who might be the better and more skilful orator and by which rhetorical devices and their instances can these claims be solidly supported. Eventually, the concluding part indicates which areas exceeded the dimension of this thesis and, consequently, offer themselves for further analysis.

2. Political rhetoric

According to Aristotle (384-322 BC), classical rhetoric can be defined as an art, whereas Plato regarded rhetoric as deliberate and often deceptive manipulation of the audience (Beard 2000: 35). In ancient Greece, rhetoric was classified as the study of persuasive communication, which included oral and written discourse. Hence, the most persuasive speech was equated with the most successful speech (Charteris-Black 2014: XV). Nowadays, rhetoric is a mostly negatively connoted term, which British National Corpus studies have shown. For instance, rhetoric is contrasted with reality and collocates with expressions such as "simplistic" "empty" "political", and even "radical" (Davies 2004).

The link between classical rhetoric and political discourse is according to the English writer George Orwell extremely close: he states that "all issues are political issues." (Orwell 1946, 1949). Orwell was the first author in the English-speaking world that addressed political terminology (Wodak & Koller 2008: 225). He further claims that "politics itself is a mass of lies, evasions, folly, hatred and schizophrenia" according to the predominantly negative perception of rhetoric in general these days (Orwell 1946).

Until a recent paradigm shift in political studies, political terminology was solely inferred from history by focussing on frequently occurring terms such as "citizen" and "state" (Wodak & Koller 2008: 225). Yet, there is still no clear doctrine of political terminology these days. Notwithstanding that, a clear distinction between political discourse and political terminology needs to be drawn: although political discourse does contain political terminology, the terms may not be equated with each other. Hence, political discourse is the language used in the field of politics, which incorporates persuasive rhetoric that typically appeals to the audience's emotions (pathos) (Wodak & Koller 2008: 226).

Many linguists referred to political terminology in terms of "essentially contested concepts" (Wodak & Koller 2008: 227). This theory was refuted by the political scientist Gallie, who asserts that political concepts can be argued endlessly by valid arguments into different directions (Gallie 1956: 169). Further, concepts are always influenced by cultural and historical conditions and will never remain constant over time (Wodak & Koller 2008: 229). Consequently, new metaphors such as 9/11 after the terrorist attack on the 11th of September 2001 are being continually created and function as an essential part in the development and enhancement of political discourse (Wodak & Koller 2008: 235). Therefore, George Lakoff's concept of the "frame" is more reliable, which consists

of socially constructed concepts by the media, political leaders, social and political movements, and further actors and institutions depending on the corresponding ideology (2002, 2004). In the United States, political discourse of the Democrats is framed by the "nurturant parent" model, whereas the Republicans' discourse is framed by the "strict father" model. Hence, the democrats' concept of the nation is framed by "the nation is a family" metaphor with a nurturing and sensitive parent, whereas the republicans' concept calls for an authoritarian and disciplinary parent (Lakoff 2004: 2-4, 24-26). The "nurturant parent" and the "strict father" model will be further elaborated on in chapter 4.7.2.

Finally, in can be concluded that the link between the political domain and linguistics is extremely close. In spite of that, there is no clear definition of political terminology. This results from the fact that although the interest in analysing political discourse increased in recent decades it is still relatively scarce. However, there is no doubt that political terminology varies according to social and historical conditions and that metaphorical concepts are framed by the different ideologies' views. Hence, it becomes clear that metaphor is an outstanding element in political discourse.

3. Political speeches

After regarding political rhetoric as a whole, it is indispensable to go into further detail and examine political speeches and their subtypes. My analysis consists of six speeches from three completely different contexts (considering characteristics such as purpose, register, and audience), which is why this chapter will provide relevant insights concerning for which reason these exact speeches were chosen and to what extent they might differ. However, before going into further detail, it is imperative to gain an overview of political speeches overall.

3.1. Definition and historical development

A speech can be defined as "structured verbal chain of coherent speech acts uttered on a special social occasion for a specific purpose by a single person, and addressed to a more or less specific audience" (Schmitz 2005: 698). Apart from linguistic distinctions and paralinguistic cues, speeches in general differ in terms of speaker, audience, time, place, topic, function, and degree of preparedness.

Due to the fact that politicians have to hold up to or even more than 150 speeches per year, their speeches are rarely delivered spontaneously: especially political speeches in the United States have become momentous events of popular culture (Kammerer 1995: 20; Schwarze & Walther 2002: 34). Therefore, deviations from pre-written transcripts by whole teams of writers including spin-doctors, ghostwriters, and political advisers are extremely uncommon (Wodak & Koller 2008: 243-252). Naturally, this is also the case with the speeches analysed.

Concerning historical development, speeches have become increasingly important due to their vast distribution via the media. This has also lead to the so-called problem of multiple addressing since politicians now need to address several and often unequal publics at the same time (Kühn 1992, 1995). Consequently, politicians employ the principle of calculated ambivalence to conceal contradicting arguments by utilising for instance ambivalent formulations, paraphrases, and euphemisms (Klein 1996). Of course, this issue also shows in pronominal usage; to address the audience more directly, politicians employ preferably plural forms (without the need of having to specify who is exactly being addressed).

Besides (and also triggered by) the matter of multiple addressing, there has been a shift towards a simpler and more colloquial style during the last decades to facilitate understanding. This renders it less problematic for less educated or more divergent listeners to follow political discourse and makes is more accessible to everyone (Herget 2005: 762-763).

In general, success of a speech is not solely determined by rhetorical eloquence anymore; expertise with the new media can actually compensate for lacking oral competence (Jochum 1999: 144-145). However, the focus of this analysis is on rhetorical devices used by the top candidates regardless of further elements that come into play.

3.2. Types of political speeches

In classical rhetoric, three types of speeches can be identified, namely judicial, deliberative (Schild 1992) and epideictic speeches (Plett 2001: 17-18) (cf. Table 1). Since the judicial genre is not relevant for this thesis, it will not be discussed any further. However, the first two speeches to be analysed (C1, T1) can be categorised as deliberative oratories since the candidates decide to accept their nominations for presidency. In contrast, C2 & T2 as much as C3 & T3 are typical epideictic oratories: in C2 and T2 the candidates react to the shooing in Orlando by remembering the victims of the attack – therefore, these speeches can be classified as commemorative speeches. The last speeches to be analysed (C3 and T3) are classical occasion-specific dinner speeches.

	Judicial genre	Deliberative genre	Epideictic genre
Topic	Justice/injustice	Expediency/harmfulness	Honour/disgrace; worthiness; reprehensibility
Function	Accusation/defence	Exhorting/dissuading	Praise/blame
Aim	(Court) decision	Decision	Contemplation
Place	Court	Parliament; people's/citizens' assembly	Public gathering
Time	Past	Future	Mostly present
Sample speeches	Judicial orations, satires, …	Political speeches (debates),	Laudatory speeches, occasion-specific speeches,

		promotional speeches, ...	opening/closing speeches, commemorative speeches, blaming speeches, victory speeches, funeral orations, ceremonial addresses, ...

Table 1. Three genres of oratory in classical rhetoric

Although the original classification is still used today, new and more complex forms of sub-types emerged. Subgenres of political speeches are numerous and are typically arranged according to the field of action, as can be inferred from Table 2, which represents a selection of sub-genres of relevance for the speeches to be analysed. These fields of actions incorporate law-making procedures, formation of public attitudes, party-internal formation of attitudes, inter-party formation of attitudes, organisation of internal/inter-state relations, political advertising, political executive and administration, and political control (Reisigl 2010: 248).

Field of action	Formation of public attitudes	Party-internal formation of attitudes	Inter-party formation of attitudes	Political advertising	Political control	Organisation of international/inter-state relations
Subgenres of political speeches	Presidential speech, state of union address, commemorative speech, ceremonial speech, election speech, ...	Speech at a party convention, opening/closing speech, farewell-speech, ...	Speech at an inter-party/government meeting, inaugural speech, commemorative speech, ...	Election speech, commemorative speech, state of union address, ...	Speech of protest, commemorative speech, election speech, ...	Commemorative speech, war speech, peace speech, laudatory speech, speech on the occasion of a state visit, ...

Table 2. Sub-genres of political speeches

As can already be concluded from Table 2, an explicit systematisation into sub-categories is due to the rich variety of genres not possible. Consequently, the speeches that are going to be analysed need to be arranged via cross-typifying (Reisigl 2010: 249).

Thus, the nomination acceptance speeches (C1 & T1) can also be designated as election speeches within the field of political advertising as much as the formation of public attitudes and political control. This speech is in contrast to the other speeches the most-dissent oriented, loaded with emotions and harshness since the speakers' goal is to defeat the opponent (Panagl & Kriechbaumer 2002; Efing 2005; Reisigl 2010: 253). The reaction speeches or commemorative speeches (C2 & T2) belong to the fields formation of public attitudes, organisation of international/inter-state relations, political advertising, and political control. This type of oratory is rather consent-oriented and very formal, containing several tropes, flag words and high-value words, whereas the speakers intend to leave the impression of speaking freely (Klein 2000: 752; Reisigl 2010: 253). The occasion-specific charity dinner-speeches (C3 & T3) can be arranged in the fields of formation of public attitudes, formation of inter-party formation of attitudes, and organisation of international/inter-state relations. This speech-type is also consent-oriented and the least formal of the speeches that will be analysed due to the more private atmosphere with the clergy and few political representatives.

Although the preceding classification might seem immensely detailed, it is crucial with regard to the empirical part of this thesis. Hence, the analysis will show if there are notable differences between the three speech types in terms of rhetorical devices and whether these differences correspond to the usual characteristics of the respective types.

3.3. Modes of persuasion

After regarding political speeches overall and their subtypes, the point has come to justify what makes a speech successful and persuasive. Actually, there are substantial elements, which crucially determine the impact of all categories of (political) speeches. These elements are summarised as so-called modes of persuasion that are also named rhetorical appeals or artistic proofs. According to Aristotle, these modes that are being created through oratory are ethos (character), logos (reason), and pathos (emotion). Nowadays, Aristotle's classification is still acknowledged and an influential part of persuasive language analysis (Charteris-Black 2014: 8).

3.3.1. Ethos

Ethos is the first of the artistic proofs according to the Aristotelian arrangement. The speaker's goal by applying ethos is to convince the audience of his or her strength of character in order to inspire trustworthiness and reliability. At the same time, the speaker can employ ethos to raise awareness of possible manipulation of the audience by the opponents. With regard to politics, this is a highly popular and useful measure in order to gain the voters' approval.

This has been no different during the election campaign 2016 and concerning the selected speeches by the top candidates. For instance, Trump repeatedly called Clinton "crooked Hillary" in relation to her controversial e-Mail correspondence in the past to foster an image of doubt and untrustworthiness in relation to Clinton. On the other hand, Clinton blamed her opponent for exploiting his powerful position in business by negotiating controversial deals that present Trump in an abusive and reckless position, which is illustrated in the following example:

1) But then — but then I also imagine people are thinking there, but Trump, he's a businessman. He must know something about the economy. Well, let's take a closer look, shall we? In Atlantic City, 60 miles from here, you will find contractors and small businesses who lost everything because Donald Trump refused to pay his bills (C1 297-300).

3.3.2. Logos

Logos is the second of the artistic proofs and corresponding to Aristotle's theory the only indispensable stage in a speech since it proofs that the speaker's arguments are based on valid reason. The most effective method to create logos is via syllogisms, which consist of a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion. In order for a conclusion to be accepted, the audience necessarily needs to advocate major and minor premise. (Charteris-Black 2014: 11).

As it is such a fundamental aspect in persuasive rhetoric, logos repeatedly showed in the candidates' speeches. This also applies to the example from Trump's Reaction Speech (T2) given below:

Major premise:

2) The killer, whose name I will not use, or ever say, was born in Afghanistan, of Afghan parents, who immigrated to the United States. [...] The bottom line is that the only reason the killer was in America in the first place, was because we allowed his family to come here (T2 35-41).

Minor premise:

3) We need to respond to this attack on America as one united people, with force, purpose, and determination. [...] If we don't get tough, and if we don't get smart, and fast, we're not going to have our country anymore. There will be nothing, absolutely nothing, left. [...] With 50 people dead and perhaps more ultimately and dozens more wounded, we cannot afford to talk around issues anymore. We have to address these issues head-on. I called for a ban after San Bernardino and was met with great scorn and anger but now many years and I have to say many years but many are saying that I was right to do so. And although the pause is temporary we must find out what is going on. We have to do it (T2 30-56).

Conclusion:

4) When I'm elected I will suspend immigration from areas of the world where there's a proven history of terrorism against the United States, Europe or our allies until we fully understand how to end these threats (T2 64-67).

Hence, only in case the audience agrees that it was a mistake to let the terrorist of the Orlando Shooting and his family immigrate into the United States and believes that a temporary immigration ban is the right solution, they will support Trump's decision.

Another effective argumentation technique is by refuting the opponent's arguments, which is also extensively implemented by both top candidates. In this case, a counter-position is presented, which is subsequently disproved, and, in the following, an alternative position is provided (Charteris-Black 2014: 12-13). This method is further illustrated by an example from Clinton in her nomination acceptance speech (C1). In opposition to Trump, who according to Clinton supports a policy of fear and division, Clinton states the opposite by actively promoting her party slogan "stronger together" as in the following example.

1 Present the counter-position

5) Our country's motto is e pluribus unum: out of many, we are one. Will we stay true to that motto? Well, we heard Donald Trump's answer last week at his convention. He wants to divide us — from the rest of the world, and from each other. [...] He wants us to fear the future and fear each other (C1 49-55).

2 Refute the counter-position

6) Now we are clear-eyed about what our country is up against. But we are not afraid. We will rise to the challenge, just as we always have. [...] We will not build a wall. [...] We will not ban a religion (C1 59-65).

3 Offer an alternative position

7) Instead, we will build an economy where everyone who wants a good job can get one. And we'll build a path to citizenship for millions of immigrants who are already contributing to our economy! [...] We will work with all Americans and our allies to fight and defeat terrorism (C1 61-66).

More precisely, Clinton holds the belief that integrating immigrants and working together towards a common goal is better than Trump's policy of isolation and hatred. Her argumentation is further supported by referring to the country's motto (allusion), which adds a certain degree of sophistication to her point.

3.3.3. Pathos

The third and final of the artistic proofs is also the most controversial one. Aristotle referred to the power of emotions that were either based on pleasure (for instance joy, happiness, or love) or pain (such as hatred, fear, and irritation). He further believed that emotions have an object and a ground and are, therefore, directed towards an entity. For example, especially in the aftermath of the international banking crisis in 2008, people might be belligerent towards banks (the object) for benefitting from other people's savings (the ground) (Fortenbaugh 2007: 117, Charteris-Black 2014: 14).

However, in classical rhetoric it was a highly debated issue whether pathos could be an acceptable source of argumentation; rhetoricians like Plato asserted that emotions would negatively impact judgement. Nonetheless, the Aristotelian view prevailed in time due to the fact that reason and emotion reciprocally influence each other (Charteris-Black 2014: 14-15).

Appealing to pathos is also a recurring strategy in the election campaigns of both presidential candidates, which can also be concluded from the examples below. Specifically within the reaction/commemorative speeches, Trump and Clinton employed countless metaphors, metonymies, repetitions, and other rhetorical devices to address the audience's compassionate feelings for the victims of the attack:

8) On Sunday, Americans woke up to a **nightmare** that's become mind numbingly familiar. Another act of terrorism in a place no one expected. A madman **filled with** hate, with guns in his hands, and just a horrible sense of vengeance and vindictiveness in his **heart**, apparently **consumed by** rage against LGBT Americans, and by extension, the openness and diversity that defines our American way of life (C2 39-43).

9) We cannot continue to allow **thousands upon thousands** of people to **pour into** our country many of whom have the same thought process as this savage killer (T2 74-75).

In the previous chapters, political rhetoric and speeches were defined. Political oratories have become increasingly significant due to the broad distribution by the media; especially in the United States speeches have reached the extent of national events. As a result, rhetorical eloquence is no longer the only crucial issue determining success of a speech anymore. Further, different speech types were introduced; consequently, significant distinctions between the oratories to be analysed could be drawn. Another essential element of speeches are the three Aristotelian artistic poofs or modes of persuasion that are consistently employed by Clinton and Trump, which could be inferred from the presented extracts. The modes of persuasion will be recurrently commented on during the course of the analysis.

4. Critical discourse analysis

After surveying political rhetoric and speeches in depth, the question arises how political oratories can be analysed. In my thesis, I will employ critical discourse analysis for it is the most suitable methodology in accordance with my research questions.

4.1. Definition of CDA

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a concept developed in the early 1990s by scholars such as Van Dijk (Discourse and Society 1990), Norman Fairclough (Language and Power 1989), and Ruth Wodak (Language, Power, and Ideology 1989). Rather than an overarching fixed set of guidelines, CDA consists of separate but still interrelated approaches corresponding to the prevailing research area. Therefore, CDA is rather viewed as flexible school or methodology that varies in consonance with the research question (Oberhuber 2008: 274; Meyer 2001: 18). In its basic form, Fairclough and Wodak describe discourse as "social practice" that is "socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned" (1997: 258). They further claim that the connection between discourse and society is reciprocal; consequently, discourse is perceived as reproduction of society and vice-versa. Therefore, knowledge across different disciplines is necessary in order to conduct critical discourse analysis (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999).

4.2. Language & power

Critical discourse analysts further argue that discourse directly affects social hierarchies since power and knowledge are interrelated terms. More specifically, the choice of certain rhetorical devices results in power difference (Kress 1992: 89). As a result, higher social strata might abuse this power and enforce their will upon lower social classes to their advantage. Thereby, van Dijk differentiates between legitimate and illegitimate exertions of power (2008a: 9). He asserts that legitimate exertions trigger positive mental consequences, whereas illegitimate exertions result in negative mental consequences that generate preconceptions, stereotypes, and treachery. However, it is extremely challenging for researchers to decide which statement should be regarded as legitimate or illegitimate; moreover, this always depends on the respective viewpoint. Particularly politicians who address miscellaneous audiences change their voices accordingly (Charteris-Black 2014: 84-85). Therefore, this thesis also aims at raising awareness of the wide range of voices that each individual speaker possesses. This will

become more visible by comparing rhetorical device usage in three distinct speech types in the empirical part.

4.3. Conducting CDA

As already mentioned, CDA always needs to be related to the context of the corresponding speech or text. According to Charteris-Black, CDA is based on three consecutive steps, namely the analysis of speech circumstances, the identification and analysis of features, and the interpretation and explanation (2014: 86-87). Each of these stages can be further subdivided into sub-stages. As they will serve as foundation for the empirical part of this thesis, the three phases will be further explained in the following:

4.3.1. Step 1: Analysis of speech circumstances

The first level of analysis comprises situational, cognitive, and process circumstances:

4.3.1.1. Situational circumstances

Situational circumstances refer to the setting in which a speech is given or a text is written, more concretely, the speaker or writer, the audience, the location, the time, and the motivation for holding a speech or devising a text. In my case, I am writing this paragraph on a sizzling morning in June in order to complete my studies in time.

4.3.1.2. Cognitive circumstances

Cognitive circumstances are also dealt with as background knowledge of speaker or writer on the one hand and audience or readership on the other hand. The interaction of both groups' beliefs and assumptions results the choice of certain rhetorical devices. For instance, a right-wing speaker will be anticipated to hold certain views towards immigration, whereas the speaker on the other side can expect the audience to most probably consist of far-right listeners that will welcome his or her stance. However, it needs to be pointed out that the audience or readers encompass people with a varying extent of background knowledge or so-called voices. In consequence, each individual will interpret a speech or text in a different way.

4.3.1.3. Process circumstances

Process circumstances are composed of the relationship between speaker and speechwriter (or author and possible ghost-writer/co-author) and speaker/writer and

the audience. However, the first information is rather difficult to obtain although speechwriters are gaining popularity in their own right. The second information concerns typical social conventions such as whether cheering or booing is allowed or requested in a certain context. This also affects rhetorical choices or denominated claptrap, which is according to Peter Bull a technique to gain the audience's approval and invite applause (Bull 2016: 473 pp., Charteris-Black 2014: 86-89).

4.3.2. Step 2: Identification and analysis of features

The second step is further separated into two categories, i.e. the analysis of linguistic features and paralinguistic features. Although it has been argued that paralinguistic features are even more decisive concerning the success of a speech, the focus of this analysis lies on linguistic features, more specifically, lexis, syntax, and stylistic features permeating the whole speech. Concerning lexis, smaller units are examined regarding their positive or negative connotations, or compared according to semantic fields and degree of formality. With syntax and overall stylistic features, lexical density, agency (passivity or activity), or modality (to what extent a speaker employs a certain degree of confidence) can be evaluated. With regard to paralinguistic features, body language, voice, overall appearance such as clothing and hairstyle and performance including the use of pre-written notes and audio-visual aids come into play. Specifically in times of social media and within the political domain, which is conforming to Charteris-Black's claims a theatrical area, these elements might not be underestimated because politicians embody a certain role or part to convince the audience (2014: 89-91).

Although it would have been interesting to elaborate on widely-discussed elements such as Trump's famous red power-tie, his rigid hand-gestures and mostly shouting speaking voice and Hillary Clinton's characteristic pantsuits and contrastingly moderate or even cautious gestures and intonation as well, these features lie beyond the scope of this thesis and are therefore only marginally addressed.

4.3.3. Step 3: Interpretation and explanation

The last step of CDA comprises interpretation and explanation depending on the interaction between speaker (writer) and speechwriter (ghost-writer/co-author) on the one hand, and the interaction between speaker (writer) and the audience (readership) on the other hand. Van Dijk uses the concept of "social cognition" to establish a connection between oratory and resulting social reception (2008a). Another scholar

who contributed to CD methodology was Norman Fairclough, who introduced the notion of "recontextualisation" that was originally based on Bernstein (1990). In this sense, texts of different areas of research and scales are compared to relate prevalent elements to new contexts. Although diverse "rhetorical structures" are being reviewed, the external sources or texts never fully predominate over the main text or speech (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). For instance, in my analysis speeches from pubic (C1/T2 and C2/T2) and semi-public fields (C3/T3) were chosen; therefore, it is possible to draw conclusions concerning discourse by divergent audiences.

Fairclough further claims that language crucially impacts our individual perceptions and ideologies of the world. Therefore, researchers need to investigate which features are utilised and which are the most prominent, if they are ordered chronologically, and whether they are rather abstract or natural. Still, it has to be stressed once more that these perspectives and attitudes always depend on the individual viewpoint and are not universal (2003: 139).

4.4. Fairclough's notion of establishment, dissemination, and implementation

Another, earlier means of categorisation is the equally three-step model by Norman Fairclough in the 1990s, which was later altered by Charteris-Black (2011, 2014) as described in the preceding chapter. In his theory, Fairclough discriminated establishment and articulation, dissemination, and implementation of discourse, which will be remarked on in the following:

4.4.1. Step 1: Establishment & articulation

A new type of discourse always incorporates elements of already existing discourses. Only through so-called "semantic wars", certain discourses can prevail and gain acknowledgement and praise within a specific research area.

4.4.2. Step 2: Dissemination

This process refers to the Faircloughian "recontextualisation" that was already addressed before. Across various contexts and fields, discourse can be interpreted in a different manner. Dissemination is a necessary precondition for implementation, whereas implementation stimulates dissemination.

Possible research questions concerning discourse and social level resulting from dissemination could be: Which rhetorical devices such as metaphors, key terms, and

arguments are frequently used? How is discourse transmitted across different audiences and contexts? To what extent is meaning imparted within different research areas? How are discourses in general incorporated within distinct fields? Who/which speaker advocates a certain type of oratory and for which reasons? Which values and functions are thereby transferred? Which processes of dissemination are applied (is it a formal or a less formal environment)?

4.4.3. Step 3: Implementation

The final process of implementation is also the most challenging to be interpreted. It shows that discourses change due to the context and, thereby, create linguistic and non-linguistic realities that interact with each other. Rather than studying discourse comparing external discourses with each other such as within the process dissemination, implementation focuses on interpreting discourse from the perspective of an "inside" group. In this sense, Fairclough coins the expression "genres", i.e. the methodology of "(inter) acting semiotically" like reports, policy theses, and further forms (2005: 58). Thus, implementation is designated as "complex set of network relationship between genres" in which genres represent "filtering devices [...] selectively including or excluding discourses in the shift from one genre to another" (2005: 59-65). Consequently, particular genres dominate over others. According to Klein, the following five speech categories should receive explicit attention and, thereby, overshadow other genres of political oratories: the election speech (C1/T1), the commemorative speech (C2/T2), the inaugural speech, the debate speech, and the TV address (2000: 748-752). Possible research questions arising from the implementation stage regarding manners of consideration and talk and organisation of actions might be: What are the normative and cultural values that are being transmitted through discourse? Which social issues are communicated? How are these issues presented in order to promote change? How are social guidelines established through rhetorical devices in order to create reliable models for social demeanour? How are genres generated and differentiated? How are political measures impacted by discourse and vice-versa?

On a concluding note, there is no concrete, overall scheme on how the Faircloughian theory needs to be employed. Comparable to CDA in general, methodology depends on the particular linguistic case and needs to be adapted correspondingly. According to

Panagl and Wodak, as a linguist it is not sufficient to confine oneself to the political field since discourses are always related to their social context (2004).

4.5. Evaluating the outcome

As can already be inferred from the previous chapters, interpreting speeches or texts is not a simple task and scientists have to be critical and cautious to remain within the frame of objectivity. Although it is individually constructed to what extent a speech might be persuasive, Charteris-Black defined five different categories that contribute to the persuasive impact of an oratory and facilitate the analysis. These categories are: the three Aristotelian artistic proofs ethos ("having the right intentions"), logos ("thinking right"), and pathos ("sounding right") representing the first three sections, overall appearance ("looking right") and mental schemata ("telling the right story") (2011: 14). The degree of persuasiveness can be immediately estimated via audience reaction (cheering and booing, heckling, loudness of applause, presence and number of participants overall). In the aftermath, responses by the media or straw polls contribute to drawing conclusions concerning persuasiveness of a speech (Charteris-Black 2014: 95-97). However, all of these repercussions need to be taken into account from a critical position.

4.6. Different approaches to CDA

The following approaches to critical discourse analysis will be discussed: the political discourse analysis approach, the discourse historical approach, the cognitive approach, and the pragmatic approach.

4.6.1. Political discourse analysis

The interest in political discourse analysis (PDA) has been increasing within the last decades. In PDA, concepts of CDA have been modified and adapted to the political domain. New sub-genres were formulated such as critical metaphor analysis (CMA) based on Lakoff and Johnson's cognitive metaphor theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Schön 1979, Schäffner & Wenden 1995). The three major approaches to PDA will be discussed in detail, namely: Chilton's cognitive approach to PDA (2004), Wodak's discourse historical approach (DHA, 2009a, 2009b, Wodak & de Cillia 2006), and Fairclough's more pragmatic approach of practical reasoning towards PDA (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012).

Before elaborating on distinct approaches of PDA, the questions arises how political discourse can be defined. According to van Dijk, political discourse is largely determined by political actors engaging in political processes; i.e. sequences of political actions like legislation, policies, and governing. Correspondingly, also other fields such as legal, educational, and medical discourse are categorised (van Dijk 1998b: 11 pp.)

Although the vast majority of analysed discourses so far is indeed conceived by politicians and political institutions, also recipients of political discourse and others involved within the process (the audience overall, demonstrators, citizens, voters, pressure and issue groups) need to be included. As a consequence, all participants of political processes have to be taken into account. Another crucial issue is that these participants also need to act as political actors in terms of ruling, dissenting, protesting, etc.; otherwise, discourse cannot be classified as veritable political discourse. Although this might be a relatively straightforward technique concerning professional politicians, also discourse by other people in influential positions including managers, lawyers, doctors, or educators can at times be described as political discourse. In case of controversies, further domains of politics need to be consulted: societal field, political values and systems, political institutions and organisations, political relations and groups, political ideologies and cognition might render conclusions concerning classification of political discourse or non-political discourse (cf. van Dijk 1998b: 16-18). There is no doubt that all six political speeches of my analysis are part of political discourse, as can be deduced from Table 3. The table shows an application of van Dijk's political domains on the speeches that are going to be examined.

Speech	C1/T1	C2/T2	C3/T3
Occasion	Nomination Acceptance Speech	Reaction Speech Orlando Shooting	Al Smith charity dinner speech
Domain	Politics	Politics	Politics
System	Federal republic	Federal republic	Federal republic
Institution	The State	The State	The State
Values & ideologies	Nurturant parent/strict father-model	Nurturant parent/strict father-model	Nurturant parent/strict father-model
Organisations	Candidates' campaigns	Candidates' campaigns	Candidates' campaigns
Political actors/participants	Presidential candidates (actively), Democratic/Republic	Presidential candidates (actively), democratic/republican	Presidential candidates (actively),

	an National Convention (passively)	supporters (passively)	members of the clergy, high-ranking politicians of both parties (passively)
Political relations	Power	Power, abuse of power, freedom	Power, freedom
Political action	Campaigning, accepting nomination	Campaigning, informing/consoling/appealing to the public concerning the attack	Campaigning, annual meeting with the clergy
Political cognitions	Attitudes about immigration, environmental issues, inequality, economy, education, women's rights, (children's) health insurance, nuclear energy, intelligence services, gun laws, …	Attitudes about immigration and foreign policy, terrorism, economy, equal rights for everyone, war, gun laws, …	Attitudes about the media, presidency, religion, climate change, education, …

Table 3. Van Dijk's political domains

Hence, political participants and further areas impacting political process prove that the speeches can be perceived as political discourse (which is anyways a given fact in political speeches).

Van Dijk further argues that political discourse analysis needs to be conducted from a chiefly critical point of view in order to yield reliable results on power relations in political science. He further claims that it is absolutely essential to focus on certain content points to answer concrete research questions (1997b: 38).

In the following, four prevalent approaches of political discourse analysis will be characterised, namely the discourse historical, the cognitive, the pragmatic, and the critical metaphor analysis approach.

4.6.2. The discourse historical approach by Wodak (2009)

The discourse historical approach (DHA) will only be referred to briefly since it will only be marginally incorporated in the analysis. DHA unites sociology, linguistics, and political science and history. Wodak states that the DHA

> attempts to integrate a large quantity of available knowledge about historical sources and background of the social and political fields in which discursive

21

> ‘events’ are embedded [...] it analyses the historical dimension of discursive actions by exploring the ways in which particular genres of discourses are subject to diachronic change [...] we integrate social theories to be able to explain the so-called context (Wodak & Meyer 2001: 65).

Since linguists require far-reaching historical, social, and political background knowledge to be able to conduct DHA, it is an extremely challenging approach. However, it is possible to establish connections of different fields that would not be possible otherwise. It would also be interesting to investigate discursive strategies of Clinton and Trump in this analysis via the concept of "topoi" or arguments. The following five basic research questions – which are also relevant concerning this analysis - specifically with regard to discrimination, i.e. a prevalent topic in DHA: How are people referred to in terms of nomination? From which point of view are these perceptions expressed? Which characteristics are attributed to these people? Are these assertions demonstrated via intensification or mitigation? Are the previous claims justified/based on valid arguments? These questions will be answered by pronoun analysis and word choice with regard to discriminatory terms since a thorough DHA would go far beyond the scope of this thesis.

Besides discrimination, it also seems reasonable to have a look at right-wing rhetoric (Reisigl & Wodak 2001). Common characteristics of right discourse would be fallacious generalisations, appealing to sentiments/pathos rather than reason/logos (*argumentum ad populum*), fiercely attacking the opponent (*argumentum ad hominem*), and "threatening with the stick" or trying to spread fear and intimidate (*argumentum ad baculum).* In addition, the empirical part will also refer to conservative and liberal rhetoric in general (cf. chapter 4.7.2). Moreover, right-wing rhetoric is commonly expressed by metaphors, similes, and hyperboles.

Although DHA is a widely acclaimed approach, it does have certain limitations. First and foremost, the perspectives of the authors of discourse are completely left out and not consulted about their intentions (Widdowson 1998: 143). Further, DHA focuses on separate assertions such as 'discourse is discriminatory' and aims at providing proof for these hypotheses instead of encompassing discourse as a whole. In addition to that, the investigation of arguments with the Aristotelian topos-scheme (i.e. place, location), which is comparable to rhetorical syllogism (cf. chapter 3.3.2.) is rather abstract and focuses on form rather than meaning.

4.6.3. The cognitive or evolutionary approach by Chilton (2004)

This approach combines cognitive science, cognitive linguistics, and politics. Rather than seeing PDA as a predominantly argumentative task as Fairclough & Fairclough suggest (2012), Chilton stresses the decisiveness of representations of reality. This is interesting with regard to metaphor analysis; for instance, concerning which roles are assigned to opponents or the inside group, or how other political relationships are represented. Chilton promotes a dominant approach in political science, namely cooperation and conflict. He claims that, on the one hand, politics is a struggle for power, and on the other hand, cooperation is necessary to reconcile different interests.

The cognitive approach has been criticised by Fairclough & Fairclough, who argue that – even though the principle of conflict and cooperation might be intriguing – there are differences that cannot be reconciled (2012: 21). They also promote a more pragmatic approach of PDA, which will be demonstrated in the next chapter.

4.6.4. The pragmatic approach by Fairclough & Fairclough (2012)

As already mentioned, Fairclough & Fairclough perceive argumentation schemes as the core of PDA. In contrast to Chilton, they see representations such as metaphors and other figures as crucial means to strengthen an argument; however, they may be integrated in the line of argumentation if necessary and do not play a major part in discourse (2012: 21). According to the authors, the most protruding issues in political discourse are deliberation, action, and decision. All these concepts are achieved by valid argumentation, which is analysed via Fairclough & Fairclough's method of practical reasoning. The most basic form of practical reasoning is managed through syllogism (cf. chapter 3.3.2.).

Since the pragmatic approach by Fairclough & Fairclough (2012) was later modified by Charteris-Black (2014), this approach will not be further outlined.

4.6.5. Critical metaphor analysis

Critical metaphor analysis (CMA) was first mentioned by Charteris-Black (2014), who bases his approach on the ordinary critical discourse analysis by Fairclough (1995): in the first step, metaphors are identified and described, and in the second step, the identified metaphors are interpreted and explained (Charteris-Black 2014: 162). The following research questions can be answered: Which political issues are referred to by

metaphors? How and for which reason are they used? Which further figures are used in conjunction with metaphor?

Since Charteris-Black's approach (2014) is overall the most suitable methodology for this thesis, CMA will also play a major role in the empirical part.

4.7. Critique of CDA

Although CDA offers a wide range of possibilities to analyse discourse critically and precisely according to the research question, there are some general remarks of critique. Two negative points concerning CDA are how audience manipulation is dealt with on the one hand and how the influence of distinct ideologies is represented on the other hand:

4.7.1. Audience manipulation

As already mentioned before, particularly politicians aim at conveying sincerity and trustworthiness in terms of ethos 'character'. Therefore, deliberate manipulation and deception of the audience is according to Van Eemeren an option to evaluate discourse negatively. He claims that

> manipulation in discourse boils down to intentionally deceiving one's addressees by persuading them of something that is foremost in one's own interest through covert use of communicative devices that are not in agreement with generally acknowledged critical standards of reasonableness (2005: xii).

However, it is nearly impossible to determine whether a deception has occurred intentionally or unintentionally. Even if the speaker or writer is being asked concerning his or her original intentions, he might not speak the truth. This issue might be confronted with Habermas's principle of normative critique, which adheres to the so-called "truthfulness" criterion. It basically states that in case that a claim is valid or true, it can be defended if necessary (1984: 38).

Regarding the analysis of Clinton and Trump's selected speeches, audience manipulation has also been widely discussed by the media. Despite that, it is not the purpose of this thesis to investigate to what extent the candidates' assertions are irrefutable or not. Rather, I will examine the use of rhetorical devices and indicate how they are deliberately employed to manipulate the audience, regardless of whether their claims are conclusive.

4.7.2. Dealing with distinct ideologies

Ideologies are manifested by the beliefs and interests of certain social groups and how they exert an impact on our daily social lives. These ideologies also explain why particular social groups are more popular and might gain power over other groups in the course of social change. However, it is also possible that ideologies of dominant groups might be accepted by members of contrasting ideologies in terms of finding a solid, common ground. Moreover, not every type of discourse is necessarily ideological; sometimes speakers or writers rather refer to their own norms and values than a specific ideology's claims. Therefore, observations concerning the relations between discourse and ideologies must be exerted with caution. Eventually, the impact of ideologies depends on them being "naturalised", which means accepted as reasonable by the people (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 98 pp.). The following research questions might be raised: Which ideologies can be identified, and which beliefs do they hold in particular? How are these practices manifested in language?

With regard to this analysis, two ideologies can be distinguished in US political discourse: conservative, right wing rhetoric on the one hand, and liberal, left wing rhetoric on the other hand:

4.7.2.1. Conservative vs. liberal rhetoric by Lakoff (1996)

George Lakoff first mentioned his philosophy of the two contrasting US ideologies in *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think* (1996). These ideologies are strongly connected to and broadly expressed by metaphor, more explicitly, 'the nation is a family' concept, which has ruled the American political worldviews. This concept views the citizens as children and the government as the parents; however, two models of the ideal family can be distinguished, i.e. the nurturant parent and the strict father model (which is according to Lakoff the dominant model throughout the last decades).

The nurturant parent morality is expressed by metaphors such as 'morality as empathy', 'morality as social protection', and 'morality as nurturance'. The responsible authority should embody a nurturing function that is able to transmit compassion, knowledge, and acumen. Further, it is seen as imperative to collaborate instead of competing against each other (Lakoff 1996, 2004; Borrero 2009: 52).

The strict father morality is illustrated by metaphors like 'moral authority', 'moral essence', and 'moral strength'. In contrast to the liberal model, here the father possesses the strict moral authority, whereas the "children" or citizens only succeed through self-discipline. Instead of a sense of community, the conservative model promotes a clear division between good and evil: the "good" citizens who are working hard shall be praised and supported, in opposition to the "evil", which must be fiercely combatted. Overall, the strict father model outlines an increasingly pessimistic outlook on life and the world, which is supposedly hazardous and hard (Lakoff 1996, 2004, Borrero 2009: 52).

Both models will be investigated in the empirical part of this thesis regarding the following research questions: do Clinton and Trump's metaphors correspond to the liberal and the conservative model by Lakoff? Which metaphors and further rhetorical devices exemplify these findings?

5. Rhetorical devices in political speeches

As already addressed in previous chapters, rhetorical devices have been a highly debated issue since classical rhetoric until today. In persuasive language in general (which obviously includes the political domain), rhetorical devices represent an indispensable item and add new value and ornamentation to ordinary language. However, the question that remains unanswered is what rhetorical devices actually consist of and how they can be defined. Usually, rhetorical devices are known as rhetorical figures in their classical sense. Yet, also ordinary linguistic items can function as implicit rhetorical devices in broader contexts. With regard to political speeches, overall lexical choice and density, sentence structure and length, pronouns, modality, transitivity, and tenses are some of the most outstanding aspects.

Eventually, it is impossible to investigate all these factors in detail. Further, it could already be concluded from CDA principles (cf. previous chapters) that scientists are urgently required to focus on separate and definite aspects. Hence, I chose the elements that are most relevant concerning my central research questions, namely beyond classical rhetorical figures (metaphor, metonymy, three-part list, antithesis, repetition, simile, personification, and hyperbole) pronominal usage. These will be elaborated in more detail in the next chapters.

5.1. Rhetorical figures

Until today, endeavours to define and categorise have been controversial since there are hundreds of different figures of speech and many ways to organise them. The first time that a collection of rhetorical figures was published was in the first century B.C., namely the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. However, this publication was so specific that there must have been earlier writings about figures that were lost. The mentioned figures were remarkably similar to the ones used today and most of them also had the same designation: metaphor, metonymy, hyperbole, synecdoche, and many others. Yet, the arrangement compared to the one that is used today was quite different: instead of the schemes and tropes that are generally accepted today, there were three different groups (figures of diction, figures of thought, and tropes) and it was often not clear how figures should be arranged according to these groups. Finally, Quintilian was the one who introduced our current system of schemes and tropes (1921). Nowadays, these figures occur across all registers and fields. According to Du Marsais, "il n'y rien de si natural, de

si ordinaire et de si commun que les figures dans le language des hommes" [There is nothing so natural, so ordinary, and so common as figures in human language.] (1977: 8).

But how can rhetorical figures be defined? Pierre Fontanier employs his principle of departure from the norm: he claims that an expression is figured if it can be replaced by a simpler and more understandable term (1977: 10). This view is affirmed by Cicero, who sees rhetorical figures as ornamentation that shall stimulate the audience's emotions and are commonly used in a more elevated register (1988: 377). A more current definition is provided by Brinton and Arnovick, who state that with every figure of speech, there is at least one feature that has changed the original term or object (2006: 82). In this sense, Jeanne Fahnestock identifies another function of rhetorical figures: not only can figures add to the overall appeal, effectiveness, vividness, and beauty of a text, they also contribute new value (1999: 20-21). Therefore, rhetorical devices are used to communicate something that could not be expressed otherwise (Stanley 2007: 7).

Concerning the number of identified rhetorical devices, there is no limit since these numbers are countless (Cicero 1949: 407). Despite that, each figure is being used in a completely unique way for various purposes and within distinct contexts (Stanley 2007: 9). Naturally, the meaning of rhetorical devices changes with the course of time. In the beginning, if a new formulation is introduced, it is known as "established extension" that extends its original meaning. Once such an expression is no longer new and already familiar and accepted by the people, it becomes a "naturalized extension" as part of common language. An example for a naturalised extension would be dead metaphors like "to kick the bucket" or "to fall in love" (Cruse 2000: 201).

5.1. Classifications

Alexander Bain claimed that the following five devices are the most important ones: hyperbole, metaphor, metonymy, simile, and synecdoche. Moreover, he distinguished three different functions of the aforementioned devices, namely to generate a feeling of similarity (via simile and metaphor), to build up contrast or opposition (via antithesis), and to promote acquisition (via metonymy, synecdoche, and hyperbole) (1867: 21).

Another classification by Joseph Devlin affirms Bain's three basic functions of devices. However, besides the five major rhetorical devices by Bain, he considers the following devices as equally important and utilised at the same frequency rate:

personification, allegory, exclamation, apostrophe, vision, antithesis, climax, epigram, interrogation, and irony (2008: 43).

A third classification is provided by E.W. Bullinger, who arranges figures of speech according to their formation and whether they have omitted, added, or transformed an entity of the original wording (2003: 11).

In my analysis, the five major rhetorical devices by Bain and the majority of Devin's most important devices will be examined since these comprise the most relevant figures concerning the research questions. However, before further elaborating on individual rhetorical figures, we should have a closer look at figures and tropes in general:

5.1.1. Schemes

As already mentioned, rhetorical devices can be divided into two groups: schemes and tropes. A scheme, which is derived from Greek *skhēma* 'figure' or 'form', is a rearrangement of the ordinary sentence structure. Classical schemes that will also be part of the analysis of Clinton and Trump's speeches are anaphora, antithesis, alliteration, parallelism, repetition, and three-part list. They contribute to the rhythm, timing, and balance of discourse. For instance, anaphora and epiphora are often used for a so-called calm-to-storm style that was coined by Martin Luther King and Barack Obama. Hence, a speech starts slowly and accelerates through the same phrases at the beginning or ending of a sentence or paragraph to the final climax to generate a stronger and more powerful effect (Charteris-Black 2014: 39 pp.).

5.1.2. Tropes

A trope, which stems from Greek *trepein* 'turn', is a means of "turning away" and changing the original meaning of a lexical item. Popular tropes that also occur in my analysis are metaphor, metonymy, simile, hyperbole, personification, allusion, anecdote, and irony. The major function of tropes is to draw attention towards desired elements (such as the candidates or the own party's own achievements and references) and disguise other, undesirable elements (like the own weaknesses or mistakes of the past). Thereby, positive emotions (hope, pride, solidarity, strength, confidence, honour, decency, trustworthiness) shall be evoked towards oneself, whereas the opponent is presented in a more negative light and shall be associated with negative feelings (such as hate, uncertainty, fear, shame, alienation, scorn). Tropes are typically utilised at high

impact points, which comes down to the beginning/prologue or the ending/epilogue of a speech. For example, Obama is famous for his high density of tropes in his speeches, which usually occur in his epilogues (one of the most memorable parts of a speech). This technique is also used in musical theory, where the coda or final part ought to refer back to the major theme. In linguistics and specifically higher registers, mostly metaphor is employed to create the illusion of a "heroic narrative of nation" and promote a more elevated style (Charteris-Black 2014: 39 pp.).

5.1.3. Combination of schemes and tropes

Schemes as much as tropes contribute to the persuasive effect of discourse: as we have heard before, schemes are analysed on the sentence level; tropes refer to the lexical level. Schemes and tropes are frequently used together – mostly at high impact points - since this triggers an overall more persuasive effect. This technique also evades drawing too much attention towards certain rhetorical figures.

After regarding schemes and tropes overall, it is now time to examine individual rhetorical devices in more detail. In the following, three-part list, antithesis, simile, hyperbole, repetition, metonymy, metaphor, and pronouns will be discussed with regard to their theoretical background.

5.2. Three-part list

The three-part list or triple structure ought to create a sense of unity and completion, especially in Western cultures. It is very popular in persuasive texts considering that it contributes to textual rhythm and conveys a message that is easy to remember. This is due to the fact that it follows a simple pattern: A-B-C. The most basic form of a three-part list is repeating the same term three times. Repetition is also commonly used in music or poetry; in linguistics, it also provides structure and in this sense is used like punctuation (Mooney & Evans 2015: 46-48). Particularly in longer speeches it is necessary to emphasise central points and highlight core values (Beard 2000: 39). Apart from repetition, it is also possible to employ the same sentence structure three times. In that eventuality, this rhetorical figure can be viewed as special case of parallelism.

According to Charteris-Black, the first part of three-part list puts the argument forward, the second part resumes and extends the first part, and the third part is an affirmation of the first parts and an indication that the argument is finished: it is time to

applaud. The number three is no coincidence; particularly in Western cultures is a recurring principle. Not only are three items effortless to retain, there is also the Holy Trinity, the lucky number three, and several three-part quotes ('blood, sweat, and tears') and many other three-part features in societies around the world (Charteris-Black 2005: 6, Jones & Wareing 1999: 44).

Three-part list is a strongly favoured feature in the candidates' speeches, which is why it was treated separate from repetition although it is basically a subcategory of repetition. Hence, it will be discussed accurately in the analytical part.

5.3. Contrastive pair or antithesis

Antithesis is originally derived from the Greek term *antitithenai* 'to oppose'. Contrastive pair is the current designation by Atkinson for what was called antithesis in classical rhetoric; therefore, both terms are valid. This rhetorical device is usually underrated; yet, it is a highly frequent and effective tool in persuasive discourse (Fahnestock 1999: 58). The prime function of antithesis or contrastive pair is to render a statement more powerful and coherent. It represents a semantic relation of contrast or opposition between two or more items, which are arranged via a parallel grammatical structure of words, clauses, or sentences. This combination of contrast and parallelism can be achieved by means of lexical, semantic, syntactical, or phonological repetition. Usually, one part is considered legitimate (often referring to the own party/the speaker him- or herself) and the other part illegitimate (the opposing party/the opponent) (Beard 2000: 39-40).

An often cited antithesis is provided by George W. Bush, who describes the United States and Western societies as civilised in contrast to the Iraq and other Arab countries, which are according to Bush's opinion linked to terrorism and social instability. To strengthen the speaker's claims, the legitimate part is often supported by a positive verb, whereas the illegitimate part is combined with a negative verb. A famous example for this concurrence is offered by Bill Clinton; he argues that it is "Our purpose […] bring together the world" in opposition to "those who tear it apart".

Besides the aforementioned examples, time is a recurring subject of antithesis in the political domain: politicians criticise past mistakes (then) and, contrastingly, ensure

that the future is going to be better (now) (Charteris-Black 2014: 40; Charteris-Black 2005: 181 ff.).

     An exceptional form of antithesis is double antithesis, which includes two contrasting pairs. In Aristotle's notion, double antithesis is more artificial but also slightly more foreseeable. As a result, the audience or readership is probably able to finish the following sentence: "The night is long and the day is ____ ." (Fahnestock 1999: 47).

Antithesis is an outstanding aspect of the candidates' speeches and occurs at a high frequency level, which is the result of the extremely fiercely fought election campaign of Trump and Clinton. Therefore, it will be examined with great care and precision in the empirical part.

5.4. Simile

Simile (derived from latin *similis* 'similar', 'like') is very related to metaphor (Greek from *metapherein* 'to transfer'): both are based on the resemblance of two objects, which are in most cases unrelated. Therefore, simile is often seen as sub-category of metaphor. However, this is not correct because simile is marked by comparative terms such as the main forms 'like' and 'as', but also 'so', 'than', or different verbs like 'resemble'. For instance, "love is a rose" would be a metaphor, and "my love is like a red rose" a simile because it involves a direct comparison (Merriam Webster 2017a). Yet, in specific situations it might be difficult to distinguish between the two devices since there is no confirmed rule, as Odonoghue (2009) remarks.

     Correspondingly, also the function of simile and metaphor are nearly identical: both conceive images and appeal to the audience's emotions to present already known information in a new light. Thereby, discourse is rendered more vivid and embellished, which has a positive impact on the audience's cognition. Some researchers argue that metaphor is probably more abstract and simile comparatively more concrete. Hence, it is controversial which device is more powerful: on the one hand, some people argue metaphor is more relevant for more abstract and less literal; on the other hand, one could also claim the opposite.

In sum, simile excels at presenting information via a contrasting and thereby simpler method, which might be more comprehensible to explain complex ideas (Burkholder &

Henry 2009: 97; Devlin 2008: 43). Due to the fact that simile (like metaphor) is paramount in political speeches and persuasive texts in general, the analysis will put considerable emphasis on this rhetorical device.

5.5. Hyperbole

Hyperbole is derived from the Greek verb *hyperballein*, which means 'to exceed' (Merriam Webster 2017b). Nowadays, it is known as exaggeration that is in Bain's view "magnifying objects beyond their natural bounds" (1867: 55). Hence, the object is displayed either better or worse or greater or less than it is in reality. As a consequence, it is more powerful and intelligible (Devlin 2008: 45; Bain 1867: 55). Hyperbole involves a comparison and is for this reason linguistically related to simile and metaphor. It is a rather persistent phenomenon not only in everyday language, but also literature (especially poetry and theatre), advertisements, and persuasive discourse such as (political) speeches in general. Common examples of hyperbole are "enough food to feed a whole army", "a ton of homework", or "having a million things to do" (Your Dictionary 2017).

The problem with hyperbole is that it might be exaggerated to an unreasonable extent although it "must be kept within the limits imposed upon the bolder figures" (Bain 1867: 56). More explicitly, the speaker or writer could be tempted to deceit the audience or even lie. Undoubtedly, this cannot be the purpose of this rhetorical figure, which needs to be properly regulated. Much rather, hyperbole ought to draw attention to main points without having to explain with many words. Moreover, it might also generate a humorous effect (Devlin 2008: 45; Bain 1867: 56).

Hyperbole is a current element in the speeches analysed. However, a particularly critical approach needs to be employed seeing that - as already remarked before – hyperbole often tends to exceed the figure's boundaries. This was specifically the case in Clinton and Trump's speeches, which will be addressed later.

5.6. Repetition

Repetition of a word or phrase is the most straightforward possibility to create lexical cohesion. In case there is a morphological change from the root, repetition is named reiteration (Charteris-Black 2014: 68). Hoey designates the recurrence of two identical terms as simple repetition; the reiteration of terms with the same root is, consequently,

a complex repetition (1991). An example of reiteration or complex repetition would be 'to sing' and 'singer'.

Repetition of certain keywords leads to the establishment of lexical chains across discourse by giving items or concepts the same name; notably, repetition also exhibits a unifying and structuring function. Thus, it is less challenging for the audience to detect principal motifs and renders discourse easier to follow. According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, rhetorical figures are comparable to fans in a football stadium. The ones who jump cheering from their seats are more evident than the ones remaining silently on their seats. Naturally, this is also applicable to repetition. Furthermore, the more repetitions are used, the more convinced and vigorous the speaker appears to be (Charteris-Black 2014: 68, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969: 144).

The importance of repetition goes back to classical rhetoric and constitutes a notable part of the *Ad Herennium*. Quintilian already realized that repetition is an effective device to prevent idiosyncratic conclusions and maintain the audience's attention. He clearly distinguishes repetition from paraphrase, which stands for repeating the same meaning in other words (Quintilian 1921, III, 211).

The *Ad Herennium* identifies the following six major classifications of repetition, which prevailed over time: *anaphora* (repetition of the beginning of consecutive phrases), *epistrophe* (repetition of endings of consecutive phrases and, thereby, the opposite of *anaphora*), *epanalepsis* (repetition of the initial structure at its ending), anadiplosis (repetition of the ending of a sentence in the beginning of the next sentence or phrase), *symploche* (repetition of the beginning and the ending in the next phrase or sentence), and *subjunctio* (repetition of the same word successively after the previous word without any interruption). All of the major types of repetition are able to occur in sequences that are not exactly successive to the previous ones. Notwithstanding that, scientists recommend employing repetition in immediate sequences to strengthen emphasis (Fahnestock 1999: 157-158).

As already addressed before, there is a difference between simple repetition and complex repetition (or rather reiteration). In classical rhetoric, the original term for repetition, or rather, the perfect repetition of the same lexical item was *ploche. Ploche* is derived from Greek *plokế* 'plaiting' and stands for a single strand of a plait (or rather, a single lexical item). It is supposed to render style in its completeness more elegant and fluent (Cicero 1954: 279, Fahnestock 1999: 158). In opposition to the six chief

classifications of repetition, *ploche* does not follow a particular sentence structure. This renders it fairly demanding for linguists to detect it. At the same time, *ploche* can be discerned as more subtle, intricate and influential due to the fact that it impacts the audience subconsciously. Nonetheless, *ploche* stands in stark contrast to the stylistic stance that repetition is often regarded as erroneous and an indication of a limited range of vocabulary. *Ploche* needs to be distinguished from *antanaclasis*, which has the same form as *ploche* but a different function, for instance: "to paper your walls, choose a paper that has a paper and not a cloth surface" (Fahnestock 1999: 158 pp.).

In contrast to the perfect or simple repetition, there is also something that would be described as imperfect or complex repetition: *polyptoton*. Here, form and function of the first term change, such as "live, living, lively, life" or different inflections such as plural and possessive *(-s, -es, 's, -s' - lives)*, the degree of adjectives *(-er, -est, - the liveliest)*, conjugation of the verb, or different affixes (relive and live) (Fahnestock 1999: 168-169).

Apart from simple and complex repetition, there is another major group, namely partial or near repetition: *agnominatio*. This is the case if a words sounds or looks similar as for instance in alliteration (repetition of the same initial letter) or assonance (repetition of the same vowel sounds). A mixed example would be "saying and seeing" which not only contains the same initial letter, but also the same consonant ending and an equal amount of syllables, which enforces the persuasive effect (Fahnestock 1999: 165).

Regarding my analysis, special attention will be devoted to anaphor and epistrophe, alliteration, *ploche*. and *subjunctio* since they are the most recurring forms of repetition in the candidates' speeches. On the whole, repetition is a widely advocated device by both speakers, which will be discussed in the empirical part.

5.7. Metonymy

Metonymy is a fairly common rhetorical device that is used in everyday language, but also in areas such as poetry and journalism (mostly newspaper articles); it strongly resembles metaphor in form and function. The main difference between the two is that metonymy stands for two objects that are semantically related to each other (more precisely, the items can be associated with each other), whereas in metaphor the objects

are experientially distinct. This becomes clearer through observing the original terminology: metaphor is derived from Greek *metapherein* 'to transfer' and metonymy from Greek *metonymia,* which is literally translated 'among name'. Hence, in metaphor new meaning is transferred (in terms of another), but in metonymy one item is seen reference to the other one (standing for each other). For example, "red and blue States" is a metonymy and stands for the United States; in contrast, the colour red or blue that is associated with republicans and democrats is a metaphor (Charteris-Black 2014: 47; Merriam Webster 2017; Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 36 pp.).

Comparable to metaphor, also metonymy is organised in conceptual systems (Gibbs 1993: 259). As a result, apart from being an excellent reference device, metonymy facilitates the organisation of thoughts and manages to focus on desired elements of discourse. The associations that people have with certain objects are in their essence culturally conditioned. For example, a bouquet of flowers could be associated with roses, tulips, orchids, or something completely different (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 36-37). Furthermore, metonymy entails an abbreviating function (by clarifying the object and its connotations) and can euphemise or dysphemise particular formulations if necessary. Comparable to metaphor, it adds ornamentation and renders discourse more vivid and effective (Rubba 2006).

There are many different views on how to properly categorise metonymy. Without any doubt, the most traditional form is synecdoche, where a part stands for the whole object. Synecdoche is so common that it is sometimes even counted as separate rhetorical figure on its own. Examples for synecdoche would be "pretty face" for pretty woman or "good heads" for intelligent people. This 'face for the person' concept is even literally manifested in our culture: it is common custody if we ask someone for a picture of somebody to show an image of the person's face (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 36- 37). Lakoff and Johnson also defined the following metonymical concepts besides synecdoche: the producer standing for the product ("She purchased a Ford/Picasso."), the object for its user ("The trains are on strike."), the controller for the controlled item ("Napoleon lost at Waterloo."), the institution for the people in charge ("The university/senate/government fully agrees."), the place for the institution (The White House/Hollywood is in turmoil."), and the place for the event ("Pearl Harbour/Vietnam still has an effect on policies nowadays."). Further concepts according to Peprník are: a quality for its agent ("Your Excellency/Honour."), an activity for the agent or product

("defence" for defending lawyers; "stop" for the street shield), a material as product (silk, porcelain), or a quality for its bearer ("antiquity" for an ancient object) (2003: 53-54).

As already cited above, these concepts are not arbitrary but systematic and demonstrate our perception of the world; further, they also help to direct our thoughts and actions into the right direction. Naturally, these schemes are based on our own experiences and are as a result even more authentic and relatable than metaphorical concepts because they habitually allude to causal or directly physical references (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 38- 39).

Special attention needs to be dedicated to religious and spiritual symbols, which are principally of metaphoric nature. A common example would be the dove, which represents the Holy Spirit. Religious metonymies establish a substantial link between abstract metaphorical terminology and everyday experiences: for instance, the sky stands for haven/the holy ground (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 40).

In conclusion, metonymy definitely constitutes a major part in persuasive language, especially political speeches. This will also become visible in the empirical part of this thesis.

5.8. Metaphor

As already acknowledged before, metaphor is probably the most dominant rhetorical figure in political rhetoric and public communication in general. Yet, metaphor is not restricted to the public domain: it is an essential part of common language despite that often remains unnoticed (Richards 1965: 92; Mooney & Evans 2015: 55). It is often described as "word or phrase to mean something different from the literal meaning" (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 2011). However, this definition is rather vague and imprecise. Much more revealing is Aristotle's notion of metaphor, which describes it as a device to view an object in terms of another one (1952). The comparison that Aristotle alludes to is formed by a shared quality (Bain 1867: 30; Devlin 2008: 43). This quality or resemblance typically refers to the shape (for instance "the hand of a clock"), the spatial relation ("the face of a building"), or shape and spatial relation of the objects combined ("the arm of a chair") (Greenbaum 1996: 418). Jaroslav Peprník pursues a marginally distinct approach and claims that the comparison is manifested in terms of

exterior features like function (the "hand" of a dial), location (the "foot" of a mountain), shape ("bell" as a plant), extent (a "drop" of talent), and colour (the "black" market or sheep) (2003: 44). Apart from Devlin and Peprník's views, Lakoff & Johnson (1980) suggest a more explicit and systematic approach, which is known as their conceptual metaphor theory. Their philosophy will be further elaborated on in chapter 5.8.3.

The reason for the dominance of metaphor is that it activates unconscious schemes in connection with certain terms, which are deeply grounded in cultural and historical values. As a result, it is highly persuasive as it appeals to the audience's emotions (pathos). Thus, the majority of successful and professional speakers refer to metaphor as one of their most convincing rhetorical tools (Charteris-Black 2014: 160-161). According to Beard, the most common political metaphor areas concern war and sport (2000: 21).

5.8.1. Functions of metaphor

The purposes of metaphor are manifold and can be according to Charteris-Black sectioned into seven categories. First and foremost, metaphor is supposed to attract and maintain the attention of the audience and appeal to ethos to insinuate a feeling of trust in the speaker (or writer). This function is often employed in prologues and epilogues, which are ought to leave a lasting impression on the audience. Secondly, metaphor can simplify complex issues and render them more comprehensible, which is especially in politics of utmost importance. Thereby, problems can be framed according to the speaker/writer's intentions (heuristic purpose). Thirdly, this device can be used to associate either positive or negative connotations with an idea or agent (predicative purpose). This already leads to the next and fourth function: metaphor ought to convey positive emotions that present the speaker (or writer) in a perspective that is beneficial to him or her (empathetic purpose). This is frequently achieved through personification or allusion, which will be further explained in the following chapter. Furthermore and fifth, this figure is effective in terms of creating coherence and refer to noted cultural and historical figures via allusion (aesthetic purpose). Hence, the main topic of discourse can already be introduced in the beginning and resumed later. Sixth, metaphor also expresses particular ideological views (ideological purpose). And lastly, metaphor aims at generating an image that is comparable to a political myth (mythic purpose). In this case, a habitually used and highly substantial type of metaphor are journey metaphors: a

definite goal is accomplished by means of a heroic journey that usually includes the own party, the nation, or solely the speaker him or herself (2014: 201 pp.).

5.8.2. Classification of metaphor

Charteris-Black describes three types of metaphor, namely novel, entrenched, and conventional metaphors. The first group, novel metaphors, consists of metaphors that are not yet part of common language since they are innovative and creative notions. Novel metaphors are being continually created with the course of time and often occur in case of language gaps: a popular example for this group is '9/11' in the aftermath of the events on the eleventh of September 2001 or the 'Arab spring'. The second group, entrenched metaphors, contains metaphors that are barely visible anymore as they have become part of common language use. This would be for instance 'the legs of a chair'. The last group, conventional metaphors, represent the step in-between novel and entrenched metaphors (2014: 178 pp.). In this case, Lakoff & Johnson speak of a continuum between 'live' (novel) and 'dead' (entrenched) metaphors (1980: 5). Hence, they are already generalised, but still not part of everyday language. Conventional and entrenched metaphors can also be distinguished via frequency level: whereas conventional metaphors typically occur five to 50 times in a sample of 100 corpus entries, entrenched metaphors show in more than half the entries of 100. Novel metaphors only occur less than five times in 100 samples (Charteris-Black 2014: 178 pp.). Goatly promotes Charteris-Black's approach of three categories: however, he speaks of "tired" (conventional), "sleeping" (entrenched), and "active" (novel) metaphors (2008: 31 pp.).

 In political speeches, the majority of metaphors are conventional or entrenched. This stands in stark opposition to literature and especially its more creative genres like poetry, where most occurring metaphors are novel. Nonetheless, all three types of metaphor should be analysed in order to draw reliable conclusions: whereas novel metaphors render insights into new historical and cultural developments, as a result, language change, entrenched metaphors provide knowledge about the intrinsic ideological approaches that the speakers manifest (Charteris-Black 2014: 180-181).

5.8.3. Metaphor concepts according to Lakoff & Johnson (1980)

Metaphors can also be categorised in concepts "around a common implicit metaphor". This procedure is called conceptual reasoning, which claims that our perceptions and experiences are chiefly of metaphorical nature as they are connected to abstract associations (Ritchie 2003: 125-126). In general, these concepts incorporate source domains on the one hand (which represent the semantic field that the words are inferred from) and target domains (the area to which the meaning is transferred) on the other hand. For the concept 'argument is war' this would be 'war' as source domain and 'argument' as target domain. Thus, each metaphorical concept integrates countless individual metaphors that are experientially interrelated.

It goes without saying that these concepts are culturally and historically conditioned and change over the course of time; moreover, the establishment of concepts is individually dependent. More explicitly, individuals might expand or restrict the actual core meaning of a term or concept according to different contextual situations, which is called "shallow processing" [1](Charteris-Black 2014: 187-188; Chilton 2010: 239; Allott 2005: 152).

The notion of metaphorical concepts helps to determine ideological and cognitive foundations of metaphors. In this sense, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) speak of "metaphorical mapping", which is purely cognitive in its essence (as source domains are based on human/cognitive perception and experience) and not linguistic[2]. However, researchers need to be cautious not to overgeneralise metaphorical concepts seeing that this would inhibit language change and progression. Moreover, concepts need to be based on discourse or global systems of larger corpora that transcend the local area (which is restricted to individual speeches) to be properly identified as such. In general, they can be divided according to positive or negative associations, for example: 'success is winning' and 'failure is losing', which correspond to the source domain 'sports and games' (Charteris-Black 2014: 185 pp.).

Lakoff & Johnson's metaphorical concepts can be divided into systematic categories, which include the following types: conduit, orientational, and ontological metaphors.

---

[1] The opposite of shallow processing (in case there is no restriction or expansion of the core meaning) would be deep processing (Allott 2005: 152).
[2] Lakoff also coined the concept of the 'frame', which offers conclusions on ideological
[2] Lakoff also coined the concept of the 'frame', which offers conclusions on ideological values and is further explained in chapter (..) (2004: 3-4, 24-26).

5.8.3.1. Conduit or structural metaphors

Conduit metaphors were first mentioned by Michael Reddy, who claims that ideas (which he designates as objects) are being expressed and structured through certain terminology (which he names containers) along so-called "conduits". This type of metaphor is highly frequent in Reddy's theory and accounts for hundreds of expression in common language. He further asserts that these sum up to 70% of formulations to converse about language. Examples for conduit metaphors would be: "this sentence 'carries' little meaning" or "if you 'have' a good idea, try to 'capture' it immediately 'in' words".

It might be difficult for people who are not familiar with the subject of metaphors to discern this metaphor type at all. However, it shows that these metaphors create meaning on their own depending on the context and the speaker (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 10-13).

5.8.3.2. Orientational metaphors

In contrast to conduit metaphors that organise one concept in terms of another one, orientational metaphors arrange whole systems of concepts in relation to another. The majority of these concepts are based on spatial orientation, more precisely: on-off, up-down, front-back, in-out, deep-shallow, and central-peripheral.

Naturally, like all metaphors, these concepts are culturally and physically conditioned. For instance, in Western cultures the future is lying 'ahead of' us, whereas in other cultures it might be 'in the back'. As a result, the following dominant concepts can be identified: 'health ("my spirits rose")/more ("their salary rose")/happy ("her spirits are boosted/high")/future events ("I am afraid of what's coming ahead of us")/high status ("I climbed the ladder of hierarchy")/good ("look up")/virtue ("she has high standards")/rational ("rise above your emotions")/conscious ("wake up") are all up'; in opposition to that, 'sickness ("he is depressed")/less ("they are underage")/sad ("he fell into a depression")/past events ("please leave that behind")/low status ("he fell in status")/bad ("high-quality work")/depravity ("they fell into an abyss of depravity")/emotional ("it fell to the emotional level")/unconscious ("he fell into a coma") are down'.

As can be inferred from the examples above, most concepts are related to spatial notions. This metaphor type is preferably used to illustrate complex and abstract ideas like "high-energy particles" or "high status" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 14 pp.).

5.8.3.3. Ontological or entity/substance metaphors

This type of metaphor extends the boundaries of mere orientation such as in the previous category. More explicitly, it renders the opportunity to refer to ("she is a good catch"), organise, quantify ("there is so much hatred in the world"), and reason about (namely, identify causes – "he committed the crime out of anger", aspects - "the brutality of war is incredible", and goals – "this is the solution to her problems/to find true happiness") specific notions, especially if these references are unclear.

As can be concluded from the examples above, the number of ontological metaphors is enormous even though most of them remain unnoticed like the previous categories. This is due to the fact that human beings can be perceived as containers that are always related to the outside world we live in. But not only us as containers, also our visual field and our actions and activities can be described and organised via ontological metaphors. Even the term "visual field" stands for a container in itself. Further examples include "are you going to the race" – which views the race as a substance and therefore container – or "he couldn't do much sprinting in the end" – with sprinting as substance/container. Besides, various states can also be conceived as containers ("we are in love"/ "he is getting in shape") (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 25 pp.).

The most protruding occurrence of ontological metaphor is clearly personification. The advantage of personification is that inhuman entities can be assigned to human characteristics. Hence, abstract phenomena can be described in terms of our own features and experiences and are therefore rendered more relatable and understandable. Typical examples of personification would be "inflation has robbed me of my savings", "life has cheated me", or "cancer finally caught up with him" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 33-34).

In conclusion, each metaphor type is used for specific purposes that refer to structure, spatial relation, or substance between different entities. Across these distinct concepts, there is naturally an interplay, which generates the possibility to create so-called metaphorical coherence. How this is conducted will be explained in the next chapter:

5.8.3.4. Metaphorical Coherence

Each metaphor involves several metaphorical entailments. For instance, 'the argument as a journey' metaphor including the premise that 'a journey defines a path' entails the conclusion that 'an argument defines a path'. In case there is a coincidence of

entailments or purposes between different metaphors, this state is called metaphorical coherence. It is extremely rare that metaphors are entirely consistent; however, coherence is in contrast fairly common.

5.8.3.5. Metaphorical concepts and their categorisation

After regarding metaphorical concepts overall, which involves the system and subcategories behind these concepts including metaphorical coherence across metaphors, the next step is to look at metaphorical concepts in detail.

It was already explained that metaphorical concepts consist of a source and a target domain that are based on cultural, historical, and individual experiences. However, it was not yet defined what a "basic domain of experience" consists of. These domains are usually "natural kinds of experience" that occur in our general perception and incorporate three categories: our bodies, our interactions with the environment, and our interactions with other people. The most common concepts are 'labour', 'happiness', 'love', 'ideas', 'time', 'arguments', 'health', 'status', 'morality', 'control', 'understanding', and many others. All of them require metaphorical definition to function in ordinary language use. Other concepts that are linked to natural experiences include 'substances', 'seeing', 'war', 'journeys', 'buildings', 'food', 'objects', 'physical orientations', and 'madness'. In contrast to the first group, the second group concepts are already sufficiently described and structured in themselves and can be used to define other concepts. The reason for this differentiation is that an object is usually described in terms of inherent ('black/brown/other colour or material gun') or interactional ('fake gun') properties. Rosch (1977) refers to this categorisation by means of prototypes. For example, a chair is commonly associated with four legs, a seat and a back, and optional armrests. Notwithstanding that, there are also atypical chairs like swivel or rocking chairs, hanging chairs, barber chairs, and many others. In general, there is no fixed set of prototypical attributes; concepts can be extended through interactional properties in case there is sufficient "family resemblance". Hence, this extension is not arbitrary according to Lakoff (1975) and is elaborated via so-called modifiers or hedges corresponding to the respective purposes. More explicitly, a moped is strictly speaking not a motorcycle; nonetheless, for reasons of bridge tolls, loosely speaking it is.

In conclusion, the categorisation of metaphorical concepts is open-ended and can lead to the establishment of concepts that are completely new. This would be for example 'love

is a collaborative work of art' which integrates entailments such as 'love is work', 'love is an aesthetic experience', or 'love is unique in each instance'. As already mentioned above, each concept highlights and conceals certain characteristics – in this case of the notion of 'love'-; therefore, this categorisation will not accord with everybody's opinion (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 117 pp.). This also explains why metaphor is probably the best asset to discern ideological positions of speakers, which is highly relevant in the analysis of Clinton and Trump's speeches.

5.8.4. Political metaphors

After elaborating on metaphorical concepts in general, it is time to look at political metaphors more specifically. The most recurring and protruding subjects in politics are obviously economy, freedom, safety, equality, power, economic independence, and many others. As already addressed, metaphor analysis is a great measure to gain further insight concerning the speaker's ideological background and possible intentions. This is further illustrated via the 'labour is a resource' concept. Although this concept is extremely popular and practically omnipresent in industrialised nations, it does not differentiate between purposeful and degenerating labour. Hence, it conceals the negative aspect of labour in terms of exploited workers in third world countries and all over the world. To resume, a critical approach is of utmost importance with conducting (political) metaphor analysis (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 236-237).

As can be concluded, metaphor is an all-pervasive element of common language and human thinking. With regard to political terminology and this thesis, it is one – it not the most - important rhetorical device. As a result, the empirical part will devote particular attention to this topic.

5.9. Pronouns

Besides rhetorical figures, pronouns are probably the most decisive aspect in terms of analysing political speeches. In ordinarily language overall, pronouns are extremely frequent due to the fact that they provide agency to actions. For this reason, they exert considerable influence on the overall effect of a speech and, thereby, generate cohesion. Moreover, pronouns provide insights concerning the relationship between audience and speaker and speaker and his party/the government/other associates (Beard 2000: 44 pp.).

Particularly the English pronominal system is interesting to analyse since it is marked by "social impoverishment": there is no indication of social hierarchy such as in the Japanese system (Harre 1988: 166). Even though it is possible to avoid using titles or names, the inflection of the verb shows existing power asymmetries in other language families such as the Romance languages. This is not the case in English, where speakers can choose the neutral "you". Nonetheless, differences of power are part of all societies and instances and can be determined via a closer look at pronoun use as a whole and with regard to specific contexts (Brown & Gilman 1960: 195).

The following research questions can be answered by means of pronoun analysis: How much responsibility is the speaker willing to take on, and to what extent is the audience/are the associates – at least according to the speaker's presumptions - willing to share this responsibility? In which contexts is the speaker trying to distance him- or herself from certain issues (exclusion), and in which areas is he or she aiming at the opposite (inclusion)? (Beard 2000: 44 pp.).

5.9.1. Political pronouns and their implementation

Basically, politicians have five options to propose new measures: the first person singular (I), the first person plural (we), a reference to their position (the minister/future president elect/other position), the use of passive voice instead of a personal pronoun, and the use of metonymy (for instance: the budget as an agent). Consequently, besides the cases where no personal pronoun is used, there are two options available: the first person singular (I/me/myself/mine) and plural (we/us/ourselves/ours). The first person plural can refer to a multitude of people and societies, which depends on the context of each individual speech. Thus, 'we' can stand for the speaker and the (American/British/another nationality) people, the speaker and his campaign, the speaker and his party, the speaker and the government, the speaker and everyone else/humanity, or the speaker and another group or person that has been addressed. The variation in the distribution of 'we' can be imagined as a series of inclusive circles: the central 'we' is represented by the speaker including one other person. This centre is surrounded by circles with subsequently more and more people until the most exterior 'we' is reached, more precisely, the speaker and humanity (Urban 1986). Consequently, it is often ambiguous who is actually addressed by 'we', which needs to be determined via contextual analysis. Hence, linguists differentiate between an inclusive 'we' (which includes the addressee in the group identified as 'we') and an

exclusive 'we' (that excludes the addressee). The exclusive 'we' serves to create distance between the speaker and the group, whereas the inclusive 'we' ought to promote a sense of unity (Wilson 1990: 48-49).

The advantage of the first person singular pronoun is that the speaker is able to show personal involvement, which is chiefly used if positive and certain messages are delivered. However, in this case the speaker might appear as egocentric and as if he would not perceive him- or herself as part of the inside-group. In opposition to the singular pronoun, the use of the plural form renders it possible to share responsibility and create a feeling of solidarity, particularly when situations are controversial or insecure. Despite that, the speaker him- or herself might not earn full credit for his or her achievements (Beard 2000: 44 pp.).

On a side note, it needs to be remarked that there is a third option in addition to the first person singular and plural form, namely the neutral, indefinite pronoun 'one', which is still at times being used by high-ranking members of the government. However, nowadays it has become an increasingly unpopular choice since it generates an eminently distancing effect.

Deciding on whether to use the singular or plural form of pronoun is highly imperative in politics and each pronominal choice needs to be carefully thought-through. Eventually, it is often a combination of singular and plural forms that is required to convey the most appropriate message at the right moment (Beard 2000: 44 pp.). There have been several studies on the frequency and context of pronominal usage of famous politicians: some claim that unscripted and spoken discourse contains more first-person singular pronouns than first person plural pronouns, and more exclusive 'we' forms than inclusive forms in contrast to scripted and written discourse. However, these findings have not been conclusive; some studies proved the exact opposite. What can be inferred with certainty is that the ratio of 'we' and 'I' use strongly depends on the topic that is being addressed. Principally, pronominal use depends on the speaker's individual perception of separate pronouns, which is consequently manifested in the speaker's idiolect. This can be better understood when looking at the distancing scale of pronouns which was introduced by Rees, as illustrated in Table 4 (Wilson 1990: 54-55).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
I	me	you	one	you	it	she	he	they
		(direct		(indefinite)				
		address)						

Table 4. Distancing scale by Rees (1983)

The scale defines the first person singular (including its variants 'me', 'my', and 'mine') as deictic centre (with a distancing effect of zero) and subsequently moves outwards to the most secluded pronoun, which is according to Rees 'they' (with a distancing effect of 8 on the scale). Rees further asserts that this scale is universal to all speakers. However, his theory was later modified by Maitland (1988) who suggests that the scale and its distribution of pronouns is individual to every speaker. For instance, 'it' could be viewed by some speakers as more negative and distant as 'they'. And some pronouns might be missing on the scale at all, such as 'I' in case the speaker is not confident and willing to take on any responsibility at all.

Nowadays, it is a widely accepted claim that each speaker's scale is individually and ideologically distinct and is also influenced by contextual aspects such as topic choice. Further, pronominal shifts within the same discourse are possible, which are sociologically and pragmatically conditioned. There are three different methodologies how speakers (in this case politicians) can employ pronouns: either they refer to themselves (self-referencing), or they create a contrasting effect between themselves and others (relations of contrast), or they refer to outside-groups and individuals (other referencing) (Wilson 1990: 61-62).

5.9.2. Self-referencing

Self-referencing describes how the speaker views him or herself in relation to the addressee and the topic. The two options first person singular and plural and their advantages and disadvantages have already been presented in the previous chapter. Furthermore, the following claims can be made according to Wilson: The first person singular form is often accompanied by a mental-process verb such as 'think' 'believe' 'wish' or 'want'. This technique is implemented to convey the speaker's sincerity and authenticity. Additionally, speakers tend to use so-called blocks of pronouns in consecutive sentences to strengthen the effect and demonstrate personal involvement even more directly. In general, it is also possible to shift from first person singular to the

plural form. Margaret Thatcher, a former British politician, pursued this methodology to present herself as loving, family and peace-oriented individual in private ('I'), which strikingly differed from her resolute and fierce public image as head of her political party and prime minister ('we') (Wilson 1990: 62-63).

5.9.3. Relations of contrast

In opposition to self-referencing, this way the speakers generate a contrast between themselves and the addressee, which might be the opponent or the opposing party. Naturally, the addressee can be presented either in a positive or negative light. For example, the opponent is simply referred to as 'he' or 'she' including their variants ('him'/ 'her', 'his'/'her). This could be interpreted as a technique to avoid directly naming the addressee in order to draw attention toward the speaker him- or herself rather than towards the opponent. In the past, it was often part of chauvinistic politics to speak of a female addressee in a degrading light, which was also the case with the Margaret Thatcher, who was already cited before, and her opponent Neil Kinnock. Kinnock commonly referred to Thatcher and her party simply has 'hers', whereas Thatcher tried to stay at conservative 'we' and labour party level 'they' (Wilson 1990: 66-67).

5.9.4. Other referencing

Other referencing alludes to individuals or unions besides the speaker and the addressee. There are several possibilities to refer to outside-groups: As already mentioned before, Thatcher chiefly employed her 'us' against 'them' – strategy, which incorporates everyone except the Soviets in the inclusive 'we' and, thereby, establish an even more outstanding contrast to the opponents. Even more powerful than Thatcher's 'them' is 'those', which is not rarely combined by negative terms like 'evil' 'horrendous' 'sinister', or 'suppress'. In this case, the distance between speaker and reference is even greater. These methods of other referencing are highly practical seeing that the speakers, and first and foremost politicians, are able to refer to opponents in generic terms without directly naming (and possibly blaming) them. This tactic is called "invited inference" for unnamed entities are recognised through background knowledge. Finally, apart from 'them' and 'those', there is also a third, slightly different mode of other-referencing: 'it'. As reported by certain linguists, 'it is even stronger than the other forms

since it depicts the outside group (such as the opposing party) as inhuman and menacing (Wilson 1990: 69-70).

In brief, pronominal usage should be carefully thought-through by rhetoricians since pronouns symbolise a decisive part in persuasive discourse and undoubtedly impact success and acknowledgement of a speech. Hence, the three options of pronominal address need to be employed according to contextual situation and audience. In general, it is obvious that each speaker exhibits a unique style concerning pronouns, which can be illustrated via a personal pronominal or distancing scale. Further aspects considering Trump and Clinton's individual pronominal style will be discussed in the empirical part.

6. Analysis of speeches by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump

The analytical part of this thesis focuses on the critical discourse analysis approach by Charteris-Black (2014), which was presented in section 4.3. To briefly reiterate, the investigation consists of three parts, namely the analysis of speech circumstances, the identification and analysis of features, and lastly interpretation and explanation of the findings of step one and two in combination. However, I combined the analytical and the interpretative and explanatory part since they logically go together.

6.1. Analysis of speech circumstances

6.1.1. Situational circumstances

For my analysis, I chose three different speech types, namely two election speeches (C1/T1), two commemorative or reaction speeches (C2/T2), and two occasion-related speeches (C3/T3). These were already discussed in detail in chapter 3.2.

   The motivations for my selection are manifold: first and foremost, the speeches need to be comparable in terms of form (length) and function (subject) – only in this case, the candidates' oratories can be contrasted to each other. In sum, the six speeches add up to approximately the same total word count; there are only slight differences concerning word count within the same speech category. Furthermore, the choice of available and – most importantly - comparable speeches of Clinton and Trump is still confined. This is mostly due to the fact that Trump has not delivered many political speeches yet as his career in politics is still comparatively recent. Notwithstanding that, I discovered three completely different speech types (with regard to register, audience, occasion, and location) of both speakers; it is particularly this distinction that renders these speeches highly interesting to examine closely. The situational circumstances of the selected speeches can be observed in table 5.

Speech	Location	Date	Occasion	Audience
C1	Philadelphia (Pennsylvania)	28 July 2016	Nomination acceptance speech	Democratic National Convention
T1	Cleveland (Ohio)	21 July 2016	Nomination Acceptance Speech	Republican National Convention
C2	Cleveland (Ohio)	13 June 2016	Reaction Speech Orlando Shooting	About 800 Clinton supporters

T2	Goffstown (New Hampshire)	13 June 2016	Reaction Speech Orlando Shooting[3]	About 100 Trump supporters (invite-only event)
C3	New York City (New York)	21 October 2016	Al Smith charity dinner speech	Elite politicians, media figures, and clergymen
T3	New York City (New York)	21 October 2016	Al Smith charity dinner speech	Elite politicians, media figures, and clergymen

Table 5. Situational circumstances of Clinton and Trump's speeches

6.1.2. Cognitive circumstances

Cognitive circumstances refer to the background knowledge of audience and speaker. As can be inferred from Table 5, the first two speech types (C1/T1 and C2/T2) directly address either advocates of the Democratic or Republican Party and solely the third category (C3/T3) speaks to a mixed audience. Thus, the orators will be likely to express their ideological views more explicitly via conservative or liberal language characteristics in the first two speech categories. This is due to the issue of multiple addressing, which was already remarked in chapter 3.1. Consequently, it might be expected that in speech type three, which is directed towards the mixed public, the orators employ more ambivalent formulations, paraphrases, euphemisms, and less direct addresses. However, it was also indicated that political speeches these days, and most outstandingly those in the United States, have become mass events that are widely distributed by the media. The speeches that I have chosen, namely the nomination acceptance and the Orlando reaction speeches, have definitely been of great national interest. As a result, differences between the three speech types might not be that significant (regardless of the immediate listeners) since the speakers aim at addressing multiple audiences in all instances.

6.1.3. Process circumstances

To briefly recapitulate, process circumstances refer to all participants that are involved in preparation and delivery of a speech. It was also mentioned that the majority of oratories nowadays are scripted by complete teams of speechwriters, which is certainly also the case with speeches of general interest such as Clinton and Trump's.

---

[3] Both reaction speeches were originally intended to target the opponent as first rally since the nomination acceptances. However, due to the terrorist attack in Orlando, these speeches needed to be adapted at the last minute.

Concerning audience interaction, heckling, cheering and booing are common features of US political speeches and in most cases allowed (and welcome). This also holds true for the six speeches I am going to analyse, which are marked by countless instances that can be identified as claptrap (like metaphors, repetitions, and numerous others).

6.2. Identification, analysis, and interpretation of features

After observing general circumstances of the six speeches, the next procedure is to identify and analyse considerable features. These include smaller items on the lexical level, larger items on the syntactic level, and items that occur throughout discourse on both levels, which will be investigated concerning their quantity (frequency level) and quality (how separate items are used in context).

Overall features of Clinton and Trumps' oratories are demonstrated in table 6, which encompass word count, number of sentences, average sentence length (which was calculated by dividing word count with the number of sentences), and unique words (the number of individual terms in each speech – thus, an indication of lexical density). Moreover, the total number of occurrences of Clinton (C1-C3) and Trump's (T1-T3) speeches concerning the previous categories are also illustrated.

Speech	Words total	Sentences	Average sentence length	Unique words
C1	5367	403	13,31 words	1351
T1	4367	269	16,23 words	1237
C2	3171	188	16,86 words	979
T2	4273	303	14,10 words	991
C3	2173	149	14,58 words	729
T3	1594	131	12,16 words	531
C total	**10711**	**740**	**ø 14,91 w.**	**ø 1019,6**
T total	**10234**	**703**	**ø 14,16 w.**	**ø 919,6**

Table 6. General features of the speakers' oratories

On the whole, the table shows that Clinton's total word count, number of sentence, average sentence length, and number of unique words are all slightly higher than Trump's. Hence, the difference between Clinton and Trump with regard to these categories is not particularly significant. In spite of that, the analysis of rhetorical devices within these sections will undoubtedly render more detailed results concerning

Clinton and Trump's rhetorical skills. These will be further elaborated on in the following.

6.3. Figures of Speech

As already mentioned in the theoretical part (cf. chapter 5.1.), I decided to use Bain's classification of most essential rhetorical figures for my analysis, namely hyperbole, metaphor, metonymy, simile, and synecdoche (1867: 21). In addition, I integrated repetition, antithesis, and three-part list. Furthermore, I chose to treat personification, anaphora and alliteration separately although they are subcategories of metaphor and repetition. This is due to the fact that personification is the most substantial subcategory of metaphor; hence, an individual categorisation absolutely makes sense to yield more detailed results. Anaphora and alliteration were chosen to gain further frequency results because repetitions are one of the most prominent elements of particularly Trump's speeches.

The reasons for my choice are based on the fact that the aforementioned devices occurred most frequently in the six speeches of my corpus; consequently, it seemed obvious to focus on these most protruding aspects. Moreover, Bain's major devices (1867: 21) are also the one that are principally investigated in most surveys focussing on political discourse.

The preceding rhetorical figures were scrutinised with great precision to elaborate their frequency levels in each individual speech. The results were subsequently displayed in table 7 (including rhetorical devices in C1 and T1), table 8 (C2 and T2), and table 9 (C3 and T3). Table 10 shows the total frequency and density of devices in Clinton and Trump's speeches. The density level was determined by dividing the total number of occurrences by the total word count and multiplying the result by 1000.

The question arises how the rhetorical devices were counted. Basically, I adhered to the definition of each figure that was already rendered in the theoretical section. However, I will need to specify this methodology (especially with regard to metaphor) in each case, which will be part of the following chapters.

Rhetorical Figure	C1	T1
Metaphor	75	32
Metonymy	24	13
Personification	2	2
Simile	2	0
Hyperbole	2	9
Three-Part-List	8	13
Anaphora	12	7
Alliteration	28	20
Contrastive Pair/Antithesis	10	2

Table 7. Rhetorical figures in Clinton and Trump's Nomination Acceptance speeches

Rhetorical Figure	C2	T2
Metaphor	39	18
Metonymy	9	2
Personification	5	7
Simile	0	0
Hyperbole	0	2
Three-Part-List	6	12
Anaphora	5	17
Alliteration	8	8
Contrastive Pair/Antithesis	1	4

Table 8. Rhetorical figures in Clinton and Trump's Reaction Speeches

Rhetorical Figure	C3	T3
Metaphor	13	3
Metonymy	5	4
Personification	1	0
Simile	1	0
Hyperbole	6	2
Three-Part-List	2	1
Anaphora	9	7
Alliteration	9	7
Contrastive Pair/Antithesis	6	0

Table 9. Rhetorical figures in Clinton and Trump's Charity Dinner Speeches

Rhetorical Figure	Density p. 1000 words C1-3	Density p. 1000 words T1-3	Total frequency C1-3	Total frequency T1-3
Metaphor	11,76%	5%	126	53
Metonymy	3%	1%	40	20
Personification	0%	0%	8	9
Simile	0%	0%	3	0
Hyperbole	0%	1%	8	13
Three-Part-List	1%	1%	16	26
Anaphora	2%	3%	26	31
Alliteration	4%	3%	45	35
Contrastive Pair/Antithesis	1%	0%	17	6

Table 10. Total frequency & density of rhetorical figures in Clinton and Trump's speeches

As can be concluded from the tables above, metaphor is by far the most frequent rhetorical device in Clinton (126 instances) and Trump's (53 instances) speeches. The second most recurring category in both speakers' discourse is alliteration (Clinton with 45; Trump with 35). Further outstanding devices are metonymy (C1-3: 40; T1-3: 20), anaphora (C1-3: 26; T1-3: 31), three-part list (C1-3: 16; T1-3: 26), and antithesis (C1-3: 16; T1-3: 6). In both cases/tables simile showed the lowest frequency rate (C1-3: 3; T1-3: 0), which was followed by personification (C1-C3: 8; T1-3: 9) and hyperbole (C1-3: 8; T1-3: 13), or, in Trump's case, antithesis with only 6 occurrences in all speeches. This result is not extremely surprising. However, the findings prove that metaphor is indeed the most frequent and significant aspect of political discourse. Furthermore, the results show that metaphor's relative (in terms of the comparative element of both figures), metonymy, is also a favoured element by Clinton and Trump. In addition, the outcome confirms the theory that repetition is undeniably a highly recurrent device of both speakers. Considering both orators in comparison, there are definitely discernible differences in terms of frequency level. First and foremost, Clinton manifests more than twice as many metaphors and nearly twice as many metonymies as her opponent. This definitely speaks for Clinton's rhetorical competence since there is no doubt how crucial metaphor in political discourse is.

Aside from examining the frequency rate of both speakers' rhetorical devices, it is indispensable to observe each of the aforementioned aspects individually. In this way, it is possible to discuss in which contexts rhetorical figures were concretely used and which impact they might have caused.

Three-part list is one of Clinton and Trump's favourite repetitive elements and occurred frequently in the analysed speeches (Clinton: 16 times, Trump: 26 times). The speakers used the figure's basic form by repeating the same term three times (A-B-C), which is demonstrated by the following example:

> 10) And they will have the support that they need to get the job done **right**, not like it is **right** now. It's not **right** (T2 168-169).

The first sample (in this case 'to do a job the *right* way') introduces the argument, the second one reaffirms and specifies it ("*right* now"), and the third occurrence indicates that the argument is finished ('it is not *right* in general') (Charteris-Black 2005: 6).

However, both orators primarily employed three-part list in the form of a special case of parallelism by repeating the same sentence structure three times. This is indicated by the following examples below:

> 11) Well I will be a President for **Democrats, Republicans, and Independents**. For the **struggling, the striving the successful** (C1 186-187).
>
> 12) America is a nation of **believers, dreamers, and strivers** that is being led by a group of **censors, critics, and cynics** (T1 322-323).

In the previous examples, Clinton and Trump combined several three-part lists together. In addition, the speakers used alliteration to reinforce the impact. In many cases, the repetitions even exceeded three occurrences; hence, they cannot be counted as three-part list (and merely as parallelisms).

In general, three-part list is a recurring device particularly in longer discourses since it highlights major passages and key items (Beard 2000: 39). For this reason, this structuring function is tremendously useful in Clinton and Trump's speeches. All further examples of a three-part list can be found in the appendix.

As frequency analysis shows, Clinton (17 samples) manifests antithesis nearly three times as often as Trump (only 6 samples). This might be due to the fact that many speakers (like Trump) tend to underestimate the power of this rhetorical figure. Furthermore, antithesis consists of a semantic opposition and a parallel syntactical structure; hence, it does not occur as frequently as figures that merely require one of these conditions (Fahnestock 1999: 58).

Usually, antithesis encompasses a legitimate and an illegitimate part that stand in opposition to each other (Beard 2000: 39-40), which also shows in the examples beyond.

13) He's taken the Republican Party a long way from **"Morning in America"** to **"Midnight in America."** (C1 54-55).

14) He's forgetting every last one of us. Americans don't say: **"I alone can fix it."** We say: **"We'll fix it together."** (C1 89-90).

15) **Americanism**, not **globalism**, will be our credo (T1 91).

The legitimate part mostly refers to the speaker and his or her party or idea (*morning in America/we together/Americanism);* the illegitimate part to the opponent or the opposing party or notion (*midnight in America/I alone/globalism*). As a result, the legitimate part appears without any doubt as more effective, logical and convincing than if it had been presented on its own without a contrasting statement.

The previous examples include certain features that do not necessarily occur with this figure. Firstly, the second example (number 14) involves a double antithesis, which is even more artificial than normal antithesis. Secondly, example number 13 comprises the metaphors *morning* and *midnight* to generate a more persuasive impact and appeal to the audience's emotions. Moreover, the extracts reveal that the parallel grammatical structure can be manifested by means of words, phrases, or also whole sentences. All further examples of Clinton and Trump's speeches are attached in the appendix.

Overall, it can be concluded that Clinton obviously puts primary stress on this scheme in contrast to Trump and, thereby, also displays it in a greater variety. The reasons for this are diverse: obviously, Clinton is does not shy away from comparing herself to her opponent. It can definitely be concluded that she demonstrates unshakable self-

confidence and authority because she clearly sees herself as the better leader for American people. At the same time, Clinton creates a stronger and more persuasive effect towards the audience (at least with regard to this device significantly more than Trump).

6.3.3. Simile

Simile was hardly ever used in terms of frequency; Clinton merely used it three times, Trump did not use it at all. The cause for this low density is more than obvious: simile was clearly overshadowed by its more extensive and versatile relative metaphor (which occurred most frequently in Clinton and Trump's speeches).

The only variety that was used includes the comparative word 'as', which can be seen in the examples blow.

16) But Donald really is as healthy **as a horse**, you know, the one that Vladimir Putin rides around on (C3 107-108).

17) For the past year, many people made the mistake of laughing off Donald Trump's comments – excusing him **as an entertainer** just putting on a show (C1 383-385).

Clinton almost exclusively applies simile to refer to her opponent in a condescending and humorous manner by comparing him to a *horse* or an *entertainer just putting on a show*. In both examples, Clinton strengthens the effect of simile by adding irony. It goes without saying that the images she thereby conjures up in the public's minds are highly exceptional and are probably going to leave a lasting impression.

Therefore, the contextual analysis supports the theoretical claims respecting that simile is an extremely powerful device of persuasive language that effectively alludes to the audience's emotions (in spite of the low frequency). Hence, in this regard simile is under no circumstances inferior to metaphor in terms of impact dimension. Just like the other rhetorical devices, all forms of simile can be found in the appendix.

6.3.4. Hyperbole

The frequency analysis shows that Trump (13 instances) used hyperbole more often than Clinton (8 instances). However, this does not provide answers concerning the question how this device was actually used and why. The contextual investigation shows

for which purposes hyperbole was mostly used/which objects or notions were described in a manner that exceeded the term's ordinary connotative boundaries (and made it appear as better/bigger or worse/less than in reality) (Devlin 2008: 45; Bain 1867: 55). This becomes probably more understandable by regarding the following extracts from Clinton and Trump's speeches.

18) We have each really **star medical records**. My blood pressure is 100/70. His is **unbelievably great.** My cholesterol is 189. His is **"presidential."** My heart rate is 72 beats per minute. His is **"the most beats ever or the least beats ever, whichever sounds best."** (C3 104-107)

19) Our roads and bridges are **falling apart**, our airports are **in Third World condition**, and forty-three million Americans are **on food stamps** (T1 57-58).

20) My opponent, on the other hand, has **supported virtually every trade agreement that has been destroying our middle class** (T1 243-244).

Contextual analysis definitely showcases considerable differences between Clinton and Trump's usage of hyperbole. As already addressed previously, Clinton recurrently integrates irony in combination with other rhetorical figures. This also applies to hyperbole and irony, which can be inferred from example 18. In general, hyperbole is regularly employed to exert a humorous effect (Devlin 2008: 45; Bain 1867: 56). This is a fairly practical strategy to express criticism in a light and subtle way.

In opposition to Clinton, Trump chiefly refers to hyperbole to let notions appear in a worse and more dramatic condition than they actually are, which usually alludes to the opponent, the opposing party, or the government. This is also shown by the excerpts above. Compared to Clinton, Trump's approach is far more direct and aggressive. One might argue that he exaggerates the function of hyperbole to an unreasonable extent. According to Bain, the natural limit/purpose of hyperbole is exceeded if speakers try to deceive the audience or even lie (Bain 1867: 56). For instance, in example 20 Trump blames Clinton for allegedly having *supported virtually every trade agreement that has been destroying our [America's] middle class.* It is needless to explain that this is an unnecessarily harsh accusation to ruin Clinton's reputation based on issues that simply cannot be true (which politician would support all settlements that destroy the middle class?). Extreme claims like this one occur repeatedly in Trump's speeches, particularly

with respect to hyperbole (cf. appendix), which is a definite indication of right-wing rhetoric (Wodak & Meyer 2001: 65). This is definitely not the purpose of this rhetorical figure; thus, the question arises whether these controversial occurrences should still be designated as hyperbole. Yet, I also encompassed contentious assertions (that might exceed the boundaries of the device) in case they were according to Bain "magnifying objects beyond their natural bounds" (1867: 55). This is due to the plain fact that the truth is sometimes hard to measure and, additionally, depends on each individual's point of view.

In brief, hyperbole is definitely a highly complex and effective tool in persuasive discourse since it renders arguments more intelligible and attracts the attention of the audience. This results from its relation to metaphor and simile because all of these devices incorporate a comparative element. Overall, the analysis detected dramatic differences between Clinton and Trump's usage of hyperbole. In conclusion, it is still questionable which of these two approaches might be the more convincing or better one. On the one hand, Clinton's subtle and ironical style might appeal to groups of people that hold particular views, especially if sensitive topics are concerned. On the other hand, Trump's more direct and belligerent tactic could be preferable and more persuasive to others since Trump displays a higher degree of self-assuredness.

6.3.5. Repetition

Although repetition is not part of Bain's five major rhetorical figures, it is an essential point of my analysis (1867: 21). Especially Trump is known for his characteristically repetitive style. Frequency analysis showed that Trump overall employed more recurrent devices (26 three-part lists, 31 anaphora) than Clinton (16 three-part lists, 26 anaphora). However, the quantitative difference between the speakers was not that as striking as one might have expected. Further devices that were analysed with regard to contextual analysis include epistrophe, symploche, subjunctio, parallelism, and ploche. Hence, the majority of primary repetition categories according to the *Ad Herennium* (except epanalepsis and anadiplosis, which would exceed the dimension of this thesis) was investigated – cf. chapter 5.6.1. (Fahnestock 1999: 157-158). Three-part list will not be discussed anymore as it was already examined in a separate chapter.

6.3.5.1. Alliteration

The following examples 21-23 demonstrate the orators' usage of alliteration, which is one of the most frequent repetitive forms that exist in my corpus. Alliteration consists of an identical commencement (of consonant sounds – consonantal alliteration or vocal sounds – vocalic alliteration) of two or more words or syllables within words. Therefore, alliteration often naturally occurs in language, which results in high frequency rates (Your Dictionary 2017b).

> 21) For the **s**truggling, the **s**triving the **s**uccessful (C1 187).
> 22) His appeal that we **b**uild **b**ridges, not walls (C3 148-149).
> 23) So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the **c**arefully-**c**rafted lies, and the media myths the Democrats are holding their convention next week (T1 20-21).

The extracts above indicate that alliteration was utilised in various forms by both speakers (across two words, within words, or even more words). The main purpose of alliteration is corresponding to most repetitive figures to attract attention and stress high impact points.

6.3.5.2. Anaphora

The excerpts 24 and 25 below demonstrate the use of anaphora of Clinton and Trump, more precisely; the repetition of one or more words at the beginning of consecutive phrases or sentences. Besides the common emphasising function of repetitive devices, anaphora creates anticipation within the audience and thereby involves the listeners emotionally and cognitively (Charteris-Black 2014: 40; Fahnestock 1999: 157-158). Anaphor is also recurrently employed by both orators; all further examples can be found in the appendix.

> 24) **For all** those who vote for me and for those who don't. **For all** Americans together! (C1 187-188).
> 25) This Administration has failed America's inner cities. **It's failed them** on education. It's failed them on jobs. **It's failed** them on crime. **It's failed them** at every level (T1 157-158).

6.3.5.3. Epistrophe

Epistrophe is basically the opposite of anaphora; hence, the repetition of one or more words at the end of successive phrases or sentences (Fahnestock 1999: 157-158). Consequently, it achieves the same effect as anaphora. Both speakers used epistrophe in their speeches; however, significantly less than anaphora, which is why it will not be discussed any further.

26) But even more important than the history we make tonight is the history we will write together in the years **ahead**. Let's begin with what we're going to do to help working people in our country get ahead and stay **ahead** (C1 198-200).
27) I'm With **You**, and I will fight for **you**, and I will win for **you** (T1 336-337).

6.3.5.4. Symploche

To briefly reiterate, symploche is a comination of anaphora and epistrophe: it encompasses an identical beginning and ending of consecutive phrases or sentences (Fahnestock 1999: 157-158). As it is a relatively complex figure, it merely occurs once in Trump's nomination acceptance speech (cf. example below). Despite that, it is extremely effective due to multiple repetitive passages and generates a powerful persuasive effect, which is even stronger in the epilogue (like in this case).

28) To all Americans tonight, in all our cities and towns, I make this promise: **We Will Make America** Strong **Again.**
29) **We Will Make America** Proud **Again.**
30) **We Will Make America** Safe **Again.**
31) And **We Will Make America** Great **Again** (T1 338-342).

6.3.5.5. Subjunctio

Subjunctio is probably the less familiar of all major categories of repetition. It stands for an immediate repetition of the exact same term after another (without any intermission) (Fahnestock 1999: 157-158). Therefore, subjunctio might seem erroneous, especially in written form. Nonetheless, Clinton and Trump employ this figure to stress keywords though their exact duplication after the previous item even more. In general, it is strongly recommended to manifest repetition in direct sequences to generate a more visible and persuasive impact.

32) We need an intelligence gathering system **second to none. Second to none** (T2 163).

33) Imagine, if you dare **imagine, imagine** him in the Oval Office facing a real crisis. (C1 348-349).

The previous examples illustrate how diversely Clinton and Trump use subjunctio. Example 33 by Clinton is exceptional as it is basically also a three-part list. Overall, Clinton applied this rhetorical devices more rarely – and if she does- in a more complex manner than her opponent. Trump, in contrast, tends to overuse repetition sometimes as in the example above (there is obviously no apparent reason for stressing a term like *second to none*; it even seems awkward or indeed fallacious at certain instances.). However, others might argue that utilising repetition in general is never wrong because the more it is employed, the more convinced and authoritative does the speaker appear (Charteris-Black 2014: 68, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969: 144). This directly leads to the next point, parallelism, which indicates similar results as subjunctio.

6.3.5.6. Parallelism

Parallelism was not yet addressed in the theoretical part. Despite that, it occurs at such excessively high frequency rates in the speakers' oratories (most outstandingly Trump's) that it has to be at least briefly mentioned. Parallelism consists of a repeated syntactical structure; in most cases, it also includes lexical repetition (Charteris-Black 2014: 41). It recurred so often in Trump's speeches that one might claim he only speaks in parallelisms. Therefore, not seldom parallelism was joined by other rhetorical devices (like three-part list in example 35 below).

34) Together, we will **lead** our party back to the White House, and we will **lead** our country back to safety, prosperity, and peace (T1 4-5).

35) That is why Hillary Clinton's message is that things will never **change.** My message is that things have to **change** – and they have to **change** right now (T1 105-106).

Just like it is the case with subjunctio, parallelism, and also many other repetitive figures, Trump's enormous use of repetitive features appears vastly exaggerated

sometimes, which resulted in sharp criticism by the media. It was even claimed that Trump's range of vocabulary was extremely limited and that he tries to conceal this lack of skill by overstating repetition. Nonetheless, my analysis shows that Trump's lexical density is at least not significantly lower than Clinton's (cf. table 6). Hence, it might be argued that repetition is merely a crucial and characteristic part of Trump's style. Generally, he could be perceived as the more self-confident and powerful speaker, which is due to countless repetitive devices that render discourse easier to follow and more understandable. However, others might assert that Trump's repetitive style is wildly exaggerated and prefer Clinton's moderate and more specific approach.

6.3.5.7. Ploche

Ploche is the most unrecognisable of all repetitive figures since it comprises exact repetitions of single lexical items (Fahnestock 1999: 158 pp.). Despite that, ploche renders interesting insights concerning the speakers' ideological positions. The question that remains unanswered is how ploche could be determined.

In my analysis, I ascertained the most frequent keywords of Clinton and Trump's speeches (for each speaker individually) and added some less frequent but relevant terms that might render information about the orators' viewpoints (like *future* and *past; good* and *bad*). Moreover, it needs to be remarked that in general I exclusively selected terms that could possibly render decisive conclusions on the speakers' stances (as it would be nonsensical to include top frequent terms such as *and, or,* or *because* considering that they are irrelevant for my investigation). In sum, 41 lexical items were collected in a list that shows Clinton and Trump's most frequent keywords or ploches according to their ranks (cf. table 11).

Rank nr.	Clinton's keywords (frequency)	Trump's keywords (frequency)
1.	America (69)	people (65)
2.	people (63)	America (50)
3.	president (38)	immigration (30)
4.	together (31)	president (26)
5.	job (24)	radical (24)
6.	good (21)	world (21)
7.	gun (14)	children (17)
8.	children (13), economy (13)	change (14)
9.	world (12), terrorist (12), family (12)	violence (13)
10.	hate (11)	job (9), Islam (9)
11.	love (10), change (10), future (10)	terrorist (8), safety (8), bad (8)
12.	women (8), war (8)	together (7),
13.	money (7), Muslim (7)	women (6), Muslim (6), crime (6), love (6), good (6)
14.	common (6), news (6), men (6)	peace (5), war (5)
15.	wall (5), progress (5)	hate (3), economy (3), ban (3), common (3), money (3), terror (3)
16.	past (4), peace (4)	future (2), family (2), men (2), education (2), crisis (2), wall (2), past (2)
17.	climate (3), education (3), violence (3), radical (3), crisis (3), ban (3)	gun (1), progress (1), news (1)
18.	insurance (2), bad (2), bridge (2), terror (2), immigration (2)	climate (0), insurance (0), bridge (0)
19.	Islam (1), safety (1)	
20.	crime (0)	

Table 11. Most frequent keywords in Clinton and Trump's speeches.

It is obvious that the speeches that I selected focussed on becoming the next American president (also the Orlando shooting reaction speeches implicitly aimed at convincing the orators' voters). Therefore, it is not surprising that terms like America, president, and people were among the most frequent ones. Yet, some notable differences could be established: Trump emphasises *immigration* (30 occurrences) drastically more than Clinton (2 occurrences). Furthermore, he addresses issues such as *safety, violence, crime, radical Islam,* and *change* much more often than his opponent. In contrast to Clinton, Trump mostly connects immigration to negativity and problems that threaten the American society in his eyes. Instilling and spreading fear and intimidation is a clear indication of right-wing rhetoric that was already commented on in chapter 4.2.6., more precisely, the *argumentum ad baculum* (Wodak & Meyer 2001: 65).

Clinton's main topics concern economic and educational notions involving terms such as *economy, job, money, education*, and *progress*, which is demonstrated by decisively higher frequency rates. Additionally, she stresses family-related and gender issues significantly more often (except for the concept of *children*, which is slightly more referred to by Trump). In comparison to her rival, Clinton underscores the *future* (10 instances) notably more than the *past* (2 instances); Trump mentions them to an equal extent (2 instances per category). This also interesting with regard to the *good-bad* distinction; Clinton uses good nearly four times as often as bad. Trump contrastingly utilises *bad* even more than *good*. This further promotes the previous arguments that Trump evidently -for the most part- employs conservative language as he rather underlines negative and menacing notions. Clinton, in opposition to that, manifests liberal language through her focus on positive and more moderate expressions. These claims are further supported by Clinton's accentuation of collaborative terms as *together, common*, and (building) *bridge*s instead of *wall*s.

With regard to *climate*, the result was relatively poor: solely Clinton discussed the *climate* at three occurrences; Trump did not mention it at all. The reason for that might be that immigration is apparently at the moment a more current issue, which lets other subjects (like climate, education, and others) recede into the background. Moreover, there is no doubt that the general result was greatly influenced by the Orlando reaction speeches, which explicitly focussed on the aftermath of the attack.

To conclude, ploche undoubtedly rendered revealing insights concerning the speakers' ideological stances and their major issues in the election campaigns. In spite of that, it

would have been worthwhile to collect more than 41 samples to arrive at more varied and precise conclusions. Unfortunately, this would have exceeded the scope of this thesis.

Concerning repetition as a whole, it could be inferred that Trump utilises this device overall more frequently than Clinton. At certain times, it could actually be argued that he overuses and exaggerates ploche. Clinton's approach is in contrast much more cautious. Consequently, it depends on the audience and who prefers a more direct or less direct style regarding which technique is to be seen as more persuasive and successful. Moreover, ploche/keyword analysis indicates that the topics discussed varied in terms of frequency level: Clinton emphasises economic and family-related notions, whereas Trump greatly stresses immigration. Again, it is open for discussion which subjects ought to be discussed in more detail than others – some listeners might prefer Trump's ranking of importance, some Clinton's.

6.3.6. Metonymy

Comparable to previous rhetorical figures, metonymy is also analysed with regard to its frequency and context.

6.3.6.1. Frequency analysis

As already explained in the theoretical part, metonymy is remarkably similar to metaphor in terms of form and function (Charteris-Black 2014: 47; Merriam Webster 2017; Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 36 pp.). Furthermore, it is after metaphor the second most frequently used trope in the examined speeches. More specifically, frequency analysis demonstrated dramatic differences between both speakers: Clinton (40 instances) employed metonymy exactly twice as often as Trump (20 instances). However, before going into further detail concerning the outcome, I will have to explain how the data was collected:

It was already remarked that metonymy like metaphor is categorised according to metonymical concepts that are grounded on individual experiences. Naturally, these concepts are also culturally and historically influenced (Gibbs 1993: 259). Different models and approaches to these concepts were already discussed in chapter 5.7.1; the concepts that I chose for my analysis vastly correspond to Lakoff & Johnson's theory. These involve THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE), PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT,

OBJECT USED FOR USER, INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE, THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION, CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED, and THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT (1980: 36 pp.). Yet, I appended one additional category of Peprník's model because it was fairly suitable and practical concerning the survey, namely A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS BEARER (2003: 53-54). All of the metonymical concepts of the analysis can be viewed in tables 12-15 below, which encompass all individual and total occurrence numbers of metonymy including examples.

Concept	C1	Example	T1	Example
THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE)	13	To drive real progress, you have to change both **hearts and laws.**	3	I AM YOUR **VOICE.**
PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT				
OBJECT USED FOR USER				
CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED				
INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE	3	So don't let anyone tell you that **our country** is weak.	2	**Communities** want relief.
THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION	7	And I believe **Wall Street** can never, ever be allowed to wreck **Main Street** again.	8	In this race for **the White House**, I am the Law and Order candidate.
THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT				
A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS BEARER	2	We heard the **man from Hope**, Bill Clinton. And the **man of hope,** Barack Obama.		
Sum	**25**		**13**	

Table 12. Metonymy concepts and their occurrences in Clinton and Trump's Nomination Acceptance Speeches

Concept	C2	Example	T2	Example
THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE)	6	And we must attack it with clear **eyes,** steady **hands,** unwavering determination and pride.	2	It's a strike at the **heart and soul** of who we are as a nation.
PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT				

OBJECT USED FOR USER	1	Thankfully, his life was saved by a **Kevlar helmet.**		
CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED				
INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE	3	[...] 13 squabbling **colonies** put aside their disagreements and united.		
THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION				
THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT				
A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS BEARER			1	The **killer** [...] was born in Afghan.
Sum	**10**		**3**	

Table 13. Metonymy concepts and their occurrences in Clinton and Trump's Reaction Speeches

Concept	C3	Example	T3	Example
THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE)	4	There are a lot of friendly **faces** in this room.	2	[...] his was built with the **hands** of God.
PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT				
OBJECT USED FOR USER				
CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED				
INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE			1	Hillary has believed that it takes a **village.**
THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION			1	**Washington** is failing.
THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT				
A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS BEARER	1	That's why it didn't take a **village** to write these jokes.		
Sum	**5**		**4**	

Table 14. Metonymy concepts and their occurrences in Clinton and Trump's Charity Dinner Speeches

Concept	C1-3	T1-3
THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE)	23	7
PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT		
OBJECT USED FOR USER	1	
CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED		
INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE	6	3
THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION	7	9
THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT		
A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS BEARER	3	1
Sum	**40**	**20**

Table 15. Metonymy concepts and their total occurrences in Clinton and Trump's speeches

Regarding table 15, it becomes clear that the speakers referred to chiefly the same conceptual categories. Clinton's by far most recurrently employed category is SYNECDOCHE (23), which is followed by THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION (7) and INSTITUATION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE (6). Surprisingly, Trump's most frequently used group is not the usual main subgroup SYNECDOCHE but THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION (9); which is then followed by SYNECDOCHE (7). Some categories did not occur at all; therefore, they won't be discussed any further. All individual tables and examples can be observed in the appendix.

6.3.6.2. Contextual analysis

Apart from employing twice as many metonymies, Clinton also manifests a higher degree of variety regarding metonymical concepts. On the one hand, this is due to the incorporation of an additional category (OBJECT USED FOR USER); on the other hand, Clinton also demonstrates more diversity within each category by utilising more distinct and atypical terminology (such as *across the aisle* as part of the whole government or *the man from hope* referring to Bill Clinton) than her opponent. However, for the most part, Clinton prefers to adhere to more common metonymies like *hearts, souls, faces, eyes, hands*, or *voices* in place of their referents. Consequently, and first and foremost, Clinton's central intention is to address the audience's emotions by applying emotive language and focussing on people issues in general. According to her policy of being "Stronger Together", she refers to several INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE metonymies as for example *our country, the community*, "it takes a *village*", and many more. Secondly, Clinton employs metonymy to strengthen her own image of sincerity and trustworthiness via statements such as "I believe it with all *my heart*". And thirdly,

she expresses criticism towards her opponent, for instance by comparing Trump's actions to something that "should set off *alarm bells* to all of us".

In opposition to Clinton, Trump displays only half as many metonymies and many of the ones he uses are repetitions (more specifically, ploches). The most typical ones include *America, Washington*, and *the White House* as PLACES FOR THE INSTITUTIONS. His metonymies are often accompanied by negative terminology like "the *hands* of savage killers", "*Iran* was being choked", or "*Washington* is failing". Hence, it can be concluded that Trump refers to metonymy in the first place to present critique towards the government, his opponent, and opposing groups such as terroristic organisations. Further, Trump again demonstrates his conviction about how well qualified he would be as future present through assertions such as "I am your *voice*" and "We will make *America* proud again". Thus, and comparable to the results of the previously addressed rhetorical devices, Trump once again might appear as the more self-assured orator in comparison to Clinton, who keeps to her more moderate and implicit style.

In brief, there is no doubt concerning the importance of metonymy in persuasive discourse; just like metaphor it is one of the most essential rhetorical devices that speakers are able to employ. Yet, the analysis shows drastic differences in terms of frequency and contextual analysis between both candidates. The fact that Trump used merely half as many and less varied metonymies as Clinton definitely speaks for itself.

6.3.7. Metaphor

Metaphor frequency and contextual analysis was conducted via the establishment of certain semantic fields (each one encompasses various metaphorical concepts – cf. table 18), which will be elaborated on in the following chapter. The results of both speakers were subsequently compared and examined with regard to different metaphor types.

6.3.7.1. Critical metaphor analysis (CMA)

Comparable to the outcome of the metonymy analysis, its relative metaphor yielded very similar results. In this case, the conclusions were even clearer: Clinton (126 instances) manifested metaphor more than twice as often as Trump (53 instances). All collected metaphors per theme and individual speech can be observed in table 16.

Table 16 also indicates how the data was gathered: since metaphor occurrences are countless in the analysed speeches, they were accumulated according to their

related semantic field as for instance "our nation's *march* toward a more perfect union" belongs to the category 'journey' (C1 189-190). Overall, 23 semantic fields or so-called metaphorical concepts were identified that matched the examined speeches and their recurring metaphors. All of these fields can be observed in table 16 encompassing politically relevant areas like 'battle', 'finances/economy', 'unity/encounter/friendship', 'leadership/authority', and many more. Most of the 23 semantic fields were established and adapted corresponding to previously designated semantic fields in other recent political discourse surveys such as Charteris-Black (2014) and Penninck (2014).

This methodology follows the source-based approach defined by Charteris-Black (2014: 186-187). According to the author, most linguists recommend the identification of semantic fields as an initial step to start critical metaphor analysis. However, researchers need to beware that the selected semantic fields may not be too general nor too specific and ought to correspond to the findings. For example, nature could potentially comprise the fields 'liquid/water' and 'fabric'; yet, it is much better and profitable to separate them to obtain more detailed results. In sum, the source-based is much more suitable for this analysis as it encompasses all metaphor instances. The contrasting, namely the topic-based approach, would have only focussed on certain subjects according to the research questions and, thereby, had presumably excluded valuable findings. This method would have only been useful in case exclusively certain topics had been investigated (2014: 186-187).

Semantic field	C1	T1	C2	T2	C3	T3	C total number	T total number
1. Battle	4	5	0	2	1	0	5	7
2. Machine/human	2	0	2	0	0	0	4	0
3. Construction/destruction	16	5	4	3	4	0	24	8
4. Journey	9	1	3	0	1	0	13	1
5. Illness/health	5	0	3	2	0	0	8	2
6. Motion	4	1	2	3	0	0	6	4
7. Nature/animal	8	3	0	0	0	0	8	3
8. (Non-)restriction	1	1	3	0	0	0	4	1
9.Unity/encounter/friendship	8	3	10	1	3	2	21	6
10. Vision	2	0	2	0	0	0	4	0
11. Position	1	2	1	0	0	0	2	2
12. Heroic myth	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
13. Supply/provision	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
14. Game/sports	5	3	1	0	1	0	7	3
15. Container	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	2
16. Leadership/authority	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0
17. Balance/weight	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
18. Liquid/water	1	4	3	5	0	0	4	9
19. Finances/economy	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	1
20. Religion	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	1
21. Transport/ship	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
22. Fabric	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0
23. Light/darkness	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
Total number metaphors	75	32	39	18	13	3		

Table 16. Metaphorical fields in Clinton & Trump's individual speeches including their frequency rates

One of the most important issues with regard to the presented semantic fields is to set clear guidelines for each category and to avoid overlapping. For instance, 'journey' metaphors could easily also be identified as 'motion' metaphors. Yet, there is obviously a difference between "Iran is *on the path* to nuclear weapons." – which stands for the 'journey' of Iran towards nuclear arms (T1 80) and "Illegal border crossings will *go down*" (T1 214) – the 'motion' of border crossings that will decrease.

As can already be inferred from table 16, the results showed drastic differences between Clinton and Trump in terms of frequency overall and semantic field occurrences. Hence, I created a table that incorporates a ranking according to the most recurrent semantic fields of both speakers, which can be viewed in table 17.

Rank	Clinton (occurrences)	Trump (occurrences)
1.	Construction/destruction (24)	Liquid/water (9)
2.	Unity/encounter/friendship (21)	Construction/destruction (8)
3.	Journey (13)	Battle (7)
4.	Illness/health (8); nature/animal (8)	Unity/encounter/friendship (6)
5.	Game/sports (7)	Motion (4)
6.	Motion (6)	Game/sports (3); nature/animal (3)
7.	Battle (5)	Illness/health (2); position (2); container (2); supply/provision (2)
8.	Machine/human (4); liquid/water (4); vision (4); (non-) restriction (4)	Light/darkness (1); religion (1); finances/economy (1); (non-)restriction (1); journey (1)
9.	Fabric (3)	
10.	Position (2); heroic myth (2); container (2); transport/ship (2); religion (2); finances/economy (2); leadership/authority (2)	
11.	Light/darkness (1)	

Table 17. Metaphorical fields in Clinton & Trump's speeches ranked according to their frequency level

Another controversy that needs to be addressed concerns the counting of metaphors. In fact, I counted each individual occurrence regardless of repetitions; more specifically, ploches. For example, the term 'build' occurred several times such as in "We *built* a coalition." (C1 153) and "the future we're going to *build"* (C1 107). Despite that, each instance was calculated. Further debatable cases involved if distinct metaphors appeared consecutively together like in "Let our legacy be about *planting seeds* in a *garden* you never get to see." (C1 417-418). Again, each metaphorical item was counted separately.

6.3.7.2. Comparison of Clinton and Trump's metaphors overall

As a result, the following conclusions can be drawn from metaphor analysis: Clinton not only employs significantly more metaphors, she also prioritises other semantic fields than Trump (cf. table 17). More precisely, 'construction/destruction' (24 evidences), 'unity/encounter/friendship' (21 evidences), and journey (13 evidences) are by far her most frequently used fields. This outcome further confirms the previous conclusions from previously discussed rhetorical devices. Clinton directly promotes her party slogan via proclamations such as "We *stand together* because we are stronger together." (C2 238). Moreover, she chiefly focuses on future and positive, literally constructive events, which is supported by the following metaphors: "the legacy we *carry forward*" (C3 128-

129), "*build bridges*" (C3 149), and "our greatest *monument* on this Earth won't be what we *build*, but the lives we *touch*" (C3 157-158).

In opposition to Clinton, Trump uses only about half as many metaphors in general. Consequently, the variety of semantic fields that he refers to is comparatively low, which becomes immediately apparent by looking at table 16. His most recurrent categories are 'liquid/water' (9 examples), 'construction/destruction' (8 examples), and 'battle' (7 examples). Hence, 'construction/destruction' is the semantic field that matches with Clinton as one of the most frequent. Nonetheless, considerable discrepancies with regard to contextual usage can be disclosed that are reminiscent of previous realisations: once more, Trump's metaphors are prevalently surrounded by negative and verbatim destructive terminology including the following examples "our roads and bridges are *falling apart*" (T1 57), "Iran was *being choked* by sanctions" (T1 74-75), and "violence *spilling across* our border" (T1 198). Consequently, metaphor analysis likewise proves the theory that Trump demonstrates many instances of extremist right-wing-rhetoric, which becomes even more evident in comparison to Clinton.

In general, Beard's claims that 'war/battle' and 'sports' concern the most outstanding semantic fields in politics can be refuted (2000: 21).

6.3.7.3. Metaphorical concepts

The outcome of this analysis demonstrates that the vast majority of metaphors are according to Charteris-Black's assertion concerning political discourse metaphor analysis indeed entrenched or conventional and not novel (2014: 178 pp.). There were extremely few representations of novel metaphors and all of them were used by Clinton: the first instance is "Our military is a national *treasure.*" (C1 339), which could be classified as THE MILITARY IS A TREASURE/NATIONAL SYMBOL/NATIONAL VALUE concept. The second instance refers to the question "How are you going to break through the *gridlock* in Washington?" (C1 290-291), which could be identified as THE GOVERNMENT IS A GRIDLOCK/BLOCKADE concept.

In general, numerous metaphorical concepts according to Lakoff & Johnson's doctrine (1980) could be discerned. The most essential ones are collected and illustrated in table 18, which incorporates examples for each category. According to Charteris-Black, the concepts can be separated into positively and negatively associated terms, which is why I employed this division in the table (2014: 185 pp.). Comparable to

the already explained procedure with semantic fields, I established metaphorical concepts (like POLITICS IS WAR/SPORTS/A GAME, GOOD GOVERNING IS CREATING, THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM IS A JOURNEY) by means of basing them on and comparing them to already prevalent concepts in political discourse (cf. Chartis-Black 2014: 212-213). All selected metaphorical concepts accord with certain semantic fields that I already detected in the first step of the analysis (cf. table 16).

Semantic field	Positive concepts	Example	Negative concepts	Example
Battle	POLITICS IS WAR IN-GROUPS ARE ALLIES SUCCESS IS VICTORY	And I believe Wall Street can never, ever be allowed to **wreck** Main Street again (C1 234-235).	SOCIAL PROBLEMS/ OUT-GROUPS ARE ENEMIES FAILURE IS DEFEAT	We all remember the images of our sailors **being forced to their knees** by their Iranian captors at gunpoint (T1 61-62).
Construction /destruction	GOOD GOVERNING IS CREATING	None of us can raise a family, **build** a business, heal a community or **lift** a country totally alone (C1 101-102).	BAD GOVERNING IS DESTROYING	The murder of innocent people **breaks** our hearts, **tears at** our sense of security and makes us furious (C2 70-72).
Motion/ journey	SUCCESS IS SPEED/UP/FRONT THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM IS A JOURNEY	Tonight, we've reached a milestone in our nation's **march toward** a more perfect union (C1 189-190).	FAILURE IS SLOWNESS/DOWN/BACK OUT-GROUPS ARE OBSTACLES	Illegal border crossings will **go down** (T1 214).
Illness/ health	THE IN-GROUP POLICIES ARE MEDICINE THE POLITICIAN IS A DOCTOR	We have to **heal** the divides in our country (C1 370).	SOCIAL PROBLEMS ARE/THE OUT-GROUP IS A DESEASE SOCIETY IS A SICK PATIENT	Too much **paralysis** in Washington (C1 69-70).
Nature/ animal	THE IN-GROUP IS A POWERFUL ANIMAL/FORCE OF NATURE	Reducing taxes will cause new companies and new jobs to come	THE OUT-GROUP IS A PARASITE/ DANGEROUS	ISIS **has spread across** the region, and the

		roaring back into our country (T1 267-268).	ANIMAL/ FORCE OF NATURE	world (T1 76).
Family (unity/ encounter/ friendship)	NURTURANT PARENT THE IN-GROUP IS A FAMILY WHERE EVERYONE SUPPORTS EACH OTHER	We have to look out for each other and **lift each other up.** (C1 141).	STRICT FATHER DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN PARTIES/GROU PS/IDEOLOGIES ARE SEPARATION/D IVORCE	Powerful forces are threatening **to pull us apart** (C1 45-46). Families **ripped apart** (T1 167).
Heroic myth	THE IN-GROUP IS A HERO/SAVIOR	I believe climate change is real and that we can **save** our planet while creating millions of good-paying clean energy jobs (C1 236-237).	THE OUT-GROUP IS A VILLAIN	
Game/ sports	POLITICS IS A GAME/SPORTS SUCCESS IS WINNING/BEIN G IN CONTROL	More than a few times, I've had to pick myself up and get back in the **game** (C1 406).	FAILURE IS LOSING/BEING OUT OF CONTROL	She is their **puppet**, and they **pull the strings** (T1 103-104).
Religion	IN-GROUPS AND THEIR POLICIES ARE A FORCE FOR GOOD/ANGELS		OPPOSING GROUPS AND THEIR POLICIES ARE A FORCE FOR EVIL/DEVILS	One more child to sacrifice on **the altar** of open borders (T1 23).
Light/ darkness	THE IN-GROUP IS/POSITIVE ISSUES ARE A SOURCE OF LIGHT		THE OUT-GROUP IS/NEGATIVE ISSUES ARE A SOURCE OF DARKNESS	This is a very **dark** moment in America's history (T2).

Table 18. Positive and negative metaphorical concepts in politics including examples

As can be concluded from table 18, there are specific metaphorical concepts that prevail in the political domain. These concepts render information about the ideological background of the speakers, which becomes the most apparent by contrasting the strict-

father and the nurturant parent model. There is no doubt that Clinton and Trump almost perfectly adhere to the liberal and conservative language theory by Lakoff (1996), which is not only confirmed by metaphor analysis but also through other previously mentioned rhetorical devices. Moreover, Clinton pursues a collaborative, caring, and generally optimistic approach; Trump, in contrast, favours a much stricter, more rigid, pessimistic, and segregating notion (cf. examples in chapter 6.3.7.2.).

With regard to metaphorical coherence, recurring metaphorical concepts such as *(re) build, divide, throw, flow, stand together, lift, meet, pour into, and go (up/down)* – often within the same conceptual groups - prove that metaphorical coherence is definitely manifested in Clinton and Trump's speeches. Entirely consistent metaphors did not occur. As already addressed in the theoretical part, metaphorical coherence accords to the structuring function of metaphor; particularly repetitive items contribute to textual coherence and facilitate understanding, which can be observed in both speakers' oratories.

6.3.7.4. Different metaphor types

The vast majority of metaphors in this analysis comprise ontological metaphors in the first place, and orientational metaphors in the second place. Conduit metaphors occurred extremely rarely and, therefore, solely represent the third place. However, these findings directly correspond to Lakoff & Johnson's doctrine concerning the frequency of metaphor types (1980: 10 pp.).

6.3.7.4.1. Ontological metaphors

In general, ontological metaphors comprise the most variable group as they can be utilised for countless purposes (cf. chapter 5.8.3.3.). Particularly in the political area, speakers chiefly refer to, organise, quantify, and reason about diverse notions, which naturally also applies to Clinton and Trump. Common examples of ontological metaphors in the examined speeches include the following: "America is in many ways *divided***. America is in many ways *divided* like it has never been before." – which represents the organising function (T3 111) and "So tonight, let's embrace the *spirit* of the evening." – referring function (C3 122).

Yet, it needs to be underscored that the primal form of ontological metaphors, namely personification, will be discussed separately.

6.3.7.4.2. Orientational metaphors

Orientational metaphors represent the second most frequent group and are typically based on spatial orientation of metaphorical concepts. Clinton and Trump manifested this category to facilitate understanding of complex notions via simpler and more illustrative terminology, which is demonstrated by the following instances: "The more we learn about what happened, the better we'll be able to protect our people *going forward."* (C2 49-50). "But today, there's only one thing to discuss, the *growing* threat of terrorism inside of our borders." (T2 9-10).

6.3.7.4.3. Conduit metaphors

Conduit metaphors encompass predominantly entrenched and, therefore, barely notable metaphors. As a result, they serve as the most naturally perceived category of metaphors that still renders information concerning the orators' ideological stance. Amongst few more, the following examples of conduit metaphors could be identified: "And, with your help, I will *carry* all of your voices and stories *with me* to the White House." (C1 183-184). "Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent because they know she will *keep our rigged system in place."* (T1 101-102).

6.3.7.5. Personification

Although personification is actually a subcategory of ontological metaphors, I analysed this group independently to yield more specified results. Hence, it is astounding that Trump employs slightly more instances (9) of personification than Clinton (8) although Clinton uses more than twice as many metaphors in general. Yet, this outcome does not really impact the overall conclusions regarding metaphor manifestation of both speakers. The following recurrences of personification could be found amongst others (cf appendix): "this will be one of the most important issues *decided by this election* (T1 293), "*troubled times*" (T1 4), "the *media talks* about" (T2 233). "Bernie, *your campaign inspired* millions of Americans (C1 26), "the third *area that demands* attention" (C2 174), "a *proud symbol*" (C3 37).

Overall, all different metaphor types were used by both speakers in similar ways. Therefore, no discernible distinctions could be observed with regard to ontological,

orientational, conduit metaphors, and personification between Clinton and Trump (aside from the fact that Clinton in general still utilizes significantly more metaphors).

To sum up, the orators manifested all seven functions of metaphor. Naturally, one of the prime purposes of metaphor is to attract and maintain the listeners' attention. Further, it could also be observed that the speakers rendered complicated issues more comprehensible and illustrative (which was especially the case with orientational metaphors). Moreover, table 16 indicates how each metaphor is connoted with positive and negative associations and how Clinton and Trump managed to present themselves and their parties' notions in a significantly better light than the opponent and the opposing party. In addition, metaphorical coherence supported the audience's understanding, which was established by means of repetitive elements, more precisely ploches, of both speakers. Naturally, metaphor analysis also showed how Clinton and Trump expressed their ideological viewpoints through metaphorical concepts. And lastly, also the seventh function, namely political myth, was fulfilled since the orators showcased instances of 'heroic myth' concepts and presented their and their parties' actions as a challenging and almost grandiose 'journey' into the right direction.

Overall, numerous differences in terms of frequency and contextual usage could be observed between the two speakers. The most outstanding fact shows that Clinton uses more than twice as many metaphors than Trump and, thereby, achieves a higher degree of variety of semantic fields and metaphorical concepts. Moreover, Clinton focuses on different issues (such as constructive notions, and unity- and journey-related areas). There is no doubt that Trump's comparatively low metaphor frequency and diversity including his focus on destructive and negative/war-related issues does not genuinely speak for his rhetorical skills. In this case, Clinton clearly represents the better and more experienced speaker. And considering the importance of metaphor in persuasive discourse as the so-called "mother of rhetorical devices overall", these results will also generate a decisive impact on the persuasiveness of Clinton and Trump's speeches.

6.4. Pronominal analysis

According to the analysis of rhetorical figures, also pronominal usage was scrutinised with regard to frequency rate and contextual occurrence.

6.4.1. Frequency analysis

The tables below exhibit personal (table 19) and possessive pronouns (table 20) in Clinton and Trump's oratories. They also include the total number of each separate pronoun per speaker.

Speech	1st p. sing. – *I (me)*	1st p. pl. – *we (us)*	2nd p. sing./pl. – *you (you)*	3rd p. sing. – *he (him), she (her), it (it)*	3rd p. pl. – *they (them)*
C1	106	156	86	139	34
T1	78	66	21	67	30
C2	50	98	27	41	32
T2	52	138	33	103	65
C3	84	27	38	63	9
T3	67	24	26	55	15
C total	**240 = Ø 80**	**281 = Ø 93,66**	**151 = Ø 50,33**	**243 = Ø 81**	**75 = Ø 25**
T total	**197 = Ø 65,66**	**228 = Ø 76**	**80 = Ø 26,66**	**328 = Ø 109,3**	**110 = Ø 36,6**

Table 19. Personal pronouns in Clinton and Trump's speeches

Speech	1st p. sing. – *my (mine)*	1st p. pl. – *our (ours)*	2nd p. sing./pl. – *your (yours)*	3rd p. sing. – *his (his), her (hers), its (its)*	3rd p. pl. – *their (theirs)*
C1	29	76	21	22	16
T1	35	95	12	22	28
C2	3	61	4	10	14
T2	2	66	2	19	16
C3	14	8	7	19	4
T3	14	1	2	14	3
C total	**46 = Ø 15,33**	**145 = Ø 48,33**	**32 = Ø 10,66**	**51 = Ø 17**	**34 = Ø 11,33**
T total	**51 = Ø 17**	**162 = Ø 54**	**16 = Ø 5,33**	**55 = Ø 18,33**	**47 = Ø 15,66**

Table 20. Possessive pronouns in Clinton and Trump's speeches

As can be inferred from table 19 and 20 above, frequency analysis already renders some evident results. Concerning first person singular and plural forms, Clinton displays a higher frequency in terms of personal pronouns than her opponent, whereas Trump excels at possessive pronouns. However, Clinton's manifestation of first person personal and possessive pronouns is definitely the highest, followed by third person pronouns and lastly second person pronouns. It might also be noteworthy that the first person

plural is the most recurrent pronoun she uses in general. This clearly shows that Clinton puts major emphasis on shared responsibilities. The question with whom these responsibilities are preferably shared (her party, the American people, the world, others) can merely be answered by contextual analysis, which will be rendered in the following. Moreover, Clinton employs approximately twice as many second person (personal and possessive) pronouns as her opponent. Hence, she displays a much greater ability to directly address and involve the public than Trump, which generates a more persuasive impact overall.

In opposition to Clinton, Trump only utilises about half as many first person plural personal pronouns and second person (personal and possessive) pronouns. Additionally, his first person singular employment in table 19 lags slightly behind Clinton's. Instead, the most recurrent form of personal pronouns he uses is the third person singular. These findings fully validate the following outcome: Trump rather focuses on a politics of opposition and highlighting other people (such as – most outstandingly – his adversary or the opposing party) than himself, his supporters, or the American citizens. Furthermore, he misses the chance to involve the audience and create a feeling of union and shared responsibility as much as Clinton (at least according to the frequency analysis). Contextual investigation will provide more profound understanding of who Trump exactly addresses; yet, the fact that his display of third person personal and possessive pronouns by far exceeds Clinton's speaks for itself.

6.4.2. Contextual analysis

In conjunction with the previous frequency analysis, it is indispensable to examine concrete textual examples of both speakers. Since the contextual results were so manifold and revealing, I divided them according to Wilson into three sections, namely self-referencing, relations of contrast, and other referencing – cf. chapters 5.9.2-5.9.4. (Wilson 1990: 61-62).

6.4.2.1. Self-referencing

Frequency survey showed that Clinton employs slightly more first person pronouns than Trump (cf. table 19). Overall, both candidates demonstrate no inhibitions to take on responsibility of their own. Of course, this is mostly the case if the speakers talk about their positive achievements and strengths. To create maximal effect, the orators utilise

whole chains/blocks of pronouns in consecutive parts, which his exemplified in the extracts below (Wilson 1990: 62-63).

36) Now, sometimes the people at this podium are new to the national stage. As you know, **I**'m not one of those people. **I**'ve been your **first lady**. Served eight years as a **Senator** from the great State of New York. Then **I** represented all of you as **Secretary of State.** But **my** job titles only tell you what **I've** done. They don't tell you why. The truth is, through all these years of public service, **the "service" part** has always come easier to me than **the "public" part** (C1 117-122).

37) When that same Secretary of State rakes in millions of dollars trading access and favors to special interests and foreign powers **I** know the time for action has come. **I** have joined the political arena so that the powerful can no longer beat up on people that cannot defend themselves. Nobody knows the system better than **me**, which is why **I alone** can fix it. **I** have seen firsthand how the system is rigged against our citizens, just like it was rigged against Bernie Sanders – he never had a chance (T1 128-134).

After looking at the examples, it becomes obvious that the speakers stage their position and their qualities differently. Clinton mainly refers to herself as former first lady, Senator, and Secretary of State to showcase her achievements and long political experience. Comparable to Margaret Thatcher, who cleverly presented her dual role as loving individual ('I') on the one hand and fierce leader of her party on the other hand ('we'), Clinton also directly addresses the distinction between a private or "service" part and a "public" part of her profession (cf. example above). Just like Thatcher, Clinton manages to incorporate swift transitions between first person singular and (primarily inclusive) plural forms, as can be seen in the excerpt below.

38) In this campaign, **I**'ve met so many people who motivate me to keep fighting for change. And, with **your** help, **I** will carry all of **your** voices and stories with **me** to the White House. And **you** heard, **you** heard from Republicans and Independents who are supporting **our** campaign. Well **I** will be a **President for Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.** For the struggling, the striving the successful. For all **those** who vote for **me** and

for **those** who don't. For **all** Americans together! Tonight, **we'**ve reached a milestone in **our** nation's march toward a more perfect union: the first time that a major party has nominated **a woman for president.** Standing here … standing here as **my mother's daughter**, and **my daughter's mother**, **I'**m so happy this day has come. **I'**m happy for grandmothers and little girls and everyone in between. **I'**m happy for boys and men – because when any barrier falls in America it clears the way for everyone. After all, when there are no ceilings, the sky's the limit. So **let's** keep going, **let's** keep going until every one of the 161 million women and girls across America has the opportunity she deserves to have (C1 182-197).

One might argue that Clinton repeatedly plays the "woman card" to present herself in a more favourable position. However, the image she creates as caring and sensitive mother ('I') and dominant and accomplished leader of democrats, republicans, and independents ('we') at the same time is extremely powerful.

In contrast to Clinton, Trump alludes to his expertise as businessman to stand out as man of the people who fights against the "rigged system" (cf. second example), which is strongly reminiscent of Thatcher's 'us against them' strategy. However, in Trump's case sometimes it might be actually called 'me against the rest' strategy ("I alone can fix it." – cf. second example).

Both orators employ mental-process verbs such as 'believe', 'think', 'imagine', or 'wish' to add more sincerity and personal involvement to their claims. Clinton intricately combines this method by establishing blocks of pronouns and a final transition from first person singular to second person, as can be viewed in the example below.

39) And here's what **I** believe. **I believe** America thrives when the middle class thrives. **I believe** our economy isn't working the way it should because our democracy isn't working the way it should. […] And **I believe** in science**. I believe** climate change is real and that we can save our planet while creating millions of good-paying clean energy jobs. **I believe** that when we have millions of hardworking immigrants contributing to our economy, it would be self-defeating and inhumane to try to kick them out. […] So whatever party **you** belong to, or if **you** belong to no party at all, if **you share these beliefs**, this is **your** campaign (C1 226-243).

In relation to Clinton, Trump demonstrates a higher degree of certainty in his lexical choice, which clearly shows in the following extract. As a result, he might be perceived as the more secure and convinced speaker of the two, which automatically exerts a more persuasive impact than Clinton does.

40) **I am certain** it is a decision he truly regrets. […] **I know** that corruption has reached a level like never before. […] **I know** the time for action has come (T1 71-130).

6.4.2.2. Relations of contrast

As was already commented on before, the election campaign between Clinton and Trump was marked by its harshness and continuous sideswipes at each other. For this reason, it is no wonder that both speakers also demonstrated the distance between them through pronominal usage to contrast themselves from their addressees. This is achieved by referring to third person pronouns like '*he'*, *'she'*, including their variants *'him', 'her', 'his',* and *'her'*. Instead of directly naming the adversary, employing pronouns generates a decreasing effect and lets the addressee appear in a less substantial perspective. This is also exemplified in the extracts below.

41) Well, we heard **Donald Trump's** answer last week at his convention. **He** wants to divide **us** — from the rest of the world, and from each other.

42) **He'**s betting that the perils of today's world will blind **us** to its unlimited promise. **He'**s taken the Republican Party a long way from "Morning in America" to "Midnight in America." **He** wants **us** to fear the future and fear each other (C1 51-55).

Clinton first introduces her statement about Trump's intentions by directly naming him. Subsequently, she shifts to a pronominal chain to avoid devoting him too much attention but still blaming him for his political plans at the same time (cf. example above).

43) Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent because they know **she** will keep our rigged

system in place. **They** are throwing money at her because **they** have total control over everything **she** does. **She** is their puppet, and **they** pull the strings (T1 101-104).

In the passage above, Trump merely refers to Clinton as 'she' and designates her as a "puppet", whose strings are being pulled by several influential associations. This is a relatively potent sequence of metaphorical expressions for the pronominal forms increase the weakening effect that the term "puppet" is identified with.

6.4.2.3. Other referencing

As already remarked in chapter 5.9.4, *'them', 'those',* and *'it'* are common methods to refer to people besides the speaker and the addressee. Frequency analysis shows that Trump overall uses substantially more third person singular and plural pronouns than Clinton. The claim that Trump pursues a stronger policy of opposition is also supported by contextual analysis. This is due to the fact that Clinton mostly uses other referencing to present the referents in a positive and benevolent manner; in opposition to that, Trump preferably employs it to perceive 'others' from a negative and condescending viewpoint. The following examples reinforce these assertions.

44) The only way to do this is by working closely with our partners, strengthening our alliances, not weakening **them** or walking away from **them** (C2 117-118).
45) She wants to take away American's guns and then admit the very people who want to slaughter us. Let **them** come into the country, we don't have guns. Let **them** come in, let **them** have all the fun they want (T2 131-133).

In the face of the recent terrorist attack in Orlando, Clinton employs about half as many third person pronouns as Trump in her reaction speech. The reason for that is that Clinton rather focuses on directly expressing her compassion for the victims than blaming the assassin. Although the events are obviously dramatic, she sticks to a positive tone and emphasizes the importance of collaboration with the nation's allies to fight terrorism (cf. example above).

In contrast to that, Trump manifests whole chains of pronouns to speak about the Orlando shooter and terrorism generally, which is often accompanied by hyperbole (of course, Trump does not want to "let them have all the fun they want"). He reinforces his argumentation by his lexical choice and largely negative terminology such as "slaughter".

In sum, my survey confirms Wilson's theory that 'them' is used in a less dramatic and patronizing fashion than 'those' or the according to the author even more extreme and distancing form 'it' (1990: 69-70). This is due to the fact that Clinton employs 'them' nearly exclusively to allude to positive terms and circumstances (this does not hold true for Trump however, who applies the pronoun in diverse contexts and at very high frequency rates – cf. table 19). In contrast to that, 'those' and 'it' occur relatively scarcely and in case they do, they usually refer to enemies or negative issues. The outcome is demonstrated by the following extracts.

46) We have to stand together, be proud together. There is no better rebuke to the terrorists and all **those** who hate (C2 223-225).
47) The media talks about home grown terrorism but Islamic radicalism and that's a very, very important term -- a term that the president refuses to use and the networks that nurture **it** are imports from overseas whether you like it or whether you don't like it (T2 233-235).

The citations above prove the effectiveness of other referencing; the second statement is even stronger than the first one since it presents radical Islamism as inhuman and threatening entity ('it').

To sum up, employing pronouns is an excellent strategy to allude to opponents without naming them directly, which both speakers (and predominantly Trump) make use of.

In conclusion, the analysis shows that pronouns indeed impact the overall effect of a speech. Furthermore, notable differences between Trump and Clinton in terms of frequency and contextual usage could be discerned.

With regard to the individual speakers, Clinton incorporates the audience about twice as much as her opponent. Moreover, she promotes a policy of shared responsibilities and collaboration with people of distinct political and migrant backgrounds, which is demonstrated by high frequencies of (inclusive) 'we's and plural pronouns in general. In addition, she uses significantly less third person pronouns than her adversary and chiefly positive terminology according to her campaign slogan "we are stronger together" (C1 44).

In comparison to Clinton, Trump implements a completely different strategy. He uses third person pronouns by far the most; hence, he focuses more on third parties than himself, his campaign, or the public. It is open to discussion whether this approach might be more successful; however, it is highly improbable. Who would vote for someone who barely addresses the audience and the American people in general? Instead, Trump designates himself as the ultimate solution and saviour: *"I am your voice"* (T1 112, 334), *"I alone can fix it"* (T1 133). Despite that, Trump displays a higher level of certainty and self-assurance than Clinton concerning mental-process verbs that supplement pronominal schemes. *"I know"* and *"I am absolutely sure"* definitely leave a more convincing impression than *"I believe"* or "*I hope*" (cf. examples above).

Finally, it needs to the pointed out that Trump's pronominal usage is generally a marker for right-wing rhetoric as he refers to third and opposing parties much more fiercely and negatively than Clinton. More specifically, attacking others is identified as the *argumentum ad hominem* of conservative rhetoric (Wodak & Meyer 2001: 65).

7. Final discussion

In retrospect, frequency and contextual analysis of Clinton and Trump's rhetorical devices rendered countless revealing results. The most protruding difference was doubtlessly indicated by critical metaphor analysis. Concerning metaphor and its relatives metonymy and simile, Clinton manifested significantly more occurrences of each individual figure: in most cases even more than twice as many. Moreover, Clinton's variety of these devices was much more distinctive and impressive. Given that metaphor is one of the most essential tools in persuasive discourse, these facts definitely speak for themselves. Further rhetorical figures under investigation provided similar insights and, most importantly, supported Lakoff's theory of conservative and liberal language (1996). Overall, Clinton's style is more collaborative, optimistic, caring and cautious, and in sum corresponding to the nurturant parent model. In opposition to that, Trump pursues a drastically more excluding, pessimistic, strict, and direct approach, which adheres to the strict parent model.

Pronominal analysis yields comparable findings: whereas Clinton focuses on shared responsibilities and direct inclusion of the audience, Trump rather emphasises third parties (chiefly in a condescending and negatively termed manner to criticise outside-groups and opponents) and himself as (in his view better) presidential leader the most. Naturally, listeners will definitely feel more engaged by speakers who explicitly address and incorporate them in their discourse such as Clinton than by someone like Trump who preferably refers to himself and third parties who are not directly involved at the moment.

Another fact that needs to be underscored is that Trump applies considerably more repetitive devices than Clinton, specifically regarding subjunctio and parallelism. The media often criticises Trump for his excessive use of repetition; yet, it depends on the audience whether they prefer Clinton's moderate and subtle style or Trump's more direct and at times extreme approach. In general, Trump's tendency to exaggerate also affects other rhetorical devices - such as hyperbole - beyond their original limits.

Regarding contrasts between different speech types, contextual analysis did not show any profound divergences except for slight deviations: for instance, Clinton stressed the concept of 'unity/encounter/friendship' more in C2/the commemorative speech. This is due to the fact that Clinton obviously stresses collaboration and a feeing of togetherness in times of crisis even more. For the same reason, Trump scored his

highest rates of first person plural (and thereby emphasised a sense of union) in the same speech (T2). He also utilised the highest number of 'liquid/water' metaphors, which is his top metaphor conceptual category overall. Through metaphors like *pouring* or *flowing into,* Trump presents immigration from a more dramatic and menacing perspective as it is a relevant topic in the aftermath of the attack in Orlando. Interestingly, both speakers did not utilise as many 'battle' or war-related metaphors in their Reaction Speeches (C2 and T2) as to be expected in crisis rhetoric.

Apart from the previously mentioned and contained aberrations, frequency rates exponentially increased in relation to speech length (C1/T1 and C2/T2 are much longer than C3/T3 and therefore yielded markedly more recurrences), which was to be expected and is not surprising.

Aside from the examined rhetorical devices, countless further elements would have suggested themselves for a closer investigation. Rhetorical figures such as allusion, anecdote, irony, sentence fragments, anacoluthon, and many others also repeatedly occurred in Clinton and Trump's speeches and would have been the next best choice to analyse. Moreover, modality, transitivity, tenses, sentence structure and lexical style overall would have rendered further illuminating insights regarding the rhetorical skills of both speakers. Unfortunately, all these surveys would have exceeded the scope of this thesis by far.

There is no doubt that metaphor and pronoun analysis constitute the most crucial aspects of political discourse analysis. Hence, CDA managed to uncover numerous valid conclusions about the rhetorical skills of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump and raise awareness concerning the impact of individual and combined rhetorical devices on the audience.

8. References

Allott, Nicholas. 2005. "The role of misused concepts in manufacturing consent: a cognitive account. In De Saussure, Louis. (ed.). *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 147-168.

Aristotle. 1952. "De Poetica". In Ross, W.D. (ed.). *The Works of Aristotle.* (6th volume) Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bain, Alexander. 1867. *English Composition and Rhetoric: a Manual.* New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Beard, Adrian. 2000. *The Language of Politics.* London: Routledge.

Beckwith, Ryan Teague. 2016. *Read Hillary Clinton's Speech About the Orlando Shooting.* http://time.com/4367046/orlando-shooting-hillary-clinton-transcript/ (10 February 2017).

Bernstein, Basil. 1990. *Class, Codes and Control: The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse.* London/New York: Routledge.

Borrero, Manuel Mejías. 2009. "Political Language in the 2004 U.S. Presidential Electoral Process". In Álvarez-Benito, Gloria; Fernández-Díaz, Gabriela; Íñigo-Mora, Isabela. *Discourse and Politics.* Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 51-60.

Brinton, Laurel; Anrovick, Leslie. 2006. *The English Language: A Linguistic History.* Canada: Oxford University Press.

Brown, Roger; Gilman, Albert. 1960. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity". In Sebeok, T.A. (ed.). *Style in Language.* M I T Press.

Bull, Peter. 2016. "Claps and Claptrap: The Analysis of Speaker-Audience Interaction in Political Speeches". *Journal of Social and Political Society* 4 (1), 473-492.

Bullinger, E.W. 2003. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated.* London: Baker Books.

Burkholder; Henry. 2009. "Criticism of Metaphor". In Kuypers, J.A. (ed.). *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action.* Lanham: Lexington Books, 97-114.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor.* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2011. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor.* (2nd edition). Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2014. *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor.* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chilton, Paul. 2010. "Political terminology". In Wodak, Ruth; Koller, Veronika. (eds.). *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*, 225-242.

Chilton, Paul. 2004. *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice.* London: Routledge.

Chouiaraki, Lilie; Fairclough, Norman. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cicero. 1949. *De Inventione. De Optimo Genere. Oratorum Topica.* Translated by H.M. Hubbell. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cicero. 1954. *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* Translated by Caplan, H. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cicero. 1988. *Orator.* Translated by Hubbell, H. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cruse, Alan. 2000. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Devlin, Joseph. 2008. *How to Speak and Write Correctly.* Rockville: Arc Manor.

Dijk, van Teun. 2008a. *Discourse and Context: A sociocognitive approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dijk, van Teun. 1998b. "What is Political Discourse Analysis?" In Dins Blommaert, J., Bulcaen, Ch. (eds.). *Political linguistics.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 11-52.

Dijk, van Teun. 1997b. "What is Political Discourse Analysis?". In Bloomaert, J. & Bulcaen, C. (eds*). Political linguistics.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 11-52.

Du Marsais. 1977. "Traité des Tropes". In Paulhan, Jean. *Traité des Figures.* Paris: Le Nouveau Commerce.

Fahnestock, Jeanne. 1999. *Rhetorical Figures in Science.* New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: the Critical Study of Language.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman; Wodak, Ruth. 1997. "Critical Discourse Analysis". In Teun, A.; Dijk, Van. (eds.). *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies.* Vol. 2. London: Sage, 258-283.

Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman. 2005. "Critical Discourse Analysis in transdisciplinary research". In Wodak, Ruth; Chilton, Paul. (eds.). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdiscipinarity.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 53-70.

Fairclough, Isabela & Norman. 2012. *Political Discourse Analysis: A method for advanced students.* New York: Routledge.

Fontanier, Pierre. 1977. *Les Figures du Discours.* Paris: Flammarion.
Gallie, Walter. 1956. "Essentially contested concepts". *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56: 167-198.

Gibbs, Raymond. 1993. "Process and products in making sense of tropes". In Ortony, A. (ed.). *Metaphor and Thought.* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 252-276.

Goatly, Andrew. 2008. *The Language of Metaphors.* (2nd ed.). London/New York: Routledge.

Golshan, Tara. 2016. *Read the full speeches: Clinton and Trump's awkward Al Smith charity dinner roasts.* Vox News. https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/10/21/13357412/clinton-trump-al-smith-roasts-full-speeches (10 February 2017).

Greenbaum, Sidney. 1996. *The Oxford English Grammar: Very Advanced.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action.* Vol. 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society, trans. T. Mc.Carthy. London: Heinemann.

Harre, Rom. 1988. "Accountability within Social Order: the role of pronouns. In Artaki, C. (ed.). *Analysing Everyday Explanation.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Herget, Winfried. 2005. "Rede: USA. In Ueding, Gert. (ed.) *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik.* Vol. 7. Tübingen: Niedermeyer, 758-765.

Jochum, Michael. 1999. "Der Bundespräsident als öffentlicher Redner. Zur Entstehung und Verbreitung der Reden Roman Herzogs". In Kopperschmidt, Josef; Schanze, Helmut. (eds.). *Fest und Festrhetorik: Zu Theorie, Geschichte und Praxis der Epideiktik.* Munich: Fink, 141-147.

Jones, Jason; Wareing, Shan. 1999. "Language and Politics". In Thomas, Linda et al. (eds.). *Language, Society and Power.* London: Routledge, 31-47.

Kammerer, Patrick. 1995. "Die veränderten Konstitutionsbedingungen politischer Rhetorik. Zur Rolle der Redenschreiber, der Medien und zum vermeintlichen Ende öffentlicher Reden". In Dyck, Joachim; Jens, Walter; Ueding, Gert. (eds.). *Rhetorik. Ein internationales Jahrbuch.* Vol. 14, 14-29.

Klein, Josef. 1996. "Insider-Lesarten: Einige Regeln zur latenten Fachkommunikation in Parteiprogrammen". In Klein, Josef; Diekmannshenke, Hajo. (eds.) *Sprachstrategien und Dialogblockaden: Linguistische und politikwissenschaftliche Studien zur politischen Kommunikation.* Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 201-209.

Klein, Josef. 2000. "Textsorten im Bereich politischer Institutionen". In Brinker, Klaus; Antos, Gerd; Heinemann, Wolfgang; Sager, Sven. (eds.).*Text- und Gesprächslinguistik/Linguistics of Text and Conversation: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung/An international Handbook of Contemporary Research.* Vol. 1. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 732-755.

Kress, Gunther. 1992. "Critical Discourse Analysis". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 11, 84-99.

Kühn, Peter. 1992. "Adressaten und Adressatenkarussell in der öffentlich-politischen Auseinandersetzung". In Dyck, Joachim; Walter, Jens; Ueding, Gert. (eds.). *Rhetorik: Ein internationals Jahrbuch*. Vol. 11, 51-66.

Kühn, Peter. 1995. *Mehrfachadressierung: Untersuchungen zur adressatenspezifischen Polyvalenz sprachlichen Handelns*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Lakoff, George; Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicage: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, George. 1996. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 2002. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. (2nd edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 2004. *Don't Think of an Elephant! Know your Values and Frame the Debate.* White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Maitland, Karen. 1988. *Why Choose Me: The pragmatics of English pronouns.* Unpublished DPhil: University of Ulster.

Merriam Webster. 2017. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/simile (14th Jun 2017)

Merriam Webster. 2017. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hyperbole (14th Jun 2017)

Merriam Webster. 2017. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/metonymy (15th Jun 2017)

Merriam Webster. 2017. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/metaphor (15th Jun 2017)

Meyer, Michael. 2001. "Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA". In Wodak, Ruth; Meyer, Michael. (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, 14-31.

Morrow, Brendan. 2016. *READ: Full Transcript of Donald Trump's Orlando Shooting Speech*. heavy. http://heavy.com/news/2016/06/donald-trump-orlando-florida-shooting-pulse-nightclub-night-club-speech-address-comments-transcript-reaction-manchester-new-hampshire/ (10 February 2016).

Oberhuber, Florian. 2008. "Dissemination and implementation of political concepts". In Wodak & Koller. (ed.). *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 244-269.

O'Donoghue, Josie. 2009. *Is metaphor like simile?* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). London: University College London. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/b224/1695af0ddfe136252b5f58a13c9895bd5333.pdf (14th Jun 2017).

Orwell, George. 1946. "Politics and the English Language". In Orwell, George. (ed.). *Inside the Whale and Other Essays.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Panagl, Oswald; Kriechbaumer, Robert. 2002. *Wahlkämpfe: Sprache und Politik.* Vienna: Böhlau.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 2011. (8th edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Panagl, Oswald; Wodak, Ruth. 2004. *Text und Kontext: Theoriemodelle und methodische Verfahren im transdisziplinären Vergleich.* Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.

Penninck, Hanne. 2014. "An analysis of metaphor used in political speeches responding to the financial crises of 1929 and 2008". MA thesis, University of Gent.

Peprník, Jaroslav. 2003. *English Lexicology.* Olomoue: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

Perelman, Chaim; Olbrechts-Tyteca, Lucie. 1969. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation.* Translated by Wilkinson, J. & Weaver, P. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Plett, Helmut. 2001. *Einführung in die rhetorische Textanalyse.* Hamburg: Buske.

Quintilian. 1921. *Institutio Oratoria.* Translated by H.E. Butler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Politico. 2016a. *Full text: Hillary Clinton's DNC speech.* http://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/full-text-hillary-clintons-dnc-speech-226410 (10 February 2017).

Politico. 2016b. *Full text: Donald Trump 2016 RNC draft speech transcript.* http://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/full-transcript-donald-trump-nomination-acceptance-speech-at-rnc-225974 (10 February 2017).

Rees, Anne. 1983. *Pronouns of Person and Power: a study of personal pronouns in public discourse.* Unpublished M.A. dissertation: University of Sheffield.

Reisigl, Martin; Wodak, Ruth. 2001. *Discourse and Discrimination, Rhetoric of Racism and Antisemitism.* London/New York: Routledge.

Reisigl, Martin. 2010. "Rhetoric of political speeches". In Wodak & Koller. (ed.). *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 244-269.

Ritchie 2003. "Argument is War: Or is it a Game of Chess? Multiple Meanings in the Analysis of Implicit Metaphors". *Metaphor and Symbol*: 18 (2), 125-146.

Rubba, Johanna. 2006. *Terms and concepts for metaphorical and metonymic analysis.* http://www. cla.calpoly –edu rubba/ 495lit/metaphor basics html.34k (15th Jun 2017).

Schäffner, Christina; Wenden, Anita. 1995. *Language and Peace.* Dartmouth: Aldershot.

Schild, Hans-Jochen. 1992. "Beratungsrede". In Ueding, Gert. (ed.). *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik.* Tübingen: Niedermeyer, 1441-1455.

Schmitz, Thomas. 2005. "Rede". In Ueding, Gert. (ed.). *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* Vol. 7, 698-709.

Schön, Donald. 1979. "Generative metaphor: a perspective on problem-setting in social policy". In Ortony, Andrew. (ed.). *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 254-283.

Schwarze, Antje; Walther, Antje. 2002. "Redenschreiben für den Bundeskanzler: Formulieren, Koordinieren und Beraten". In Korte, Karl-Rudolf. (ed.). *Das Wort hat der Bundeskanzler: Eine Analyse der Großen Regierungserklärungen von Adenauer bis Schröder.* Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 33-55.

Stanley, Jeff. 2007. *A Guide to Figures of Speech Used in Scripture.* http://www.biblicalresearchjournals.org/brj-pages_pdf/002gtf_2007-04_guide_to_figures_01.pdf (2 Jun. 2017).

Urban, Greg. 1986. *Rhetoric of a War Chief. Working Papers and Proceedings of the Centre for Psychosocial Studies.* Chicago.

Wilson, John. 1990. *Politically Speaking: The Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Wodak, Ruth; Meyer, Michael. (eds.). 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage.

Wodak, Ruth; De Cillia, Rudolf. 2006. "Politics and language: Overview". In Brown, K. (ed.). *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics.* (Vol. 9, 2nd edition). Oxford: Elsevier.

Wodak, Ruth; Koller, Veronika. 2008. *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wodak, Ruth. 2009a. *The Discourse of Politics in Action*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, Ruth. 2009b. "Language and politics". In Culpeper, Jonathan; Katamba, Francis; Kerswill, Paul; Wodak, Ruth; McEnery, Tony. (eds.). *English Language: Description, Variation and Context.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 576-593.

Your Dictionary. 2017a. *Examples of hyperboles.* http://examples.yourdictionary.com/examples-of-hyperboles.html (15 Jun 2017).

Your Dictionary. 2017b. *Alliteration.* http://www.dictionary.com/browse/alliteration (29 June 2017).

Your Dictionary. 2017c. *Examples of synecdoche.* http://examples.yourdictionary.com/examples-of-synecdoche.html (30 June 2017).

9. Appendix

9.1. Speeches by Clinton and Trump

9.1.1. Hillary Clinton: Nomination Acceptance Speech (C1)

Thank you! Thank you all very much! Thank you for that amazing welcome.

Thank you all for the great convention that we've had.

And Chelsea, thank you. I'm so proud to be your mother and so proud of the woman you've become. Thank you for bringing Marc into our family, and Charlotte and Aidan into the world.

And Bill, that conversation we started in the law library 45 years ago, it is still going strong. You know that conversation has lasted through good times that filled us with joy, and hard times that tested us.

And I've even gotten a few words in along the way.

On Tuesday night, I was so happy to see that my Explainer-in-Chief is still on the job. I'm also grateful to the rest of my family and the friends of a lifetime. For all of you whose hard work brought us here tonight. And to those of you who joined our campaign this week, thank you. What a remarkable week it's been.

We heard the man from Hope, Bill Clinton. And the man of hope, Barack Obama. America is stronger because of President Obama's leadership, and I'm better because of his friendship.

We heard from our terrific vice president, the one-and-only Joe Biden. He spoke from his big heart about our party's commitment to working people, as only he can do.

And First Lady Michelle Obama reminded us that our children are watching, and the president we elect is going to be their president, too.

And for those of you out there who are just getting to know Tim Kaine – you will soon understand why the people of Virginia keep promoting him: from city council and mayor, to Governor, and now Senator. And he'll make the whole country proud as our Vice President.

And I want to thank Bernie Sanders. Bernie, your campaign inspired millions of Americans, particularly the young people who threw their hearts and souls into our primary. You've put economic and social justice issues front and center, where they belong.

And to all of your supporters here and around the country: I want you to know, I've heard you. Your cause is our cause. Our country needs your ideas, energy, and passion. That is the only way we can turn our progressive platform into real change for America. We wrote it together – now let's go out and make it happen together.

My friends, we've come to Philadelphia – the birthplace of our nation – because what happened in this city 240 years ago still has something to teach us today.

We all know the story. But we usually focus on how it turned out — and not enough on how close that story came to never being written at all.

When representatives from 13 unruly colonies met just down the road from here, some wanted to stick with the king and some wanted to stick it to the king.

The revolution hung in the balance. Then somehow they began listening to each other … compromising … finding common purpose. And by the time they left Philadelphia, they had begun to see themselves as one nation. That's what made it possible to stand up to a king. That took courage. They had courage. Our founders embraced the enduring truth that we are stronger together.

Now America is once again at a moment of reckoning. Powerful forces are threatening to pull us apart. Bonds of trust and respect are fraying.

And just as with our founders, there are no guarantees. It truly is up to us. We have to decide whether we all will work together so we all can rise together.

49 Our country's motto is e pluribus unum: out of many, we are one. Will we stay true to
50 that motto?
51 Well, we heard Donald Trump's answer last week at his convention. He wants to
52 divide us — from the rest of the world, and from each other.
53 He's betting that the perils of today's world will blind us to its unlimited
54 promise. He's taken the Republican Party a long way from "Morning in America" to
55 "Midnight in America." He wants us to fear the future and fear each other.
56 Well, a great Democratic President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, came up with the
57 perfect rebuke to Trump more than 80 years ago during a much more perilous
58 time: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."
59 Now we are clear-eyed about what our country is up against. But we are not
60 afraid. We will rise to the challenge, just as we always have. We will not build a
61 wall. Instead, we will build an economy where everyone who wants a good job can
62 get one.
63 And we'll build a path to citizenship for millions of immigrants who are already
64 contributing to our economy!
65 We will not ban a religion. We will work with all Americans and our allies to fight
66 and defeat terrorism.
67 Yet we know there is a lot to do.
68 Too many people haven't had a pay raise since the crash.
69 There's too much inequality. Too little social mobility. Too much paralysis in
70 Washington. Too many threats at home and abroad.
71 But just look for a minute at the strengths we bring as Americans to meet these
72 challenges. We have the most dynamic and diverse people in the world. We have the
73 most tolerant and generous young people we've ever had. We have the most
74 powerful military. The most innovative entrepreneurs. The most enduring values —
75 freedom and equality, justice and opportunity.
76 We should be so proud that these words are associated with us. I have to tell you, as
77 your Secretary of State, I went to 112 countries, and when people hear those
78 words, they hear America.
79 So don't let anyone tell you that our country is weak. We're not. Don't let anyone tell
80 you we don't have what it takes. We do.
81 And most of all, don't believe anyone who says: "I alone can fix it."
82 Yes, those were actually Donald Trump's words in Cleveland. And they should set off
83 alarm bells for all of us.
84 Really? I alone can fix it? Isn't he forgetting troops on the front lines? Police officers
85 and fire-fighters who run toward danger? Doctors and nurses who care for
86 us? Teachers who change lives?
87 Entrepreneurs who see possibilities in every problem? Mothers who lost children to
88 violence and are building a movement to keep other kids safe?
89 He's forgetting every last one of us. Americans don't say: "I alone can fix it." We say:
90 "We'll fix it together."
91 And remember. Remember: Our founders fought a revolution and wrote a
92 Constitution so America would never be a nation where one person had all the
93 power. Two hundred and forty years later, we still put our faith in each other.
94 Look at what happened in Dallas. After the assassinations of five brave police
95 officers. Police Chief David Brown asked the community to support his force, maybe
96 even join them. And you know how the community responded? Nearly 500 people
97 applied in just 12 days. That's how Americans answer when the call for help goes
98 out.

99   Twenty years ago I wrote a book called "It Takes a Village." A lot of people looked at
100   the title and asked, "What the heck do you mean by that?"
101   This is what I mean: None of us can raise a family, build a business, heal a community
102   or lift a country totally alone.
103   America needs every one of us to lend our energy, our talents, our ambition to
104   making our nation better and stronger. I believe that with all my heart.
105   That's why "Stronger Together" is not just a lesson from our history. It's not just a
106   slogan for our campaign. It's a guiding principle for the country we've always been
107   and the future we're going to build.
108   A country where the economy works for everyone, not just those at the top. Where
109   you can get a good job and send your kids to a good school, no matter what ZIP code
110   you live in.
111   A country where all our children can dream, and those dreams are within
112   reach. Where families are strong, communities are safe, and yes, where love trumps
113   hate.
114   That's the country we're fighting for. That's the future we're working toward. And so
115   it is with humility, determination, and boundless confidence in America's
116   promise that I accept your nomination for President of the United States!
117   Now, sometimes the people at this podium are new to the national stage. As you
118   know, I'm not one of those people. I've been your first lady. Served eight years as a
119   Senator from the great State of New York. Then I represented all of you as Secretary
120   of State.
121   But my job titles only tell you what I've done. They don't tell you why.
122   The truth is, through all these years of public service, the "service" part has always
123   come easier to me than the "public" part.
124   I get it that some people just don't know what to make of me. So let me tell you.
125   The family I'm from, well, no one had their name on big buildings. My family were
126   builders of a different kind. Builders in the way most American families are.
127   They used whatever tools they had – whatever God gave them – and whatever life in
128   America provided – and built better lives and better futures for their kids.
129   My grandfather worked in the same Scranton lace mill for 50 years. Because he
130   believed that if he gave everything he had, his children would have a better life than
131   he did. And he was right.
132   My dad, Hugh, made it to college. He played football at Penn State and enlisted in the
133   Navy after Pearl Harbor.
134   When the war was over he started his own small business printing fabric for
135   draperies. I remember watching him stand for hours over silk screens.
136   He wanted to give my brothers and me opportunities he never had. And he did.
137   My mother, Dorothy, was abandoned by her parents as a young girl. She ended up on
138   her own at 14, working as a house maid. She was saved by the kindness of others.
139   Her first grade teacher saw she had nothing to eat at lunch, and brought extra food to
140   share. The lesson she passed on to me years later stuck with me: No one gets through
141   life alone. We have to look out for each other and lift each other up.
142   She made sure I learned the words from our Methodist faith: "Do all the good you
143   can, for all the people you can, in all the ways you can, as long as ever you can."
144   So I went to work for the Children's Defense Fund, going door-to-door in New
145   Bedford, Massachusetts on behalf of children with disabilities who were denied the
146   chance to go to school.
147   I remember meeting a young girl in a wheelchair on the small back porch of her
148   house. She told me how badly she wanted to go to school – it just didn't seem

149 possible in those days. And I couldn't stop thinking of my mother and what she went
150 through as a child.
151 It became clear to me that simply caring is not enough. To drive real progress, you
152 have to change both hearts and laws. You need both understanding and action.
153 So we gathered facts. We built a coalition. And our work helped convince Congress to
154 ensure access to education for all students with disabilities.
155 It's a big idea, isn't it? Every kid with a disability has the right to go to school.
156 But how? How do you make an idea like that real? You do it step-by-step, year-by-
157 year… sometimes even door-by-door.
158 My heart just swelled when I saw Anastasia Somoza representing millions of young
159 people on this stage – because we changed our law to make sure she got an
160 education.
161 So it's true... I sweat the details of policy – whether we're talking about the exact
162 level of lead in the drinking water in Flint, Michigan, the number of mental health
163 facilities in Iowa, or the cost of your prescription drugs.
164 Because it's not just a detail if it's your kid, if it's your family. It's a big deal. And it
165 should be a big deal to your president, too.
166 After the four days of this convention, you've seen some of the people who've
167 inspired me. People who let me into their lives, and became a part of mine.
168 People like Ryan Moore and Lauren Manning. They told their stories Tuesday night.
169 I first met Ryan as a 7-year-old. He was wearing a full body brace that must have
170 weighed 40 pounds because I leaned over to lift him up.
171 Children like Ryan kept me going when our plan for universal health care failed and
172 kept me working with leaders of both parties to help create the Children's Health
173 Insurance Program that covers 8 million kids in our country.
174 Lauren Manning, who stood here with such grace and power, was gravely injured on
175 9/11. It was the thought of her, and Debbie St. John who you saw in the movie, and
176 John Dolan and Joe Sweeney, and all the victims and survivors, that kept me working
177 as hard as I could in the Senate on behalf of 9/11 families, and our first responders
178 who got sick from their time at Ground Zero.
179 I was still thinking of Lauren, Debbie and all the others 10 years later in the White
180 House Situation Room when President Obama made the courageous decision that
181 finally brought Osama bin Laden to justice.
182 In this campaign, I've met so many people who motivate me to keep fighting for
183 change. And, with your help, I will carry all of your voices and stories with me to the
184 White House.
185 And you heard, you heard from Republicans and Independents who are supporting
186 our campaign. Well I will be a President for Democrats, Republicans, and
187 Independents. For the struggling, the striving the successful. For all those who vote
188 for me and for those who don't. For all Americans together!
189 Tonight, we've reached a milestone in our nation's march toward a more perfect
190 union: the first time that a major party has nominated a woman for president.
191 Standing here … standing here as my mother's daughter, and my daughter's mother,
192 I'm so happy this day has come. I'm happy for grandmothers and little girls and
193 everyone in between.
194 I'm happy for boys and men – because when any barrier falls in America it clears the
195 way for everyone. After all, when there are no ceilings, the sky's the limit. So let's
196 keep going, let's keep going until every one of the 161 million women and girls
197 across America has the opportunity she deserves to have.

198   But even more important than the history we make tonight is the history we will
199   write together in the years ahead. Let's begin with what we're going to do to help
200   working people in our country get ahead and stay ahead.
201   Now, I don't think President Obama and Vice President Biden get the credit they
202   deserve for saving us from the worst economic crisis of our lifetimes.
203   Our economy is so much stronger than when they took office. Nearly 15 million new
204   private-sector jobs. Twenty million more Americans with health insurance. And an
205   auto industry that just had its best year ever. Now that's real progress but none of us
206   can be satisfied with the status quo. Not by a long shot.
207   We're still facing deep-seated problems that developed long before the recession and
208   stayed with us through the recovery.
209   I've gone around the country talking to working families. And I've heard from many
210   who feel like the economy sure isn't working for them.
211   Some of you are frustrated – even furious. And you know what? You're right. It's not
212   yet working the way it should.
213   Americans are willing to work and work hard. But right now, an awful lot of people
214   feel there is less and less respect for the work they do. And less respect for them,
215   period.
216   Democrats, we are the party of working people. But we haven't done a good enough
217   job showing we get what you're going through, and we're going to do something to
218   help.
219   So I want to tell you tonight how we will empower Americans to live better lives.
220   My primary mission as president will be to create more opportunity and more good
221   jobs with rising wages right here in the United States. From my first day in office to
222   my last. Especially in places that for too long have been left out and left behind.
223   From our inner cities to our small towns, from Indian Country to Coal
224   Country. From communities ravaged by addiction to regions hollowed out by plant
225   closures.
226   And here's what I believe. I believe America thrives when the middle class thrives. I
227   believe our economy isn't working the way it should because our democracy isn't
228   working the way it should.
229   That's why we need to appoint Supreme Court justices who will get money out of
230   politics and expand voting rights, not restrict them. And if necessary, we will pass a
231   constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United.
232   I believe American corporations that have gotten so much from our country should
233   be just as patriotic in return. Many of them are. But too many aren't. It's wrong to
234   take tax breaks with one hand and give out pink slips with the other. And I believe
235   Wall Street can never, ever be allowed to wreck Main Street again.
236   And I believe in science. I believe climate change is real and that we can save our
237   planet while creating millions of good paying clean energy jobs.
238   I believe that when we have millions of hardworking immigrants contributing to our
239   economy, it would be self-defeating and inhumane to try to kick them out.
240   Comprehensive immigration reform will grow our economy and keep families
241   together — and it's the right thing to do.
242   So whatever party you belong to, or if you belong to no party at all, if you share these
243   beliefs, this is your campaign.
244   If you believe that companies should share profits, not pad executive bonuses, join
245   us. If you believe the minimum wage should be a living wage…and no one working
246   full time should have to raise their children in poverty, join us.

247	If you believe that every man, woman, and child in America has the right to
248	affordable health care, join us. If you believe that we should say "no" to unfair trade
249	deals, that we should stand up to China, that we should support our steelworkers
250	and autoworkers and home-grown manufacturers then join us.
251	If you believe we should expand Social Security and protect a woman's right to make
252	her own health care decisions, then join us.
253	And yes, if you believe that your working mother, wife, sister, or daughter deserves
254	equal pay, join us. That's how we're going to make sure this economy works for
255	everyone, not just those at the top.
256	Now, you didn't hear any of this — did you — from Donald Trump at his
257	convention. He spoke for 70-odd minutes – and I do mean odd. And he offered zero
258	solutions.
259	But we already know he doesn't believe these things. No wonder he doesn't like
260	talking about his plans. You might have noticed, I love talking about mine.
261	In my first 100 days, we will work with both parties to pass the biggest investment in
262	new, good-paying jobs since World War II. Jobs in manufacturing, clean energy,
263	technology and innovation, small business, and infrastructure.
264	If we invest in infrastructure now, we'll not only create jobs today, but lay the
265	foundation for the jobs of the future. And we will also transform the way we prepare
266	our young people for those jobs.
267	Bernie Sanders and I will work together to make college tuition-free for the middle
268	class and debt-free for all! We will also — we will also — liberate millions of people
269	who already have student debt.
270	It's just not right that Donald Trump can ignore his debts and students and families
271	can't refinance their debts.
272	And something we don't say often enough: Sure college is crucial, but a four-year
273	degree should not be the only path to a good job.
274	We will help more people learn a skill or practice a trade and make a good living
275	doing it. We will give small businesses, like my dad's, a boost, make it easier to get
276	credit. Way too many dreams die in the parking lots of banks.
277	In America, if you can dream it, you should be able to build it. And we will help you
278	balance family and work. And you know what, if fighting for affordable childcare and
279	paid family leave is playing the "woman card," then deal me in!
280	Now, now, here's the other thing. Now we're not only, we're not only going to make
281	all these investments, we're going to pay for every single one of them. And here's
282	how: Wall Street, corporations, and the super-rich are going to start paying their fair
283	share of taxes.
284	This is — this is not because we resent success. But when more than 90% of the
285	gains have gone to the top 1%, that's where the money is. And we are going to follow
286	the money. And if companies take tax breaks and then ship jobs overseas, we'll make
287	them pay us back. And we'll put that money to work where it belongs: creating jobs
288	here at home!
289	Now I imagine some that some of you are sitting at home thinking, well that all
290	sounds pretty good, but how are you going to get it done? How are you going to
291	break through the gridlock in Washington?
292	Well, look at my record. I've worked across the aisle to pass laws and treaties and to
293	launch new programs that help millions of people. And if you give me the
294	chance, that's exactly what I'll do as president.
295	But then — but then I also imagine people are thinking there, but Trump, he's a
296	businessman. He must know something about the economy.

297 Well, let's take a closer look, shall we? In Atlantic City, 60 miles from here, you will
298 find contractors and small businesses who lost everything because Donald Trump
299 refused to pay his bills. Now remember what the President said last night — don't
300 boo, vote.
301 But think of this. People who did the work and needed the money, not because he
302 couldn't pay them, but because he wouldn't pay them. He just stiffed them. And you
303 know that sales pitch he's making to be your president? Put your faith in him – and
304 you'll win big? That's the same sales pitch he made to all those small businesses.
305 Then Trump walked away, and left working people holding the bag.
306 He also talks a big game about putting America first. Well please explain what part of
307 America First leads him to make Trump ties in China, not Colorado. Trump suits in
308 Mexico, not Michigan. Trump furniture in Turkey, not Ohio. Trump picture frames in
309 India, not Wisconsin.
310 Donald Trump says he wants to make America great again – well, he could start by
311 actually making things in America again.
312 Now, the choice we face in this election is just as stark when it comes to our national
313 security. Anyone, anyone reading the news can see the threats and turbulence we
314 face.
315 From Baghdad and Kabul, to Nice and Paris and Brussels, from San Bernardino to
316 Orlando, we're dealing with determined enemies that must be defeated. So it's no
317 wonder that people are anxious and looking for reassurance. Looking for steady
318 leadership. Wanting a leader who understands we are stronger when we work with
319 our allies around the world and care for our veterans here at home. Keeping our
320 nation safe and honoring the people who do it will be my highest priority.
321 I'm proud that we put a lid on Iran's nuclear program without firing a single shot –
322 now we have to enforce it, and we must keep supporting Israel's security.
323 I'm proud that we shaped a global climate agreement – now we have to hold every
324 country accountable to their commitments, including ourselves.
325 And I'm proud to stand by our allies in NATO against any threat they face, including
326 from Russia.
327 I've laid out my strategy for defeating ISIS. We will strike their sanctuaries from
328 the air, and support local forces taking them out on the ground. We will surge our
329 intelligence so that we detect and prevent attacks before they happen. We will
330 disrupt their efforts online to reach and radicalize young people in our country. It
331 won't be easy or quick, but make no mistake – we will prevail.
332 Now Donald Trump, Donald Trump says, and this is a quote, "I know more about ISIS
333 than the generals do...."
334 No, Donald, you don't. He thinks that he knows more than our military because he
335 claimed our armed forces are "a disaster."
336 Well, I've had the privilege to work closely with our troops and our veterans for
337 many years, including as a Senator on the Armed Services Committee. And I know
338 how wrong he is.
339 Our military is a national treasure. We entrust our commander-in-chief to make the
340 hardest decisions our nation faces. Decisions about war and peace. Life and death.
341 A president should respect the men and women who risk their lives to serve our
342 country – including Captain Khan and the sons of Tim Kaine and Mike Pence, both
343 Marines.
344 So just ask yourself: Do you really think Donald Trump has the temperament to be
345 commander-in-chief? Donald Trump can't even handle the rough-and-tumble of a
346 presidential campaign. He loses his cool at the slightest provocation — when he's

347 gotten a tough question from a reporter, when he's challenged in a debate, when he
348 sees a protestor at a rally. Imagine, if you dare imagine, imagine him in the Oval
349 Office facing a real crisis. A man you can bait with a tweet is not a man we can trust
350 with nuclear weapons.
351 I can't put it any better than Jackie Kennedy did after the Cuban Missile Crisis. She
352 said that what worried President Kennedy during that very dangerous time was that
353 a war might be started – not by big men with self-control and restraint, but by little
354 men – the ones moved by fear and pride.
355 America's strength doesn't come from lashing out. It relies on smarts, judgment, cool
356 resolve, and the precise and strategic application of power. That's the kind of
357 commander-in-chief I pledge to be.
358 And if we're serious about keeping our country safe, we also can't afford to have a
359 President who's in the pocket of the gun lobby. I'm not here to repeal the 2nd
360 Amendment. I'm not here to take away your guns. I just don't want you to be shot by
361 someone who shouldn't have a gun in the first place.
362 We will work tirelessly with responsible gun owners to pass common-sense reforms
363 and keep guns out of the hands of criminals, terrorists and all others who would do
364 us harm. For decades, people have said this issue was too hard to solve and the
365 politics too hot to touch. But I ask you: how can we just stand by and do nothing? You
366 heard, you saw, family members of people killed by gun violence on this stage. You
367 heard, you saw, family members of police officers killed in the line of duty because
368 they were outgunned by criminals. I refuse to believe we can't find common ground
369 here.
370 We have to heal the divides in our country. Not just on guns. But on race.
371 Immigration. And more. And that starts with listening, listening to each other. Trying,
372 as best we can, to walk in each other's shoes.
373 So let's put ourselves in the shoes of young black and Latino men and women who
374 face the effects of systemic racism, and are made to feel like their lives are
375 disposable.
376 Let's put ourselves in the shoes of police officers, kissing their kids and spouses
377 goodbye every day and heading off to do a dangerous and necessary job. We will
378 reform our criminal justice system from end-to-end, and rebuild trust between law
379 enforcement and the communities they serve.
380 And we will defend, we will defend all our rights – civil rights, human rights and
381 voting rights… women's rights and workers' rights… LGBT rights and the rights of
382 people with disabilities!
383 And we will stand up against mean and divisive rhetoric wherever it comes from. For
384 the past year, many people made the mistake of laughing off Donald Trump's
385 comments – excusing him as an entertainer just putting on a show. They thought he
386 couldn't possibly mean all the horrible things he says – like when he called women
387 "pigs." Or said that an American judge couldn't be fair because of his Mexican
388 heritage. Or when he mocks and mimics a reporter with a disability. Or insults
389 prisoners of war like John McCain— a hero and a patriot who deserves our respect.
390 Now, at first, I admit, I couldn't believe he meant it either. It was just too hard to
391 fathom – that someone who wants to lead our nation could say those things. Could be
392 like that.
393 But here's the sad truth: There is no other Donald Trump. This is it. And in the end, it
394 comes down to what Donald Trump doesn't get: America is great – because America
395 is good.

396   So enough with the bigotry and the bombast. Donald Trump's not offering real
397   change. He's offering empty promises. What are we offering? A bold agenda to
398   improve the lives of people across our country - to keep you safe, to get you good
399   jobs, to give your kids the opportunities they deserve. The choice is clear, my friends.
400   Every generation of Americans has come together to make our country freer, fairer,
401   and stronger. None of us ever have or can do it alone.
402   I know that at a time when so much seems to be pulling us apart, it can be hard to
403   imagine how we'll ever pull together. But I'm here to tell you tonight — progress is
404   possible. I know. I know because I've seen it in the lives of people across America
405   who get knocked down and get right back up. And I know it from my own life.
406   More than a few times, I've had to pick myself up and get back in the game. Like so
407   much else in my life, I got this from my mother, too. She never let me back down
408   from any challenge. When I tried to hide from a neighborhood bully, she literally
409   blocked the door. "Go back out there," she said. And she was right. You have to stand
410   up to bullies.
411   You have to keep working to make things better, even when the odds are long and
412   the opposition is fierce.
413   We lost our mother a few years ago but I miss her every day. And I still hear her
414   voice urging me to keep working, keep fighting for right, no matter what. That's what
415   we need to do together as a nation.
416   And though "we may not live to see the glory," as the song from the musical Hamilton
417   goes, "let us gladly join the fight." Let our legacy be about "planting seeds in a garden
418   you never get to see."
419   That's why we're here...not just in this hall, but on this Earth. The founders showed
420   us that. And so have many others since. They were drawn together by love of country
421   and the selfless passion to build something better for all who follow. That is the story
422   of America. And we begin a new chapter tonight.
423   Yes, the world is watching what we do. Yes, America's destiny is ours to choose. So
424   let's be stronger together, my fellow Americans. Let's look to the future with courage
425   and confidence. Let's build a better tomorrow for our beloved children and our
426   beloved country. And when we do, America will be greater than ever.
427   Thank you and may God bless you and the United States of America!

9.1.2. Donald Trump: Nomination Acceptance Speech (T1)

Friends, delegates and fellow Americans: I humbly and gratefully accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States.

Together, we will lead our party back to the White House, and we will lead our country back to safety, prosperity, and peace. We will be a country of generosity and warmth. But we will also be a country of law and order.

Our Convention occurs at a moment of crisis for our nation. The attacks on our police, and the terrorism in our cities, threaten our very way of life. Any politician who does not grasp this danger is not fit to lead our country.

Americans watching this address tonight have seen the recent images of violence in our streets and the chaos in our communities. Many have witnessed this violence personally, some have even been its victims.

I have a message for all of you: the crime and violence that today afflicts our nation will soon come to an end. Beginning on January 20th 2017, safety will be restored.

The most basic duty of government is to defend the lives of its own citizens. Any government that fails to do so is a government unworthy to lead.

It is finally time for a straightforward assessment of the state of our nation.

I will present the facts plainly and honestly. We cannot afford to be so politically correct anymore.

So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the carefully crafted lies, and the media myths the Democrats are holding their convention next week.

But here, at our convention, there will be no lies. We will honor the American people with the truth, and nothing else.

These are the facts:

Decades of progress made in bringing down crime are now being reversed by this Administration's rollback of criminal enforcement.

Homicides last year increased by 17% in America's fifty largest cities. That's the largest increase in 25 years. In our nation's capital, killings have risen by 50 percent. They are up nearly 60% in nearby Baltimore.

In the President's hometown of Chicago, more than 2,000 have been the victims of shootings this year alone. And more than 3,600 have been killed in the Chicago area since he took office.

The number of police officers killed in the line of duty has risen by almost 50% compared to this point last year. Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens.

The number of new illegal immigrant families who have crossed the border so far this year already exceeds the entire total from 2015. They are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources.

One such border-crosser was released and made his way to Nebraska. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root. She was 21 years old, and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 Grade Point Average. Her killer was then released a second time, and he is now a fugitive from the law.

I've met Sarah's beautiful family. But to this Administration, their amazing daughter was just one more American life that wasn't worth protecting. One more child to sacrifice on the altar of open borders. What about our economy?

Again, I will tell you the plain facts that have been edited out of your nightly news and your morning newspaper: Nearly Four in 10 African-American children are living in

50 poverty, while 58% of African American youth are not employed. 2 million more Latinos
51 are in poverty today than when the President took his oath of office less than eight years
52 ago. Another 14 million people have left the workforce entirely.
53 Household incomes are down more than $4,000 since the year 2000. Our manufacturing
54 trade deficit has reached an all-time high – nearly $800 billion in a single year. The
55 budget is no better.
56 President Obama has doubled our national debt to more than $19 trillion, and growing.
57 Yet, what do we have to show for it? Our roads and bridges are falling apart, our airports
58 are in Third World condition, and forty-three million Americans are on food stamps.
59 Now let us consider the state of affairs abroad.
60 Not only have our citizens endured domestic disaster, but they have lived through one
61 international humiliation after another. We all remember the images of our sailors being
62 forced to their knees by their Iranian captors at gunpoint.
63 This was just prior to the signing of the Iran deal, which gave back to Iran $150 billion
64 and gave us nothing – it will go down in history as one of the worst deals ever made.
65 Another humiliation came when president Obama drew a red line in Syria – and the
66 whole world knew it meant nothing.
67 In Libya, our consulate – the symbol of American prestige around the globe – was
68 brought down in flames. America is far less safe – and the world is far less stable – than
69 when Obama made the decision to put Hillary Clinton in charge of America's foreign
70 policy.
71 I am certain it is a decision he truly regrets. Her bad instincts and her bad judgment –
72 something pointed out by Bernie Sanders – are what caused the disasters unfolding
73 today. Let's review the record. In 2009, pre-Hillary, ISIS was not even on the map.
74 Libya was cooperating. Egypt was peaceful. Iraq was seeing a reduction in violence. Iran
75 was being choked by sanctions. Syria was under control. After four years of Hillary
76 Clinton, what do we have? ISIS has spread across the region, and the world. Libya is in
77 ruins, and our Ambassador and his staff were left helpless to die at the hands of savage
78 killers. Egypt was turned over to the radical Muslim brotherhood, forcing the military to
79 retake control. Iraq is in chaos.
80 Iran is on the path to nuclear weapons. Syria is engulfed in a civil war and a refugee
81 crisis that now threatens the West. After fifteen years of wars in the Middle East, after
82 trillions of dollars spent and thousands of lives lost, the situation is worse than it has
83 ever been before.
84 This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: death, destruction and weakness.
85 But Hillary Clinton's legacy does not have to be America's legacy. The problems we face
86 now – poverty and violence at home, war and destruction abroad – will last only as long
87 as we continue relying on the same politicians who created them. A change in leadership
88 is required to change these outcomes. Tonight, I will share with you my plan of action
89 for America.
90 The most important difference between our plan and that of our opponents is that our
91 plan will put America First. Americanism, not globalism, will be our credo. As long as we
92 are led by politicians who will not put America First, then we can be assured that other
93 nations will not treat America with respect. This will all change in 2017.
94 The American People will come first once again. My plan will begin with safety at home –
95 which means safe neighborhoods, secure borders, and protection from terrorism. There
96 can be no prosperity without law and order. On the economy, I will outline reforms to
97 add millions of new jobs and trillions in new wealth that can be used to rebuild America.

98 A number of these reforms that I will outline tonight will be opposed by some of our
99 nation's most powerful special interests. That is because these interests have rigged our
100 political and economic system for their exclusive benefit.
101 Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my
102 opponent because they know she will keep our rigged system in place. They are
103 throwing money at her because they have total control over everything she does. She is
104 their puppet, and they pull the strings.
105 That is why Hillary Clinton's message is that things will never change. My message is
106 that things have to change – and they have to change right now. Every day I wake up
107 determined to deliver for the people I have met all across this nation that have been
108 neglected, ignored, and abandoned.
109 I have visited the laid-off factory workers, and the communities crushed by our horrible
110 and unfair trade deals. These are the forgotten men and women of our country. People
111 who work hard but no longer have a voice.
112 I AM YOUR VOICE.
113 I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians put
114 their personal agendas before the national good. I have no patience for injustice, no
115 tolerance for government incompetence, no sympathy for leaders who fail their citizens.
116 When innocent people suffer, because our political system lacks the will, or the courage,
117 or the basic decency to enforce our laws – or worse still, has sold out to some corporate
118 lobbyist for cash – I am not able to look the other way.
119 And when a Secretary of State illegally stores her emails on a private server, deletes
120 33,000 of them so the authorities can't see her crime, puts our country at risk, lies about
121 it in every different form and faces no consequence – I know that corruption has reached
122 a level like never before.
123 When the FBI Director says that the Secretary of State was "extremely careless" and
124 "negligent," in handling our classified secrets, I also know that these terms are minor
125 compared to what she actually did. They were just used to save her from facing justice
126 for her terrible crimes.
127 In fact, her single greatest accomplishment may be committing such an egregious crime
128 and getting away with it – especially when others have paid so dearly. When that same
129 Secretary of State rakes in millions of dollars trading access and favors to special
130 interests and foreign powers I know the time for action has come.
131 I have joined the political arena so that the powerful can no longer beat up on people
132 that cannot defend themselves. Nobody knows the system better than me, which is why
133 I alone can fix it. I have seen firsthand how the system is rigged against our citizens, just
134 like it was rigged against Bernie Sanders – he never had a chance.
135 But his supporters will join our movement, because we will fix his biggest issue: trade.
136 Millions of Democrats will join our movement because we are going to fix the system so
137 it works for all Americans. In this cause, I am proud to have at my side the next Vice
138 President of the United States: Governor Mike Pence of Indiana.
139 We will bring the same economic success to America that Mike brought to Indiana. He is
140 a man of character and accomplishment. He is the right man for the job. The first task for
141 our new Administration will be to liberate our citizens from the crime and terrorism and
142 lawlessness that threatens their communities.
143 America was shocked to its core when our police officers in Dallas were brutally
144 executed. In the days after Dallas, we have seen continued threats and violence against
145 our law enforcement officials. Law officers have been shot or killed in recent days in
146 Georgia, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas, Michigan and Tennessee.

147 On Sunday, more police were gunned down in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Three were
148 killed, and four were badly injured. An attack on law enforcement is an attack on all
149 Americans. I have a message to every last person threatening the peace on our streets
150 and the safety of our police: when I take the oath of office next year, I will restore law
151 and order our country.
152 I will work with, and appoint, the best prosecutors and law enforcement officials in the
153 country to get the job done. In this race for the White House, I am the Law And Order
154 candidate. The irresponsible rhetoric of our President, who has used the pulpit of the
155 presidency to divide us by race and color, has made America a more dangerous
156 environment for everyone.
157 This Administration has failed America's inner cities. It's failed them on education. It's
158 failed them on jobs. It's failed them on crime. It's failed them at every level.
159 When I am President, I will work to ensure that all of our kids are treated equally, and
160 protected equally.
161 Every action I take, I will ask myself: does this make life better for young Americans in
162 Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, Ferguson who have as much of a right to live out their
163 dreams as any other child America?
164 To make life safe in America, we must also address the growing threats we face from
165 outside America: we are going to defeat the barbarians of ISIS. Once again, France is the
166 victim of brutal Islamic terrorism.
167 Men, women and children viciously mowed down. Lives ruined. Families ripped apart. A
168 nation in mourning.
169 The damage and devastation that can be inflicted by Islamic radicals has been over and
170 over – at the World Trade Center, at an office party in San Bernardino, at the Boston
171 Marathon, and a military recruiting center in Chattanooga, Tennessee.
172 Only weeks ago, in Orlando, Florida, 49 wonderful Americans were savagely murdered
173 by an Islamic terrorist. This time, the terrorist targeted our LGBT community. As your
174 President, I will do everything in my power to protect our LGBT citizens from the
175 violence and oppression of a hateful foreign ideology. To protect us from terrorism, we
176 need to focus on three things.
177 We must have the best intelligence gathering operation in the world. We must abandon
178 the failed policy of nation building and regime change that Hillary Clinton pushed in
179 Iraq, Libya, Egypt and Syria. Instead, we must work with all of our allies who share our
180 goal of destroying ISIS and stamping out Islamic terror.
181 This includes working with our greatest ally in the region, the State of Israel. Lastly, we
182 must immediately suspend immigration from any nation that has been compromised by
183 terrorism until such time as proven vetting mechanisms have been put in place.
184 My opponent has called for a radical 550% increase in Syrian refugees on top of existing
185 massive refugee flows coming into our country under President Obama. She proposes
186 this despite the fact that there's no way to screen these refugees in order to find out who
187 they are or where they come from. I only want to admit individuals into our country who
188 will support our values and love our people.
189 Anyone who endorses violence, hatred or oppression is not welcome in our country and
190 never will be.
191 Decades of record immigration have produced lower wages and higher unemployment
192 for our citizens, especially for African-American and Latino workers. We are going to
193 have an immigration system that works, but one that works for the American people.
194 On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by illegal
195 immigrants Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and Jamiel Shaw. They are just three
196 brave representatives of many thousands. Of all my travels in this country, nothing has

197 affected me more deeply than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who
198 have lost their children to violence spilling across our border.
199 These families have no special interests to represent them. There are no demonstrators
200 to protest on their behalf. My opponent will never meet with them, or share in their
201 pain. Instead, my opponent wants Sanctuary Cities. But where was sanctuary for Kate
202 Steinle? Where was Sanctuary for the children of Mary Ann, Sabine and Jamiel? Where
203 was sanctuary for all the other Americans who have been so brutally murdered, and
204 who have suffered so horribly?
205 These wounded American families have been alone. But they are alone no longer.
206 Tonight, this candidate and this whole nation stand in their corner to support them, to
207 send them our love, and to pledge in their honor that we will save countless more
208 families from suffering the same awful fate.
209 We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop the gangs
210 and the violence, and to stop the drugs from pouring into our communities. I have been
211 honored to receive the endorsement of America's Border Patrol Agents, and will work
212 directly with them to protect the integrity of our lawful immigration system.
213 By ending catch-and-release on the border, we will stop the cycle of human smuggling
214 and violence. Illegal border crossings will go down. Peace will be restored. By enforcing
215 the rules for the millions who overstay their visas, our laws will finally receive the
216 respect they deserve.
217 Tonight, I want every American whose demands for immigration security have been
218 denied – and every politician who has denied them – to listen very closely to the words I
219 am about to say.
220 On January 21st of 2017, the day after I take the oath of office, Americans will finally
221 wake up in a country where the laws of the United States are enforced. We are going to
222 be considerate and compassionate to everyone.
223 But my greatest compassion will be for our own struggling citizens. My plan is the exact
224 opposite of the radical and dangerous immigration policy of Hillary Clinton. Americans
225 want relief from uncontrolled immigration. Communities want relief.
226 Yet Hillary Clinton is proposing mass amnesty, mass immigration, and mass lawlessness.
227 Her plan will overwhelm your schools and hospitals, further reduce your jobs and
228 wages, and make it harder for recent immigrants to escape from poverty.
229 I have a different vision for our workers. It begins with a new, fair trade policy that
230 protects our jobs and stands up to countries that cheat. It's been a signature message of
231 my campaign from day one, and it will be a signature feature of my presidency from the
232 moment I take the oath of office.
233 I have made billions of dollars in business making deals – now I'm going to make our
234 country rich again. I am going to turn our bad trade agreements into great ones. America
235 has lost nearly-one third of its manufacturing jobs since 1997, following the enactment
236 of disastrous trade deals supported by Bill and Hillary Clinton.
237 Remember, it was Bill Clinton who signed NAFTA, one of the worst economic deals ever
238 made by our country.
239 Never again.
240 I am going to bring our jobs back to Ohio and to America – and I am not going to let
241 companies move to other countries, firing their employees along the way, without
242 consequences.
243 My opponent, on the other hand, has supported virtually every trade agreement that has
244 been destroying our middle class. She supported NAFTA, and she supported China's
245 entrance into the World Trade Organization – another one of her husband's colossal
246 mistakes.

247 She supported the job killing trade deal with South Korea. She has supported the Trans-
248 Pacific Partnership. The TPP will not only destroy our manufacturing, but it will make
249 America subject to the rulings of foreign governments. I pledge to never sign any trade
250 agreement that hurts our workers, or that diminishes our freedom and independence.
251 Instead, I will make individual deals with individual countries.
252 No longer will we enter into these massive deals, with many countries, that are
253 thousands of pages long – and which no one from our country even reads or
254 understands. We are going to enforce all trade violations, including through the use of
255 taxes and tariffs, against any country that cheats.
256 This includes stopping China's outrageous theft of intellectual property, along with their
257 illegal product dumping, and their devastating currency manipulation. Our horrible
258 trade agreements with China and many others, will be totally renegotiated. That
259 includes renegotiating NAFTA to get a much better deal for America – and we'll walk
260 away if we don't get the deal that we want. We are going to start building and making
261 things again.
262 Next comes the reform of our tax laws, regulations and energy rules. While Hillary
263 Clinton plans a massive tax increase, I have proposed the largest tax reduction of any
264 candidate who has declared for the presidential race this year – Democrat or
265 Republican. Middle-income Americans will experience profound relief, and taxes will be
266 simplified for everyone.
267 America is one of the highest-taxed nations in the world. Reducing taxes will cause new
268 companies and new jobs to come roaring back into our country. Then we are going to
269 deal with the issue of regulation, one of the greatest job-killers of them all. Excessive
270 regulation is costing our country as much as $2 trillion a year, and we will end it. We are
271 going to lift the restrictions on the production of American energy. This will produce
272 more than $20 trillion in job creating economic activity over the next four decades.
273 My opponent, on the other hand, wants to put the great miners and steel workers of our
274 country out of work – that will never happen when I am President. With these new
275 economic policies, trillions of dollars will start flowing into our country.
276 This new wealth will improve the quality of life for all Americans – We will build the
277 roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, and the railways of tomorrow. This, in turn,
278 will create millions more jobs. We will rescue kids from failing schools by helping their
279 parents send them to a safe school of their choice.
280 My opponent would rather protect education bureaucrats than serve American children.
281 We will repeal and replace disastrous Obamacare. You will be able to choose your own
282 doctor again. And we will fix TSA at the airports! We will completely rebuild our
283 depleted military, and the countries that we protect, at a massive loss, will be asked to
284 pay their fair share.
285 We will take care of our great Veterans like they have never been taken care of before.
286 My opponent dismissed the VA scandal as being not widespread – one more sign of how
287 out of touch she really is. We are going to ask every Department Head in government to
288 provide a list of wasteful spending projects that we can eliminate in my first 100 days.
289 The politicians have talked about it, I'm going to do it. We are also going to appoint
290 justices to the United States Supreme Court who will uphold our laws and our
291 Constitution.
292 The replacement for Justice Scalia will be a person of similar views and principles. This
293 will be one of the most important issues decided by this election. My opponent wants to
294 essentially abolish the 2nd amendment. I, on the other hand, received the early and
295 strong endorsement of the National Rifle Association and will protect the right of all
296 Americans to keep their families safe.

297 At this moment, I would like to thank the evangelical community who have been so good
298 to me and so supportive. You have so much to contribute to our politics, yet our laws
299 prevent you from speaking your minds from your own pulpits.
300 An amendment, pushed by Lyndon Johnson, many years ago, threatens religious
301 institutions with a loss of their tax-exempt status if they openly advocate their political
302 views.
303 I am going to work very hard to repeal that language and protect free speech for all
304 Americans. We can accomplish these great things, and so much else – all we need to do is
305 start believing in ourselves and in our country again. It is time to show the whole world
306 that America Is Back – bigger, and better and stronger than ever before.
307 In this journey, I'm so lucky to have at my side my wife Melania and my wonderful
308 children, Don, Ivanka, Eric, Tiffany, and Barron: you will always be my greatest source of
309 pride and joy. My Dad, Fred Trump, was the smartest and hardest working man I ever
310 knew. I wonder sometimes what he'd say if he were here to see this tonight.
311 It's because of him that I learned, from my youngest age, to respect the dignity of work
312 and the dignity of working people. He was a guy most comfortable in the company of
313 bricklayers, carpenters, and electricians and I have a lot of that in me also. Then there's
314 my mother, Mary. She was strong, but also warm and fair-minded. She was a truly great
315 mother. She was also one of the most honest and charitable people I have ever known,
316 and a great judge of character.
317 To my sisters Mary Anne and Elizabeth, my brother Robert and my late brother Fred, I
318 will always give you my love you are most special to me. I have loved my life in business.
319 But now, my sole and exclusive mission is to go to work for our country – to go to work
320 for all of you. It's time to deliver a victory for the American people. But to do that, we
321 must break free from the petty politics of the past.
322 America is a nation of believers, dreamers, and strivers that is being led by a group of
323 censors, critics, and cynics.
324 Remember: all of the people telling you that you can't have the country you want, are the
325 same people telling you that I wouldn't be standing here tonight. No longer can we rely
326 on those elites in media, and politics, who will say anything to keep a rigged system in
327 place.
328 Instead, we must choose to Believe In America. History is watching us now.
329 It's waiting to see if we will rise to the occasion, and if we will show the whole world that
330 America is still free and independent and strong.
331 My opponent asks her supporters to recite a three-word loyalty pledge. It reads: "I'm
332 With Her". I choose to recite a different pledge.
333 My pledge reads: "I'M WITH YOU – THE AMERICAN PEOPLE."
334 I am your voice.
335 So to every parent who dreams for their child, and every child who dreams for their
336 future, I say these words to you tonight: I'm With You, and I will fight for you, and I will
337 win for you.
338 To all Americans tonight, in all our cities and towns, I make this promise: We Will Make
339 America Strong Again.
340 We Will Make America Proud Again.
341 We Will Make America Safe Again.
342 And We Will Make America Great Again.
343 THANK YOU.
344

9.1.3. Hillary Clinton: Reaction Speech Orlando Shooting (C2)

2 Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

3 Thank you all very much.

4 (APPLAUSE)

5 Thank you. Thank you all.

6 (APPLAUSE)

7 Thank you. Thank you. I am -- I'm absolutely -- I'm absolutely delighted to be back in
8 Cleveland and to be here at the Industrial Innovation Center. I've had a chance to learn
9 about the great work you do here. I especially want to applaud Team Wendy for
10 everything you do to protect our troops, first responders.

11 (APPLAUSE)

12 And others from traumatic brain injury. It is so important that we continue to support
13 those who protect us.

14 AUDIENCE: We want Hillary!

15 CLINTON: Thank you.

16 AUDIENCE: We want Hillary!

17 CLINTON: Thank you all.

18 AUDIENCE: We want Hillary!

19 (APPLAUSE)

20 CLINTON: It is good to be back in Cleveland, I can tell you that.

21 (APPLAUSE)

22 I want to thank -- I want to thank your extraordinary senator, Sherrod Brown, for his
23 leadership, for that very kind and generous introduction. You are very fortunate to -- to
24 have him representing you. I want to thank your congresswoman, Marcia Fudge...

25 (APPLAUSE)

26 Who is both indomitable and indefatigable. She is such a tenacious advocate for the
27 people she represents. I want to acknowledge the mayor, Mayor Jackson, who was here,
28 County Executive Budish (ph). And I particularly want to recognize the passing of
29 George Voinovich, and he devoted his life to serving the people of Ohio as mayor of
30 Cleveland, as governor and senator. And we send our prayers and sympathy to his
31 family.

32 I also want to thank Dan Moore, the owner and founder of this company and Team
33 Wendy for his belief in Cleveland, for his commitment to create jobs. I can't wait to work
34 with him to do more of what he has accomplished here.

35 (APPLAUSE)

36 You know, originally, I had intended to come to Cleveland under very different
37 circumstances. We are heading into a general election that could be the most
38 consequential of our lifetimes. But today is not a day for politics.

39 On Sunday, Americans woke up to a nightmare that's become mind numbingly familiar.
40 Another act of terrorism in a place no one expected. A madman filled with hate, with
41 guns in his hands, and just a horrible sense of vengeance and vindictiveness in his heart,
42 apparently consumed by rage against LGBT Americans, and by extension, the openness
43 and diversity that defines our American way of life.

44 We will learn more about the killer in the days to come. We know that he pledged
45 allegiance to ISIS that they are now taking credit and that part of their strategy is to
46 radicalize individuals and encourage attacks against the United States, even if they are
47 not coordinated with ISIS leadership. But there's a lot we still don't know, including
48 what other mix of motives drove him to kill.

49 The more we learn about what happened, the better we'll be able to protect our people
50 going forward. In the days ahead, we will also learn more about the many lives he
51 viciously cut short, many of them young people, just starting out in their lives. They
52 were travel agents and pharmacy techs, college students and amusement park workers,
53 sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, and they had one thing in common. They all
54 had a lot more to give.
55 CLINTON: We should take a moment today amid our busy lives to think about them, to
56 pray for everyone who was killed, for the wounded, those who are fighting to regain
57 their lives and futures, for our first responders who walked into danger one more time.
58 As a mother, I can't imagine what those families are going through.
59 But let's also remember the other scenes we saw on Sunday. We saw the faces of some of
60 those first responders who rushed into danger and tried to save as many people as they
61 could. We saw survivors like Chris Hansen who risked their lives to help others.
62 People gathering outside hospitals to comfort anxious family members, waiting for news
63 of their loved ones and waiting, too, to learn more about what they could do to make
64 sure this never happened again.
65 Religion leaders condemning hate and appealing for peace. People lining up to donate
66 blood. Americans refusing to be intimidated or divided.
67 Yesterday I called Mayor Dyer of Orlando and offered my support and my appreciation
68 for the leadership that he and the other officials have shown. This is a moment when all
69 Americans need to stand together.
70 No matter how many times we endure attacks like this, the horror never fades. The
71 murder of innocent people breaks our hearts, tears at our sense of security and makes
72 us furious.
73 Now we have to steal our resolve to respond. And that's what I want to talk to you about.
74 How we respond.
75 The Orlando terrorist may be dead, but the virus that poisoned his mind remains very
76 much alive. And we must attack it with clear eyes, steady hands, unwavering
77 determination and pride in our country and our values.
78 (APPLAUSE)
79 I have no doubt -- I have no doubt we can meet this challenge if we meet it together.
80 Whatever we learn about this killer, his motives in the days ahead, we know already the
81 barbarity that we face from radical jihadists is profound.
82 In the Middle East, ISIS is attempting a genocide of religious and ethnic minorities. They
83 are slaughtering Muslims who refuse to accept their medieval ways. They are beheading
84 civilians, including executing LGBT people. They are murdering Americans and
85 Europeans, enslaving, torturing and raping women and girls.
86 In speeches like this one, after Paris, Brussels and San Bernardino, I have laid out a plan
87 to defeat ISIS and the other radical jihadist groups in the region and beyond.
88 The attack in Orlando makes it even more clear, we cannot contain this threat. We must
89 defeat it. And the good news is that the coalition effort in Syria and Iraq has made recent
90 gains in the last months.
91 So we should keep the pressure on ramping up the air campaign, accelerating support
92 for our friends fighting to take and hold ground and pushing our partners in the region
93 to do even more.
94 We also need continued American leadership to help resolve the political conflicts that
95 fuel ISIS recruitment efforts.
96 But as ISIS loses actual ground in Iraq and Syria, it will seek to stage more attacks and
97 gain stronger footholds wherever it can, from Afghanistan, to Libya, to Europe.

98 The threat is metastasizing. We saw this in Paris. And we saw it in Brussels. We face a
99 twisted ideology and poisoned psychology that inspires the so-called lone wolves,
100 radicalized individuals who may or may not have contact and direction from any formal
101 organization.
102 CLINTON: So, yes, efforts to defeat ISIS on the battlefield must succeed. But it will take
103 more than that.
104 (APPLAUSE)
105 We have to be just as adaptable and versatile as our enemies. As president, I will make
106 identifying and stopping lone wolves a top priority.
107 (APPLAUSE)
108 I will put a team together from across our government, the entire government, as well as
109 the private sector and communities to get on top of this urgent challenge. And I will
110 make sure our law enforcement and intelligence professionals have all the resources
111 they need to get the job done.
112 As we do this, there are three areas that demand attention. First, we and our allies must
113 work hand-in-hand to dismantle the networks that move money, and propaganda, and
114 arms and fighters around the world.
115 (APPLAUSE)
116 We have to flow -- we have to stem the flow of jihadists from Europe and Iraq, Syria,
117 Afghanistan and then back again. The only way to do this is by working closely with our
118 partners, strengthening our alliances, not weakening them or walking away from them.
119 Second, here at home, we must harden our own defenses. We have to do more to
120 support our first responders, law enforcement and intelligence officers who do
121 incredible work every day at great personal risk to keep our country safe.
122 (APPLAUSE)
123 I have seen firsthand how hard their job is, and how well they do it.
124 In Orlando, at least one police officer was shot in the head. Thankfully, his life was saved
125 by a Kevlar helmet, something folks here at Team Wendy know a lot about.
126 (APPLAUSE)
127 It has often been said that our law enforcement, our intelligence agencies, our first
128 responders have to be right 100 percent of the time, but terrorists only have to be right
129 once.
130 What a heavy responsibility. These men and women deserve both our respect and
131 gratitude. And they deserve the right tools, and resources and training. Too often, state
132 and local officials can't get access to intelligence from the federal government that
133 would help them do their jobs.
134 We need to change that. We also need to work...
135 (APPLAUSE)
136 We also need to work with local law enforcement and business owners on ways to
137 protect vulnerable, so-called soft targets, like nightclubs and shopping malls and hotels
138 and movie theaters and schools and houses of worship.
139 Now, I know a lot of Americans are asking how it was possible that someone already on
140 the FBI's radar could have still been able to commit an attack like the one in Orlando,
141 and what more we can do to stop this kind of thing from happening again.
142 Well, we have to see what the investigation uncovers. If there are things that can and
143 should be done to improve our ability to prevent, we must do them. We already know
144 we need more resources for this fight. The professionals who keep us safe would be the
145 first to say we need better intelligence to discover and disrupt terrorist plots before they
146 can be carried out.

147   That's why I have proposed an intelligence surge to bolster our capabilities across the
148   board with appropriate safeguards here at home.
149   Even as we make sure our security officials get the tools they need to prevent attacks,
150   it's essential that we stop terrorists from getting the tools they need to carry out the
151   attack.
152   (APPLAUSE)
153   CLINTON: And that is especially true when it comes to assault weapons like those used
154   in Orlando and San Bernardino.
155   (APPLAUSE)
156   I believe weapons of war have no place on our streets and we may have our
157   disagreements about gun safety regulations, but we should all be able to agree on a few
158   essential things.
159   If the FBI is watching you for a suspected terrorist link, you shouldn't be able to just go
160   buy a gun with no questions asked.
161   And you shouldn't be able to exploit loopholes and evade criminal background checks by
162   buying online or at a gun show.
163   And yes, if you're too dangerous to get on a plane, you are too dangerous to buy a gun in
164   America.
165   Now, I know some will say that assault weapons and background checks are totally
166   separate issues having nothing to do with terrorism. Well, in Orlando and San
167   Bernardino terrorists used assault weapons, the AR-15. And they used it to kill
168   Americans. That was the same assault weapon used to kill those little children in Sandy
169   Hook.
170   We have to make it harder for people who should not have those weapons of war. And
171   that may not stop every shooting or every terrorist attack, but it will stop some and it
172   will save lives and it will protect our first responders.
173   And I want you to know, I'm not going to stop fighting for these kinds of provisions.
174   Now, the third area that demands attention is preventing radicalization and countering
175   efforts by ISIS and other international terrorist networks to recruit in the United States
176   and Europe.
177   For starters, it is long past time for the Saudis, the Qataris and the Kuwaitis and others to
178   stop their citizens from funding extremist organizations. And they should stop
179   supporting radical schools and mosques around the world that have set too many young
180   people on a path towards extremism.
181   We also have to use all our capabilities to counter jihadist propaganda online. This is
182   something that I spend a lot of time on at the State Department.
183   As president, I will work with our great tech companies from Silicon Valley to Boston to
184   step up our game. We have to a better job intercepting ISIS' communications, tracking
185   and analyzing social media posts and mapping jihadist networks, as well as promoting
186   credible voices who can provide alternatives to radicalization.
187   And there is more to do offline as well.
188   CLINTON: Since 9/11, law enforcement agencies have worked hard to build
189   relationships with Muslim American communities. Millions of peace-loving Muslims live,
190   work and raise their families across America. And they are the most likely to recognize
191   the insidious effects of radicalization before it's too late, and the best positioned to help
192   us block it. So we should be intensifying contacts in those communities, not
193   scapegoating or isolating them.
194   (APPLAUSE)

195 Last year, I visited a pilot program in Minneapolis that helps parents, teachers, imams,
196 mental health professionals and others recognize signs of radicalization in young people
197 and work with law enforcement to intervene before it's too late.
198 I've also met with local leaders pursuing innovative approaches in Los Angeles and
199 other places. And we need more efforts like that in more cities across America. And as
200 the director of the FBI has pointed out, we should avoid eroding trust in that community,
201 which will only make law enforcement's job more difficult.
202 Inflammatory anti-Muslim rhetoric and threatening to ban the families and friends of
203 Muslim Americans as well as millions of Muslim business people and tourists from
204 entering our country hurts the vast majority of Muslims who love freedom and hate
205 terror.
206 (APPLAUSE)
207 So does saying that we have to start special surveillance on our fellow Americans
208 because of their religion. It's no coincidence that hate crimes against American Muslims
209 and mosques have tripled after Paris and San Bernardino. That's wrong. And it's also
210 dangerous. It plays right into the terrorists' hands.
211 Still, as I have said before, none of us can close our eyes to the fact that we do face
212 enemies who use their distorted version of Islam to justify slaughtering $ innocent
213 people. They'd take us all back to the Stone Age if they could, just as they have in parts of
214 Iraq and Syria.
215 The terrorist in Orlando targeted LGBT Americans out of hatred and bigotry. And an
216 attack on any American is an attack on all Americans.
217 (APPLAUSE) And I want to say this to all the LGBT people grieving today in Florida and
218 across our country. You have millions of allies who will always have your back.
219 (APPLAUSE)
220 And I am one of them.
221 (APPLAUSE)
222 From Stonewall to Laramie, and now Orlando, we've seen too many examples of how the
223 struggle to live freely, openly and without fear has been met by violence. We have to
224 stand together, be proud together. There is no better rebuke to the terrorists and all
225 those who hate.
226 Our open, diverse society is an asset in the struggle against terrorism, not a liability. It
227 makes us stronger and more resistant to radicalization. And this raises a larger point
228 about the future of our country.
229 America is strongest when we all believe that we have a stake in our country and our
230 future.
231 CLINTON: This vision has sustained us from the beginning. The belief that, yes, we are all
232 created equal and the journey we have made to turn that into reality over the course of
233 our history, that we are not a land of winners and losers, that we should all have the
234 opportunity to live up to our God-given potential. And we have a responsibility to help
235 others do so as well.
236 (APPLAUSE)
237 As I look at American history, I see that this has always been a country of "we" not "me."
238 We stand together because we are stronger together. E pluribus unum. One -- out of
239 many, one -- has seen us through the darkest chapters of our history. Ever since 13
240 squabbling colonies put aside their disagreements and united because they realized they
241 were going to rise together or fall separately, generation after generation has fought and
242 marched and organized to widen the circle of dignity and opportunity. Ending slavery.
243 Securing and expanding the right to vote. Throwing open the doors of education.
244 Building the greatest middle class the world has ever seen.

245 And we are stronger when more people can participate in our democracy.
246 (APPLAUSE)
247 And we are stronger when everyone can share in the rewards of our economy and
248 contribute to our communities, when we bridge our divides and lift each other up
249 instead of tearing each other down. Now we have overcome a lot together and we will
250 overcome the threats of terror and radicalization and all of our other challenges. Here in
251 Ohio and across America, I've listened to people talk about the problems that keep you
252 up at night.
253 The bonds that hold us together as communities, as one national community, are
254 strained by an economy with too much inequality and too little upward mobility. By
255 social and political divisions that have diminished our trust in each other and our
256 confidence in our shared future. I have heard that, and I want you to know as your
257 president I will work every day to break down all the barriers holding you back and
258 keeping us apart.
259 We're gonna get an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top, we're
260 gonna forge a new sense of connection and shared responsibility to each other and our
261 nation.
262 And finally,
263 (APPLAUSE) finally let me remind us all, I remember, I remember how it felt, on the day
264 after 9/11, and I bet many of you do as well. Americans from all walks of life rallied
265 together with a sense of common purpose on September the 12th and in the days and
266 weeks and months that followed. We had each others' backs. I was a senator from New
267 York. There was a Republican president, a Republican governor, and a Republican
268 mayor. We did not attack each other. We worked with each other to protect our country
269 and to rebuild our city (ph).
270 (APPLAUSE)
271 President Bush went to a Muslim community center just six days after the attacks to
272 send a message of unity and solidarity. To anyone who wanted to take out their anger on
273 our Muslim neighbors and fellow citizens, he said, "That should not, and that will not,
274 stand in America." It is time to get back to the spirit of those days, spirit of 9/12. Let's
275 make sure we keep looking to the best of our country, to the best within each of us.
276 Democratic and Republican presidents have risen to the occasion in the face of tragedy.
277 That is what we are called to do my friends and I am so confident and optimistic that is
278 exactly what we will do.
279 Thank   you   all   so   much.

9.1.4. Donald Trump: Reaction Speech Orlando Shooting (T2)

TRUMP: (OFF-MIKE) This was going to be a speech on Hillary Clinton and all of the bad things and we all know what's going on, and especially how poor she'd do as president in these very, very troubled times of radical Islamic terrorism.

TRUMP: Even her former Secret Service agent, who's seen her under pressure and in times of stress, has stated that she lacks the temperament and integrity to be our president. There will be plenty of opportunity to discuss these important issues at a later time, and I will deliver that speech very, very soon.

But today, there's only one thing to discuss, the growing threat of terrorism inside of our borders. The attack on the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, was the worst terror strike on our soil since September 11th, and the worst mass shooting in our country's history.

So many people -- it's just hard to believe, but just so many people dead, so many people gravely injured, so much carnage, such a disgrace. The horror is beyond description. The families of these wonderful people are totally devastated, and they will be forever. Likewise, our whole nation and indeed the whole world is devastated.

We express our deepest sympathies to the victims, the wounded, and their families. We mourn as one people for our nation's loss, and pledge our support to any and all who need it. I would like to ask now that we all observe a moment of silence for the victims of this attack.

Thank you. Our nation stands together in solidarity with the members of Orlando's LGBT community. They have been through something that nobody could ever experience. This is a very dark moment in America's history. A radical Islamic terrorist targeted the nightclub, not only because he wanted to kill Americans, but in order to execute gay and lesbian citizens, because of their sexual orientation.

It's a strike at the heart and soul of who we are as a nation. It's an assault on the ability of free people to live their lives, love who they want, and express their identity. It's an attack on the right of every single American to live in peace and safety in their own country.

We need to respond to this attack on America as one united people, with force, purpose, and determination. But the current politically correct response cripples our ability to talk and to think and act clearly. We're not acting clearly, we're not talking clearly, we've got problems.

If we don't get tough, and if we don't get smart, and fast, we're not going to have our country anymore. There will be nothing, absolutely nothing, left. The killer, whose name I will not use, or ever say, was born in Afghan, of Afghan parents, who immigrated to the United States.

His father published support for the Afghan Taliban, a regime which murders those who don't share its radical views, and they murdered plenty. The father even said he was running for president of Afghanistan. The bottom line is that the only reason the killer was in America in the first place was because we allowed his family to come here.

That is a fact, and it's a fact we need to talk about. We have a dysfunctional immigration system, which does not permit us to know who we let into our country, and it does not permit us to protect our citizens properly. We have an incompetent administration.

And if I'm elected president, that will not change, I will tell you, that will not change over the next four years. We have an administration that will not change. But if I get in there, it's going to change, and it's going to change quickly. We're going from totally incompetent to just the opposite, believe me.

(APPLAUSE)

50   TRUMP: Thank you.

51   With 50 people dead and perhaps more ultimately and dozens more wounded, we
52   cannot afford to talk around issues anymore. We have to address these issues head-on. I
53   called for a ban after San Bernardino and was met with great scorn and anger but now
54   many years and I have to say many years but many are saying that I was right to do so.
55   And although the pause is temporary we must find out what is going on. We have to do
56   it.

57   It will be lifted -- this ban -- when and as a nation we're in a position to properly and
58   perfectly screen these people coming into our country. They're pouring in and we don't
59   know what we're doing. The immigration laws of the United States give the president
60   powers to suspend entry into the country of any class of persons. Now, any class -- it
61   really is determined and to be determined by the president for the interests of the
62   United States. And it's as he or she deems appropriate. Hopefully it's he in this case.

63   (APPLAUSE)

64   Thank you. I will use this power to protect the American people. When I'm elected I will
65   suspend immigration from areas of the world where there's a proven history of
66   terrorism against the United States, Europe or our allies until we fully understand how
67   to end these threats. After a full ...

68   (APPLAUSE)

69   Thank you.

70   And by the way we have no choice. After a full and partial and long -- really long overdue
71   security assessment we will develop a responsible immigration policy that serves the
72   interests and values of America.

73   (APPLAUSE)

74   We cannot continue to allow thousands upon thousands of people to pour into our
75   country many of whom have the same thought process as this savage killer. Many of the
76   principles of radical Islam are incompatible with Western values and institutions.

77   (APPLAUSE) Remember this, radical Islam is anti-woman, anti-gay and anti- American.

78   (APPLAUSE)

79   I refuse to allow America to become a place where gay people, Christian people, Jewish
80   people are targets of persecution and intimation by radical Islamic preachers of hate and
81   violence.

82   (APPLAUSE)

83   This is not just a national security issue. It's a quality of life issue. If we want to protect
84   the quality of life for all Americans -- women and children, gay and straight, Jews and
85   Christians and all people then we need to tell the truth about radical Islam and we need
86   to do it now.

87   (APPLAUSE)

88   We need to tell the truth also about how radical Islam is coming to our shores. And it's
89   coming ...

90   (APPLAUSE)

91   With these people, folks, it's coming. We're importing radical Islamic terrorism into the
92   West through a failed immigration system and through an intelligence community held
93   back by our president. Even our own FBI director has admitted that we cannot
94   effectively check the backgrounds of people we're letting into America. All of the
95   September 11th hijackists were issued visas. Large numbers of Somali refugees in
96   Minnesota have tried to join ISIS.

97   The Boston bombers came here through political asylum. The male shooter in San
98   Bernardino again whose name I will not mention was the child of immigrants from

99   Pakistan and he brought his wife, the other terrorist from Saudi Arabia through another
100   one of our easily exploited visa programs.
101   (APPLAUSE)
102   TRUMP: Immigration from Afghanistan into the United States has increased nearly five
103   fold -- five fold in just one year. According to Pew Research, 99 percent of the people in
104   Afghanistan support oppressive sharia law. We admit many more, and that's just the
105   way it is. We admit many more from other countries in the region.
106   And I'll tell you what: They share these oppressive views and values. We want to remain
107   a free and open society. Then, and if we do, then we have to control our borders. We
108   have to control, and we have to control them now, not later. Right now.
109   (APPLAUSE)
110   Thank you.
111   Yet Hillary Clinton, for months, and despite so many attacks, repeatedly refused to even
112   say the words radical Islam until I challenged her yesterday. And, guess what, she will
113   probably say them. She sort of has said them, but let's see what happens. She really has
114   no choice, but she doesn't want to.
115   However, she's really been forced, and she has been forced to say these words. She
116   supports, and the reason is, she supports so much of what is wrong, and what is wrong
117   with this country, and what's going wrong with our country and our borders. She has no
118   clue, in my opinion, what radical Islam is and she won't speak honestly about it if she
119   does, in fact, know. She's in total denial, and her continuing reluctance to ever name the
120   enemy broadcasts weakness across the entire world -- true weakness.
121   I don't know if you know this, but just a few weeks before San Bernardino, the slaughter,
122   that's all it was a slaughter, Hillary Clinton explained her refusal to say the words
123   "radical Islam." Here is what she said, exact quote, "Muslims are peaceful and tolerant
124   people, and have nothing whatsoever to do with terrorism." That is Hillary Clinton.
125   So, she says the solution is to ban guns. They tried that in France, which has among the
126   toughest gun laws anywhere in the world, and 130 people were brutally murdered by
127   Islamic terrorists in cold blood. Her plan is to disarm law abiding Americans, abolishing
128   the Second Amendment, and leaving only the bad guys and terrorists with guns. No
129   good. Not going to happen, folks. Not going to happen. Not going to happen. (APPLAUSE)
130   Thank you.
131   She wants to take away American's guns and then admit the very people who want to
132   slaughter us. Let them come into the country, we don't have guns. Let them come in, let
133   them have all the fun they want.
134   I will be meeting with the NRA, which has given me their earliest endorsement in a
135   presidential race, to discuss how to ensure Americans have the means to protect
136   themselves in this age of terror. I will be always defending the Second Amendment.
137   (APPLAUSE)
138   Thank you. Thank you.
139   The bottom line is that Hillary supports policies that bring the threat of radical Islam
140   into American and allow it to grow oversees, and it is growing. In fact, Hillary Clinton's
141   catastrophic immigration plan will bring vastly more radical Islamic immigration into
142   this country, threatening not only our society but our entire way of life. When it comes
143   to radical Islamic terrorism, ignorance is not bliss. It's deadly -- totally deadly.
144   The Obama administration, with the support of Hillary Clinton and others, has also
145   damaged our security by restraining our intelligence gathering and we have, just, no
146   intelligence gathering information. We need this information so badly, and he stopped it.
147   We don't have the support. We don't have the support of the law enforcement system

148 because Obama is not letting them do their job. They are not being allowed to do their
149 job. And, they can do it well -- better than anybody.
150 We need a new leader. We need a new leader fast.
151 (APPLAUSE)
152 TRUMP: Thank you.
153 They have put political correctness above common sense, above your safety, and above
154 all else. I refuse to be politically correct.
155 (APPLAUSE)
156 I want to do the right thing. I want to straighten things out and I want to make America
157 great again.
158 (APPLAUSE)
159 The days of deadly ignorance will end, and they will end soon if I'm elected. As president
160 I will give our intelligence community, law enforcement and military the tools they need
161 to prevent terrorist attacks. They don't have those tools now.
162 (APPLAUSE)
163 We need an intelligence gathering system second to none. Second to none. That includes
164 better cooperation between state, local and federal officials, and with our allies, very
165 importantly. I will have an Attorney General, a Director of National Intelligence and a
166 Secretary of Defense who'll know how to fight a war on radical Islamic terrorism.
167 (APPLAUSE)
168 And they will have the support that they need to get the job done right, not like it is right
169 now. It's not right.
170 (APPLAUSE)
171 We also must ensure the American people are provided the information they need to
172 understand the threat. The Senate subcommittee on Immigration has already identified
173 hundreds of immigrants charged with terrorist activities inside the United States since
174 September 11th. Nearly a year ago, the Senate Subcommittee asked President Obama's
175 Department of Justice, State and Homeland Security to provide the immigration history
176 of all terrorists inside the United States. These Departments refused to comply. Nobody
177 even knows why. They refused to comply.
178 President Obama must release the full and complete immigration histories of all
179 individuals implicated in terrorist activities of any kind since September 11th. So
180 important. The public has a right to know how these people got here, how they came on
181 to this great land, why are they here?
182 (APPLAUSE)
183 We have to screen applicants to know whether they are affiliated with or supporting
184 radical groups and beliefs, very simple. We have to control the amount of future
185 immigration into this country and we have to prevent large pockets of radicalization
186 from forming inside America. Not complicated.
187 (APPLAUSE)
188 Every - and just think of this. Take a look. Every single event, even a single individual can
189 be devastating, and all you have to do is take a look at what happened in Orlando and
190 what happened in other cases. Just a single event. And just one person. Can you imagine
191 what they'll do in large groups, which we're allowing now to come here.
192 Truly our President doesn't know what he's doing. He's failed us and he's failed us badly.
193 Under his leadership this situation will not get any better, it will only get worse. And I've
194 been saying that for a long time. Each year the United States permanently admits
195 100,000 immigrants from the Middle East and many more from Muslim countries
196 outside of the Middle East. Our government has been admitting ever- growing numbers,
197 year after year, without any effective plan for our own security.

198   In fact, Clinton's State Department was in charge of admissions and the admissions
199   process for people applying to enter from overseas. Having learned nothing from these
200   attacks, she now plans to massively increase admissions without a screening plan
201   including a 500 percent increase in Syrian refugees coming into our country. Tell me; tell
202   me - how stupid is that?
203   This could be a better, bigger, more horrible version than the legendary Trojan Horse
204   ever was. Altogether, under the Clinton plan, you'd be admitting hundreds of thousands
205   of refugees from the Middle East with no system to vet them, or to prevent the
206   radicalization of the children and their children. Not only their children, by the way,
207   they're trying to take over our children and convince them how wonderful ISIS is and
208   how wonderful Islam is and we don't know what's happening.
209   TRUMP: The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us why she believes immigration from
210   these dangerous countries should be increased without any effective system to really to
211   screen. We're not screening people.
212   So why don't we have an effective screening system? We don't. We're being laughed at
213   all over the world. The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us why we should admit
214   anyone into our country who supports violence of any kind against gay and lesbian
215   Americans. The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us how she will pay for it, her plan
216   will cost hundreds of billions of dollars long term.
217   Wouldn't this be money better spent rebuilding America for our current population
218   including the many poor people already living here. We have cities, we have inner
219   cities...
220   (APPLAUSE)
221   We have poverty all over and this is how we're spending billions of dollars. We have to
222   stop the tremendous flow of Syrian refugees into the United States. We don't know who
223   they are, they have no documentation and we don't know what they're planning and we
224   won't unless we have proper supervisor and proper leadership in which case they're out
225   of here. What I want...
226   (APPLAUSE)
227   What I want is common sense. I want a mainstream immigration policy that promotes
228   American values. That's a choice I put before the American people. A mainstream
229   immigration policy designed to benefit America or Hillary Clinton's radical immigration
230   policy designed to benefit politically correct special interests. That's all it is. We've got to
231   get smart and tough and vigilant and we've got to do it now because later is too late --
232   going to be too late for our country.
233   The media talks about home grown terrorism but Islamic radicalism and that's a very,
234   very important term -- a term that the president refuses to use and the networks that
235   nurture it are imports from overseas whether you like it or whether you don't like it.
236   Yes, there are many radicalized people already inside our country as a result of poor
237   policies of the past.
238   But the whole point is that we will be much, much and it will be easier to deal with our
239   current problem if we don't keep on bringing people who add to the problem. And that's
240   what they're doing. We're letting all of these people -- hundreds of thousands of people
241   come in and all they're doing is adding to this incredible problem we have.
242   For instance, the controversial mosque attended by the Boston bombers had at its
243   founder and as its founder an immigrant from overseas charged in an assassination plot.
244   This shooter and amazingly in Orlando was the child of an immigrant father who
245   supported one of the most repressive regimes on earth. Why would we admit people
246   who support violent hatred?

247 Hillary Clinton can never claim to be a friend of the gay community as long as she
248 continues to support immigration policies that bring Islamic extremists to our country
249 and who suppress women, gays and anyone who doesn't share their views or values.
250 (APPLAUSE)
251 She can't have it both ways. She can't claim to be supportive of these communities while
252 trying to increase the number of people coming in who want to oppress these same
253 communities. How does this kind of immigration make our lives better? How does this
254 kind of immigration make our country better? Why does Hillary Clinton want to bring
255 people in in vast numbers who reject our values? Why? Explain.
256 Ask yourself who is really the friend of women and the LGBT community, Donald Trump
257 with actions or Hillary Clinton with her words?
258 TRUMP: I will tell you who the better friend is and some day I believe that will be proven
259 out bigly (ph).
260 (APPLAUSE)
261 And by the way the LGBT community is just -- what's happened to them is just so sad
262 and to be thinking about where their policies are currently with this administration is a
263 disgrace to that community, I will tell you right now.
264 Clinton wants to allow radical Islamic terrorists to pour into our country. They enslave
265 women, and they murder gays. I don't want them in our country.
266 (APPLAUSE)
267 Immigration is a privilege, and we should not let anyone into this country who doesn't
268 support our communities. All of our communities, every single one of them. Americans
269 already admitted four times more immigrants than any country on Earth, anybody in the
270 world. Four times more. At least, because we don't even know who's coming in. And we
271 continue to admit millions more with no real checks or scrutiny.
272 Not surprisingly, wages for our workers haven't budged. In almost 20 years. You wonder
273 why we get the crowds, you wonder why we get this tremendous support, you wonder
274 why I've gotten more votes than any Republican in any primary in the history of the
275 Republican Party? Take a look at that. Take a look at your security; take a look at the
276 wages. For 18 years they've been stagnant, they've even gone down.
277 So whether it's a matter of national security, or financial security, we can't afford to keep
278 on going like this. Cannot afford it. We owe $19 trillion in debt. And no longer have any
279 options. Our communities from all backgrounds are ready for some relief. This is not an
280 act of offense against anyone. It's really an act of defense. I want us all, all of us, to work
281 together. We have to form a partnership, with our Muslim communities. We have
282 Muslim communities in this country that are great, and we have to form that
283 partnership.
284 Now, the Muslim community, so important. They have to work with us. They have to
285 cooperate with law enforcement and turn in the people who they know are bad. They
286 know it. And they have to do it, and they have to do it forthwith. I want to fix our schools.
287 I want to fix our bridges. And our jobs market, we're going to have it rocket again, we're
288 going to make great trade deals. But I want every American to succeed including
289 Muslims.
290 But the Muslims have to work with us. They have to work with us. They know what's
291 going on. They know that he was bad. They knew the people in San Bernardino were
292 bad. But you know what? They didn't turn them in. And you know what? We had death,
293 and destruction.
294 Hillary Clinton wants to empty out the Treasury to bring people into the country that
295 include individuals who preach hate against our citizens. I want to protect our citizens,
296 all of our citizens. The terrorist attack on Pulse nightclub demands a full and complete

297 investigation into every single aspect of the assault. In San Bernardino, as an example,
298 people who knew what was going on, they knew exactly, but they used the excuse of
299 racial profiling for not reporting it. They said oh, "We thought so but we didn't want to
300 use racial profiling." Which was probably an excuse given to them by their lawyer, so
301 they don't get in trouble.
302 We need to know what the killer discussed with his relatives, parents, friends and
303 associates. We need to know if he was affiliated with any radical mosques or radical
304 activists and what, if any, is their immigration status. We have to know, and we have to
305 know fast. We need to know if he traveled anywhere and who he traveled with. We need
306 to know, and we need to make sure, every single last person involved in this plan,
307 including anyone who knew something but didn't tell us, is brought to justice, so when
308 people know what's going on and they don't tell us, and we have an attack, and people
309 die, these people have to have consequences. Big consequences.
310 (APPLAUSE)
311 America must do more -- much more -- to protect its citizens, especially people who are
312 potential victims of crimes based on their backgrounds or sexual orientation, as you just
313 saw in Orlando.
314 TRUMP: It also means we must change our foreign policy. The decision to overthrow the
315 regime in Libya, then pushing for the overthrow of the regime in Syria, among other
316 things, without plans for the day after, have created space for ISIS to expand and grow
317 like nobody has ever seen before.
318 These actions, along with our disastrous Iran deal, have also reduced our ability to work
319 in partnership with our Muslim allies in the region. That is why our new goal must be to
320 defeat Islamic terrorism not nation building. No more nation building. It's never going to
321 work.
322 And by the way we've spent almost $5 trillion over the years on trying to nation build in
323 the Middle East and it has been complete and total disaster. We're further away now
324 than we were 15 years ago. For instance, the last major NATO mission was Hillary
325 Clinton's war in Libya. That mission helped to unleash ISIS on a new continent.
326 I've said NATO need to change its focus and stop terrorism. We have to focus on
327 terrorism and we have to stop terrorism. Since I've raised that criticism and it's OK. I've
328 gotten no credit for it but these are minor details -- NATO has since announced a new
329 initiative -- front page of the Wall Street Journal four days ago focused on just that.
330 America must unite the whole civilized world in the fight against Islamic terrorism.
331 (APPLAUSE)
332 Pretty much like we did with communism during the Cold War. We tried it President
333 Obama's   way,   doesn't   work.   He   gave   the   world   his
334 apology tour. We got ISIS and many other problems in return. That's what we got.
335 Remember the famous apology tour. We're sorry for everything.
336 I'd like to conclude my remarks today by again expressing our solitarily with the people
337 of Orlando who have come under this horrific attack. When I'm president I pledge to
338 protect and defend all Americans who live inside our borders. Wherever they come
339 from, wherever they were born, I don't care. All Americans living here and following our
340 laws not other laws will be protected.
341 (APPLAUSE)
342 Thank you. Thank you. We're going to be tough and we're going to be smart and we're
343 going to do it right. America will be a tolerant and open society. America will also be a
344 safe society. We will protect our borders at home. We will defeat ISIS overseas. We have
345 no choice. We will ensure every parent can raise their children in peace and safety. We

346   will make America rich again. We will make America safe again. We will make America
347   great again. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.
348   (APPLAUSE)
349   Thank you. Thank you very much, everybody. Appreciate it. Thank you.

Clinton: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Your eminence, your excellencies, members of the clergy, Donald and Melania, and all the distinguished guests. Earlier tonight, Al reminded me that when he first ran for president, he chose the progressive senator from Arkansas, Joseph G. Robinson, who is one of my husband's political heroes.

This work that you do through the dinner, Al — you have done it now for 30 years — is such a labor of love. You have been a hero for both the children of the archdiocese and for the city of New York, and I think we all owe Al Smith a great round of applause.

This is such a special event that I took a break from my rigorous nap schedule to be here. And as you have already heard, it is a treat for all of you, too, because usually I charge a lot for speeches like this. But for me, it was kind of ironic thinking about a fiery populist, Al Smith.

If he were here today and saw how much money we had raised, he would be very proud. And if he saw this magnificent room full of plutocrats celebrating his legacy, he would be very confused.

It is a special honor to be here with your eminence. I know you were criticized for inviting both Donald and me here tonight. You responded by saying, "If I only sat down with those who are saints, I would be taking all my meals alone." Now, just to be clear, I think the cardinal is saying I'm not eligible for sainthood. But getting through these three debates with Donald has to count as a miracle.

So I guess I am up against the highest, hardest stained glass ceiling. But, your eminence, you do deserve great credit for bringing together two people who have been at each other's throats, mortal enemies, bitter foes. I've got to ask, how did you get the governor and mayor here together tonight?

I've got to say, there are a lot of friendly faces in this room, people I have been privileged to know and work with. I just want to put you all in a basket of adorables. And you look so good in your tuxes, or as I refer to them, formal pantsuits.

And because this dinner is for such a great cause, Donald, if at any time you don't like what I'm saying, feel free to stand up and shout "Wrong" while I'm talking. Come to think of it, it's amazing I am appearing after Donald. I did not think he would be okay with a peaceful transition of power. And, Donald, after listening to your speech, I will also enjoy listening to Mike Pence deny that you ever gave it.

I have had the privilege of being at the Al Smith dinners in years past, and I always enjoy it. But remember, if you are not happy with the way it comes out, it must be rigged. And it's always a special treat for me to be back in New York, a city which I love and I think truly embodies the best of America. Don't you think?

People look at the Statue of Liberty and see a proud symbol of our history as a nation of immigrants, a beacon of hope for people around the world. Donald looks at the Statue of Liberty and sees a 4.

[Groans]

Maybe a 5 if she loses the torch and tablet and changes her hair. Come to think of it, you know what would be a good number for a woman? 45.

But I digress. I will try my best tonight, but I understand I am not known for my sense of humor. That's why it did take a village to write these jokes. People say, and I hear them, they say I'm boring compared to Donald, but I'm not boring at all. In fact, I am the life of every party I attended — and I have been to three.

And when the parties get out of hand, as occasionally they do, it is important to have a responsible chaperone who can get everyone home safely — and that is why I picked Tim Kaine to be my vice president.

50 You notice there is no teleprompter here tonight, which is probably smart, because
51 maybe you saw Donald dismantle his own. Maybe it is harder when you are translating
52 from the original Russian.
53 [Laughter]
54 [Boos]
55 But every year, this dinner brings together a collection of sensible, committed,
56 mainstream Republicans, or as we now like to call them, Hillary supporters.
57 Now, some of my critics — and I hear that, too, they think I only say what people want to
58 hear. Tonight, that is true. And here's exactly what you want to hear. This election will
59 be over very, very soon. And look at this dais. We've got Charlie Rose and Chris
60 Matthews and Gayle King and Katie Couric. This counts as a press conference, right?
61 It is great also to see Mayor Bloomberg here. It is a shame he is not speaking tonight. I
62 am curious to hear what a billionaire has to say. And look at the dais. We got the
63 honorable Chuck Schumer, the honorable Andrew Cuomo, the honorable Bill de Blasio,
64 the honorable Dave Dickens, and so many other wonderful officials.
65 And we have Rudy Giuliani. Many don't know this, but Rudy actually got his start as a
66 prosecutor going after wealthy New Yorkers who avoided paying taxes. But as the
67 saying goes, if you can't beat them, go on Fox News and call him a genius.
68 So as I said, we have now had our third and thankfully final debate. Sharing the stage
69 with Donald Trump is like, well, nothing really comes to mind. There is nothing like
70 sharing a stage with Donald Trump.
71 Donald wanted me drug-tested before last night's debate. And look, I've got to tell you, I
72 am so flattered that Donald thinks I used some sort of performance enhancer. Now,
73 actually, I did. It's called preparation.
74 Looking back, I had to listen to Donald for three full debates, and he says I don't have
75 any stamina — he says I don't have any stamina. That is four and a half hours. I have
76 now stood next to Donald Trump longer than any of his campaign managers.
77 Look, I have deep respect for people like Kellyanne Conway. She is working day and
78 night for Donald, and because she is a contractor, he is probably not even going to pay
79 her.
80 [Laughter]
81 [Boos]
82 But I think the good news is that the debates finally allowed Republicans to unite around
83 a candidate. The bad news is it is Mike Pence. And it has been a long, long campaign.
84 That should be one of our highest priorities, shortening the campaign.
85 And whoever wins this election, the outcome will be historic. We will either have the
86 first female president or the first president to have started a Twitter war with Cher. And
87 if Donald does win, it will be awkward at the annual Presidents Day photo when all the
88 former presidents gather at the White House, and not just with Bill. How is Barack going
89 to get past the Muslim ban?
90 [Laughter]
91 [Groans]
92 Republicans in particular seemed frustrated with their nominee. Paul Ryan told the
93 members of the House, "You don't have to support the top of the ticket; just do what's in
94 your best interest." So I guess Donald really has unified his party around his core
95 philosophy.
96 I don't understand their unhappiness. They say Donald does not have any policies. I
97 keep hearing that. I would like to defend him on this. Donald has issues, serious issues.
98 Really, really serious issues. And I worry about Donald's going-alone attitude. For

99 example, at his convention when he said, "I alone can fix it." In the 1990s, I said the same
100 about America's health care system, and it did not work out so well for me either.
101 Speaking of health, Donald has been very concerned about mine. He actually sent me a
102 car to bring me here tonight. Actually, it was a hearse.
103 But I kind of just want to put the information out there so everybody can draw their own
104 conclusions and you can judge our relative health. We have each really star medical
105 records. My blood pressure is 100/70. His is unbelievably great.
106 My cholesterol is 189. His is "presidential." My heart rate is 72 beats per minute. His is
107 "the most beats ever or the least beats ever, whichever sounds best." But Donald really
108 is as healthy as a horse, you know, the one that Vladimir Putin rides around on.
109 [Laughter]
110 [Boos]
111 But I can say without fear of contradiction that I will be the healthiest and youngest
112 woman ever to serve as president.
113 But this has been a really strange campaign. You saw it last night and tonight. Donald
114 has attacked me for life in public service. I did not get that at first. I kind of get it now. As
115 he told Howard Stern, he does not like it when women have been around for more than
116 35 years. But Donald, we have so much more in common than you may realize. For
117 example, I have tried to inspire young people by showing them that with resilience and
118 hard work, anything is possible, and you are doing the same. A third-grade teacher told
119 me that one of her students refused to turn in his homework because it was "under
120 audit." And here's another similarity. The Republican National Committee is not
121 spending a dime to help either one of us.
122 So tonight, let's embrace the spirit of the evening. Let's come together, remember what
123 unites us, and just rip on Ted Cruz.
124 I hope you enjoyed my remarks tonight. I said no to some jokes that I thought were over
125 the line, but I suppose you can judge for yourself on WikiLeaks in the next few days.
126 Donald will tell us after the benediction whether he accepts this dinner is over. He has to
127 wait and see. But there is nothing funny about the stakes in this election. In the end,
128 what makes this dinner important are not the jokes we tell, but the legacy we carry
129 forward. It is often easy to forget how far this country has come. And there are a lot of
130 people in this room tonight who themselves, or their parents or grandparents, came
131 here as immigrants, made a life for yourselves, took advantage of the American dream
132 and the greatest system that has ever been created in the history of the world, to
133 unleash the individual talent, energy, and ambition of everyone willing to work hard.
134 When I think about what Al Smith went through, it is important to just reflect how
135 groundbreaking it was for him, a Catholic, to be my party's nominee for president.
136 Don't forget, school boards sent home letters with children saying that if Al Smith is
137 elected president, you will not be allowed to have or read a Bible. Voters were told that
138 he would annul Protestant marriages. I saw recently that he would connect a secret
139 tunnel between Holland and America for the pope to rule our country.
140 Those fears of division can cause us to treat each other as the other. Rhetoric like that
141 makes it harder for us to see each other and listen to each other, and certainly a lot
142 harder to love our neighbor as ourselves. I believe the way we treat others is the highest
143 expression of faith and of service. I am not Catholic, I'm a Methodist, but one of the
144 things we share is a belief that in order to achieve salvation, we need both faith and good
145 works.
146 You certainly don't need to be Catholic to be inspired by the humility and hearts of the
147 holy father Pope Francis, or to embrace his message. His message about rejecting a
148 mindset of hostility. His call to reduce inequality. His warning about climate change. His

149   appeal that we build bridges, not walls. As you know, my running mate, Tim, is Catholic,
150   and he went to Jesuit schools, and one of the ideas that I have talked about is the more,
151   the better.
152   We need to get better at finding ways to disagree on matters of policy while agreeing on
153   questions of decency and civility. How we talk to each other, treat each other, respect
154   each other.
155   So I have taken this concept to heart in this campaign, the daily heat and back and forth
156   of a presidential campaign, to ask how we can do more for each other and better for
157   each other. Because I think for each of us, our greatest monument on this Earth won't be
158   what we build, but the lives we touch. And that is ultimately what this dinner is all about.
159   And it is why it has been such a great honor to join you all again. Thank you.

Trump: Thank you, Al. Wow, that was good. I want to thank your eminence. We love it, Gov. Cuomo, great senators. Hi, Chuck.

He used to love me when I was a Democrat, you know.

Mayor de Blasio, wherever you are. Where is Mayor de Blasio? In the old days, I would have known him very well, but I have not been doing so much of the real estate anymore. I want to thank Al Smith. Just a fantastic job you do at the dinner, and congratulations on a record.

And a special hello to all of you in this room who have known and loved me for many, many years. The politicians. They have had me to their homes. They have introduced me to their children. I have become their best friends in many instances. They have asked for my endorsements, and they always wanted my money. They even called me really a dear, dear friend. But suddenly, when I ran for president as a Republican, they decided I have always been a no-good, rotten, disgusting scoundrel, and they totally forgot about me. But that's okay.

You know, they say when you do this kind of event; you always start out with a self-deprecating joke. Some people think this would be tough for me, but the truth is I am actually a modest person, very modest. It is true. In fact, many people tell me that modesty is perhaps my best quality — even better than my temperament.

You know, Cardinal Dolan and I have some things in common. For instance, we both run impressive properties on Fifth Avenue. Of course, his is much more impressive than mine. That's because I built mine with my own beautifully formed hands, while his was built with the hands of God, and nobody can compete with God, is that correct? Nobody, right?

That's right. It's great to be here with a thousand wonderful people, or as I call it, a small, intimate dinner with some friends. Or as Hillary calls it, her largest crowd of the season. This is corny stuff.

I do recognize that I come into this event with a little bit of an advantage. I know that so many of you in the archdiocese already have a place in your heart for a guy who started out as a carpenter working for his father. I was a carpenter working for my father.

It's true. Not for a long period of time, but about three weeks. What's great about the Al Smith dinner is that even in the rough-and-tumble world of a really hard-fought campaign — in fact, I don't know if you know, Hillary, but last night they said that was the most vicious debate in the history of politics, presidential debate — the most vicious. Are we supposed to be proud of that? But we did say it, and I am trying to think back to Lincoln. I don't know if they can really speak to that, but the candidates have some light-hearted moments together, which is true. I have no doubt that Hillary is going to laugh quite a bit tonight. Sometimes even at an appropriate moment.

And even tonight, with all of the heated back and forth between my opponent and me at the debate last night, we have proven that we can actually be civil to each other. In fact, just before taking the dais, Hillary accidentally bumped into me, and she very civilly said, "Pardon me."

And I very politely replied, "Let me talk to you about that after I get into office."

Just kidding, just kidding.

And Hillary was very gracious. She said that somehow if she gets elected, she wants me to be, without question, either ambassador to Iraq or to Afghanistan. It's my choice.

But one of the things I noticed tonight, and I've known Hillary for a long time, is this is the first time ever that Hillary Clinton is sitting down and speaking to major corporate leaders and not getting paid for it.

50 It's true. You know, last night, I called Hillary a nasty woman. But this stuff is all relative.
51 After listening to Hillary rattle on and on and on, I don't think so badly of Rosie
52 O'Donnell anymore. In fact, I am actually starting to like Rosie a lot.
53 These events gave not only the candidates a chance to be with each other in a very social
54 setting; it also allows the candidates the opportunity to meet the other candidate's team.
55 I know Hillary met my campaign manager, and I got a chance to meet the people who are
56 working so hard to get her elected. There they are, the heads of NBC, CNN, CBS, ABC.
57 There is the New York Times right over there, and the Washington Post. They are
58 working overtime.
59 This one is going to get me in trouble. Not with Hillary. You know, the president told me
60 to stop whining, but I really have to say, the media is even more biased this year than
61 ever before. You want the proof? Michelle Obama gives a speech, and everyone loves it.
62 It's fantastic. They think she is absolutely great. My wife, Melania, gives the exact same
63 speech and people get on her case. And I don't get — and I don't get it. I don't know why.
64 And it was not her fault. Stand up, Melania. She took a lot of abuse.
65 Oh, I'm in trouble when I go home tonight. She did not know about that one. Am I okay?
66 Is that okay? Cardinal, please speak to her.
67 I'd like to address an important religious matter: the issue of going to confession. Or, as
68 Hillary calls it, the Fourth of July weekend with FBI Director Comey.
69 I am told Hillary went to confession before tonight's event, but the priest was having a
70 hard time and he asked her about her sins and she said she could not remember 39
71 times. Hillary is so corrupt, she got kicked off the Watergate commission.
72 [Boos]
73 How corrupt do you have to be to get kicked off the Watergate commission? Pretty
74 corrupt. Hillary is and has been in politics since the 1970s. What is her pitch? The
75 economy is busted, the government is corrupt, Washington is failing. Vote for me. I have
76 been working on these problems for 30 years. I can fix it, she says.
77 I was not really sure if Hillary was going to be here tonight, because, I guess, you did not
78 send her an invitation by email, or maybe you did and she just found out about it
79 through the wonder of WikiLeaks. We have learned so much from WikiLeaks. For
80 example, Hillary Clinton believes it is vital to deceive the people by having one public
81 policy—
82 [Boos]
83 And it a different policy in private. That's okay. I don't know who they are angry at. Here
84 she is tonight in public, pretending not to hate Catholics.
85 [Boos]
86 Now, if some of you have not noticed, Hillary is not laughing as much as the rest of us.
87 That's because she knows the jokes. All of the jokes were given to her in advance of the
88 dinner by Donna Brazile—
89 [Boos]
90 Everyone knows, of course, Hillary has believed that it takes a village, which only makes
91 sense, after all, in places like Haiti, where she has taken a number of them.
92 [Boos]
93 Thank you. I won't go this evening without saying something nice about my opponent.
94 Hillary has been in Washington a long time. She knows a lot about how government
95 works. And according to her sworn testimony, Hillary has forgotten more things than
96 most of us will ever, ever know, that I can tell you.
97 [Boos]
98 We are having some fun here tonight, and that's good. On a personal note, what an
99 amazing honor it is to be with all of you. I want to congratulate Hillary on getting the

100	nomination, and over the next 19 days, someone will be chosen. We will see what
101	happens. But I have great memories of coming to this dinner with my father over the
102	years when I was a young man. Great experience for me. This was always a special
103	experience for him and me to be together. One thing we can all agree on is the need to
104	support the great work that comes out of the dinner. Millions of dollars have been raised
105	to support disadvantaged children. And I applaud the many people who have worked to
106	make this wonderful event a critical lifeline for children in need.
107	And that we together broke the all-time record tonight is really something special. More
108	than $6 million. We can also agree on the need to stand up to anti-Catholic bias, to
109	defend religious liberty, and to create a culture that celebrates life. America is in many
110	ways divided.
111	Thank you. America is in many ways divided like it has never been before. And the great
112	religious leaders here tonight give us all an example that we can follow. We are living in
113	a time and age that we never thought possible before. The vicious barbarism we read
114	about in history books but never thought we would see it in our so-called modern-day
115	world. Who would have thought we would be witnessing what we are witnessing today?
116	We have got to be very strong, very, very smart, and we've got to come together not only
117	as a nation, but as a world community. Thank you very much. God bless you, and God
118	bless America. Thank you.

9.2. Rhetorical figures in Clinton and Trump's speeches

9.2.1. Three-part list

9.2.1.1. Three-part list in C1

- You do it **step-by-step, year-by-year**… sometimes even **door-by-door.**
- A bold agenda to improve the lives of people across our country - **to keep** you safe, **to get** you good jobs, **to give** your kids the opportunities they deserve. The choice is clear, my friends.
- Every generation of Americans has come together to make our country **freer, fairer, and stronger.**
- And we will defend, we will defend all our rights – **civil rights, human rights and voting rights**…
- If you believe that **every man, woman, and child** in America has the right to affordable health care, join us.
- Well I will be a President for **Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.** For the struggling, the striving the successful.
- And so it is with **humility, determination**, and boundless **confidence** in America's promise that I accept your nomination for President of the United States!
- Our country needs your **ideas, energy, and passion.**

9.2.1.2. Three-part list in T1

- **Friends, delegates and fellow Americans:** I humbly and gratefully accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States.
- Together, we will lead our party back to the White House, and we will lead our country back to **safety, prosperity, and peace.**
- This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: **death, destruction and weakness.**
- Every day I wake up determined to deliver for the people I have met all across this nation that have been **neglected, ignored, and abandoned.**
- It is time to show the whole world that America Is Back – **bigger, and better and stronger** than ever before.
- She was **strong,** but also **warm** and **fair-minded.**
- America is a nation of **believers, dreamers, and strivers** that is being led by a group of **censors, critics, and cynics.**

133

- It's waiting to see if we will rise to the occasion, and if we will show the whole world that America is still **free and independent and strong.**

9.2.1.3. Three-part list in C2

- They are murdering Americans and Europeans, **enslaving, torturing and raping** women and girls.
- In speeches like this one, after **Paris, Brussels and San Bernardino**, I have laid out a plan to defeat ISIS and the other radical jihadist groups in the region and beyond.
- It has often been said that **our law enforcement, our intelligence agencies, our first responders** have to be right 100 percent of the time, but terrorists only have to be right once.
- And they deserve the right **tools, and resources and training.**
- Ever since 13 squabbling colonies put aside their disagreements and united because they realized they were going to rise together or fall separately, generation after generation has **fought and marched and organized** to widen the circle of dignity and opportunity.
- There was a **Republican president, a Republican governor, and a Republican mayor.**

9.2.1.4. Three-part list in T2

- We express our deepest sympathies to **the victims, the wounded, and their families.**
- We need to respond to this attack on America as one united people, with **force, purpose, and determination.** But the current politically correct response cripples our ability **to talk and to think and act** clearly. We're not acting clearly, we're not talking clearly, we've got problems.
- If we don't get **tough**, and if we don't get **smart, and fast**, we're not going to have our country anymore.
- **After a full and partial and long** -- really long overdue security assessment we will develop a responsible immigration policy that serves the interests and values of America.
- That includes better cooperation between **state, local and federal officials,** and with our allies, very importantly.

- This could be a **better, bigger, more horrible** version than the legendary Trojan Horse ever was.
- We've got to get **smart and tough and vigilant** and we've got to do it now because later is too late -- going to be too late for our country.
- We're going to be **tough a**nd we're going to be **smart** and we're **going to do it right.** America will be a **tolerant** and **open society**. America will also be a **safe** society.

9.2.1.5. Three-part list in C3

- But every year, this dinner brings together a collection of **sensible, committed, mainstream** Republicans, or as we now like to call them, Hillary supporters.
- Let's **come together, remember** what unites us, and just **rip on** Ted Cruz.

9.2.1.6. Three-part list in T3

- But suddenly, when I ran for president as a Republican, they decided I have always been a **no-good, rotten, disgusting** scoundrel, and they totally forgot about me.

9.2.2. Contrastive pair/antithesis

9.2.2.1. Contrastive pair/antithesis in C1

- You know that conversation has lasted through **good times** that filled us with joy, and **hard times** that tested us.
- He's taken the Republican Party a long way from "**Morning in America**" to "**Midnight in America.**"
- But my job titles **only tell** you what I've done. They **don't tell you** why.
- For all **those who vote for me** and **for those who don't.**
- **Many** of them **are.** But **too many aren't.**
- No wonder **he doesn't like talking about his plans.** You might have noticed, **I love talking about mine.**
- Don't **boo, vote.**
- But think of this. People who did the work and needed the money, not because he **couldn't pay them**, but because he **wouldn't pay them.**

- I know that at a time when so much seems to be **pulling us apart**, it can be hard to imagine how we'll ever **pull together.**

- He's forgetting every last one of us. Americans don't say: "**I alone can fix it**."We say: "**We'll fix it together**."

9.2.2.2. Contrastive pair/antithesis in T1

- **Americanism**, not **globalism**, will be our credo.

- While Hillary Clinton plans **a massive tax increase**, I have proposed the **largest tax reduction** of any candidate who has declared for the presidential race this year – Democrat or Republican.

9.2.2.3. Contrastive pair/antithesis in C2

- The Orlando **terrorist may be dead**, but the **virus that poisoned his mind remains very much alive.**

9.2.2.4. Contrastive pair/antithesis in T2

- With 50 people dead and perhaps more ultimately and dozens more wounded, we **cannot afford to talk around issues anymore**. We **have to address these issues head-on.**

- This is not just a **national security issue**. It's a **quality of life** issue.

- Under his leadership this situation **will not get any better,** it **will only get worse.**

- The media talks about home grown terrorism but Islamic radicalism and that's a very, very important term -- a term that the president refuses to use and the networks that nurture it are imports from overseas **whether you like it** or **whether you don't like it.**

9.2.2.5. Contrastive pair/antithesis in C3

- We will either **have** the **first female president** or **the first president to have** started a Twitter war with Cher.

- My blood pressure is **100/70**. His is **unbelievably great.** My cholesterol is **189**. His is "**presidential**." My heart rate is **72 beats per minute.** His is "**the most beats ever or the least beats ever, whichever sounds best.**

- In the end, what makes this dinner important are **not the jokes we tell**, but **the legacy we carry forward.**

- Because I think for each of us, our greatest monument on this Earth won't be **what we build**, but **the lives we touch.**

9.2.2.5. Contrastive pair/antithesis in C3

9.2.3. Simile

9.2.3.1. Simile in C1

- For the past year, many people made the mistake of laughing off Donald Trump's comments – excusing him **as an entertainer** just putting on a show.

- And by the time they left Philadelphia, they had begun to see themselves **as one nation.**

9.2.3.2. Simile in T1

9.2.3.3. Simile in C2

9.2.3.4. Simile in T2

9.2.3.5. Simile in C3

- But Donald really is as healthy **as a horse**, you know, the one that Vladimir Putin rides around on.

9.2.3.6. Simile in T3

9.2.4. Hyperbole

9.2.4.1. Hyperbole in C1

- Now, I don't think President Obama and Vice President Biden get the credit they deserve for saving us from **the worst economic crisis of our lifetimes.**

- Now that's real progress but **none of us can be satisfied** with the status quo. Not by a long shot.

- It's wrong to take tax breaks with one hand and **give out pink slips** with the other.

9.2.4.2. Hyperbole in T1

- Our **roads and bridges are falling apart,** our **airports are in Third World condition**, and forty-three million Americans are on food stamps.

- Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent because they know she will keep our rigged system in place. **They are throwing money at her** because they have total control over everything she does.

- **Nobody knows the system better than me,** which is why **I alone can fix it.**

- This Administration has failed America's inner cities. It's failed them on education. It's failed them on jobs. It's failed them on crime. **It's failed them at every level.**

- Yet **Hillary Clinton is proposing mass amnesty, mass immigration, and mass lawlessness.** Her plan will overwhelm your schools and hospitals, further reduce your jobs and wages, and make it harder for recent immigrants to escape from poverty.

- My **opponent**, on the other hand, has **supported virtually every trade agreement that has been destroying our middle class.** She supported NAFTA, and she supported China's entrance into the World Trade Organization – another one of her husband's colossal mistakes.

9.2.4.3. Hyperbole in C2

9.2.4.4. Hyperbole in T2

- Our nation stands together in solidarity with the members of Orlando's LGBT community. They have been through something **that nobody could ever experience.**

- Her plan is to disarm law abiding Americans, abolishing the Second Amendment, and **leaving only the bad guys and terrorists with guns.**

- In fact, Hillary Clinton's catastrophic immigration plan will bring vastly more radical Islamic immigration into this country, **threatening** not only our society but **our entire way of life.**

9.2.4.5. Hyperbole in C3

- But, your eminence, you do deserve great credit for bringing together two people **who have been at each other's throats,** mortal enemies, bitter foes.

- We have **each really star medical records.** My blood pressure is 100/70. His is unbelievably great. My cholesterol is 189. His is "presidential." My heart rate is

72 beats per minute. His is "the most beats ever or the least beats ever, whichever sounds best."

9.2.4.6. Hyperbole in T3

- But suddenly, when I ran for president as a Republican, they decided I have always been a **no-good, rotten, disgusting scoundrel**, and they totally forgot about me.
- And according to her sworn testimony, Hillary **has forgotten more things than most of us will ever, ever know**, that I can tell you.

9.2.5. Repetition

9.2.5.1. Anaphora

9.2.5.1.1. Anaphora in C1

- **For all** those who vote for me and for those who don't. **For all** Americans together!
- There's **too** much inequality. **Too** little social mobility. **Too** much paralysis in Washington. **Too** many threats at home and abroad.
- **We have** the most dynamic and diverse people in the world. **We have** the most tolerant and generous young people we've ever had. **We have** the most powerful military. **The most** innovative entrepreneurs. **The most** enduring values — freedom and equality, justice and opportunity.
- **So don't let anyone tell you** that our country is weak. We're not. **Don't let anyone tell you** we don't have what it takes. We do.
- **That's the** country we're fighting for. **That's the** future we're working toward.
- And here's what I believe. **I believe** America thrives when the middle class thrives. **And I believe** Wall Street can never, ever be allowed to wreck Main Street again. **I believe** that when we have millions of hardworking immigrants contributing to our economy, it would be self-defeating and inhumane to try to kick them out. **If you believe** that companies should share profits, not pad executive bonuses, join us. **If you believe** the minimum wage should be a living wage…and no one working full time should have to raise their children in poverty, join us. **If you believe** that every man, woman, and child in America has the right to affordable health care, join us. **If you believe** that we should say "no"

to unfair trade deals, that we should stand up to China, that we should support our steelworkers and autoworkers and homegrown manufacturers then join us. **If you believe** we should expand Social Security and protect a woman's right to make her own health care decisions, then join us. And yes, **if you believe** that your working mother, wife, sister, or daughter deserves equal pay, join us.

- **We will** help more people learn a skill or practice a trade and make a good living doing it. **We will** give small businesses, like my dad's, a boost, make it easier to get credit.

- **Now, now**, here's the other thing. **Now** we're not only, we're not only going to make all these investments, we're going to pay for every single one of them.

- **I'm not here to** repeal the 2nd Amendment. **I'm not here to** take away your guns.

- **I know. I know** because I've seen it in the lives of people across America who get knocked down and get right back up. **And I know** it from my own life.

9.2.5.1.2. Anaphora in T1

- **We will be a country of** generosity and warmth. But **we will also be a country of** law and order.

- This Administration has failed America's inner cities. **It's failed them** on education. **It's failed them** on jobs. It's failed them on crime. **It's failed them** at every level.

- **She supported** the job killing trade deal with South Korea. **She has supported** the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

- We will repeal and replace disastrous Obamacare. You will be able to choose your own doctor again. And **we will** fix TSA at the airports! **We will** completely rebuild our depleted military, and the countries that we protect, at a massive loss, will be asked to pay their fair share. **We will** take care of our great Veterans like they have never been taken care of before. My opponent dismissed the VA scandal as being not widespread – one more sign of how out of touch she really is. **We are going to** ask every Department Head in government to provide a list of wasteful spending projects that we can eliminate in my first 100 days. The politicians have talked about it, I'm going to do it. **We are also going to** appoint justices to the United States Supreme Court who will uphold our laws and our Constitution.

- **She was** strong, but also warm and fair-minded. **She was** a truly great mother. **She was** also one of the most honest and charitable people I have ever known, and a great judge of character.
- **We Will Make America** Strong Again. **We Will Make America** Proud Again.**We Will Make America** Safe Again. **And We Will Make America** Great Again.

9.2.5.1.3. Anaphora in C2

- **We saw** the faces of some of those first responders who rushed into danger and tried to save as many people as they could. **We saw** survivors like Chris Hansen who risked their lives to help others.
- **We need to** change that. **We also need to** work... (applause) **We also need to** work with local law enforcement and business owners on ways to protect vulnerable, so-called soft targets, like nightclubs and shopping malls and hotels and movie theaters and schools and houses of worship.
- **And we are stronger when** more people can participate in our democracy. (APPLAUSE) **And we are stronger when** everyone can share in the rewards of our economy and contribute to our communities, when we bridge our divides and lift each other up instead of tearing each other down.
- **We** did not attack each other. **We** worked with each other to protect our country and to rebuild our city (ph).
- **We saw this in** Paris. **And we saw it in** Brussels.
- **I will** put a team together from across our government, the entire government, as well as the private sector and communities to get on top of this urgent challenge. **And I will** make sure our law enforcement and intelligence professionals have all the resources they need to get the job done.

9.2.5.1.4. Anaphora in T2

- **We** express our deepest sympathies to the victims, the wounded, and their families. **We** mourn as one people for our nation's loss, and pledge our support to any and all who need it.
- **We admit many more,** and that's just the way it is. **We admit many more** from other countries in the region.
- **She** has no clue, in my opinion, what radical Islam is and she won't speak honestly about it if she does, in fact, know. **She**'s in total denial, and her

continuing reluctance to ever name the enemy broadcasts weakness across the entire world -- true weakness.

- No good. **Not going to happen**, folks. **Not going to happen. Not going to happen.** (APPLAUSE)

- **Let them come into** the country, we don't have guns. **Let them come in**, let **them** have all the fun they want.

- **We don't have the support**. **We don't have the support** of the law enforcement system because Obama is not letting them do their job.

- **We need a new leader. We need a new leader** fast.

- **I want to** do the right thing. **I want to** straighten things out and I want to make America great again.

- **We have to** screen applicants to know whether they are affiliated with or supporting radical groups and beliefs, very simple. **We have to** control the amount of future immigration into this country and we have to prevent large pockets of radicalization from forming inside America.

- **She can't** have it both ways. **She can't** claim to be supportive of these communities while trying to increase the number of people coming in who want to oppress these same communities.

- **How does this kind of immigration make our** lives better? **How does this kind of immigration make our** country better? **Why** does Hillary Clinton want to bring people in in vast numbers who reject our values? **Why?**

- **Take a look at** that. **Take a look at** your security, take a look at the wages.

- **I want to fix our** schools. **I want to fix our** bridges.

- But the Muslims have to work with us. **They** have to work with us. **They** know what's going on. **They** know that he was bad. **They** knew the people in San Bernardino were bad.

- **We will** protect our borders at home**. We will** defeat ISIS overseas. We have no choice. **We will** ensure every parent can raise their children in peace and safety. **We will** make America rich again. **We will** make America safe again. **We will** make America great again. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

- **We need to know** if he traveled anywhere and who he traveled with. **We need to know,** and we need to make sure, every single last person involved in this

142

plan, including anyone who knew something but didn't tell us, is brought to justice, so when people know what's going on and they don't tell us, and we have an attack, and people die, these people have to have consequences.

9.2.5.1.5. Anaphora in C3

- **If he** were here today and saw how much money we had raised, he would be very proud. **And if he** saw this magnificent room full of plutocrats celebrating his legacy, he would be very confused.
- **I've got to** ask, how did you get the governor and mayor here together tonight? **I've got to** say, there are a lot of friendly faces in this room, people I have been privileged to know and work with.
- **And** you look so good in your tuxes, or as I refer to them, formal pantsuits. **And** because this dinner is for such a great cause, Donald, if at any time you don't like what I'm saying, feel free to stand up and shout "Wrong" while I'm talking.
- **It is** great also to see Mayor Bloomberg here. **It is** a shame he is not speaking tonight.
- **My** cholesterol is 189. His is "presidential." **My** heart rate is 72 beats per minute. His is "the most beats ever or the least beats ever, whichever sounds best."
- **But** I can say without fear of contradiction that I will be the healthiest and youngest woman ever to serve as president. **But** this has been a really strange campaign.
- **I** did not get that at first. **I** kind of get it new.
- **His** message about rejecting a mindset of hostility. **His** call to reduce inequality. **His** warning about climate change. **His** appeal that we build bridges, not walls.
- **And** that is ultimately what this dinner is all about. **And** it is why it has been such a great honor to join you all again.

9.2.5.1.6. Anaphora in T3

- **They** have had me to their homes. **They** have introduced me to their children. I have become their best friends in many instances. **They** have asked for my endorsements, and they always wanted my money. **They** even called me really a dear, dear friend. **But** suddenly, when I ran for president as a Republican, they decided I have always been a no-good, rotten, disgusting scoundrel, and they totally forgot about me. **But** that's okay.

- **I** do recognize that I come into this event with a little bit of an advantage. **I** know that so many of you in the archdiocese already have a place in your heart for a guy who started out as a carpenter working for his father. **I** was a carpenter working for my father.
- **I** don't know if they can really speak to that, but the candidates have some lighthearted moments together, which is true. **I** have no doubt that Hillary is going to laugh quite a bit tonight.
- **And I don't get — and I don't get it. I don't** know why.
- **I** have been working on these problems for 30 years. **I** can fix it, she says. **I** was not really sure if Hillary was going to be here tonight, because, I guess, you did not send her an invitation by email, or maybe you did and she just found out about it through the wonder of WikiLeaks.
- **And** I applaud the many people who have worked to make this wonderful event a critical lifeline for children in need. **And** that we together broke the all-time record tonight is really something special.

9.2.5.2. Alliteration

9.2.5.2.1. Alliteration in C1

- For **the struggling, the striving the successful.**
- The family I'm from, well, no one had their name on **big buildings**
- We have the most **dynamic and diverse** people in the world.
- And Bill, that conversation we started in the law library 45 years ago, it is **still going strong.**
- You know that conversation has lasted through good times that filled us with joy, and hard **times that tested** us.
- I'm also grateful to the rest of my **family and the friends** of a lifetime.
- That is the only way we can turn our **progressive platform** into real change for America.
- He wants us to fear the **future and fear** each other.
- He's taken the Republican Party a long way from **"Morning in America" to "Midnight in America."**
- Then I represented all of you as **Secretary of State**.

- The truth is, through all these years of public service, the "service" part has always come easier to me than the "**public" part.**

- I remember watching him stand for hours over **silk screens.**

- He was wearing a full body brace that must have weighed 40 pounds because I **leaned over to lif**t him up.

- Some of you are **frustrated – even furious.**

- Americans are **willing to work** and work hard

- If you believe that companies **should share** profits, not pad executive bonuses, join us.

- Bernie Sanders and I **will work** together to make college tuition-free for the middle class and debt-free for all!

- Way too many **dreams die** in the parking lots of banks.

- That's the **same sales** pitch he made to all those small businesses.

- We will **strike their sanctuaries** from the air, and support local forces **taking them out on** the ground.

- We will disrupt their efforts online **to reach and radicalize** young people in our country.

- So enough with the **bigotry and the bombast.**

- Every generation of Americans has come together to make our country **freer, fairer, and stronger**.

- You do it **step-by-step, year-by-year**… sometimes even **door-by-door.**

9.2.5.2.2. Alliteration in T1

- So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the **carefully-crafted** lies, and the media myths the Democrats are holding their convention next week.

- The number of new **illegal immigrant** families who have crossed the border so far this year already exceeds the entire total from 2015.

- Not only have our citizens endured **domestic disaster**, but they have lived through one international humiliation after another.

- The **damage and devastation** that can be inflicted by Islamic radicals has been over and over – at the World Trade Center, at an office party in San Bernardino, at the Boston Marathon, and a military recruiting center in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

- We will **repeal and replace** disastrous Obamacare.

- But to do that, we must break free from the **petty politics** of the past.

- Together, we will lead our party back to the White House, and we will lead our country back to safety, **prosperity, and peace**.

- American youth are not employed. 2 million more Latinos are in poverty today than when the President took his **oath of office** less than eight years ago.

- The **budget is no better.**

- President Obama has **doubled our national debt** to more than $19 trillion, and growing.

- This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: **death, destruction** and weakness.

- **Big business**, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent because they know she will keep our rigged system in place.

- Every day I wake up **determined to deliver** for the people I have met all across this nation that have been neglected, ignored, and abandoned.

- When I am President, I **will work** to ensure that all of our kids are treated equally, and protected equally.

- On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by **illegal immigrants** Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and Jamiel Shaw.

- We are going to build a great border wall to stop **illegal immigration**, to stop the gangs and the violence, and to stop the drugs from pouring into our communities.

- We are going to be **considerate and compassionate** to everyone.

- It's been a signature message of my campaign from day one, and it will be a signature feature of my presidency from the moment I take the **oath of office.**

- We are going to enforce all trade violations, including through the use of **taxes and tariffs.**

- Again, I will tell you the plain facts that have been edited out of your **nightly news** and your morning newspaper: Nearly Four in 10 African-American children are living in poverty, while 58% of African American youth are not employed.

9.2.5.2.3. Alliteration in C2

- Who is both **indomitable and indefatigable.**

- A madman filled with hate, with guns in his hands, and just a horrible sense of **vengeance and vindictiveness** in his heart, apparently consumed by rage against LGBT Americans, and by extension, the openness and diversity that defines our American way of life.
- The murder of innocent people breaks our hearts, tears at our **sense of security** and makes us furious.
- The professionals who keep us safe would be the first to say we need better intelligence to **discover and disrupt** terrorist plots before they can be carried out.
- We face a twisted ideology and **poisoned psychology** that inspires the so-called lone wolves, radicalized individuals who may or may not have contact and direction from any formal organization.
- So does saying that we have to **start special surveillance** on our fellow Americans because of their religion.
- It makes us stronger and more **resistant to radicalization.**
- I also want to thank Dan Moore, the owner and founder of this company and Team Wendy for his belief in Cleveland, for his **commitment to create** jobs.

9.2.5.2.4. Alliteration in T2

- I will use this **power to protect** the American people.
- America will also be a **safe society.**
- They share these oppressive **views and values.**
- This was going to be a speech on Hillary Clinton and all of the bad things and we all know what's going on, and especially how poor she'd do as president in these very, very **troubled times** of radical Islamic terrorism.
- They have put political **correctness above common** sense, above your safety, and above all else.
- Yes, there are many radicalized people already inside our country as a result of poor **policies of the past.**
- Our communities from all backgrounds are **ready for some relief.**
- We had **death, and destruction.**

9.2.5.2.5. Alliteration in C3

- Your **eminence**, your **excellencies**, members of the clergy, Donald and Melania, and all the distinguished guests.
- This work that you do through the dinner, Al — you have done it now for 30 years — is such a **labor of love.**
- So I guess I am up against the **highest, hardest** stained-glass ceiling.
- I've got to say, there are a lot of **friendly faces** in this room, people I have been privileged to know and work with.
- And because this dinner is for such a great cause, Donald, if at any time you don't like what I'm saying, **feel free** to stand up and shout "Wrong" while I'm talking.
- Maybe a 5 if she loses the **torch and tablet** and changes her hair.
- "You don't have to support the **top of the ticket**; just do what's in your best interest."
- You certainly don't need to be Catholic to be inspired by the **humility and hearts** of the holy father Pope Francis, or to embrace his message.
- His appeal that we **build bridges**, not walls.

9.2.5.2.6. Alliteration in T3

- But one of the things I noticed tonight, and I've known Hillary for a long time, is this is the first time ever that Hillary Clinton is **sitting down and speaking** to major corporate leaders and not getting paid for it.
- These events gave not only the candidates a chance to be with each other in a very **social setting.**
- My wife, Melania, gives the exact **same speech** and people get on her case
- For example, Hillary Clinton believes it is vital to deceive the people by having one **public policy**—
- And it a different **policy in private.**
- I won't go this evening without **saying something** nice about my opponent.
- We can also agree on the need to stand up to anti-Catholic bias, to defend religious liberty, and to **create a culture** that celebrates life.

9.2.6. Metonymy

9.2.6.1. Metonymies in C1

Concept	Nr.	Examples
THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE)	13	Way too many dreams die in the **parking lots of banks**. I've worked **across the aisle** to pass laws and treaties and to launch new programs that help millions of people. He spoke from his **big heart** about our party's commitment to working people, as only he can do. Bernie, your campaign inspired millions of Americans, particularly the young people who threw **their hearts and souls** into our primary. I believe that with all **my heart.** Now, sometimes the people **at this podium** are new to the national stage. The family I'm from, well, no one had their **name on big buildings.** My **heart** just swelled when I saw Anastasia Somoza representing millions of young people on this stage – because we changed our law to make sure she got an education. And they should set off **alarm bells** for all of us. To drive real progress, you have to change both **hearts and laws.** Tonight, we've reached a **milestone** in our nation's march toward a more perfect union: the first time that a major party has nominated a woman for president.
PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT		
OBJECT USED FOR USER		
CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED		
INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE	3	So don't let anyone tell you that **our country** is weak. And you know how **the community** responded? "It Takes **a Village**."

THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION	7	Too much paralysis in **Washington.** And I believe **Wall Street** can never, ever be allowed to wreck **Main Street** again. And here's how: **Wall Street,** corporations, and the super-rich are going to start paying their fair share of taxes. How are you going to break through the gridlock in **Washington**? And so it is with humility, determination, and boundless confidence in **America**'s promise that I accept your nomination for President of the United States! We should be so proud that these words are associated with us. I have to tell you, as your Secretary of State, I went to 112 countries, and when people hear those words, they hear **America**.
THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT		
A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS BEARER	2	We heard the **man from Hope**, Bill Clinton. And the **man of hope**, Barack Obama.
Total number	25	

9.2.6.2. Metonymies in T1

Concept	Nr.	Examples
THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE)	3	Libya is in ruins, and our Ambassador and his staff were left helpless to die at the **hands** of savage killers. Our roads and bridges are falling apart, our airports are in Third World condition, and forty-three million Americans **a**re on **food stamps.** I AM YOUR **VOICE.**
PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT		
OBJECT USED FOR USER		
CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED		
INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE	2	When innocent people suffer, because our **political system** lacks the will, or the courage, or the basic decency to enforce our laws – or worse still, has sold out to some corporate lobbyist for

Concept	Nr.	Examples
		cash – I am not able to look the other way. **Communities** want relief.
THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION	8	**Iran** was being choked by sanctions. But Hillary Clinton's legacy does not have to be **America'**s legacy. **America** was shocked to its core when our police officers in Dallas were brutally executed. In this race for **the White House,** I am the Law And Order candidate. Once again, **France** is the victim of brutal Islamic terrorism. Instead, we must choose to Believe In **America.** We Will Make **America** Strong Again. We Will Make **America** Proud Again.
THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT		
A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS BEARER		
Total number	13	

9.2.6.3. Metonymies in C2

Concept	Nr.	Examples
THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE)	6	And we must attack it with clear **eyes,** steady **hands**, unwavering determination and pride in our country and our values. We have to a better job intercepting ISIS' communications, tracking and analyzing social media posts and mapping jihadist networks, as well as promoting credible **voices** who can provide alternatives to radicalization. Still, as I have said before, none of us can close our **eyes** to the fact that we do face enemies who use their distorted version of Islam to justify slaughtering innocent people. The murder of innocent people breaks our **hearts**, tears at our sense of security and makes us furious.

		We're gonna get an economy that works for everyone, not just those **at the top**, we're gonna forge a new sense of connection and shared responsibility to each other and our nation.
PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT		
OBJECT USED FOR USER	1	Thankfully, his life was saved by a **Kevlar helmet**, something folks here at Team Wendy know a lot about.
CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED		
INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE	3	But as **ISIS** loses actual ground in Iraq and Syria, it will seek to stage more attacks and gain stronger footholds wherever it can, from Afghanistan, to Libya, to Europe. So, yes, efforts to defeat **ISIS** on the battlefield must succeed. Ever since **13 squabbling colonies** put aside their disagreements and united because they realized they were going to rise together or fall separately, generation after generation has fought and marched and organized to widen the circle of dignity and opportunity.
THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION		
THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT		
A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS BEARER		
Total number	10	

9.2.6.4. Metonymies in T2

Concept	Nr.	Examples
THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE)	2	It's a strike **at the heart and soul** of who we are as a nation.
PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT		
OBJECT USED FOR USER		
CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED		
INSTITUTION		

FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE		
THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION		
THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT		
A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS BEARER	1	**The killer,** whose name I will not use, or ever say, was born in Afghan, of Afghan parents, who immigrated to the United States.
Total number	3	

9.2.6.5. Metonymies in T3

Concept	Nr.	Examples
THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE)	4	But, your eminence, you do deserve great credit for bringing together two people who have been at each other's **throats,** mortal enemies, bitter foes. I've got to say, there are a lot of friendly **faces** in this room, people I have been privileged to know and work with. You certainly don't need to be Catholic to be inspired by the humility and **hearts** of the holy father Pope Francis, or to embrace his message. So I have taken this concept to **heart** in this campaign, the daily heat and back and forth of a presidential campaign, to ask how we can do more for each other and better for each other.
PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT		
OBJECT USED FOR USER		
CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED		
INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE	1	That's why it did take a **village** to write these jokes.
THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION		
THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT		
A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS		

Concept	Nr.	Examples
BEARER		
Total number	5	

Concept	Nr.	Examples
THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (SYNECDOCHE)	2	That's because I built mine with my own beautifully formed **hands,** while his was built with the **hands** of God, and nobody can compete with God, is that correct?
PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT		
OBJECT USED FOR USER		
CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED		
INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE	1	Everyone knows, of course, Hillary has believed that it takes a **village**, which only makes sense, after all, in places like Haiti, where she has taken a number of them.
THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION	1	The economy is busted, the government is corrupt, **Washington** is failing.
THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT		
A QUALITY/AN ACTIVITY FOR ITS BEARER		
Total number	4	

9.2.7. Metaphor

9.2.7.1. Metaphors in C1

Semantic field	Nr.	Example
1. Battle	4	I know because I've seen it in the lives of people across America who **get knocked down** and **get right back up.** And I believe Wall Street can never, ever be allowed to **wreck** Main Street again. But just look for a minute at the strengths we bring as

		Americans to **meet** these challenges.
2. Machine/ human	2	And we will also **transform** the way we prepare our young people for those jobs.

How are you going to break through the **gridlock** in Washington? |
| 3. Construction/ destruction | 16 | Instead, we will **build** an economy where everyone who wants a good job can get one.

And we'll **build** a path to citizenship for millions of immigrants who are already contributing to our economy!

Mothers who lost children to violence and are **building** a movement to keep other kids safe?

None of us can raise a family, **build** a business, heal a community or **lift** a country totally alone.

It's a guiding principle for the country we've always been and the future we're going to **build.**

My family were **builders** of a different kind. **Builders** in the way most American families are.

They used whatever tools they had – whatever God gave them – and whatever life in America provided – and **built** better lives and better futures for their kids.

We **built** a coalition.

In America, if you can dream it, you should be able to **build** it.

They were drawn together by love of country and the selfless passion **to build** something better for all who follow.

Way too many dreams **die** in the parking lots of banks.

I'm proud that we **shaped** a global climate agreement – now we have to hold every country accountable to their commitments, including ourselves.

Let our legacy be about "**planting seeds** in a **garden** you never get to see." |
| 4. Journey | 9 | He's taken the Republican Party **a long way** from "Morning in America" to "Midnight in America." |

		Tonight, we've reached a milestone in our nation's **march toward** a more perfect union: the first time that a major party has nominated a woman for president.
		Sure college is crucial, but a four-year degree should not be **the only path to** a good job.
		And we **begin a new chapter** tonight.
		So let's **keep going,** let's **keep going** until every one of the 161 million women and girls across America has the opportunity she deserves to have.
		Let's begin with what we're going to do to help working people in our country **get ahead** and **stay ahead.**
		And Bill, that conversation we started in the law library 45 years ago, it is **still going strong.**
5. Illness/health	5	Too much **paralysis** in Washington.
		None of us can raise a family, build a business, **heal** a community or lift a country totally alone.
		We have to **heal** the divides in our country.
		We **lost** our mother a few years ago but I miss her every day.
		Comprehensive immigration reform **will grow** our economy and keep families together — and it's the right thing to do.
6. Motion	4	You've **put** economic and social justice issues **front and center,** where they belong.
		We're still facing deep-seated problems that developed long before the recession and **stayed with** us through the recovery.
		But when more than 90% of the gains **have gone to the top** 1%, that's where the money is.
		And we are going to **follow** the money.
7. Nature/animal	8	I'm happy for boys and men – because when any **barrier** falls in America it **clears the way** for everyone.
		After all, when there are no **ceilings,** the **sky**'s the limit.
		From communities **ravaged** by addiction to regions **hollowed**

		out by plant closures. And here's what I believe. I believe America **thrives** when the middle class **thrives.**
8. (Non-) restriction	1	And so it is with humility, determination, and **boundless** confidence in America's promise that I accept your nomination for President of the United States!
9. Unity/ encounter/ friendship	8	Then Trump **walked away,** and left working people holding the bag. We have to look out for each other and **lift each other up.** Powerful forces are threatening **to pull us apart.** Trying, as best we can, to **walk in each other's shoes.** I know that at a time when so much seems to be **pulling us apart**, it can be hard to imagine how we'll ever **pull together.** They were **drawn together** by love of country and the selfless passion to build something better for all who follow. He wants **to divide us** — from the rest of the world, and from each other.
10. Vision	2	He's betting that the perils of today's world **will blind us** to its unlimited promise. Now we are **clear-eyed** about what our country is up against.
11. Position	1	Looking for **steady** leadership.
12. Heroic myth	2	I believe climate change is real and that we can **save** our planet while creating millions of good-paying clean energy jobs. Our military is a national **treasure.**
13. Supply/ provision	0	
14. Game/sports	5	And you know what, if fighting for affordable child care and paid family leave is **playing the "woman card,"** then **deal me in**!

		Put your faith in him – and you'll **win** big?
		More than a few times, I've had to **pick myself up** and get back in the **game.**
15. Container	1	I believe that when we have millions of hardworking immigrants contributing to our economy, it would be self-defeating and inhumane to try to **kick them out.**
16. Leadership/ authority	1	And if we're serious about keeping our country safe, we also can't afford to have a President who's in the **pocket** of the gun lobby.
17. Balance/ weight	2	The revolution **hung in the balance.**
		And we will help you **balance** family and work.
18. Liquid/water	1	He's offering **empty** promises.
19. Finances/ economy	1	If you believe that companies should share profits, not **pad** executive bonuses, join us.
20. Religion	0	
21. Transport/ship	2	And, with your help, I will **carry** all of your voices and stories **with me** to the White House.
		And if companies take tax breaks and then **ship** jobs **overseas**, we'll make them pay us back.
22. Fabric	1	Bonds of trust and respect **are fraying.**
23. Light/ darkness	0	
Total number	75	

9.2.7.2. Metaphors in T1

Semantic field	Nr.	Example
1. Battle	5	We all remember the images of our sailors **being forced to their knees** by their Iranian captors at gunpoint.
2. Machine/ human	0	
3. Construction/ destruction	5	So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the **carefully-crafted** lies, and the media myths the Democrats are holding their

		convention next week.
		Our roads and bridges **are falling apart,** our airports are in Third World condition, and forty-three million Americans are on food stamps.
		On the economy, I will outline reforms to add millions of new jobs and trillions in new wealth that can be used **to rebuild** America.
		Iran **was being choked** by sanctions.
		So if you want to hear the corporate **spin**, the carefully-crafted lies, and the media myths the Democrats are holding their convention next week.
4. Journey	1	Iran is **on the path to** nuclear weapons.
5. Illness/health	0	
6. Motion	1	Illegal border crossings will **go down.**
7. Nature/animal	3	ISIS **has spread across** the region, and the world.
		To make life safe in America, we must also address the **growing** threats we face from outside America: we are going to defeat the barbarians of ISIS.
		Reducing taxes will cause new companies and new jobs to come **roaring back** into our country.
8. (Non-) restriction	1	Another humiliation came when president Obama **drew a red line** in Syria – and the whole world knew it meant nothing.
9. Unity/ encounter/ friendship	3	Big business, elite media and major donors **are lining up behind** the campaign of my opponent because they know she will keep our rigged system in place.
		The irresponsible rhetoric of our President, who has used the pulpit of the presidency **to divide us** by race and color, has made America a more dangerous environment for everyone.
		Families **ripped apart.**
10. Vision	0	
11. Position	2	America is far less safe – and the world is **far less stable** – than when Obama made the decision to put Hillary Clinton in charge

		of America's foreign policy. Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent because they know she will **keep our rigged system in place.**
12. Heroic myth	0	
13. Supply/ provision	1	They are **throwing** money at her because they have total control over everything she does.
14. Game/sports	3	She is their **puppet**, and they **pull the strings.** Tonight, this candidate and this whole nation **stand in their corner** to support them, to send them our love, and to pledge in their honor that we will save countless more families from suffering the same awful fate.
15. Container	1	Syria is **engulfed** in a civil war and a refugee crisis that now threatens the West.
16. Leadership/ authority	0	
17. Balance/ weight	0	
18. Liquid/water	4	Of all my travels in this country, nothing has affected me more deeply than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to violence **spilling across** our border. We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop the gangs and the violence, and to stop the drugs from **pouring into** our communities. With these new economic policies, trillions of dollars will start **flowing into** our country. My opponent has called for a radical 550% increase in Syrian refugees on top of existing massive refugee **flows** coming into our country under President Obama.
19. Finances/ economy	1	When that same Secretary of State rakes in millions of dollars trading access and favors to special interests and foreign powers I know **the time** for action **has come.**
20. Religion	1	One more child to sacrifice on **the altar** of open borders.
21. Transport/	0	

ship		
22. Fabric	0	
23. Light/ darkness	0	
Total number	32	

9.2.7.3. Metaphors in C2

Semantic field	Nr.	Example
1. Battle	0	
2. Machine/ human	2	First, we and our allies must work hand-in-hand **to dismantle** the networks that move money, and propaganda, and arms and fighters around the world. We have to flow -- we have **to stem** the flow of jihadists from Europe and Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan and then back again.
3. Construction/ destruction	4	The murder of innocent people **breaks** our hearts, **tears at** our sense of security and makes us furious. **Building** the greatest middle class the world has ever seen. We did not attack each other. We worked with each other to protect our country and **to rebuild** our city.
4. Journey	3	The more we learn about what happened, the better we'll be able to protect our people **going forward.** And they should stop supporting radical schools and mosques around the world that have set too many young people **on a path towards** extremism. Ever since 13 squabbling colonies put aside their disagreements and united because they realized they were going to rise together or fall separately, generation after generation has fought and **marched** and organized to widen the circle of dignity and opportunity.
5. Illness/health	3	The Orlando terrorist may be dead, but **the virus** that **poisoned** his mind remains very much alive. We face a twisted ideology and **poisoned** psychology that inspires the so-called lone wolves, radicalized individuals who may or may not have contact and direction from any formal organization.
6. Motion	2	And the good news is that the coalition effort in Syria and Iraq has made recent **gains** in the last months. First, we and our allies must work hand-in-hand to dismantle the networks that **move** money, and propaganda, and arms and fighters around the world.

161

7. Nature/animal	0	
8. (Non-) restriction	3	Ever since 13 squabbling colonies put aside their disagreements and united because they realized they were going to rise together or fall separately, generation after generation has fought and marched and organized **to widen the circle** of dignity and opportunity. **Throwing open** the doors of education. I believe weapons of war **have no place** on our streets and we may have our disagreements about gun safety regulations, but we should all be able to agree on a few essential things.
9. Unity/ encounter/ friendship	10	People **lining up to** donate blood. This is a moment when all Americans need to **stand together.** I have no doubt -- I have no doubt we can **meet** this challenge if we **meet** it together. First, we and our allies must **work hand-in-hand** to dismantle the networks that move money, and propaganda, and arms and fighters around the world. The only way to do this is by working closely with our partners, strengthening our alliances, not weakening them or **walking away from** them. We have to **stand together,** be proud together. We **stand together** because we are stronger together. And we are stronger when everyone can share in the rewards of our economy and contribute to our communities, when we bridge our divides and **lift each other up** instead of **tearing each other down**.
10. Vision	2	And we must attack it with **clear eyes**, steady hands, unwavering determination and pride in our country and our values.
11. Position	1	And we must attack it with clear eyes, **steady** hands, unwavering determination and pride in our country and our values.
12. Heroic myth	0	
13. Supply/ provision	0	

14. Game/sports	1	As president, I will work with our great tech companies from Silicon Valley to Boston to step up our **game.**
15. Container	0	
16. Leadership/ authority	0	
17. Balance/ weight	0	
18. Liquid/water	3	Whatever we learn about this killer, his motives in the days ahead, we know already the barbarity that we face from radical jihadists is **profound.** We have **to flow** -- we have to stem **the flow** of jihadists from Europe and Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan and then back again.
19. Finances/ economy	1	This is something that I **spend** a lot of **time** on at the State Department.
20. Religion	1	It is time to get back to the **spirit** of those days, spirit of 9/12.
21. Transport/ ship	0	
22. Fabric	2	**The bonds** that hold us together as communities, as one national community, **are strained** by an economy with too much inequality and too little upward mobility.
23. Light/ darkness	1	One -- out of many, one -- has seen us through the **darkest** chapters of our history.
Total number	39	

9.2.7.4. Metaphors in T2

Semantic field	Nr.	Example
1. Battle	2	I don't know if you know this, but just a few weeks before San Bernardino, the **slaughter**, that's all it was a **slaughter,** Hillary Clinton explained her refusal to say the words "radical Islam."
2. Machine/human	0	
3. Construction/ destruction	3	That is why our new goal must be to defeat Islamic terrorism not **nation building.** No more **nation building.** And by the way we've spent almost $5 trillion over the years on trying to **nation build** in the Middle East and it has been complete and total disaster.

4. Journey	0	
5. Illness/health	2	But the current politically correct response **cripples** our ability to talk and to think and act clearly.
6. Motion	3	Take a look at your security, take a look at the wages. For 18 years they've been **stagnant,** they've even **gone down.** But today, there's only one thing to discuss, the **growing** threat of terrorism inside of our borders.
7. Nature/animal	0	
8. (Non-) restriction	0	
9. Unity/ encounter/ friendship	1	Our nation **stands together** in solidarity with the members of Orlando's LGBT community.
10. Vision		
11. Position		
12. Heroic myth		
13. Supply/ provision	1	The media talks about home grown terrorism but Islamic radicalism and that's a very, very important term -- a term that the president refuses to use and the networks that **nurture** it are imports from overseas whether you like it or whether you don't like it.
14. Game/sports	0	
15. Container	0	
16. Leadership/ authority	0	
17. Balance/ weight	0	
18. Liquid/water	5	We express our **deepest** sympathies to the victims, the wounded, and their families. They're **pouring in** and we don't know what we're doing. We cannot continue to allow thousands upon thousands of

		people to **pour into** our country many of whom have the same thought process as this savage killer. We have to stop the tremendous **flow** of Syrian refugees into the United States. Clinton wants to allow radical Islamic terrorists to **pour into** our country.
19. Finances/ economy	0	
20. Religion	0	
21. Transport/ ship		
22. Fabric	0	
23. Light/ darkness	1	This is a very **dark** moment in America's history.
Total number	18	

9.2.7.5. Metaphors in C3

Semantic field	Nr.	Example
1. Battle	1	Let's come together, remember what unites us, and just **rip on** Ted Cruz.
2. Machine/ human	0	
3. Construction/ destruction	4	His appeal that we **build bridges**, not walls. Because I think for each of us, our greatest **monument** on this Earth won't be what we **build,** but the lives we touch.
4. Journey	1	In the end, what makes this dinner important are not the jokes we tell, but the legacy we **carry forward.**
5. Illness/health	0	
6. Motion		
7. Nature/animal	0	
8. (Non-) restriction	0	
9. Unity/ encounter/ friendship	3	Those fears of **division** can cause us to treat each other as the other. Because I think for each of us, our greatest monument on this

Semantic field	Nr.	Example
		Earth won't be what we build, but the lives we **touch.**
		I just want to put you all in a **basket** of adorables.
10. Vision	0	
11. Position	0	
12. Heroic myth	0	
13. Supply/ provision	0	
14. Game/sports	1	And as you have already heard, it is a **treat** for all of you, too, because usually I charge a lot for speeches like this.
15. Container	1	I said no to some jokes that I thought were **over the line**, but I suppose you can judge for yourself on WikiLeaks in the next few days.
16. Leadership/ authority	1	"You don't have to support **the top of the ticket;** just do what's in your best interest.
17. Balance/ weight	0	
18. Liquid/water		
19. Finances/ economy	0	
20. Religion	1	So tonight, let's embrace the **spirit** of the evening.
21. Transport/ ship	0	
22. Fabric	0	
23. Light/ darkness	0	
Total number	13	

9.2.7.6. Metaphors in T3

Semantic field	Nr.	Example
1. Battle	0	
2. Machine/ human	0	

3. Construction/ destruction	0	
4. Journey	0	
5. Illness/health	0	
6. Motion	0	
7. Nature/animal	0	
8. (Non-) restriction	0	
9. Unity/ encounter/ friendship	2	America is in many ways **divided.** America is in many ways **divided** like it has never been before.
10. Vision	0	
11. Position	0	
12. Heroic myth	0	
13. Supply/ provision	0	
14. Game/sports	0	
15. Container	1	Hillary is so corrupt, she got **kicked off** the Watergate commission.
16. Leadership/ authority	0	
17. Balance/ weight	0	
18. Liquid/water	0	
19. Finances/ economy	0	
20. Religion	0	
21. Transport/ ship	0	
22. Fabric	0	
23. Light/	0	

darkness		
Total number	3	

9.2.8. Personification

9.2.8.1. Personification in C1

- Bernie, **your campaign inspired** millions of Americans, particularly the young people who threw their hearts and souls into our primary.

- In Atlantic City, 60 miles from here, you will find contractors and **small businesses who lost** everything because Donald Trump refused to pay his bills.

9.2.8.2. Personification in T1

- That is because these **interests have rigged** our political and economic system for their exclusive benefit.

- This will be one of the most important issues **decided by this election**.

9.2.8.3. Personification in C2

- Well, we have to see what **the investigation uncovers.**

- Now, the third **area that demands** attention is preventing radicalization and countering efforts by ISIS and other international terrorist networks to recruit in the United States and Europe.

- Last year, I visited a **pilot program** in Minneapolis **that helps** parents, teachers, imams, mental health professionals and others recognize signs of radicalization in young people and work with law enforcement to intervene before it's too late.

- **Inflammatory anti-Muslim rhetoric** and threatening to ban the families and friends of Muslim Americans as well as millions of Muslim business people and tourists from entering our country **hurts** the vast majority of Muslims who love freedom and hate terror.

9.2.8.4. Personification in T2

- This was going to be a speech on Hillary Clinton and all of the bad things and we all know what's going on, and especially how poor she'd do as president in these very, very **troubled times** of radical Islamic terrorism.

- But the current politically correct **response cripples** our ability to talk and to think and act clearly.

- His father published support for the Afghan Taliban, a **regime which murders** those who don't share its radical views, and they murdered plenty.

- We have a **dysfunctional immigration system, which does not permit** us to know who we let into our country, and it does not permit us to protect our citizens properly.

- After a full and partial and long -- really long overdue security assessment we will develop a responsible immigration **policy that serves** the interests and values of America.

- The **media talks** about home grown terrorism but Islamic radicalism and that's a very, very important term -- a term that the president refuses to use and the networks that nurture it are imports from overseas whether you like it or whether you don't like it.

- Our **communities from all backgrounds are ready for some relief.**

9.2.8.5. Personification in C3

- People look at the Statue of Liberty and see a **proud symbol** of our history as a nation of immigrants, a beacon of hope for people around the world.

9.2.8.6. Personification in T3

10. Abstract English

This thesis examines the use of rhetorical devices in six selected speeches by US electoral top candidates Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump during their election campaigns 2016. The main research goal is to determine which devices have been most frequently employed and in which context. Consequently, conclusions can be drawn concerning the speakers' individual rhetorical skills, which are eventually compared to each other.

The analysis is conducted via critical discourse analysis focussing on the following rhetorical figures: metaphor, metonymy, hyperbole, simile, three-part list, antithesis, repetition, and personification. Besides, the use of pronouns has been subject to investigation. Clearly, particular emphasis of the analysis is on metaphor and pronouns as these are the most crucial aspects in political discourse.

The results show that significant differences can be observed regarding the two speakers' rhetorical devices in terms of frequency and contextual analysis. Overall, Clinton manifests a considerably higher number of metaphors and metonyms, whereas Trump uses more hyperbola and repetitions than his opponent. Moreover, metaphorical source domains and contextual use in general differ. Hence, Clinton demonstrates more diverse metaphorical concepts and semantic fields and stresses constructive, collaborative, and future-related issues more; in opposition to that, Trump rather underlines destructive, excluding, war-related, and at times extremist terminology.

As a result, these findings support and confirm Lakoff's model of conservative right-wing and liberal left-wing rhetoric (1996). More precisely, Clinton's discourse largely adheres to the nurturant parent-model and Trump's to the contrasting strict father-model. The outcome is also reinforced via pronominal analysis: Clinton emphasises shared responsibilities and directly addresses the audience much rather than her opponent, whose central emphasis is on third parties (which predominantly refers to adversaries and opposing groups).

In conclusion, the thesis raises awareness of essential rhetorical tools that political orators exploit to achieve a more persuasive impact through discourse. Furthermore, the survey shows how distinct ideological viewpoints can be expressed and explains which linguistic features serve as indicators for corresponding stances.

11. Abstract German

Diese Diplomarbeit examiniert die rhetorischen Mittel in sechs verschiedenen ausgewählten Reden von den US Spitzenkandidaten Hillary Clinton und Donald Trump während des Wahlkampfes 2016. Das Hauptziel der Arbeit besteht darin zu bestimmen, welche Mittel am häufigsten und in welchem Kontext sie verwendet wurden. Dadurch können Schlussfolgerungen bezüglich der individuellen rhetorischen Fähigkeiten der Sprecher gezogen werden, welche letztlich miteinander verglichen werden.

Die Analyse wird mittels kritischer Diskursanalyse durchgeführt und fokussiert dabei folgende rhetorische Figuren: Metapher, Metonymie, Hyperbole, Vergleich, dreiteilige Liste, Antithese, Wiederholung und Personifikation. Daneben wurde die Verwendung von Pronomen untersucht. Eindeutig liegt der Fokus der Analyse auf Metaphern und Pronomen, da diese die entscheidendsten Aspekte in politischem Diskurs darstellen.

Die Resultate haben signifikante Unterschiede sowohl im Bezug auf die Häufigkeit als auch der kontextuellen Analyse der von den Sprechern verwendeten rhetorischen Figuren gezeigt. Insgesamt verwendet Clinton eine erheblich höhere Anzahl an Metaphern und Metonymien, während Trump mehr Übertreibungen und Wiederholungen als seine Gegnerin verwendet. Zudem unterscheiden sich metaphorische Quellendomänen und die kontextuelle Verwendung insgesamt. Folglich demonstriert Clinton häufiger verschiedene metaphorische Konzepte und Wortfelder und betont konstruktive, gemeinsame, und zukunftsbezogene Fragen mehr; im Gegensatz dazu unterstreicht Trump destruktive, ausschließende, kriegsbezogene, und an manchen Instanzen extremistische Terminologie.

Infolgedessen unterstützen und bestätigen diese Resultate Lakoffs Modell von konservativer rechter und liberaler linker Rhetorik (1996). Präziser ausgedrückt hält sich Clintons Diskurs zum größten Teil an das *nurturant partent-model* und Trump an das dem gegenüberstehende *strict father-model*. Dieses Ergebnis wird auch durch die Analyse der Pronomen verstärkt: Clinton betont geteilte Verantwortlichkeiten und spricht das Publikum viel mehr an als ihr Gegner, welcher hauptsächlich Dritte (und damit Gegner und gegnerische Vereinigungen) betont.

In Summe schärft diese Diplomarbeit das Bewusstsein von essentiellen rhetorischen Mitteln die sich politische Sprecher zunutze machen um eine noch überzeugendere Wirkung mittels ihres Diskurses zu erzeugen. Des Weiteren zeigt die

Untersuchung wie verschiedene ideologische Sichtweisen ausgedrückt werden können und erklärt welche linguistischen Charakteristika als Indikator für den entsprechenden Standpunkt dienen können.

12. Curriculum Vitae
LARISSA WOLF

Stromstraße 21/16, 1200 Wien

Tel.: 0699/10413857, E-Mail: Larissa_431@hotmail.com

Persönliches

Geburtsdatum/-ort	28.03.90, Wien
Staatsbürgerschaft	Österreich

Ausbildung

2010-2017	Lehramtsstudium UF Englisch UF Spanisch
Sept – Nov 2016	Ausbildung zur diplomierten Fitness- und Personaltrainerin
Jänner 2016	Ausbildung zur Lernbetreuerin (VHS Wien)
September 2015	Ausbildung zur diplomierten Reiseleiterin (Club Europa)
2008-2009	1. Abschnitt des Studiums der Rechtswissenschaften
2000-2008	Absolventin des BG&BRG Keimgasse in Mödling
1996-2000	Karl-Stingl-Volksschule in Mödling

Berufserfahrung

September 2011 – heute	Verkäuferin; Ankerbrot (Teilzeit)
	Aufgabenbereiche: Produktaufbereitung, Kundenbetreuung, Verkauf
März 2016 – heute	Freie Übersetzerin (fallweise)
	Aufgabenbereiche: Übersetzen von diversen wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten sowie mündlichen Abhandlungen (Geschäftsverhandlungen, Krisensituationen)
März - April 2016	Reiseleiterin Rundreise Schweiz-Frankreich-Spanien
Jänner 2016 – Juli 2016	Lernbetreuerin; VHS Wien
	Aufgabenbereiche: Leitung von Lernkursen der VHS an diversen Wiener Schulen, Leitung und Betreuung von Lernstationen
2010 - heute	Nachhilfelehrerin Englisch, Spanisch (fallweise)

Sprachkenntnisse

Deutsch, Englisch, Spanisch (fließend in Wort und Schrift)

Französisch (Niveau B1)

Italienisch (Niveau A1)

Latein (Latinum)

Weitere Qualifikationen

MS Office

Maschineschreiben

Führerscheinklasse B

Unternehmerführerschein Module A + B

Hobbies

Reisen

Neue Kulturen und Sprachen kennenlernen

Fitness (Laufen, Krafttraining, …)

Fotographie