Nancy Samir Wahba Demitry

Persuasive Strategies in Trump's Final Presidential Debate:
A Critical Discourse Analysis

By
Nancy Samir Wahba Demitry
A Lecturer at the British University in Egypt

Abstract

The present research aims to analyze the linguistic tools used by Trump in the third and final presidential debate in order to persuade the audience with his political views and enhance his positon as a presidential nominee. Trump deploys pragmatic and stylistic devices with the purpose of manipulating the minds of the audience. Presupposition and conversational implicature are explored in the course of the analysis, in addition to some rhetorical tools such as metaphor, hyperbole, irony, repetition and syntactic parallelism. Critical Discourse Analysis constitutes the theoretical framework for the analysis and van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach is employed as it emphasizes the relationship between social interaction and discourse. The analysis of these linguistic features prove that Trump always depicts the Americans as victims of the former government, exploits the situation in Iraq, the economic decline and the national insecurity to launch an attack at Clinton's political short-sightedness, and finally avows that a bright future is ahead under his reign.
Keywords: Grice's maxims, presupposition, metaphor, hyperbole, irony, repetition, parallelism, CDA, ideology, power.

0.1 Introduction

It is noteworthy saying that the American presidential election which was held in 2016 has been described as an "unquestionably unique and historic race, culminating in political outsider, reality television star, and real estate magnate Donald Trump facing off against the historic first major political party female nominee, Hilary Clinton" (Stewart, Eubanks, Dye, Eidelman & Wicks, 2017: 546). It is generally agreed that the 2016 presidential election has marked a turning point in the history of the United States; the result of which on November 19 was shocking to the international community as Donald Trump "a businessman with no former political experience and a knack for nationalistic and anti-establishment rhetoric, became the 45th President of the United States" (Lezana Escribano, 2017: 3).

Three American presidential debates preceded the 2016 American presidential elections. They were organized by The Commission on Presidential Debates between Donald Trump, the Republican nominee and Hillary Clinton, the Democratic nominee. Presidential debates constitute a channel through which candidates address certain issues at the same time, make their election manifestoes and enhance their

attitudes among the audience. As a matter of fact, Trump's interaction in the third and final presidential debate, which is the corpus of this study, has spurred an elevated degree of interest in anyalsing it due to the ferocious communication that took place between him and Hilary Clinton.

The final pre-election presidential debate took place at the Thomas and Mack Centre at the University of Nevada in Las Vegas on October 19, 2016. It has been proven that "71.6 million viewers watched the final debate------- making it the third most watched presidential debate ever''(Stewart et al., 2017:546). Chris Wallace, the moderator, presented important and critical topics, namely: the Supreme Court, abortion, immigration, the economy and 'foreign hot spots'.

1.1. Aim of the Study

This study undertakes to explore the strategies used by Trump to entice citizens to cast a vote for him; it focuses on the ways he deploys language and political discourse to legitimize his political stances and appeal to different audiences. In fact, Trump's discursive style conforms to what Barthes (1970:16 as cited in Curbelo, 2017:3) postulates that "language is never innocent". In other words, "Trump's language and political discourse were instrumental in his pursuit of power and legitimization" (Curbelo, 2017:2).

1.2. Research Questions

The present study seeks to answer the following questions:

1) What linguistic strategies did Trump use to appeal to the rational and emotive perceptions of the voters?
2) How did the linguistic features used by the Republican nominee serve as a means of manipulating and exercising mind control of the audience?
3) To what extent did these discursive structures help in delineating Trump's ideologies and power?

1.3. Research Methodology

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is adopted as a general theoretical framework in the course of the analysis. It is an "interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse. It sees language as a form of social practice and aims to investigate how power, ideology, and hegemony are embedded in language. By so doing, it attempts to reveal how language use can reinforce power" (Wang, 2016: 2768). In other words, CDA does not belong to a single discipline; it makes use of various methods adopted from different fields of study. Wodak and Meyer (2002:15) posit that the idea of context underpins CDA, since "this explicitly includes social, psychological, political and ideological components and thereby postulates an interdisciplinary procedure….. The conclusion is that CDA does not constitute a well-defined empirical method but rather a cluster of approaches with a similar theoretical base".

The discourse analytical approaches concerning the study of CDA have been developed and represented by a number of well-known scholars who have made great contribution to the development of CDA such as: Fowler (1979), Kress (1985), Fairclough (1995), Wodak (1989), van Dijk (2009) and many others. However, van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach will be employed in the present study. Dijk believes there is a strong relationship between social interaction and discourse manifested by the "cognitive interface of mental models, knowledge, attitude and ideology" (van Dijk, 2009: 64). In other words, van Dijk (2008: 3), points out that "discourse is not analyzed as an autonomous object but also as situated interaction, as a social practice, or as a type of communication in a social, cultural, historical or political situation". Thus, discourse is considered to be a communicative event, a social phenomenon or a manifestation of a variety of meanings.

According to Liu and Guo (2016: 1079), Dijk's approach has smartly introduced the study of "cognition into the analytical studies in the field of CDA by exploring the interrelationship between cognitive phenomenon and discourse structures, as well as social structures". In other words, Dijk's triangular model of discourse, cognition and society underpins his social cognitive approach. He further introduces and defines some of the key notions related to cognition such as: ideology,

control and power. van Dijk's approach explores the ideologies shared by society and emphasizes the abuse of power by the elites stressing the "control of discourse dimensions as a means to gain access to power" (Tenorio, 2011: 190).

Ideology is a social conception that constitutes a framework "for organizing the social cognitions shared by members of social groups, organizations or institutions" (van Dijk, 1995:17-18). Ideologies are inherently encoded in texts and discourse "functions to persuasively help construct new and confirm already present ideologies" (van Dijk, 1995: 22). Concerning the idea of power, it should be defined in relation to the notion of control. Therefore, social groups are said to be powerful if they can control the actions and/or minds of members of other groups which results in influencing their actions, ideologies and attitudes. In a nutshell, "CDA is much more interested in the implicit manifestation of power which is not clearly marked or coded but can strongly control discourse and discourse (re)production" (Le,Le &Short, 2009: 12). In sum, ideology, power and control are key concepts which constitute a central place in CDA.

Cabrejas-Peñuelas and Díez-Prados, (2014: 159) postulate that "pre-electoral debates form a sub-genre of political discourse". Lezana Escribano (2017: 10) points out that "political discourse analysis is concerned with discourses that take place within political contexts and which are pronounced by political actors such as politicians…to achieve political goals". Accordingly, exploring which linguistic strategies used in order to pursue a certain political purpose is one of the main purposes of political discourse analysis. It is worth mentioning that the language used in political debates (political language) is not to appeal to the voters' logic and reason but to their emotions and expectations. Politicians use language not to inform people but to make them believe and act accordingly.

In order to explore the structures, strategies and properties of Trump's verbal interaction which manifest his attempts at manipulating the audience and exercising a mind control of them, some linguistic devices

are chosen as key tools for the analysis of his language that indexes and expresses social power abuse which eventually aims at domination. Pragmatic tools are explored especially presupposition and implicature, in addition to some stylistic devices, namely: metaphor, irony, hyperbole parallelism and repetition. These linguistic tools are considered a valid means for demystifying Trump's ideologies toward critical social issues. A brief account of these linguistic features prove essential prior to undertaking the analysis.

1.3.1. Pragmatic Tools

It is worth mentioning that when analyzing a discourse from a pragmatic perspective, "it tends to focus specifically on aspects of what is unsaid or unwritten (yet communicated) within the discourse being analyzed…In order to do the pragmatics of discourse, we have to look behind the forms and structures present in the text" (Yule, 1996: 83).

1.3.1.1 Pragmatic Presupposition

According to Yule (1996:25) "a presupposition is something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance". In other words, presuppositions are "propositions implicitly supposed before the relevant linguistic business is transacted. One has presuppositions in virtue of the statements he makes, the questions he asks, the commands he issues. Presuppositions" (Stalnaker, 1972:388, as cited in Horn &Ward, 2004:33). In view of Stalnaker's notion, presuppositions are considered to be "what the speaker takes to be common background for the participants in the context". Yule (1996: 26) points out that presupposition is considered to be "a relationship between two propositions. If the sentence: *Mary's dog is cute* contains the proposition *p* and the sentence: *Mary has a dog* contains a proposition *q*, then using the symbol ≥ to mean presupposes", the relationship can be represented as follows:

> a. "Mary's dog is cute   (=p)"
> b. "Mary has a dog.   (=q)"
> c. "p ≥ q"

Presupposition serves as an important pragmatic tool in decoding ideologies embedded in texts and distributing information in discourse.

As a matter of fact, it is unrealistic for speakers to define everything during verbal interaction, but "the degree of explicitness will vary from situation to situation, and depend on the knowledge that speakers and hearers will assume of each other" (Wales, 1989:375). According to Levinson (1983:179), presuppositions "seem to be tied to particular words or aspects of surface structure in general", which are called presupposition triggers. Below is a classificatory model of presuppositions that is a hybrid of four models: Levinson (1983), Short (1989), Green (1989) and Yule (1996):

1) Existential: definite noun phrases: proper names, phrases introduced by a definite determiner, and personal pronouns, e.g., John got married last year≥ there exists a person called John

2) Factive:
   a) Epistemic, e.g., "know", realize", "prove", "be aware/odd"
   b) Emotive ,e.g., "regret", "amaze", "be glad, sorry, proud, sad": Mary regretted that her husband lost his job ≥ Her husband lost his job.

3) Non-factive Verbs, e.g., "dream", pretend", "imagine":
   "We imagined we were in Hawaii" ≥ "We were not in Hawaii".

4) Lexical:
   a) Implicative Verbs, e.g., "remember", " dare", " manage", "happen", "forgot", "avoid": " John managed to open the door" ≥ "John opened the door"
   b) Change-of-State Verbs ,e.g., "Stop", "begin", "die", "start", "begin", "cease", "take", "leave", "carry on": "He stopped smoking" ≥ "He used to smoke".
   c) Iteratives, e.g., "call back", "another time", "again", "restore", "repeat": "The police arrested him again" ≥"The police arrested him before".
   d) Judging Verbs, e.g., "blame", "criticize", "accuse". "To accuse A of X" ≥ "A did X and X is bad". "Mary blamed her son for stealing" ≥ "Mary's son stole and this was bad".

5) Structural:
   a) Comparisons and Contrast: They can be sources of presupposition and include: "better", "as good as", "resemble":

"Cynthia is a better pop singer than Susan" ≥ "Susan is a pop singer".

b) Questions:" Did he leave?" ≥ "He either left or did not leave"; "why did he leave early?" ≥ "He left early".

c) Counterfactive Conditionals: "If Mary had come ten minutes earlier, she would have seen James" ≥ "Mary did not come ten minutes earlier".

d) Non-restrictive Relative Clauses: "President Sadat, who signed a peace treaty with Israel, was assassinated in 1981" ≥ "Sadat signed a peace treaty with Israel".

e) Cleft and Pseudo-Cleft Sentences: "It was his wife who reported him to the police" ≥"Somebody reported him to the police"; "what made him mad was that his wife reported him to the police" ≥ "Something made him mad".

f) Temporal Clauses: they are introduced by time markers such as: "before", "while", "since", "when", "after". For example, the sentence: "After his father died, he stepped into a large fortune" ≥ "his father died".

According to Yule (1996: 29), presuppostions "represent subtle ways of making information that the speaker believes appear to be what the listener should believe". In addition to this, they help writers/speakers "avoid redundancy and also establish a common ground, or a conceptual framework that has to be accepted by the audience" (Mazid, 1999: 37).

The following sub-section gives a brief account of the second pragmatic tool that is employed in the course of the analysis: conversational implicature.

1.3.1.2. Conversational Implicature

Before embarking on explaining the meaning of implicature, one should shed light on the Co-operative Principle which is the core of Gricean pragmatics. "Grice proposed that more could be conveyed than was said if one assumed that in conversing, human beings, regardless of their cultural background, adhere to a basic principle, governing conversation, which he termed the Co-operative Principle" (Green, 1996: 90). That is to say, while conversing, it is assumed that participants will

cooperate with each other and are expected to observe the Co-operative Principle, which, according to Grice (1975: 45, as cited in Davies, 2000: 2) runs as follows: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged". In other words, a typical conversation does not consist of a random or disconnected series of utterances and remarks. On the contrary, a conversation should have a general purpose and participants are expected to exert cooperative efforts to relate to its overall purpose or direction.

It is worth noting that a scrupulous study of Grice' work shows that the distinction between the speaker-meaning and the sentence-meaning is one of the most important and recurrent issues. He acknowledges the fact that speakers mean to covey more than they say and in order to attain a logical explanation to bridge the gap between what is said and what is actually meant, Grice introduced the concept of 'conversational implicature', which is "the extra meaning that is not triggered by the socially- fixed meanings of particular words" (Davies, 2000: 16). Grice believes that this implicit or implied meaning is generated on account of the fact that participants involved in a conversation cooperate with each other.

Grice's main concern is to discover how speakers generate these 'conversational implicatures' and how they assume their hearers will understand the implicit meanings. In so doing, he postulates a set of guidelines underpinning an effective use of language in a conversation. He calls them 'maxims'. According to Grice, there are four maxims outlined as follows: First, "the maxim of quantity" which relates to the amount of information that should be provided; under it, fall the following sub-maxims: "(i) make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange; (ii) do not make your contribution more informative than is required". Second, "the maxim of quality" which is concerned with truth telling and embodies two sub-maxims: "(i) do not say what you believe to be false; (ii) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence". Third is the "maxim of relevance" which stresses the fact that people's contribution should "be relevant". Fourth is "the maxim of manner: Be perspicuous"; it comprises

four components: "(i) avoid obscurity of expression; (ii) avoid ambiguity; (iii) be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity); (iv)be orderly" (Yule, 1996: 37).

Yule (1996: 37) points out that maxims are "unstated assumptions in conversations", in the sense that, it is assumed that participants are not evasive, or redundant and are telling the truth. However, participants might choose to flout any of these maxims purposefully in a conversation with the aim of generating conversational implicatures.

As has already been mentioned, when it comes to analyzing Trump's speeches in the third and final debate, some pragmatic and stylistic tools are deployed as they prove essential in undertaking the analysis. Two important Pragmatic tools have already been dealt with, namely: Presuppostion and Implicature. The following sub-section is devoted to reviewing the five stylistic devices, namely: metaphor, irony, hyperbole, parallelism and repetition.

1.3.2. Stylistic Devices

It is worth mentioning that stylistic devices are "used to make messages aesthetically pleasing, more convincing, emotionally loaded, visual or even just simpler to understand" (Lezana Escribano, 2017: 16). These rhetorical devices are used by politicians to impact people's views and perceptions and to eventually, lure them to accept new policies and claims. (Kurnianingsih, 2017). That is why they are frequently resorted to in political speeches.

1.3.2.1. Metaphor

A metaphor is considered to be the most fundamental form of figurative language "that brings together ideas and images in unexpected conjunction" (Cameron, 2003: 4). This in turn accounts for metaphor being "associated with a particular rule of transference in which F= 'Like L'. That is the figurative meaning F is derived from the literal meaning L in having the same' Like L'" (Leech, 1969: 151). A metaphor comprises three notional elements or components: "the tenor" which is the subject of the comparison, "the vehicle- that is, the image or analogue in terms of

which the tenor is represented". The third component of metaphor is the "ground of the comparison" or the common attributes of the two objects. In other words, "every metaphor is implicitly of the form 'X is like Y in respect of Z', where X is the tenor, Y the vehicle, and Z the ground" (Leech, 1969: 151).Wang (2016: 2767) posits that metaphors are used "to strengthen the pathos and ethos of political speeches, and how they can build myths so as to persuade audiences".

1.3.2.2. Irony

Irony is considered to be one of the most important figures of speech that can be defined as "utterances whose literal meaning expresses the opposite of what the speaker intends to say" (Booth, 1974, as cited in Lezana Escribano, 2017: 16). In other words, the meaning intended by the speaker stands in contrast to the stated one. In fact, the core of this rhetorical tool is to "criticize or disparage under the guise of praise of neutrality….The 'mask' of approval may be called the overt or the direct meaning, and the disapproval behind the mask the covert or the oblique meaning" (Leech, 1969: 172).

1.3.2.3. Hyperbole

Hyperbole is one of the most prominent figures of speech that is used in eulogy and poetry to celebrate human ideals. van Dijk defines it as "a description of an event or action in strongly exaggerated terms" (van Dijk, 1995: 154). In fact, rhetorical hyperbole is frequently concerned with "personal values and sentiments: that is, with making subjective claims which, however exaggerated, we could not verify unless we were somehow able to get inside the cranium of the person about whom the claims are made" (Leech, 1969: 168). In other words, recipients have to use their discretion and their knowledge of the general standards of society and of the speakers themselves in order to decide whether such claims are credible or not. It should be noted that subjective statements may seem hyperbolic from the perspective of the addressee, but completely serious from the point of view of the speaker. (Leech, 1969).

1.3.2.4. Parallelism and Repetition

Leech and Short (2007:113, as cited in Kurnianingsih, 2017: 807) posit that "parallelism is a figure of speech in which words, phrases, or sentences are expressed and repeated structurally". In other words, components of a sentence that have the same grammatical structure, sound or meaning are repeated. This strategy adds balance to sentences and contributes to a nice and pleasant flow of ideas; hence, serves as a persuasive tool to convey and emphasize ideas owing to the quality of repetition it employs.

As far as repetition is concerned, Farghal and Shunnaq (1999:13) define repetition as a "semantic phenomenon which refers to repeating words, phrases and sentences more than necessary to clarify a term or concept. It is a central and important notion to understand the individuals and their representation". Repetition is a fundamental and useful strategy that creates a special rhetorical effect and acts as a cohesive tie in a discourse. In addition, it is viewed as one of the most important strategies that is used to "draw attention to preferred meanings and to enhance construction of such meanings in mental models which attempts to persuade the audience's memorization" (van Dijk, 1997: 32).

After reviewing the pragmatic and stylistic tools which are employed in the course of the analysis, it is shown how these tools in the third and final presidential debate enhance Trump's political stance, delineate his ideologies and highlight his power and control over the audience's views and perceptions . This has in turn, weakened Clinton's popularity and position as a presidential nominee; hence, lure people to cast a vote for him.

1.4. The Analysis

1.4.1. Pragmatic Tools

1.4.1.1. Presupposition

Presuppositions have been manifested in Trump's language as a linguistic tool to fire a series of attacks at Hilary Clinton, convey a negative vision of the current status in the U.S. and declare his endorsement of the notion of change. The following section analyzes the

different presupposition triggers used by Trump in the third and final pre-electoral debate.

When Chris Wallace, the moderator, asks Trump about his opinion with regard to the subject of immigration, Trump calls for the necessity of deporting undocumented people and building strong borders in order to protect the country. He believes that illegal immigrants and materials that support terrorism and other criminal activities enter through the current borders. In order to prove his point of view, he replies by saying: "---the border patrol of agents, 16,500 plus I.C.E------know what's going on. They know it better than anybody" (cf. Appendix A, extract 1). The border patrol of agents' mission is to ensure that terrorists and weapons do not enter the country and the I.C.E, which stands for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, targets illegal immigrants by enforcing stringent laws to protect the U.S. against terrorist attacks. Trump's use of the factive epistemic verb 'know' presupposes the truth and the fact that the country is suffering from thousands of people who come into the country illegally; hence, the imperative need of strong borders. Furthermore, using the comparative structure 'better than' presupposes that people are not aware of how the U.S. is suffering from the current situation.

Trump goes into further explanation concerning the same topic by ensuring that by building strong borders, people who "are waiting to become citizens", can "come back in". (cf. Appendix A, extract 2). The use of the verbs 'come back' and 'become', denotes a change of state; they presuppose that those people are not American citizens; they have all the legal documents which make them eligible to enter the U.S., but are still waiting for their turn. Trump wants to ascertain the audience that by implementing his strategy, i.e., by building strong border, illegal immigration is going to diminish and those people will be given a fair chance to become American citizens. As a smart plan to convince the audience with his point of view, Trump continues by criticizing the current government by saying: "What she doesn't say is that President Obama has deported millions and millions of people" (cf. Appendix A, extract 3). This pseudo-cleft structure presupposes the truth that Obama

has already started implementing the strategy of deportation, which Hilary Clinton does not want to concede and is currently criticizing.

When Chris Wallace asked Trump about his plan to raise the economy and create more jobs, Trump immediately attacks the current political establishment by first referring to NATO. He thinks it is unfair for the U.S. to contribute three-fourths of NATO's budget to support American allies, while NATO other members are not making proper financial contribution to the NATO alliance. He confirms that he has asked the rich countries to pay their fair share by saying that: "Since I did this, this was a year ago. All of a sudden, they're paying" (cf. Appendix A, extract 4). The use of the temporal clause 'Since I did this', presupposes that Trump negotiated NAFTA a year ago and the results were very fruitful. He wants to draw the attention of the audience to the fact that it was only through his intervention that the situation has changed and by so doing, motivating them to support his upcoming strategies to raise the economy.

Trump directs his attack at NAFTA, which stands for the [North American Free Trade Agreement](). It is a treaty that former President Bill Clinton signed between Canada, Mexico and the United States, which aims at removing trade barriers between them. Trump disagrees with it and thinks its repercussions are not in favor of the Americans in terms of job loss and suppressed wages. He promises to 'renegotiate NAFTA' and states: "We're bringing our jobs back……They're going to start hiring people…..We are going to start the engine rolling again" (cf. Appendix A, extract 5). The use of the change-of-state verb 'bring back' presupposes that plenty of jobs used to exist before the NAFTA deal, which has led to the loss of many jobs as many manufacturing companies moved to Mexico because labor was cheap. The use of the verb 'start' two times presupposes that American economy used to be very strong compared to the current status. Trump fires another attack at NAFTA; when asked about his opinion with regard to Obamacare, he says: "And that will be as bad as NAFTA". The comparative structure presupposes that NAFTA was a very bad decision.

Hilary Clinton accused Trump of building his hotel from Chinese steel which was illegally dumped into the American markets. She further

attacks him for using 'Chinese steelworkers, not American steelworkers' to build the hotel. In his response to her accusations, he outsmarts her by throwing the ball again saying: "Why the hell didn't you do it over the last 15, 20 years?" (cf. Appendix A, extract 6). In fact, Trump's question presupposes Clinton, while being a Senator, did not contribute positively to prohibit people from shipping jobs to other countries. During the debate, it has been proven that Trump is in a continuous state of denial. When Wallace, the moderator, investigates the case of the nine women who accused Trump of groping and kissing them by force, he immediately defends himself by saying: "I believe it was her campaign that did it" (cf. Appendix A, extract 7). The cleft construction presupposes that Clinton's campaign hired those women to distort Trump's image in front of the people.

Instead of refuting the claims of the nine women by providing evidence to support his positon, he shifts to a different thesis, which is Clinton's deliberate deletion of 33,000 emails. He states: "---what isn't fictionalized are her emails", "----what happened to the FBI, I don't know" (cf. Appendix A, extract 8). Trump uses pseudo-cleft sentences as presuppositional constructions. It should be noted that Clinton was asked in late 2014 by the State Department to submit any emails related to work. Clinton had already started deleting some emails prior to that request, justifying this by saying they were personal emails. On the other hand, Republicans accused Hilary of using a private server and deliberately deleted the emails to hide the federal records laws. After a thorough investigation, the FBI declared the truth that Clinton was not guilty of anything.

In fact, the first pseudo-cleft sentence: "---what isn't fictionalized are her emails" presupposes that Clinton's deletion of a total of 33,000 emails is something that is not invented or imagined; it is a fact that is known and acknowledged; whereas the second pseudo-cleft sentence: "----what happened to the FBI, I don't know" presupposes that the FBI's blessing of Clinton's deletion of the emails is incomprehensible, questionable and does not promote transparency. In fact, Trump's usage of these structural

presuppostions aims to distort Clinton's image by his flagrant declaration of how corrupted and inefficient she is.

When asked about his plan to 'push ISIS out of Mosul' and whether he approves of sending U.S. troops to ensure they are never back again, Trump primarily expresses his repudiation to Clinton's decision when she decided to leave Mosul and his dissatisfaction with the current decision to restore it. He states: "----But when she left, she took everybody out, we lost Mosul", "Now we're fighting again to get Mosul" (cf. Appendix a, extract 9).

The use of the 'change-of-state' verbs 'left', 'lost' and 'took' and the iterative 'again' presupposes that the U.S. troops were once in full control of Mosul; they fought before to earn a territory. Trump goes on to question the reasonableness of this decision by saying: "….if you look at what's happening, much tougher than they thought….Much more dangerous, going to be more deaths" (cf. Appendix A, extract 10). The use of this series of comparisons presupposes that when the U.S. decided to take Mosul before, it was not an easy task as the situation was dangerous, tough and caused the death of many lives. Trump wants to paint a dim picture by displaying how incompetent the current government is.

In trying to solve the problem of the national debt, Trumps reassures the audience that he is going to raise the GDP which stands for gross domestic product. It is 'the total value of everything produced by all the people and companies in the country'. He promises to create "a tremendous economic machine once again. To do that, we're taking back jobs" (cf. Appendix A, extract 11). The use of the iterative 'again' and the verb 'take back' presupposes that America's economy used to be strong and people used to have jobs. Trump blatantly criticizes the current 'political establishment' by saying that "We don't make our product anymore-----We've become very, very sloppy" (cf. Appendix A, extract 11). The use of the iterative 'anymore' and the verb 'become' presupposes that there used to be manufacturers who produced U.S. products which made America dexterous and superior. He concludes by

saying: "---and people, ---, will again go back to work" (cf. Appendix A, extract 12). The use of the iterative 'again' and the verb 'go back' presupposes that people used to have jobs and that they were skillful and clever; a state which stands in contrast to the current situation.

Trump concedes his contempt for the Affordable Care Act, which he calls 'Obamacare'. He thinks if sustained, it can make the situation "even worse and it can't get any worse" (cf. Appendix A, extract 13). The comparative structures trigger a presupposition that people are suffering from the negative consequences of the current health insurance system: they have to pay higher premiums and more taxes. Trump claims that it is a 'disaster and suggests that it should be overhauled. He stresses his point of view by addressing Clinton and saying: "Your husband disagrees with you". The use of the non-implicative verb 'disagree' presupposes that former president Bill Clinton disapproves of this current health insurance system and calls it 'the craziest thing in the world'. This shows that Trump has no political experience; he does not use evidence and reliable sources to support his claims, but rather any means to weaken Clinton's position and prove her inefficiency as a president.

In his closing words, Trump believes there is a strong relationship between America being restored to its previous glorious and superior status and him becoming president. This has been ostentatious when he says: "---we are going to make America great again and it has to start now" (cf. Appendix A, extract 14). The lexical item 'again' presupposes that America used to be great and his being elected president will ensure its restoration to its former greatness. The verb 'start' denotes a change-of-state, in the sense that all the resources that have been dormant and stagnant under the current political establishment will flourish and blossom again.

The foregoing section has scrutinized the different kinds of pragmatic presuppositions used by Trump in the third and final presidential debate. Presuppositions have been triggered mainly by cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions, comparative structures, iterative predicates, change-of-state verbs and adverbial clauses. The following section examines Grice's

maxims and conversational implicatures; it is shown that Trump has deliberately violated most of the maxims that have been reviewed earlier, namely: the maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner. This violation of the maxims of the "co-operative principle" has been incorporated in Trump's speeches, in order to generate certain implicatures which convey his incompetent but flamboyant personality as a debater in the course of the analysis.

1.4.1.2. Implicature

The maxim of quantity has not been observed in many instances during Trump's contribution in the debate. When Wallace, the moderator asks him about his opinion with regard to the Supreme Court and to how the constitution should be interpreted, Trump announces his disapproval of the current justices by referring to justice Ginsburg who "made inappropriate statements toward me and toward a tremendous number of people. Many, many millions of people that I represent and she was forced to apologize. And apologize she did. But these were statements that should have never, ever been made" (cf. Appendix B, extract 1). Trump deliberately violates the maxim of quantity in order to highlight how inefficient the current government is by referring to a private incident with justice Ginsburg instead of directly answering the question. Trump goes on to describe the second amendment as being "under absolute siege--------and under absolute trauma" (cf. Appendix B, extract 2). He flouts the maxim of quality by using figurative language to convey how the second amendment is being criticized, but does not provide any reason or proof as to why and how it faces a lot of problems and questions.

Trump supports and upholds the second amendment; hence endorses the right of citizens to carry guns. When Wallace asks him to justify his support, he states: "-----I am a very supporter of the second amendment. And I don't know if Hillary was saying it in a sarcastic manner but I'm very proud to have the endorsement of the NRA and it was the earliest endorsement they've ever given to anybody who ran for president. So I am very honored by all of that. We are going to appoint justices, this is

the best way to help the second amendment. We are going to appoint justices that will feel very strongly about the second amendment. That will not do damage to the second amendment". (cf. Appendix B, extract 3). It is obvious that Trump's response is incomplete; it does not include any reasons or examples as to why he supports the 'national right-to-carry law'; hence violates the maxim of manner, which states that speakers should 'be orderly' in a conversation.

In addition to this, Trump repeats the same exact words such as 'we are going to appoint justices', 'the second amendment' and 'endorsement'. In fact, using unnecessary statements entails that the same amount of information could have been conveyed more briefly; hence flouting the maxim of manner which expects speakers to 'be brief'. Finally, Trump's use of hyperbolic expressions such as 'it was the earliest endorsement they've ever given to anybody who ran for president' and 'this is the best way to help the second amendment'. Hyperbole is triggered by the use of the superlative forms 'earliest', 'ever given', 'best'. This stimulates suspicion as to whether the information presented is credible or not, especially when he does not provide any evidence to support his claim. Hence contravenes the maxim of quality. Trump is shown to be an evasive candidate who lacks political competence.

Trump's reaction to the global issue of 'late term partial abortions' stands in contrast to Clinton's attitude as she advocates the idea that women have the right to 'make their own healthcare decision'. He expresses his reaction by saying: "Well I think it is terrible. If you go with what Hilary is saying, in the ninth month you can take baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby. Now, you can say that that is ok and Hilary can say that that is ok, but it's not ok with me. Because based on what she is saying and based on where she's going and where she's been, you can take baby and rip the baby out of the womb. In the ninth month. On the final day. And that's not acceptable" (cf. Appendix B, extract 4). Trump blatantly flouts the maxim of quantity: he explicitly states again Hilary's opinion which has already been explained thoroughly in the preceding response; second, he repeats the same idea of ripping the baby out of a mother's womb in the ninth

month twice in the same paragraph. This is done with the purpose of misrepresenting Hilary through emphasizing her inhumane attitude with regard to the subject of late abortion and at the same time, appealing to the audience's emotions.

Wallace asks Trump directly whether he condemns the Russian intervention in the American election. Trump responds by saying: "Of course I condemn, of course I condemn- I don't know Putin. I have no idea----- I never met Putin. This is not my best friend. But if the United States got along with Russia, it wouldn't be so bad ------Putin has outsmarted her and Obama at every single step of the way" (cf. Appendix B, extract 5). Trump's response is very misleading and reveals an attempt on his part to shift the focus of the interaction as what he says is not relevant to the acceptable course of the conversation. He violates the maxim of relevance with the aim of distracting the attention of the audience to what he declares: "Of course I condemn" because he actually does not mind getting along with Russia.

Clinton accuses Trump of using Chinese steel and Chinese workers in building his hotel and promises to 'enforce agreements' that encourage people to buy 'American products'. Trump daringly responds by saying: "Why the hell didn't you do it over the last 15, 20 years?" (cf. Appendix B, extract 6). He violates the maxim of relevance because instead of refuting the accusation, he admits the charge against him; that dumping Chinese steel into the market and using it, is something illegal. Another instance where Trump violates the maxim of relevance is when the topic of the federal income tax is raised and Clinton accuses Trump of not paying his taxes. Again, instead of refuting the claim, he acknowledges that Clinton's donors who took "hundreds of millions of dollars" "have done the same thing" (cf. Appendix B, extract 7) as he did, i.e., did not pay the federal taxes. Trump's utterances are not relevant to the acceptable course of the conversation; hence the maxim of relevance is violated.

Wallace asks Trump whether he is going to 'accept the result of the election' irrespective of who the winner is, Trump chooses to mislead the

moderator by giving a very ambiguous and indirect response: "I will look at it at the time. I'm not looking at anything now, I'll look at it at the time" (cf. Appendix B, extract 8). Later on, when asked the same question, he says: "What I'm saying is that I will tell you at the time. I'll keep you in suspense, okay?" (cf. Appendix B, extract 9). He violates the maxim of manner which assumes that speakers will 'avoid ambiguity' and 'be brief' in conversations. Trump does not provide a clear answer to the question and keeps repeating the same exact words which sheds light on his evasive character.

Trump uses a lot of hyperbolic expressions and proves that he is an inconsistent politician who is in a continuous state of denial to all accusations and his responses are a clear manifestation of his evasive character. He violates almost all the maxims of the Cooperative Principle. After examining the pragmatic tools, namely: pragmatic presupposition and conversational implicatures, the following section provides a detailed explanation of some of the stylistic tools which embody Trump's style and discourse.

1.4.1.3. Stylistic Tools

Trump's style abounds in metaphors, irony, hyperbole, parallelism and repetition. Each of these rhetorical devices are explored in the course of the analysis. First, Trump's use of metaphors is obvious in a lot of instances. For example, he uses a horrific image when he expresses his reaction towards the issue of abortion which continues to inspire political battles and proposals for constitutional change. Trump, in his response to Clinton's declaration of her endorsement to the 'late term partial birth abortions' if carrying on pregnancy threatens women's health, comments by saying: "---in the ninth month you can take baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby" (cf. Appendix C, extract 1). Trump's use of the abominable expression 'rip the baby out' reveals his lack of stylistic finesses and even Hilary describes this imagery as 'scary rhetoric'. Trump compares the baby in their mother's womb to something that becomes torn after being pulled

suddenly and violently. Trump's ideology is apparent here as he displays an appealing image of himself as being 'pro-life'.

Trump advocates the idea of building strong borders to ensure that the country is safe and secure. He thinks that with the current situation, i.e., with illegal and 'undocumented people coming in, "drugs are pouring in through the border", "--- heroin --pours across our southern borders" (cf. Appendix C, extract 2). Trump compares drugs such as heroin to liquids that flow continuously. He uses this imagery to accentuate the notion of having strong borders to protect the youths from these drugs which jeopardize their health and destroy their future. It is clear that Trump is drawing a dim and gloomy picture of the current situation emphasizing that Americans are victims of the former government that takes a cavalier attitude to critical issues that threaten the security of the country. His ideology of domination is obvious as he is conceived of as the person who is going to save the country.

Trump ensures that his strategy creates more jobs and contributes to the growth of the economy. He declares: "We are going to start the engine rolling again" (cf. Appendix C, extract 3). Trump compares the economy of the country to an engine which has stopped working and assures the audience that it is going to start working again. He points out that the economy of the country has declined and people are suffering from a period of recession according to the GDP. Again, Trump's ideologies are highlighted as he paints a pessimistic picture of the current situation and depicts the Americans as victims of it and his plan is the only means of reestablishing the economy.

Trump believes that allowing refugees from Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, and other war zones to enter the country threatens its national security because many terrorist attacks take place. He expresses his concern by saying: "---this is going to be the great Trojan horse" (cf. Appendix C, extract 4). Trump's use of this metaphorical expression invites the audience to identify with him by drawing a vivid image that delineates the tragedy. He compares the refugees to the Trojan horse that is perilous to the national security. Trump takes advantage of the deteriorated

situation in Aleppo and the issue of the refugees to attack Clinton and criticize her imprudent and short-sighted decision to fight Assad.

Hyperbole is one of the five rhetorical devices that permeates Trump's discourse. He employs this tool to emphasize his ideas and magnify the deficiencies and inadequacies of the former government. Trump's prospective policy is to reduce the crime rate by deporting all the undocumented people. Therefore, he considers Clinton's decision to 'give amnesty' "a disaster" (cf. Appendix C, extract 5). He maximizes the situation to give credit to his forthcoming policy which ensures peace and fairness. Trump also describes Clinton's plan to reduce taxes as a "disaster" (cf. Appendix C, extract 6) as he believes it is going to double the taxes. Moreover, he represents the Affordable Care Act as "the disaster known as Obamacare. It is destroying our country" (cf. Appendix C, extract 7). Trump refers to the ACT as Obamacare as he thinks the Democratic President is responsible for its outcomes which he promises to repeal. He also depicts the situation in Aleppo as a "disaster" and "a humanitarian nightmare" (cf. Appendix C, extract 8) as it has caused the death of many people. Furthermore, Trump asserts that "our cities are a disaster. You get shot walking to the store". He magnifies the fact that people feel insecure because of the terrorist attacks. In fact, Trump's exaggeration of these situations aims to feature the state of the economy and politics as inept and incompetent.

When the topic of drugs is brought to the surface, Trump reacts to this issue by saying: "The single biggest problem is heroin" (cf. Appendix C, extract 9). The exaggeration is triggered by the suffix-est which creates the superlative form of the adjective big. Using the noun phrase 'the single' is a false estimation because Americans are definitely suffering from other problems. Trump wants to draw the attention of the audience by using excessive language. Another instance where Trump resorts to exaggeration is when he describes the NAFTA deal that was signed by former President Bill Clinton as "one of the worst deals ever made of any kind signed by anybody" (cf. Appendix C, extract 10). Trump augments the disadvantages of this free trade agreement and overlooks its benefits which reveals his lack of objectivity. Trump adopts the strategy of

'positive self-evaluation' and exaggerates in doing this. For instance, when he talks about his achievements, he says: "I built a phenomenal company----some of the greatest assets anywhere in the world----".

Trump resorts to generalization in order to magnify the situation and accentuate his point of view. For instance, when he stresses the importance of building strong borders, he says: "----they all want the wall" (cf, Appendix C, extract 11). This is an illogical reasoning because not all Americans approve of building a wall. Another instance is when Clinton accuses Trump of not paying his federal taxes, he counterattacks her by saying "—all of her donors, just about all of them-----took hundreds of millions of dollars" (cf. Appendix C, extract 12) without paying their taxes as well. This is an exaggeration which aims to weaken Clinton's popularity and position as a presidential nominee.

Trump utters some sarcastic statements which are considered bold because they imply something contrary to what he actually means. For instance, Trump thinks that America's policy in Iraq paves the way for Iran to gain control of Iraq which means that Mosul is going to suffer more. He expresses his concern and fear ironically by saying: "Mosul is going to be a wonderful thing" (cf. Appendix C, extract 13). Trump means the opposite of what he says; he implies that under the current policy, Mosul is going to disintegrate and fall apart. Another instance where Trump wants to show the audience that Clinton is politically incompetent and short-sighted is when he raises the issue of the Syrian refugees who are now entering the country and, who he calls 'ISIS-aligned'. Trump reassures the audience that because of Clinton's misjudgment, America's national security is threatened. He addresses her sarcastically: "Lots of luck, Hillary. Thanks a lot for doing a great job" (cf. Appendix C, extract 14). Trump's intended meaning is contrary to the literal one that he utters as he thinks Clinton's policy is tearing the country apart.

Trump's discourse is characterized by the use of different types of repetition and syntactic parallelism. As for repetition, he largely deploys pronominal, phrasal and clausal repetition in order to convey and clarify

his ideas and ideologies. Trump uses the first person plural 'we' as a generic pronoun which invokes a sense of unity and comprehensiveness as it stands for the American nation as a whole. Trump expresses the necessity and urgency of building a wall, a strong border to protect the country by saying: "We either have a country or we don't. We're a country of laws. We either have a border or we don't" (cf. Appendix C, extract 15). The repetition of the pronoun 'we' aims to build a unified identity between Trump and the audience and to enhance the idea that both share the responsibility of maintaining the safety of the country. When Trump introduces his prospective plan to restore America to its former economic glory, he says: "We're taking back jobs. We're not going to let our companies be raided by other countries where we lose our jobs-----We have the greatest business people----We have to use them----We have to use our great people---We will create an economic machine" (cf. Appendix C, extract 16). Trump's ideology of domination is apparent; he wants to control the mind and attitude of the audience by cleverly drawing a bright picture of the future of America under his reign. He smartly achieves this by using the pronoun 'we' which implies that he does not speak as an individual, but wants to enhance unanimity and solidarity in order to bring the whole nation together.

Trump uses the pronoun 'they' when he wants to create a distance between the Americans and the other parties which he considers as foes. For example, when he refers to Obama and Clinton, he uses the pronoun 'they' in order to create a gap between them and the audience. He skillfully does this when he refers to them as the main source of violence and chaos that spread in the country: "They hired people. They paid them 1500 dollars, and they're on tape saying be violent--" (cf. Appendix C, extract 17). The repetition of the pronoun 'they' emphasizes Trump's idea and persuades the audience that Obama and Clinton's policies and intentions stand in contrast to his ideologies, which are primarily devoted to promoting change for the welfare of all Americans.

Phrasal repetition occurs plenty of times in Trump's interaction. For instance, when Wallace, the moderator faces Trump with the claim submitted by nine women accusing him of groping and kissing them

without their approval, Trump immediately denies these claims and says: "I didn't know these women. I didn't see these women. These women---" (cf. Appendix C, extract 18). Trump's repetition of the phrase 'these women' emphasizes the idea that he does not know them and wants to convince the audience that these claims are lies and have been created to distort his image by his foes and affect his popularity. Another instance where he uses phrasal repetition is when he refers to the justices that he is going to appoint. He tries to emphasize that they are the right people who are going to implement the constitution as it is meant to be interpreted and ensure justice among Americans. He declares: "They will have a conservative bent. They will be protecting the second amendment. They will interpret the constitution the way the founders wanted it interpreted" (cf. Appendix C, extract 19). Trump's repetition of the phrase 'They will' aims to convince the audience with his political views and draw a positive image of himself.

Phrasal repetition has also been manifested when Trump refers to the negative consequences of the NAFTA deal in terms of the massive loss of jobs, he tries to emphasize that the whole nation is living a crisis by saying: "… You go to Pennsylvania, you go to Ohio, you go to Florida, you go to any of them. You go to upstate New York…" (cf. Appendix C, extract 20). The repetition of the phrase 'you go to' is used to emphasize the current ordeal and stress the fact that the economic crisis permeates all the states equally. It also expresses Trump's certainty and confidence that all Americans are suffering from the loss of jobs.

Trump manifests his manipulation of the language to serve his political purposes by deploying clausal repetition. For instance, when Trump refers to Clinton's political incompetence, he says: "She has been outsmarted by Putin and all you have to do is look at the Middle East. They've taken over-------She has been outsmarted---" (cf. Appendix C, extract 21). Trump wants to emphasize that Clinton is politically inept. Another instance is when Trump refers to the fact that America is protecting a lot of countries including the rich ones, which he believes should pay in return for this service. He questions the current situation by saying: "Why aren't they paying? ------Why aren't they paying?" and

declares: "They have to pay up. We're protecting people. They have to pay up. And I'm a big fan of NATO but they have to pay up" (cf. Appendix C, extract 22). Trump's repetition of the rhetorical question 'why aren't they paying?' and the clause 'they have to pay up' accentuates the idea that the political establishment is inefficient and incapable of keeping the rights of the Americans and his call for the important financial contribution of the rich countries empowers his positon as a presidential nominee.

Syntactic parallelism is manifested in Trump's language when he expresses his concern about drugs invading the country. He describes them as "pouring and destroying their youth—poisoning the blood of their youth" (cf. Appendix C, extract 23). The successive occurrence of the gerunds 'pouring, destroying and poisoning" creates a rhythmic flow which emphasizes the hazardous impact of drugs on Americans, especially the youth. Moreover, Trump employs parallelism when he represents the current economic crisis which America is suffering from. He points out that America is not producing or manufacturing any product per se, instead, "our product is pouring in from China, pouring in from Vietnam, pouring in from all over the world" (cf. Appendix C, extract 24). Trump wants to highlight the seriousness of the economic situation which has resulted from the transference of enormous jobs in different fields to other countries

1.5 Conclusion

After analyzing Trump's language in the third and final presidential debate, it has been witnessed that some of the pragmatic devices, namely; pragmatic presupposition and conversational implicature and stylistic features such as metaphor, irony, hyperbole, repetition and syntactic parallelism, have been manifested as key tools in his rhetoric. Trump's usage of these linguistic strategies proves that he is a political outsider who is in a continuous state of denial to all accusations. In fact, these linguistic features have helped to a great extent demystify Trump's ideologies toward critical social issues. He succeeds in manipulating the minds of the audience by frequently presenting the Americans as victims

of the former government whose incompetence and bad judgement have led people to suffer socially, economically and politically.

In addition to this, he exploits the deteriorating situation in Iraq, the national insecurity and the economic recession to launch an attack at Clinton's political conduct in order to distort her image and weaken her popularity. Moreover, Trump exercises mind control of the audience by always drawing a bright picture of the future under his reign; he has promised to raise the economy, build strong borders, appoint 'pro-life' justices and work hard for the welfare of the citizens. In fact, these promises and calls for unity are a means of dominating and controlling the minds of the audience.

It is worth mentioning that the aforementioned ideologies of victimization, exploitation and domination have been manifested through the use of the pragmatic and stylistic devices. For instance, Presuppositions, which have been triggered mainly by cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions, comparative structures, iterative predicates, change-of-state verbs and adverbial clauses, have been manifested in Trump's language to shed light on the misconduct of the former government and particularly on Clinton's political short-sightedness.

Trump violates almost all the maxims of the Cooperative Principle which proves that he is a political outsider and an evasive person. He flouts the maxim of relevance in many instances during the debate and resorts to unnecessary restatements in order to emphasize his ideas instead of evidences to support his positon. Sometimes he provides insufficient information; hence opts out the maxim of quantity. Trump does not resort to logic or substantial evidences, but rather to rhetorical tools to persuade the audience and enhance his position. Trump violates the maxim of manner in terms of being 'ambiguous' and redundant. Finally, his frequent use of the stylistic devices, namely: metaphor, hyperbole, irony, repetition and syntactic parallelism has emphasized his ideas, served to convince the audience with his political views and have delineated the inadequacies of the former government.

References

Primary sources:
Presidential Debate
https://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/full-transcript-third-2016-presidential-debate-230063
Secondary Sources:

Barthes, R. (1970) *Writing Degree Zero*. Boston: Beacon Press (translated by Lavers A. and Smith C.), pp. 16

Booth, W. C. (1974). *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cabrejas-Peñuelas, A. B., & Díez-Prados, M. (2014). Positive self-evaluation versus negative other-evaluation in the political genre of pre-election debates. *Discourse & Society*, *25*(2), 159-185.

Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in Educational Discourse*. A&C Black.

Curbelo, A. A. (2017). *Analysing The (AB) Use of Language in Politics: The Case of Donald Trump*: Working Paper. University of Pristol.

Davies, B. (2000). Grice's cooperative principle: Getting the meaning across. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics*, *8*, 1-26.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.

Farghal, M. & Shunnaq, A. (1999) .Translation with Reference to English and Arabic. Irbid: Dar Al Hilal for Translation.

Fowler, R. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Green, G. M. (1989). *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*. Routledge.

Grice, H.P. (1975). 'Logic and conversation' In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (eds.) Syntax *and Semantics*, Volume 3. New York: Academic Press. pp. 41-58.

Horn, L., & Ward, G. (Eds.). (2008). *The handbook of pragmatics* (Vol. 26). John Wiley & Sons.

Kress, G. (1985). Discourses, texts, readers and the pro-nuclear arguments. In P. Chilton (Ed.), *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate*: Nukespeak Today. London, 65-87.

Kurnianingsih, I. H. (2017). Rhetoric In The US Second Presidential Debate In 2016: A Discursive Stylistic Study. *Sastra Inggris-Quill*, *6*(8), 806-815.

Le, T., Le, Q., & Short, M. (2009). *Critical Discourse Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Perspective.* Nova Science Publishers.

Leech, G. N. (1969). *A linguistic guide to English poetry* (Vol. 4). Routledge.

Leech, G. & Short, M. 2007. *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* (2nd Edition). Pearson Education Limited: Edinburgh.

Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Lezana Escribano, M. (2017). Denotation and Connotation in Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump: discourse analysis of the 2016 presidential debates.

Liu, K. & Guo, F. (2016). A Review on Critical Discourse Analysis: *The Journal of Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 6* (5), 1076-1084.

Mazid, M. B. (1999). *Ideology and Control in Some Speech and Newspaper Genres: A Politicolinguistic Approach to Discourse Analysis* (unpublished Doctoral dissertation).

Short, M. (1989). *Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of* Drama. In R. Carter and P. Simpson (Eds)., pp. 139-168.

Stalnaker, Robert C. (1972). Pragmatics. In Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman(eds.), *Semantics of Natural Language*, 380–97. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Stewart, P. A., Eubanks, A. D., Dye, R. G., Eidelman, S., & Wicks, R. H. (2017). Visual Presentation Style 2: Influences on Perceptions of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton Based on Visual Presentation Style During the Third 2016 Presidential Debate. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *61*(5), 545-557.

Tenorio, E. H. (2011). "Critical discourse analysis, an overview". *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 10*(1), 183-210.

van Dijk, T. A. (1995). *Aims of critical discourse analysis*. Japanese discourse, 1(1), 17-28.

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). "What is political discourse analysis". *Belgian Journal of Linguistics, 11*(1), 11-52. doi:10.1075/bjl.11.03dij

van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, London: Sage

Wales, K. (1989). *A dictionary of stylistics*. Routledge.

Wang, J. (2016). "A New Political and Communication Agenda for Political Discourse Analysis: Critical Reflections on Critical Discourse Analysis and Political Discourse Analysis": *International Journal of Communication, Vol. 10* (19), 2766-2784.

Wodak, R. (1989). *Language, Power and Ideology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis.* Sage.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Hongkong: Oxford University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A: Pragmatic Presupposition

Extract 1

Trump: ---They're coming in illegally. Drugs are pouring in through the border.   We   have no country if we have no border. Hillary wants to give amnesty. She wants to have open borders. As you know, the border patrol agents, 16,500 plus I.C.E. last week endorsed me. First time they've endorsed a candidate. It means their job is tougher. But they know what's going on. They know it better than anybody.

Extract 2

Trump: ---Now, you can come back in and you can become a citizen. But it's very unfair. We have millions of people that did it the right way. They're on line. They're waiting. We're going to speed up the process bigly, because it's very inefficient. But they're on line and they're waiting to become citizens.

Extract 3

Trump: --- Very unfair that somebody runs across the border, becomes a citizen. Under her plan you have open borders. You would have a disaster on trade and and you will have a disaster with your open borders. What she doesn't say is that President Obama has deported millions and millions of people.

Extract 4

Trump: ---Since I did this, this was a year ago. All of a sudden they're paying. And I've been given a lot of credit for it. All of a sudden, they're starting to pay up. They have to pay up. We're protecting people. They have to pay up. And I'm a big fan of NATO but they have to pay up.

Extract 5

Trump: ---We're bringing our jobs back. I'm going to renegotiate NAFTA. And if I can't make a great deal, then we're going to terminate NAFTA and we're going to create new deals. We're going to have trade but we're going to terminate it. We're going on make a great trade deal. If we can't, we're going to go our separate way because it has been a disaster. We're going to cut taxes massively. We're going to cut business taxes massively. They're going to start hiring people we're going to bring the $2.5 trillion that's offshore back into the country. We are going to start the engine rolling again—

Extract 6

Trump: Can I ask a simple question? She's been doing this for 30 years. Why the hell didn't you do it over the last 15, 20 years? You were very much involved.

Extract 7

Trump: Well, first of all, those stories have been largely debunked. Those people, I don't know those people. I have a feeling how they came. I believe it was her campaign that did it.

Extract 8

Trump: ---But I will tell you what isn't fictionalized are her e-mails where she destroyed 33,000 e-mails criminally, criminally after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress. What happened to the FBI, I don't know. We have a great general, four-star general, today you read it in all the papers going to potentially serve five years in jail for lying to the FBI, one lie.

Extract 9

Trump: Let me tell you, Mosul is so sad. We had Mosul. But when she left, she took everybody out, we lost Mosul. Now we're fighting again to get Mosul. The problem with Mosul and what they wanted to do is they wanted to get the leaders of ISIS who they felt were in Mosul.

Extract 10

Trump: ----But who is going to get Mosul really? We'll take Mosul eventually. By the way, if you look at what's happening, much tougher than they thought. Much, much tougher. Much more dangerous, going to be more deaths than they thought. But the leaders that we wanted to get are all gone because they're smart.

Extract 11

Trump: Well I saw they're wrong because I'm going to create tremendous jobs. And we're bringing GDP from really 1%, which is what it is now, and if she got in, it would be less than zero, but we're bringing it from 1% up to 4%, and I actually think we can go higher than 4%. I think you can go to 5% or 6%. And if we do, you don't have to bother asking your question. Because we have a tremendous machine. We will have created a tremendous economic machine once again. To do that, we're taking back jobs. We're not going to let our companies be raided by other countries where we lose all our jobs. We don't make our product anymore. It's very sad, but I am going to create a… the kind of a country that we were from the standpoint of industry. We used to be there. We've given it up. We've become very, very sloppy.

Extract 12

Trump: ---But that being said, we will create an economic machine the likes of which we haven't seen in many decades and people, Chris, will again go back to work, and they'll make a lot of money, and we'll have companies that will will grow and expand and start from new.

Extract 13

Trump: ---And I'm really glad that the premiums have started, at least the people see what's happening because she wants to keep Obamacare and she wants to make it even worse and it can't get any worse. Bad health care at the most expensive price. We have to repeal and replace Obamacare.

Extract 14

Trump: ---All she's done is talk to the African-Americans and to the Latinos, but they get the vote and then they come back, they say 'we'll see you in four years.' We are going to make America strong again and we are going to make America great again and it has to start now. We cannot take four more years of Barack Obama, and that's what you get when you get her.

Appendix B: Conversational Implicature

Extract 1

Trump: Well, first of all, it's so great to be with you and thank you, everybody. The Supreme Court, it is what it is all about. Our country is so, so, it is just so imperative that we have the right justices. Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some very inappropriate statements toward me and toward a tremendous number of people. Many, many millions of people that I represent and she was forced to apologize. And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made.

Extract 2

Trump: ---We need a Supreme Court that in my opinion is going to uphold the second amendment and all amendments, but the second amendment which is under absolute siege. I believe, if my opponent should win this race, which I truly don't think will happen, we will have a second amendment which will be a very, very small replica of what it is right now. But I feel that it is absolutely important that we uphold because of the fact that it is under such trauma.

Extract 3

Trump: Well, let me just tell you before we go any further, in Chicago, which has the toughest gun laws in the United States, probably you could say by far, they have more gun violence than any other city. So we have the toughest laws and you have tremendous gun violence. I am a very strong supporter of the second amendment. And I don't know if Hillary was saying it in a sarcastic manner but I'm very proud to have the endorsement of the NRA and it was the earliest endorsement they've ever given to anybody who ran for president. So I'm very honored by all of that. We are going to appoint justices, this is the best

way to help the second amendment. We are going to appoint justices that will feel very strongly about the second amendment. That will not do damage to the second amendment.

Extract 4

Trump: Well I think it is terrible. If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month you can take baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby. Now, you can say that that is okay and Hillary can say that that is okay, but it's not okay with me. Because based on what she is saying and based on where she's going and where she's been, you can take baby and rip the baby out of the womb. In the ninth month. On the final day. And that's not acceptable.

Extract 5

Wallace: Do you condemn their interference?

Trump: Of course I condemn, of course I condemn - I don't know Putin. I have no idea-

Wallace: I'm not asking you that.

Trump: I never met Putin. This is not my best friend. But if the United States got along with Russia, it wouldn't be so bad. Let me tell you, Putin has outsmarted her and Obama at every single step of the way. Whether it is Syria. You name it. Missiles. Take a look at the start-up that they signed. The Russians have said, according to many, many reports, I can't believe they allowed us to do this. They create warheads and we can't. The Russians can't believe it. She has been outsmarted by Putin and all you have to do is look at the Middle East. They've taken over. We've spent $6 trillion. They've taken over the Middle East.

Extract 6

Trump: Can I ask a simple question? She's been doing this for 30 years. Why the hell didn't you do it over the last 15, 20 years? You were very much involved.

Extract 7

Trump: We're entitled because of the laws that people like her pass to take massive amounts of depreciation on other charges and we do it. And all of her donors, just about all of them. I know Buffett took hundreds of millions of dollars. Soros, George Soros took hundreds of millions of dollars.

Wallace: Mr. Trump --

Trump: --Let me just explain. All of her donors. Most of her donors --

Wallace: Mr. Trump --

Trump: Have done the same thing as I did. And you know what she should have done? You know Hillary, what you should have done? You should have changed the law when you were a United States senator if you don't like it --

Extract 8

Trump: I will look at it at the time. I'm not looking at anything now, I'll look at it at the time. What I've seen, what I've seen, is so bad. First of all, the media is so dishonest and so corrupt and the pile on is so amazing. "The New York Times" actually wrote an article about it, but they don't even care. It is so dishonest, and they have poisoned the minds of the voters. But unfortunately for them, I think the voters are seeing through it. I think they're going to see through it, we'll find out on November 8th, but I think they're going to see through it. If you look --

Extract 9

Trump: What I'm saying is that I will tell you at the time. I'll keep you in suspense, okay?

Appendix C: Stylistic Tools

Extract 1

Trump: Well I think it is terrible. If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month you can take baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby. Now, you can say that that is okay and Hillary can say that that is okay, but it's not okay with me. Because based on what she is saying and based on where she's going and where she's been, you can take baby and rip the baby out of the womb. In the ninth month. On the final day. And that's not acceptable.

Extract 2

Trump: They're coming in illegally. Drugs are pouring in through the border. We have no country if we have no border. Hillary wants to give amnesty. She wants to have open borders. As you know, the border patrol agents, 16,500 plus I.C.E. last week endorsed me. First time they've endorsed a candidate. It means their job is tougher. But they know what's going on. They know it better than

anybody. They want strong borders. They feel we have to have strong borders. I was up in New Hampshire the other day. The biggest complaint they have, it's with all the problems going on in the world, many of the problems caused by Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama. All of the problems. The single biggest problem is heroin that pours across our southern borders.

Extract 3

Trump: ----- We're going to cut taxes massively. We're going to cut business taxes massively. They're going to start hiring people we're going to bring the $2.5 trillion that's offshore back into the country. We are going to start the engine rolling again because right now, our country is dying. At 1% GDP.

Extract 4

Trump: ----- And this is what's caused the Great Migration where she's taking in tens of thousands of Syrian refugees, who probably in many cases -- not probably, who are definitely in many cases, ISIS-aligned. And we now have them in our country. Wait til you see -- this is going to be the great Trojan horse. Wait til you see what happens in the coming years. Lots of luck, Hillary. Thanks a lot for doing a great job.

Extract 5

Trump: Well first of all, she wants to give amnesty, which is a disaster. And very unfair to all of the people waiting in line for many, many years. We need strong borders.

Extract 6

Trump: Well, first of all, before I start on my plan, her plan is going to raise taxes and even double your taxes. Her tax plan is a disaster.

Extract 7

Trump: It is going to totally help you. And one thing we have to do is repeal and replace the disaster known as Obamacare. It's destroying our country. It's destroying our businesses, our small business and our big businesses. We have to repeal and replace Obamacare.

Extract 8

Trump: Well Aleppo is a disaster. It's a humanitarian nightmare, but it has fallen from any standpoint. What do you need, a signed document? Take a look at Aleppo. It is so sad when you see what's happened.

Extract 9

Trump: -----The single biggest problem is heroin that pours across our southern borders. Just pouring and destroying their youth It is poisoning the blood of their youth and plenty of other people. We have to have strong borders. We have to keep the drugs out of our country.

Extract 10

Trump: Chris, I think it's -- I think I should respond. First of all, I had a very good meeting with the President of Mexico. Very nice man. We will be doing very much better with Mexico on trade deals. Believe me. The NAFTA deal signed by her husband is one of the worst deals ever made of any kind signed by anybody. It's a disaster---.

Extract 11

Trump: ---- We need strong borders. We need absolute, we cannot give amnesty. Now, I want to build the wall. We need the wall. The border patrol, I.C.E., they all want the wall-----.

Extract 12

Trump: We're entitled because of the laws that people like her pass to take massive amounts of depreciation on other charges and we do it. And all of her donors, just about all of them. I know Buffett took hundreds of millions of dollars. Soros, George Soros took hundreds of millions of dollars.

Extract 13

Trump: -----But who is going to get Mosul really? We'll take Mosul eventually. By the way, if you look at what's happening, much tougher than they thought. Much, much tougher. Much more dangerous, going to be more deaths than they thought. But the leaders that we wanted to get are all gone because they're smart. They say what we need this for. So Mosul is going to be a wonderful thing, and Iran should write us a letter of thank you---.

Extract 14

Trump: ---- If she did nothing, we would be in much better shape. And this is what's caused the Great Migration where she's taking in tens of thousands of Syrian refugees, who probably in many cases -- not probably, who are definitely in many cases, ISIS-aligned. And we now have them in our country. Wait til you see -- this is going to be the great Trojan horse. Wait til you see what happens in the coming years. Lots of luck, Hillary. Thanks a lot for doing a great job.

Extract 15

Trump: President Obama has moved millions of people out. Nobody knows about it. Nobody talks about it. But under Obama, millions of people have been moved out of this country. They've been deported. She doesn't want to say that, but that's what has happened and that's what happened - big league. As far as moving these people out and moving, we either have a country or we don't. We're a country of laws. We either have a border or we don't.

Extract 16

Trump: ---- Because we have a tremendous machine. We will have created a tremendous economic machine once again. To do that, we're taking back jobs. We're not going to let our companies be raided by other countries where we lose all our jobs. We don't make our product anymore. It's very sad, but I am going to create a… the kind of a country that we were from the standpoint of industry. We used to be there. We've given it up. We've become very, very sloppy. We've had people that are political hacks making the biggest deals in the world. Bigger than companies. You take these big companies.

These trade deals are far bigger than these companies, and yet we don't use our great leaders, many of whom back me and many of whom backed Hillary, I must say, but we don't use those people. Those are the people...these are the greatest negotiators in the world. We have the greatest business people in the world. We have to use them to negotiate our trade deals. We use political hacks. We use people that get the position because they made a campaign contribution, and they're dealing with China and people that are very much smarter than they are, so we have to use our great people. But that being said, we will create an economic machine the likes of which we haven't seen in many decades and people, Chris, will again go back to work, and they'll make a lot of money, and we'll have companies that will will grow and expand and start from new.

Extract 17

Trump: ---- I believe it was her campaign that did it just like if you look at what came out today on the clips where I was wondering what happened with my rally in Chicago and other rallies where we had such violence. She's the one and Obama that caused the violence. They hired people. They paid them $1500, and they're on tape saying be violent, cause fights, do bad things. I would say the only way ----.

Extract 18

Trump: ----- because those stories are all totally false. I have to say that, and I didn't even apologize to my wife who is sitting right here because I didn't do

anything. I didn't know any of these women. I didn't see these women. These women, the woman on the plane, the woman on the - I think they want either fame or her campaign did it----.

Extract 19

Trump: ---- The justices that I am going to appoint will be pro-life. They will have a conservative bent. They will be protecting the second amendment. They are great scholars in all cases and they're people of tremendous respect. They will interpret the constitution the way the founders wanted it interpreted and I believe that's very important---.

Extract 20

Trump: ---But we have horrible deals. Our jobs are being taken out by the deal that her husband signed. NAFTA. One of the worst deals ever. The jobs are being sucked out of our economy. You look at the places I just left. You go to Pennsylvania, you go to Ohio, you go to Florida, you go to any of them. You go to upstate New York. Our jobs have fled to Mexico and other places----

Extract 21

Trump: I never met Putin. This is not my best friend. But if the United States got along with Russia, it wouldn't be so bad. Let me tell you, Putin has outsmarted her and Obama at every single step of the way. Whether it is Syria. You name it. Missiles. Take a look at the start-up that they signed. The Russians have said, according to many, many reports, I can't believe they allowed us to do this. They create warheads and we can't. The Russians can't believe it. She has been outsmarted by Putin and all you have to do is look at the Middle East. They've taken over. We've spent $6 trillion. They've taken over the Middle East. She has been outsmarted and outplayed worse than anybody I've ever seen in any government whatsoever.

Extract 22

Trump: ---But I would like to start off where we left. Because when I said Japan and Germany and I'm not just singling them out. But South Korea, these are very rich countries. Saudi Arabia. Nothing but money. We protect Saudi Arabia. Why aren't they paying? She immediately, when she heard this, I questioned it, and I questioned NATO, why aren't they NATO questioned? Why aren't they paying? Because they weren't paying. Since I did this, this was a year ago. All of a sudden they're paying. And I've been given a lot of credit for it. All of a sudden, they're starting to pay up. They have to pay up. We're

protecting people. They have to pay up. And I'm a big fan of NATO but they have to pay up--.

Extract 23

Trump: ----The biggest complaint they have, it's with all the problems going on in the world, many of the problems caused by Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama. All of the problems. The single biggest problem is heroin that pours across our southern borders. Just pouring and destroying their youth. It is poisoning the blood of their youth and plenty of other people----.

Extract 24

Trump: ---- The report was so bad. Look, our country is stagnant. We've lost our jobs, we've lost our businesses. We're not making things anymore, relatively speaking. Our product is pouring in from China, pouring in from Vietnam, pouring in from all over the world. I've visited so many communities. This has been such an incredible education for me, Chris. I've gotten to know so many, I've developed so many friends over the last year. And they cry when they see what has happened---.