

Hillary Clinton's Rhetoric in the US Presidential Campaign of 2016 as Compared with Campaign of 2008: A Linguistic Analysis

Eva Podivínská

Bachelor's thesis
2017



Tomas Bata University in Zlín
Faculty of Humanities

*

Univerzita Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně
Fakulta humanitních studií
Ústav moderních jazyků a literatur
akademický rok: 2016/2017

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: **Eva Podivínská**
Osobní číslo: **H13523**
Studijní program: **B7310 Filologie**
Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk pro manažerskou praxi**
Forma studia: **prezenční**

Téma práce: **Rétorika Hillary Clintonové v americké prezidentské kampani 2016 ve srovnání s kampaní 2008: Lingvistická analýza**

Zásady pro vypracování:

Studium odborné literatury
Shromáždění korpusu textů k analýze
Formulace cílů práce a specifikace oblastí analýzy
Analýza korpusu a porovnání analyzovaných jevů
Stanovení závěrů

Rozsah bakalářské práce:

Rozsah příloh:

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Seznam odborné literatury:

Edwards, Janis L. 2009. Gender and Political Communication in America: Rhetoric, Representation, and Display. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Fairclough, Norman, and Isabel Fairclough. 2012. Political Discourse Analysis. New York: Routledge.

Johnstone, Barbara, and Christopher Eisenhart, eds. 2008. Rhetoric in Detail: Discourse Analyses of Rhetorical Talk and Text. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lawler, Peter, and Robert Schaefer. 2016. American Political Rhetoric: Essential Speeches and Writings. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Yoos, George. 2009. Politics and Rhetoric: Coming to Terms with Terms. New York: Springer.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce:

Mgr. Lenka Drábková, Ph.D.

Ústav moderních jazyků a literatur

Datum zadání bakalářské práce:

11. listopadu 2016

Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce:

5. května 2017

Ve Zlíně dne 16. prosince 2016


doc. Ing. Anežka Lengálová, Ph.D.
ústavní




PhDr. Katarína Nemčoková, Ph.D.
vedoucí ústavu

PROHLÁŠENÍ AUTORA BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

Beru na vědomí, že

- odevzdáním bakalářské práce souhlasím se zveřejněním své práce podle zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, bez ohledu na výsledek obhajoby ¹⁾;
- beru na vědomí, že bakalářská práce bude uložena v elektronické podobě v univerzitním informačním systému dostupná k nahlédnutí;
- na moji bakalářskou práci se plně vztahuje zákon č. 121/2000 Sb. o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon) ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, zejm. § 35 odst. 3 ²⁾;
- podle § 60 ³⁾ odst. 1 autorského zákona má UTB ve Zlíně právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití školního díla v rozsahu § 12 odst. 4 autorského zákona;
- podle § 60 ³⁾ odst. 2 a 3 mohu užít své dílo – bakalářskou práci - nebo poskytnout licenci k jejímu využití jen s předchozím písemným souhlasem Univerzity Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně, která je oprávněna v takovém případě ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které byly Univerzitou Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně na vytvoření díla vynaloženy (až do jejich skutečné výše);
- pokud bylo k vypracování bakalářské práce využito softwaru poskytnutého Univerzitou Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně nebo jinými subjekty pouze ke studijním a výzkumným účelům (tj. k nekomerčnímu využití), nelze výsledky bakalářské práce využít ke komerčním účelům.

Prohlašuji, že

- elektronická a tištěná verze bakalářské práce jsou totožné;
- na bakalářské práci jsem pracoval samostatně a použitou literaturu jsem citoval. V případě publikace výsledků budu uveden jako spoluautor.

Ve Zlíně 4.5.2014

Podpis autora

1) zákon č. 111/1998 Sb. o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, § 47b Zveřejňování závěrečných prací:

(1) Vysoká škola nevydělečně zveřejňuje disertační, diplomové, bakalářské a rigorózní práce, u kterých proběhla obhajoba, včetně posudků oponentů a výsledku obhajoby prostřednictvím databáze kvalifikačních prací, kterou spravuje. Způsob zveřejnění stanoví vnitřní předpis vysoké školy.

(2) *Disertační, diplomové, bakalářské a rigorózní práce odevzdané uchazečem k obhajobě musí být též nejméně pět pracovních dnů před konáním obhajoby zveřejněny k nahlázení veřejnosti v místě určeném vnitřním předpisem vysoké školy nebo není-li tak určeno, v místě pracoviště vysoké školy, kde se má konat obhajoba práce. Každý si může ze zveřejněné práce pořizovat na své náklady výpisy, opisy nebo rozmnoženiny.*

(3) *Platí, že odevzdáním práce autor souhlasí se zveřejněním své práce podle tohoto zákona, bez ohledu na výsledek obhajoby.*

2) *zákon č. 121/2000 Sb. o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon) ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, § 35 odst. 3:*

(3) *Do práva autorského také nezasahuje škola nebo školské či vzdělávací zařízení, užije-li nikoli za účelem přímého nebo nepřímého hospodářského nebo obchodního prospěchu k výuce nebo k vlastní potřebě dílo vytvořené žákem nebo studentem ke splnění školních nebo studijních povinností vyplývajících z jeho právního vztahu ke škole nebo školskému či vzdělávacímu zařízení (školní dílo).*

3) *zákon č. 121/2000 Sb. o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon) ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, § 60 Školní dílo:*

(1) *Škola nebo školské či vzdělávací zařízení mají za obvyklých podmínek právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití školního díla (§ 35 odst.*

3). *Odpírá-li autor takového díla udělit svolení bez vážného důvodu, mohou se tyto osoby domáhat nahrazení chybějícího projevu jeho vůle u soudu. Ustanovení § 35 odst. 3 zůstává nedotčeno.*

(2) *Není-li sjednáno jinak, může autor školního díla své dílo užit či poskytnout jinému licenci, není-li to v rozporu s oprávněnými zájmy školy nebo školského či vzdělávacího zařízení.*

(3) *Škola nebo školské či vzdělávací zařízení jsou oprávněny požadovat, aby jim autor školního díla z výdělku jím dosaženého v souvislosti s užitím díla či poskytnutím licence podle odstavce 2 přiměřeně přispěl na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložily, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše; přitom se přihlídí k větší výdělku dosaženého školou nebo školským či vzdělávacím zařízením z užití školního díla podle odstavce 1.*

ABSTRAKT

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá analýzou rétoriky Hillary Clinton v průběhu prezidentských kampaní roku 2008 a 2016.

Teoretická část se zabývá klasickou rétorikou, od rétorických žánrů po rétorická pravidla. Dále se zaměřuje na rétorický styl a lingvistiku a poslední kapitola popisuje politickou kariéru Hillary Clinton.

Praktická část zkoumá dva druhy rétoriky Hillary Clintonové, a to její projevy a rozhovory s ní. Následně jsou projevy a rozhovory z obou kampaní porovnány.

Klíčová slova: Rétorika, lingvistická analýza, Hillary Clinton, projev, rozhovor

ABSTRACT

This Bachelor thesis deals with analysis of Hillary Clinton's rhetoric during her presidential campaigns in 2008 and 2016.

The theoretical part examines classical rhetoric, from rhetorical genres to canons of rhetoric. Next, it focuses on rhetorical style and linguistics and the last chapter describes a political career of Hillary Clinton.

Analytical part examines two types of Hillary Clinton's rhetoric – her speeches and interviews that she gave. Thereafter, the speeches and interviews are compared.

Keywords: Rhetoric, linguistic analysis, Hillary Clinton, speech, interview

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my adviser Mgr. Lenka Drábková, Ph.D. who showed her incredible patience, tolerance and helpfulness. I would also like to thank my sister for her support.

I hereby declare that the print version of my Bachelor's/Master's thesis and the electronic version of my thesis deposited in the IS/STAG system are identical.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	9
THEORY	10
1 RHETORIC.....	11
1.1 RHETORICAL GENRES	11
1.2 RHETORICAL APPEALS	12
1.3 CANONS OF RHETORIC.....	13
1.3.1 INVENTION.....	13
1.3.2 ARRANGEMENT	14
1.3.3 STYLE.....	15
1.3.4 MEMORY	15
1.3.5 DELIVERY.....	16
2 STYLE	17
2.1 DICTION	17
2.2 LANGUAGE VARIETIES.....	17
2.3 SPOKEN AND WRITTEN STYLE	18
2.4 GRAMMAR.....	18
2.5 SENTENCE CHOICES.....	18
2.6 FIGURES OF SPEECH.....	20
3 HILLARY CLINTON’S POLITICAL CAREER	22
ANALYSIS	24
4 INTRODUCTION TO ANALYSIS.....	25
5 SPEECHES.....	26
5.1 REMARKS ON SOLUTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN ECONOMY	26
5.2 REMARKS AT A CAMPAIGN RALLY IN MARSHALLTOWN, IOWA	28
5.3 COMPARISON OF REMARKS IN 2008 AND 2016 CAMPAIGNS	31
5.4 SPEECH AT THE AIPAC CONFERENCE	32
5.5 REMARKS AT THE AIPAC POLICY CONFERENCE	34
5.6 COMPARISON OF AIPAC SPEECHES	36
6 INTERVIEWS.....	38
6.1 INTERVIEW WITH BOB SCHIEFFER ON CBS NEWS’ “FACE THE NATION”	38
6.2 INTERVIEW WITH CHARLIE GIBSON OF ABC NEWS.....	39
6.3 INTERVIEW WITH WOLF BLITZER OF CNN.....	41
6.4 INTERVIEW WITH GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS OF ABC NEWS “THIS WEEK”	41
6.5 COMPARISON OF INTERVIEWS FROM 2008 AND 2016 CAMPAIGNS	43
CONCLUSION.....	44
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45

INTRODUCTION

American presidential elections are followed by people all over the world because president of such a world power has a great influence on other states through his in foreign policy. Communication with public through speeches and interviews is integral to the presidential campaigns, and it is an essential aspect for candidates to succeed. This thesis investigates rhetoric used in Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign of the years 2008 and 2016.

I chose this topic because the topic in connection with the American presidential election engaged my attention, and I wanted to learn more about the persuasive strategies that occur in political speeches.

The main purpose of the thesis is to analyse and compare Hillary Clinton's rhetoric during her political campaigns in 2008 and 2016, in particular speeches and interviews which she gave during her two presidential campaigns.

The theoretical part is devoted to classical rhetoric with an application to the present day oratory. It explains rhetorical genres, rhetorical appeals and five canons of rhetoric. Then it focuses on the rhetorical style and linguistics. Lastly, it describes Clinton's political career.

The analytical part examines two kinds of Clinton's rhetoric – speeches and interviews. The analysis is followed by the comparison of Clinton's language, tone and her rhetorical strategies in both years, which monitors her rhetorical development.

I. THEORY

1 RHETORIC

Beginnings of rhetoric go way back to the 4th century BC into the ancient Greece. Origin of the term then comes naturally from Greek, and the verb *eiro*, which means “I say”. Another two nouns derived from it – *rhema*, which means “a word”, and *rhetor*, “a teacher of oratory” (Martin 2014, 1 – 15). At that time the democratic system of government formed, which obviously contributed to rhetorical development. Every free citizen had the opportunity to vote, speak publicly, present thoughts on some social or political subject and convince other people about one’s beliefs (Žantovská 2015, 85). Rhetoric also became to be taught in ancient Greek schools as the art of speech, and eventually evolved into a science discipline which examines content of the speech, nonverbal communication, linguistic tools, and how to, by all these means, influence and persuade an audience (Lotko 2004, 16).

Cicero, Aristotle, Isocrates and Quintilian, they all gave their own definition for *rhetoric* but the essence of them is quite similar. They mostly describe it as a science of communication skills whose aim is primarily to persuade. For instance, Aristotle defines rhetoric as “the faculty of discovering the persuasive means available in given case” (Aristotle 1924, 7). Much later writing by Corbett and Connors even use a phrase “use or manipulation of words” (Corbett and Connors 1999, 20). Although, it, as they point out, does not correspond with the etymology of the word *rhetoric*, the persuasive discourse is firmly connected to it.

1.1 Rhetorical Genres

Context of speech differs with every occasion, and therefore every oration should have different features. Aristotle describes three branches of rhetoric according to three aspects – speaker, subject and hearer. On their basis he identifies *ceremonial*, *judicial* and *political* genre. Every one of them is connected to different time (past, present, future) (Aristotle 1924, 15).

Ceremonial (epideictic) speeches are carried on specific events, for instance, on weddings, funerals, graduations or in past, they were also uttered in battles to motivate soldiers before combats (Lynee and Eble 2016, 231). It follows that the ceremonies have usually a broad audience, and the orator refers to the *present* actions. This kind of talks should convince hearers and leave a certain emotion. The theme of the epideictic discourse is either to praise or to blame (Aristotle 1924, 15). For example, during the retirement speeches people are commonly praised.

Judicial or forensic rhetoric deals with *past* affairs, and its function is to accuse or defend (ibid.). It is usually connected with arguments about breaking the law, therefore performed in trials in front of a judge or jury, who are a typical audience for this genre of rhetoric. However, apart from courts, judicial genre can be generally employed by anyone who is defending their past decisions or behaviour (Lynee and Eble 2016, 230).

Lastly, *deliberative* genre of rhetoric (also political or legislative) focuses on *future* and typically encourages audience to (or not to) act (Aristotle 1924, 15). This genre includes political speeches and debates, as well as recruiting tactics of institutions (Lynee and Eble 2016, 230). Since this kind of discussions is commonly over future subjects that have not happened yet, the arguments are more about personal opinions, possible choices and results of taking (or not taking) the actions, than actual unbiased facts, such as in judicial rhetoric (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012, 19).

Nowadays, the occasions of speeches are obviously different that in ancient Greece, and therefore the genres described by Aristotle sometimes do not correspond with today's situations. This, though, does not mean that the described genres would be useless. Despite the fact that some oratory cannot be placed exclusively into one of those three genres, they probably fall into more of them at once. Martin (2014, 53) states an example of a political argument when, apart from discussing the future policy (deliberative genre), participants sometimes refer to a government's records from the past, too (judicial genre). Another situation, when the mixture of political and ceremonial rhetoric is used, could be a statesman's reaction to a catastrophe, offering his sympathies to family members of victims, calming down the public and commenting on government's next steps etc. (ibid. 54).

1.2 Rhetorical Appeals

In his writing, Aristotle defines 3 basic rhetorical appeals – *logos*, *ethos* and *pathos* (reason, credibility, and emotion) (Johnstone and Eisenhart 2008, 195). This selection of argument types enables speaker to persuade audience. Although Aristotle described these persuasive models in Ancient Greece, they all are quite up to date and fitting for nowadays speeches.

Logos is used as an appeal of reason or logic. It includes using of proofs and reasonable claims (ibid., 195). However this appeal might seem effective, it is not a rule that the speaker will persuade an audience, even though his/her arguments are logical. The orator has to combine logos with the other appeals to reach the highest effectiveness of the argument, and also think about how the audience is probably going to react to the evidence and arguments

provided (Martin 2014, 59). The reason is that the hearers have to process the information in a certain way, and the speaker has to lead them to reach the conclusion he/she wants (Larson 2010, 75).

Another appeal of persuasion is *ethos* (credibility of the author). He/she should be confident with the arguments because it strengthens the power of persuasion. Aristotle then mentions the importance of authority, image and reputation of the speaker, and Martin (2014, 58) adds experience, qualification or job position. All these will have some effect on listeners. Additionally, speaker's qualities can be divided to explicit and implicit. Explicit *ethos* refers to previous accomplishments, experience, or education, whereas into implicit appeals fall the way of speaking and general impression of the speaker (Demirdogen 2010, 192).

Pathos is an appeal on hearer's emotions. Orator is trying to raise feelings (love, pity, fear, anger etc.), senses of moral virtues, hope or humour of the audience by using specific lexis, mood and tone of speech (Martin 2014, 64). Similarly to *logos*, with *pathos* author has to take into consideration certain abilities of hearers, such as emotional intelligence and empathy. In political discourse, for example, fear of future is largely evoked when speaking about opposition and consequences of voting for them, or when introducing the speech with some friendly greeting with addressing the hearers (Larson 2010, 75).

In oratory there is often an element of each kind of appeals but of course it is not fundamental. In fact, in many fields *pathos* is considered unwanted, such as in science, or in front of an academic audience. Rationality is commonly preferred to emotions in that area. However, according to Cicero the sentimental appeal is the most important of all for a successful conviction (May 2002, 61).

1.3 Canons of Rhetoric

There are five canons of rhetoric according to Cicero – *invention*, *arrangement*, *style*, *memory*, and *delivery*. Nowadays, this classification by Cicero is used for both, analyzing and teaching rhetoric. However, memory and delivery are often marginalized. (Burton 2016)

1.3.1 Invention

Invention (or discovery) is a stage when an orator looks for suitable arguments for the speech. It is connected to *logos*, which means that in this stage author focuses on *what* he/she is going to say rather than *how* (Corbett and Connors 1999, 22 – 25). Again, as it was

mentioned above, the speaker has to consider background of the audience during this phase of preparation.

1.3.2 Arrangement

Arrangement is focused on a structure of a speech and Cicero with Quintilian divide it into six parts – *introduction*, *narrative* (statement of facts), *division*, *confirmation* (proof), *refutation*, and *conclusion*. It gives clear principles of organization of the text. However, there has been made some modifications by a few rhetoricians. For example, to be more effective, the scheme was cut to introduction, body and conclusion, which is commonly used today. Furthermore, Cicero matches every part with a rhetorical appeal. Introduction is tied to ethos, the next four, or the body part, to logos and conclusion is connected to pathos (Corbett and Connors 1999, 25).

First part, the *introduction*, usually starts with greeting or thanking the hearers and telling them, what is the speech going to be about. This part is important for the reason of catching the hearers' attention. Therefore, the author usually uses some famous quote but he/she may also start with a question, paradox or observation (Martin 2014, 66).

The next part is *narrative*. It involves recounting already known neutral facts that others agree on being true. This section mostly occurs at the courts, news reports, and interviews with politicians, in which case it is often followed by the request on their commentary (Martin 2014, 67). Despite this characterization, *narration* can be manipulative, too. Skinner (2002b, 200) describes a term “rhetorical redescription” that prioritizes information suitable for the rhetorician or rephrases it in a way which is more convenient for him/her.

Third and fourth stages are *division* and *confirmation*. *Division* sketches out what will follow, and thus it is tied to canon of *memory*, which will be described later. The *confirmation*, or proof, is naturally aiming to convince the hearers through logos (Burton 2016). It is crucial in political speeches or debates but almost insignificant in ceremonial rhetoric. Speaker provides his/her own defensive arguments, which logically need to be more prominent and powerful during, for example, a controversial political discussion than in funeral or marriage rhetoric (Martin 2014, 68).

Refutation follows the *confirmation* and it reacts on the opponent's counterarguments. These two parts of an oratory are sometimes blended together but due to their different features they are considered to be separate categories. Nevertheless, the *refutation* is essential for persuasion as well because disproving arguments of others actually strengthens

arguments of one's own. Moreover, *refutation* together with *confirmation* are necessary in political speeches, and, on contrary, not so eligible in ceremonial rhetoric. (ibid.)

Lastly, *conclusion* sums up the oration and seals the argument with a final point. Sometimes speakers return to the beginning, if they put up a question (Cockroft and Cockroft 2005, 97). As it was mentioned above, this part is connected to pathos, thus it should include some emotion which will leave more significant appeal and listeners will remember it.

1.3.3 Style

Style deals with language, or *how* are things being said. According to Martin (2014, 71) *style* and *delivery* fairly affect ethos and pathos. The choices that author makes about style influence the tone of the whole speech and make it memorable. Simple formal language does not give much power to the persuasive function of the speech and the appeal to audition is not that prominent (Cockroft and Cockroft 2005, 115).

That is why the work with language is important in rhetoric and especially in politics. Politicians need to convince as many listeners as possible; therefore, their language has to be comprehensible and clear to the broad audience. Rhetoricians would not reach that with using technical terminology, or, contrarily, wildly decorative language with extensive amount of figurative speech. Not concentrating much on style, which happens usually during interviews or debates, when speaker have not prepared answers, can cause losing authority for the audience and even produce distaste for the speaker. Martin (2014, 72) describes examples of former US presidents. Ronald Reagan was weak in answering questions from journalists which were unprepared. President George W. Bush was sometimes criticized for not using a proper grammar, which on the other hand, might have made him look like "one of the people" and more sincere. And finally, Barack Obama, who was generally considered as a good speaker, was predominantly popular because his speeches were well-prepared and intelligent. All of them created certain image, on the bases of language they used, whether it was intentional or not. (ibid.)

As mentioned above, style represents the language, expressing the arguments. In practice it relates to choice of words (diction), figures of speech, and composition (Corbett and Connors 1999, 386).

1.3.4 Memory

This part of rhetoric, as the name indicates, refers to ability of memorizing the speech. This aspect is not paid much attention, yet, it is influential in the terms of persuasiveness. It

determines whether the delivery of the speech will appear natural or not (Burton 2016). Moreover, well memorized speech gives confidence to the rhetorician.

1.3.5 Delivery

According to Martin (2014, 83), delivery is nowadays just as important as the content of speech, even though, this canon used to be neglected as well. Delivery deals with body language, facial expressions, tone of voice, gestures, and emotions that the speaker shows (Cicero 2001, 292), which is essential for the rate of persuasiveness of a speech. Techniques of delivery change with individual people in connection to their age or culture (Martin 2014, 83).

2 STYLE

2.1 Diction

The language has to be clear and acceptable for listeners. The analysis of the word choice is determined by context. The subject or topic, the purpose of the speech, and the audience, these are all criteria which have to be taken in mind. It means that the words should not be out-of-date, they have to be understood by today's people and especially by the audience. Archaisms and historicisms will probably not be a good choice. The same goes with dialectical, technical, foreign words and coinages; nonetheless, with these types of words speaker has to consider the background of the hearers, because they may be appropriate in certain occasions (Corbett and Connors 1999, 393).

Connotations of words are another aspect of diction, more precisely emotions linked with them. Author can take advantage of common connotations when thinking about pathos. Corbett and Connors (*ibid.*, 397) give an example of different connotations of words "politician" and "statesman", when both have the same meaning but the latter one is, unlike the first one, usually honoured. According to context, rhetorician chooses the one which is suitable and convenient for his/her speech.

2.2 Language Varieties

Cicero describes low, middle and high style of language. Each is suitable for different situations. Low style is convenient for conversational purposes because it is characterized with informal and colloquial language (Fahnestock 2013, 80). Contractions are typical for informal style as well as dialectal or regional expressions. Obscene or even vulgar terms fall into this type of style, too. As an example Fahnestock gives an interview with President Obama about Gulf Oil Spill in 2010 where he declared that he talked to experts to know "whose ass to kick." Some found it suitable for the context of the situation; some thought that as a president he should not have used such a language.

Middle style is a neutral language appropriate for respected books, newspapers, or magazines for broad audience, not so typical in spoken forms of language. This kind of style has set rules for spelling, punctuation, grammar, and sentence structure and in the United States it is known as Standard Edited America English. It is usually editors and publishers of these works who determine what falls into the standard convention (*ibid.*, 81).

Formal English, or high style, is kind of elevated Standard Edited English which is used in official or academic documents, publications, and sometimes in highly ceremonial

speeches. Its common feature is using terms of foreign origin, mostly Latin or Greek, polysyllabic words, and complex sentences (ibid.).

2.3 Spoken and Written Style

It is typical for spoken style to use colloquial language, non-standard grammar, empty words or hesitation sounds, figures of speech, less complex sentences, intensifiers, such as very, really, etc. Written discourse is lexically wealthier than spontaneous speeches (Chafe and Danielewicz 1987, 90). The same goes with speeches prepared in advance because the author has more time to think about the word choice. Fahnestock (2013, 91), however, examines Martin Luther King's speeches, and finds out that the most effective is a combination of prepared written sections and spontaneous language. The fact that the speaker has planned the speech in advance gives an impression of respect for the listeners. Whereas spontaneous language, which probably sounds also more informal, demonstrates that the speaker is mentally involved in the moment, alert, and/or emotionally touched.

2.4 Grammar

Grammar is sometimes confused with rhetoric, and although, they are two different things, there is after all a slight connection. The scale of grammar goes from phoneme through syllable, word and phrase to clause, on contrary, the smallest unit of rhetoric is a word and after a clause it concerns with paragraph, division and a composition of text as a whole. Plus, grammar deals with correctness, in other words, the rules for how those parts are put together. On the other hand, on the base of rhetoric, people choose the most suitable expression out of several possible options (Corbett and Connors 1999, 387). Thus grammatical competence has to be obviously acquired first, and then style in general could be improved.

Grammar has an impact on the result of persuasion, ethos in particular, as the previous example with George W. Bush shows. Using ungrammatical formulations might create an image of uneducated person. Anyway, this could have both, positive or negative effect, which obviously depends on the context of speech.

2.5 Sentence Choices

Appropriate syntactical choices during speech-creating can serve well to the overall tone of the speech and lead to the author's success. Changing word order in spoken language can help with ambiguity, monotony, emphasizing or de-emphasizing of any word or phrase, or

with rhythm of the sentence (Corbett and Connors 1999, 405). For instance, the length of the sentence affects the rhythm and emphasis in the spoken language. Short simple sentences imply straightforwardness whereas long complex sentences are usually descriptive.

A classical structure of sentence in English is *subject, verb, and object*. Subject can be any noun phrase or noun clause, and that can be either something with physical existence (humans, animals, things) or an abstraction (Fahnestock 2013, 150-152). In terms of rhetoric, the general abstractions used as subjects have the most powerful appeal. These words, such as *liberty, justice, equality, fairness* etc., meet with an extensive public agreement, at least until they are more specified and applied on a concrete case or occasion (ibid., 150-2). Human subjects, especially those referring to listeners of the speech, for example, *American people, voters, every person here*, provide senses of unity, involvement, or relevance. The same goes with the pronouns *we, you, us*, and with addressing people, for instance, *my fellow Americans, friends*, etc. However, there can be also a “dummy” subject *it* or *there is* which can help with changing topics because it transfers the attention to the predicate (ibid. 152).

Choosing a suitable verb involves, besides other things, the choice of tense which, in rhetoric, fulfils the function of emphasis. Present tense is generally used less often but it is rather usual in political speeches, even though deliberative genre is supposed to refer to the future situations. Verbs in present tense are usually employed when calling for action, for example *I need you to, I call upon*, etc. Apart from that, present tense is used also in generally known truths, generalizations, or assumptions about human behaviour (ibid., 155). The calling for action is connected with imperative mood which is used in that situation, too. Though, most of the sentences are obviously indicative.

Next aspect of the rhetorical choice is negation. Double negation, such as “*I don’t disagree*,” often emerges in the political discourse, as well as negating a positive verb, like in the sentence “*The politician did not win the election*.” The choice between “*The politician lost the election*.” and the negation of the positive verb probably depends on the context and on what information the author wants to emphasize or de-emphasize.

Last part of verb choice relates to modality and voice. In concerns of modality, Fahnestock (2013, 158) states that it demonstrates uncertainty, confidence, or urgency (e.g. *can, may, might, must, etc.*). Naturally, it can be expressed also with other than verb phrases (e.g. adjectives, adverbs). Voice, on the other hand, can be purposefully used to emphasize certain parts, to change meaning of the sentence, or to make text coherent. Author can use passive voice to get rid of responsibility for some actions, which is why passive voice is

sometimes considered as misleading and obfuscating and it is sometimes criticized for it (ibid.).

2.6 Figures of Speech

Figures of speech are tropes and schemes. Tropes usually change semantic meaning of terms and schemes are based on syntactical changes (Yoos 2009, 113). If used with deliberation, figurative language can add a spirit and put more life into the speech. The immoderate use may be harmful, and lacking it completely, on the other hand, might mean throwing the talk into a stereotype. Tropes create meaning which adds more accuracy into the language and shapes the tone and the content of arguments, whereas schemes deal with word arrangement in order to intensify their effect (Martin 2014, 75 - 80).

Basic tropes, frequently used in a language of politics are metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony (Fahnestock 2013, 101). Metaphor is a word, a phrase or even longer piece of text that represents some concept with the use of another one on the base of their similarity (Yoos 2009, 103), such as in a sentence *He is the light of my life*. The meaning behind calling someone “the light of one’s life” is that he/she brings happiness to the other person.

Metonymy works on different principles than metaphor. Metaphor is driven by semantics, whereas metonymy works with structural association and the substituted word has a certain connection with the one which replaced it (Cockroft and Cockroft 2005, 120). For example, *The White House introduced a new strategy in foreign policy*; the social actor here is not a human being, instead it is replaced by broader entity. In this way of using metonymy, the responsibility of concrete people can be hidden. It is called impersonalization.

Synecdoche is basically dividing a whole into parts which then represent the whole or vice versa. On the base of their similarities, synecdoche is usually considered as a type of metonymy (Martin 2014, 79). However, metonymy, unlike synecdoche, uses associations, as mentioned above. Moreover, synecdoche can be, according to Cockroft and Cockroft (2005, 122), a strong ideological weapon because it enables purposely not mentioning things, like people, issues or ideas, and in that way marginalize them. As an example they state the word *man*, which is used as a term for both men and women.

Last trope, which is often acquired during political discourse, is irony. Irony declares untruthful claim in order to draw more attention to the problem and mocking it. It can be

used as a humorous element in the speech, to make a contact with the audience, and of course it can also have a strengthening effect on author's argument (Fahnestock 2013, 115).

Nonetheless, apart from the four basic tropes, there are many others that are typical for political discourse, such as simile, hyperbole or rhetorical questions. Since simile is comparison of two things, it has mainly illustrative purpose. Hyperbole, as an exaggeration, is used to intensify author's point. Thus it has emphasizing effect but in some situations it can be also employed to mock. And eventually, rhetorical question which, if formulated correctly, can lead listeners to the conclusion author wants them to reach, or it can be a device for speaker that helps him/her to promote or deny something (Corbett and Connors 1999, 439-61).

Schemes are generally rare in prose but they frequently occur in political discourse (Cockroft and Cockroft 2005, 125). They are, however, not unprecedented. The most common is, for instance, anaphora which is repetition of words at the beginning of consecutive clauses, or epistrophe which is repetition at the end of consecutive clauses. Antithesis then works with word order and places two terms in contrast, such as in "*we are friends, not enemies*", and resemblance of structure between two units (could be phrases, clauses, or longer) is called parallelism (Martin 2014, 76). These are just a fraction of all existing schemes of course but they are probably the most common and useful for discussion.

3 HILLARY CLINTON'S POLITICAL CAREER

Hillary Clinton was born on 26th October 1947 in Chicago to middle class couple. Her mother Dorothy Howell Rodham was a housewife with democratic beliefs, and Hugh E. Rodham was a republican working as small businessman (Clinton 2004, 2). In 1965, Hillary went to the Wellesley College and graduated in a year 1969. After that, she was admitted to both the Harvard and Yale University. Nonetheless, she decided to go to the Yale Law University. While attending the university, she got involved to the Children's Defense Fund, received grant and scholarship, and met her future husband and Democratic President Bill Clinton (Ebstein 2010, 22-24).

After graduation, she moved with Bill to Arkansas and they got married (Clinton 2004, 65). She worked there as a lawyer for the Rose Law Firm. At that time her husband was trying to become a state governor. Hillary was helping him with the campaign, and in 1979, he was elected to the post. In the same year, Hillary was appointed a partner of the Rose Law Firm, and simultaneously, as a first lady of Arkansas she was engaged in charity work. Later on she was appointed as a head of the Arkansas Education Standards Committee by her husband, and she made several educational reforms. (Ebstein 2010, 35-43).

In 1992 her husband announced his presidential candidacy. Hillary was engaging in the campaign, and helping him with it a lot, as well as after he was elected president (Abrams 2009, 72). Bill therefore named Hillary the chair of the Health Care Task Force. However, her plans were not successful, and their stay in the White House was accompanied by several scandals, which meant that their popularity that they had among people declined (Ebstein 2010, 70). Nonetheless, as a First Lady she made several state trips or gave speeches on international summits.

After leaving the White House, Hillary was offered to run for the Senate. She won the election and in 2006 she was re-elected. Her priority was reformation of health care, and she stood for rights of families, children and working parents (ibid. 76).

On 20th January 2007 she announced her presidential candidacy. She made this decision on the base of her unsuccessful fight against the policy of George W. Bush as a senator (Abrams 2009, 121). Her major opponent was Barack Obama, senator from Illinois. Eventually, she lost the primaries with him but she kept supporting him afterwards. Obama also offered her the post of secretary of state and she accepted it and was carrying it out for both Obama's periods (Ebstein 2010, 92).

In 2015 she announced another candidacy for the President of the United states. She defeated Senator Bernie Sanders in primaries but eventually lost with the Republican candidate Donald Trump.

II. ANALYSIS

4 INTRODUCTION TO ANALYSIS

The goal of this part of the thesis is to analyse the language of Hillary Clinton's rhetoric during her two political campaigns in 2008 and 2016, and thereafter compare it. I am going to focus especially on the persuasive strategies that she used, and the overall tone that her performance provided. However, I am not going deal with *invention*, *memory* and *delivery*. Even though they contain important tools of persuasion and play significant part in rhetorical studies, they are not that relevant in linguistic analysis. Therefore, I am going to pay attention mainly to the *style* in connection with the rhetorical appeals and to the *arrangement*.

The corpus of analysed oratory contains four pre-prepared speeches, as well as four interviews, which are predominantly improvised. For the sake of accuracy I have selected those where Hillary Clinton talks about the same topic, or those that are at least from the same period of time during the two political campaigns before the presidential nomination. Transcripts of all the used speeches and interviews are taken from the website www.presidency.ucsb.edu, or from the official websites of the TV programmes which broadcasted them (CBS News, CNN, ABC News).

What I expect are differences in diction and persuasive tools in general as a consequence of various speech writers of Clinton's in 2008 and 2016. She might also show more assertiveness in 2016 campaign than in 2008, since it was her second presidential run, plus it might be influenced by the approach of other candidates. Her language in interviews will be probably more informal than in her speeches, and I think her overall tone will be also more assertive and intense in speeches than in interviews.

Each transcript will be analysed on its own, starting with formal information, such us occasion, subject and audience of the oratory, and continuing with the actual analysis of the text. After that, there will be a comparison of the two related texts, and summary at the end of each chapter. The transcripts are provided on an enclosed CD.

5 SPEECHES

In this chapter I am going to analyse four speeches, two from every year of Hillary Clinton's campaign. In two of them she is concerned with American economy and the other two are from AIPAC Conferences in 2008 and 2016.

5.1 Remarks on Solutions for the American Economy

Hillary Clinton delivered this speech on 24th January 2008 in Furman University in South Carolina. She talks about specific economic problems, whereupon she provides her solutions to them. The premises of the university, where the speech takes place, imply that the audience is probably consisted predominantly from educated people of younger age. This, however, cannot be stated with great certainty because in the speech Clinton addresses American people in general, and both the informal language and the content indicate that she aims for a broad audience because she talks about various problems that concern every age group predominantly from middle class.

As far as the genre is concerned, it is a blend of all three of them – deliberative, ceremonial and judicial. At the beginning of the speech she is apologising for being late, and then she spends some time with thanking the people who spoke before her and veterans. This falls into ceremonial genre. Further in the text she talks about past and engages accusative attitude towards previous republican president George W. Bush, and refers to other famous statesmen from the past, which is judicial genre. And lastly, Clinton provides her solutions to the economic problems, which she would follow if elected president, and promises to take the necessary steps to solve them as soon as she is elected, which fulfils the characteristic of deliberative genre.

The structure is clear and the whole speech is well arranged. After she gets through the greeting, apologising and thanking, she turns her attention to the actual topic. To engage listeners' attention she uses humour. After reminding the audience that soon "*President Bush will give his final State of the Union Address*", she reacts "*It's enough to make you want to burst out in song. Don't worry, I'll spare you. You don't have to listen to me sing.*" That gives an impression of spontaneity in comparison to the rest of the speech where she provides a lot of factual information. It is also the first time in the speech where Hillary shows her stance towards President Bush. The criticism continues throughout the whole speech but this probably contributed to catch the hearers' attention. Next the author continues with the narrative, where she states the problem and then provides her possible solution. In this part, Clinton quotes some problems of people she met or words of famous statesmen to support

her points. Together with facts and numbers she gives, it backs up her logical appeal. This well-ordered pattern continues until the end of the talk, where the emotional appeal is significant. That has a function of making the message memorable for the listeners. Even though she does not really summarize her arguments in the conclusion, it is clear what her point and the point of the entire speech is – to vote for Hillary Clinton.

As I indicated above, the language is adapted for a broad audience. I did not detect any ambiguous words; it is comprehensible, practically with no use of highly technical terms or foreign words or phrases. However, the author uses words and phrases, which relate to the topic of economics, such as *mortgage crisis*, *economic crisis*, *housing market*, *consumer spending*, *foreclosure*, *skyrocketing*, *unemployment*, etc. That has an impact on her credibility (ethos), and it means that the author is educated and acquainted with this field.

Another contribution to Clinton's credibility is the fact that she uses correct grammar. Her language is informal with the use of contractions and colloquial phrases but since the middle and high style with formal language is typical for the written texts, it would have been highly affected if she had used that. Informal language offers closer connection to the audience and therefore positive impact on pathos and ethos in this case. Hillary also does not use any empty words or "fill ups", and she shows a rich vocabulary, which is a sign of pre-prepared speech. Thus she evinces respect for the audience.

Regarding the word choice, there is an apparent occurrence of powerful abstract nouns, such as *inattention*, *denial*, *neglect*, *optimism*, *faith*, *belief*, *fairness*, *depression*, *freedom*, *fear*, *fatalism*, *despair*, *American dream* and strong adjectives and adverbs like *devastating*, *realistically*, *courageously*, *confidently*, *optimistically*. They are considered as strong because nearly everyone agrees with their general meaning, for example, everybody wants taxes to be fair, as well as everybody disagrees with denial, neglect or depression – these words are generally viewed as negative. They appear at the beginning, and then especially at the end of the speech where the author tries to appeal to listeners' emotions. There are also verbs of urgency at the end, for instance the repetition of the verb *need* or *want* (*I need you to*, *we need*, *I want you to etc*).

Frequent use of pronoun I, in my opinion, denotes Clinton's authority, and her ability to take responsibility, which is another contribution to the ethos. On the other hand, when she uses the pronoun we, it should most likely provide the sense of unity and involvement of the listeners. The same purpose of involvement and relevance applies to the addressing of the audience with the pronouns you and your. The assimilation of social actors with the purpose

of unification often occurs in the speech, too. Author uses expressions as “*America, American people, Americans.*” These have for one impact on pathos.

Sentence length varies with different parts of the speech. In the introduction and the body of the talk, she uses mainly long complex sentences which are ordinarily intended for descriptive type of text. However, towards the end the sentences become shorter, simpler and the language is more straightforward. This is again related to the pathos; it emphasizes the content and makes it more memorable and touching.

As far as figures of speech are concerned, Clinton uses a significant amount of anaphora and epistrophe in particular, which play a role of intensifying the effect of the repeated phrase or term, and brings a hearer’s attention to that specific part of text. Tropes occur occasionally in a form of metaphors or rhetorical questions with the function of colouring the text and making contact with the audience.

Finally, I think the overall tone of the speech is sharp, and in some places even angry because Clinton criticizes President Bush and his administration a lot, sometimes she is even mocking him, I would say. Despite that, in the second part of talk she creates rather motivational tone with a mark of urgency.

To sum up, the purpose of the speech is clearly to mobilise as many potential voters and supporters of the speaker as possible. To reach it, she uses all the rhetorical appeals. The most significant, however, is the appeal on emotions of the hearers, in my opinion. She is trying to unify them through the dissatisfaction and dislike towards republican president, through the sense of nationalism when comparing America to other countries, and through compassion towards the people who, as she claims, ended up in a bad financial situations as a consequence of the economic problems. Pathos is also highly supported with the choice of powerful words, repetition and addressing the audience.

5.2 Remarks at a Campaign Rally in Marshalltown, Iowa

This speech was delivered by Hillary Clinton on the 26th January 2016 in Marshalltown. She comments on economy, education system, health care, and foreign policy. The audience is again probably composed primarily of middle class people because that is the group Hillary is targeting on, and the speech is adjusted to it. The purpose is to convince hearers that she is the most suitable candidate for the presidential office and to persuade them to go caucus the following Monday.

The genre is a mixture of all three of them again. There is ceremonial genre represented by thanking and praising at the beginning which actually sometimes appears also later in the

text. Judicial genre is covered by abundant criticizing of opposition and author's recalling of her meetings with people and when she listened to their stories, problems and opinions. And lastly, describing the future consequences of voting for the republicans and listing her programme steps fall into the deliberative genre.

The structure of the speech is clear, following the three main stages and moving continuously from one topic to another. However, what often happens during her narration is that she interrupts her thought and shortly digress off the topic and then comes back to it. The accommodated structure shows that author prepared for the speech, and it is highly possible that a specialist wrote it for her but it certainly looks like she had no notes. That gives an impression of spontaneity; she may also appear more emotionally involved which then transfers to the listeners.

The language is informal; Clinton uses contracted forms, colloquial expressions (*oh, my goodness, took a chainsaw to a big stack of regulations, that's what this is all about, etc.*), and empty words (*you know, you see, well, etc.*). That is also a sign of spoken language and talking "off-hand". The text is comprised of short compound or simple sentences, there are no incomprehensible terms, and the author uses clear grammatically correct language. Nonetheless, her vocabulary is not as rich as in the previous analysed speech. She uses some strong abstract nouns, such as *fail, success, discrimination, justice, etc.*, but there are not many of them. On the other hand, powerful verbs with emotional appeal, such as *demonize, insult, push out, defame, rip up, slashed, knock down* etc. often occur in the text.

Another rhetorical strategy, which appears in the speech, is frequent addressing the hearers, using phrase *my friends*, or personal pronouns *you* and *we*, which, I think, should provide not only sense of involvement and relevance but also give an impression of equality, an impression that Clinton is on the same level as the listeners, that she is one of them, that they are "on the same team."

Hillary often emphasizes certain parts of the speech with a change of word order – "*back came the republicans and back came trickle-down economics*", and repetition, which is typical for political speeches. Then she uses anaphora – "*our roads, our bridges, our tunnels, our ports, our airports, our rail system, our sewer system, our water systems*". For the purpose of engaging listeners and keeping their attention, she uses rhetorical questions. The text is also coloured with occasional metaphors and irony. It is apparent that Clinton is trying to engage humour in this speech, for instance, when she criticizes drug companies, she comments on their TV adverts, ridicules them, and finally uses hyperbole "*your nose will fall off*". In another case, for example, she starts with an irony claimed in a humorous way

“Now, I can tell you I built the coalition that imposed sanctions on Iran. I know a little bit about how you do this.”, and then even proceeds to sarcasm which criticizes the opposition: *You don’t start by insulting people’s religion and then ask them to be part of your effort to defeat a common adversary.”*

The criticism of the Republican Party is frequent; it basically follows every topic that Clinton touches. She either gives an example of Republican failure from the past or criticizes their future intentions (*it’s a terrible idea, it does not work, the worst part is*). She even literally says: *“I believe that the Republican policies [...] would set our country back, rip up the progress we’ve made, and undermine our future.”* So she is intimidating the audience with, I think, exaggerated picture of their future if they are going to vote for the Republicans. Clinton is also mocking them: *“You know, the Republicans, when you ask them about climate change, they all say the same thing. ‘Well, I don’t know, I’m not a scientist.’ You know, there’s an easy way to remedy that. Go talk to a scientist [...].”* She indicates that the Republicans are uneducated by saying that. With all this criticism and mocking, Clinton is trying to throw the Republicans into a negative sight and to convince the hearers that it is a wrong or even shameful to vote for them.

Clinton here manipulates the hearers, as well. First, she mentions horrible consequences of the Republican administration from the past and then she says: *“Now, if you want to go back there, you got a lot of folks, including one who was here today, who are spouting that same stuff, because that’s where we’ll end up again.”* Another example of manipulation occurs when she lists her political intentions and then claims: *“Now, everything I’ve just said to you the Republicans don’t agree with it, every bit of it.”* And then continues to demonize them: *“They don’t really tell you what they will do except just, you know, get out of the way and let corporations do whatever they want and let their, you know, big donors do whatever they want.”* Next manipulative strategy she adopted in this speech is through rhetorical questions when she addressed a congressman and asks him whether he is in favour of clean energy, affordable college, and early childhood education, which was followed by a question: *“Or are you going to deny that to the 350,000 people who live in your district?”*

Furthermore, Clinton flatters the Iowan people, which then strengthen the emotional appeal, such as in a sentence: *“I know we can create those jobs because look at what Iowa has done.”* because majority of her audience is probably Iowans. The emotional stories of people that she met have also an impact on pathos. For instance, when talking about health care, she describes her failure of Hillarycare, then she mentions a story of two ill girls whose parents cannot get insurance for them. Thereupon she gives a solution to the problem of

those two little girls and puts her failure to the contrast with a success of her cooperation with the Republicans which resulted in Children's Health Insurance Program. That puts her in a position of "a hero" or "a saviour" and gives an impression of her being a strong woman "a leader", "a unifying person". Plus I think it has motivational purpose as well and presents a message "even though you fail you have to stand up and try again".

Moreover, the author ensures her credibility by claiming that she knows both previous democratic presidents, that she has a 20-plus years of experience as a senator, first lady, and Secretary of State and that influential people like a billionaire Warren Buffett, Nobel Prize-winning economist Paul Krugman or a politician Barney Frank endorse her and support her plan. Similarly, she states that she is the only candidate who promotes a fair tax system which makes her unique and supports her original point – to vote for her.

The tone of the speech is sharp, dramatic, and in my point of view, even provocative especially because of all the intimidating, criticism and mockery. However, the latter one also lightens the whole spirit of the text. Apart from that, I think there is an indication of motivation and positive ambition at the end where she uses humour again.

To sum up, to achieve her purpose, author does not rely much on sophisticated diction. Although, it is not dull either because there is some occurrence of ornamental language, Clinton's speech depends more on criticising of the Republican Party, humour and promoting herself. And each of those aspects has some rhetorical appeal. The criticizing is basically supporting her point which falls into logos. It might have an impact on hearers' emotions, as well as the humour, which is ethos. And lastly, ethos is covered with self-promotion and mentioning the influential people who stand by the author.

5.3 Comparison of Remarks in 2008 and 2016 Campaigns

Both the speeches have the same speaker, although the writer might be different, both of them have the same purpose, and both were delivered in roughly the same part of the campaign. Even though the 2008 speech concerns mainly problems of economic crisis, Clinton touches also health care. Apart from economy and health care she comments on education and foreign policy in the 2016 speech. The audience might be different but they are probably middle class people of all ages in both cases. The genres in the speech seem to be the same as well, yet, the speeches differ a lot.

The diversity is apparent in the style and the tone. The language in the 2008 speech is informal, as well as in the 2016 but it definitely appeared more mature and not that leisure

as it was in the latter one. On the other hand, the 2016 text gives an impression of greater spontaneity and does not seem affected like the 2008 one.

The vocabulary in 2008 speech is richer than in 2016 with significant representation of economical terms, which I interpret as a consequence of different tone of the speech. In 2016 speech Clinton uses more colloquialisms as well as figurative language. There is a greater amount of metaphors, repetition, rhetorical questions and irony. Clinton also addresses audience differently. Unlike in 2016, in 2008 she keeps distance from the listeners and she is more reserved.

In comparison to the 2008, the 2016 speech is extremely criticizing. However, there is also some humorous aspect which in 2008 does not occur. All the above indicates that the speech from Clinton's first presidential campaign is more sophisticated and serious than the one from her second presidential run, and it slowly graduates towards the end. The speech from 2016 is more aggressive and manipulative. Clinton puts more emphasis on pathos and tries to get closer to the audience.

5.4 Speech at the AIPAC Conference

Hillary Clinton delivered the speech at the occasion of the AIPAC Conference on 4th June 2008 in Washington, D.C. AIPAC is the American Israel Public Affairs Committee which is lobbying for pro-Israel policy and alliance of Israel and the United States. In the audience there are AIPAC members, statesmen, students that Clinton acknowledges in her speech, and whoever else supports the pro-Israel policy because the AIPAC conferences are accessible to public (after registration).

The aim seems to be rather different than in the previous two remarks. Author's performance at the conference is obviously part of her campaign, thus she is trying to convince the audience that she is the perfect candidate for president. However, it is slightly sidelined by her effort to inspire or motivate the listeners to stand up for one's beliefs, against anti-Semitism, and to support relationship with Israel. Nonetheless, it is also possible that it is another intentional strategy of hers, which should contribute to her credibility and suitability as a presidential candidate by showing her strong principles.

As it was before, ceremonial, judicial and deliberative genres mix in the speech. At the beginning Clinton applies an implicit ethos by thanking, congratulating and paying tribute, which belongs to the ceremonial genre. Recalling past events and using them as examples or proofs confirming her arguments falls into judicial genre. And finally, giving her opinions belongs to deliberative genre.

The whole speech is clear and well-organised. Concerning the language, there are some contractions, which are a feature of informality but apart from that the language appears rather formal. Clinton does not use almost any colloquial phrases, any fill ups, and the vocabulary is rich, the grammar is adequate. On the other hand, she does not use any bookish expressions, complicated terminology; with the exception of foreign names, such as “*Hamas, Hezbollah, etc.*” thus the speech is comprehensible and obviously well prepared. I did not find any signs of spontaneity, which might not be even suitable for this occasion anyway, considering the seriousness of the topic and the esteemed statesmen in the audience. The sentence length evidently changes but the author uses mainly longer descriptive sentences.

The richness of the vocabulary is enhanced by the use of strong abstract nouns, such as “*freedom, democracy, hatred, joy, relief, peace, security, valour, struggle, right, hope etc.,*” lexical verbs and modals like “*reject, believe, fight, defend, need, must*” and adjectives as “*courageous, failed, dangerous, heroic, unyielding, nonnegotiable, prosperous, unchanging.*” All these do not only enrich the vocabulary, they also carry an emotional character, and therefore they are elements of the speech’s pathos.

At the beginning, Clinton titles the listeners “*friends*” and she claims that she “*feels like this is a giant family reunion*”. Apart from the informality that it implies, it functions as a unifying and connecting tool. However, she never calls the audience “*friends*” again, she uses a pronoun “*you*” instead. It may be intentional, so the addressing corresponds with the rather formal impression of the speech. First person plural is not sporadic, too, as it was not in the previous speeches. Equally, she often uses a word “*America*” which also plays a unifying role, and awakens a sense of nationalism among the listeners (“*America needs, America does, etc.*”).

For emphasizing Clinton uses repetition but there are not many cases where this feature appears. Therefore, I assume that Clinton must have operated with her voice a lot, and work with the powerful words which have already weight on their own, and draw attention. There is not many figures of speech, except a few metaphors (e.g. “*a swamp of fear and pessimism*”), and descriptive metaphorical part at the end of the speech, whose purpose is to appeal on the hearers’ emotions (“*In a way we are still walking together and the image of this very dignified Ethiopian Jew [...] bearing the scars of his heroic rescue effort [...] was one I will carry with me my entire life because that was really Israel.*”)

At the beginning of the speech, after she thanks everyone, Clinton attracts the audience by conveying empathy to those who had been discouraged from standing up for American-

Israeli relationship, and inspiring them to persistence. Moreover, as a senator from New York, she tries to involve the listeners and catch their attention by asking a question, whether there are some New Yorkers in the audience.

The speech is interspersed with stories that Clinton experienced, and with some facts that are supposed to shock the hearers, for example that “*the Palestinian textbooks reject Israel’s right to exist*” or that “*the Saudis have textbooks describing Jews as wicked*”. In a great rate, she introduces her stories or arguments with “*I went to, I visited, I have seen, etc.*” which obviously contributes to her credibility, and she appears as an experienced, worldly-wise woman. Clinton also intends to persuade the audience by showing her attitudes and resolute principles “*I feel, I believe, I support, I have a bedrock commitment to*”, whereas with phrases “*I know it is right in my head, in my heart and in my gut, I am deeply moved by, etc.*” she engages pathos of the speech.

Regarding comments of criticism, Clinton has a couple insinuations about President Bush’s failed policy but what is more significant in this speech is her urging on voting for a Democrat and her warnings about future if a Republican ends up to be a president. She also praises Senator Obama, even though he is basically her opponent.

The speech carries serious and urgent tone. It appears to be sentimental in some places but the author rather uses these passages to inspire and motivate. The thing in which this speech differs from the previous two is that it motivates the audience not only to support Clinton but also AIPAC, pro-Israel policy, and to hold by one’s opinions.

To sum up, Clinton bases this speech on powerful words and real life stories, in majority those, which she experienced herself, or which touch her somehow. All those have a direct impact on pathos, ethos and logos at the same time. The language is rather formal adapted to the occasion and the audience.

5.5 Remarks at the AIPAC Policy Conference

Hillary Clinton made this speech at the AIPAC Conference in Washington, D.C. on 21st March 2016 to the audience of AIPAC members, statesmen, as well as to the public and students whose presence she often mentions in the speech, and refers to them as the “*future of AIPAC*”. She intends to convince the listeners about her opinions about U.S. cooperation with Israel, and that these opinions and principles are the ones that the next President of the United States has to possess. Thus, the main purpose of the speech is again to mobilize supporters and voters, and unify people in a belief that the relationship with Israel is important for them and for America.

As it usually is in this kind of speeches, there is a combination of all three genres. Clinton introduces her talk with thanking and greeting (ceremonial). Then presents her arguments with a help of past events and her experience (judicial), convey her intentions as a president, and warns against consequences of wrong choice concerning the election (deliberative).

The speech is organised, intelligible, and grammatically correct. Contractions occasionally occur there as well as some empty words. Clinton's wealthy vocabulary contributes to the seriousness of topic and corresponds with the nature of the event. However, there is a lot of figurative language. Therefore, I would characterize her language as informal. Despite that she uses longer compound sentences most of the time, even towards the end of the speech, where I would expect them to be shorter and straightforward, and that is a sign of formal language, too.

There are some instances of the abstract powerful nouns, such as "*equality, tolerance, pluralism, freedom, intolerance, extremism, peace, etc.*" I also detected frequent use of modals "*must, need*" which gives an urging impression. Clinton addresses the hearers rarely as "*you*", instead she uses first person plural, and in that way creates a sense of integrity. A word "*friends*" often appears in the speech, too. However, it works as an addressing just three times – at the beginning, in the middle part, and at the end. It is one of the features of informality but it helps to keep the contact with the audience. In the rest of the cases, it functions as an expression for good relationships with other countries.

To add more sense of integrity the author employs words "*United States*" and "*America*". These are examples of assimilation but in some cases, she does not use them in a positive way, for the unifying effect. For instance, in the part where she mentions that candidates who have opposing opinions about the topic are wrong, she follows: "*It would be a serious mistake for the United States to abandon our responsibilities or cede the mantle of leadership for global peace and security.*" I think that she is trying to magnify the fact of terrible consequences, which might come, and would have impact on the whole America, if voting for the other candidates.

"*United States*" appears also in metonymy later in the speech: "*[...] if I'm fortunate enough to be elected president, the United States will reaffirm we have a strong and enduring national interest in Israel's security.*" In this instance, however, the impersonalization does not carry a purpose of hiding responsibility because it would not give much sense in the context. Instead, Clinton is again trying to provide an impression of unity, which she confirms with the use of personal pronoun "*we*" following right after.

As it was mentioned above, Clinton adopts a lot of figurative language in this speech. The most frequent are metaphors, such as *“a rising tide of extremism across a wide arc of instability; rockets rain down on residential neighbourhoods; Teheran’s fingerprints are on every conflict; that poisons the future, etc.”*, synecdoche is occasional *“we need steady hands”*. Then she uses rhetorical questions to keep the contact with the audience, and anaphora with parallelism for emphasizing.

When employing the pathos with the strategy of touching stories, she often uses children as the main subjects because they are innocent and vulnerable. Therefore, the whole story has even greater emotional appeal. In addition, the stories are often shocking *“I’ve listened to doctors describe the shrapnel left in a leg, an arm or even a head”*, and to intensify that, the author uses connotations of words with vast sentimental impact. For example, *“Taylor Force was murdered by a Palestinian terrorist”*, the word “murder” often notes a human killing, which is against the law, and it is more negative than the word “kill”, which is more general.

The criticizing of other candidates is not direct. In one case, Clinton mocks candidates who are not persistent in their opinions, and puts herself in a position of the opposite, the ideal candidate. Nonetheless, more than criticizing opposition, she acquires warning from future, and highlights the importance of the elections. At the same time, she stresses and describes her experience and strong principles, especially in terms of foreign policy, terrorism, and relationships with Israel.

The figurative language gives the speech a sentimental undertone but the overall tone is rather serious and urgent. Furthermore, the repeated modals *“must, need”* provide a motivational spirit, and when Clinton addresses the students, she is often inspiring, such as in a part *“I hope you stay strong, keep speaking out, don’t let anyone silence you, bully you or try to shut down debate, especially in places of learning like colleges and universities.”*

To sum up, this speech is rather informal but Clinton still takes in mind the seriousness of the conference, and adjusts her vocabulary to the present audience, which consists from honoured people, as well as students and broad public. There is a lot of figurative language and stories, which engage emotions and have an impact on her credibility as well because she presents them as she experienced it.

5.6 Comparison of AIPAC Speeches

Clinton gave both speeches at the AIPAC Conference, before the results of primary elections were known. The audience was more or less the same in relation to demographics, except it

was bigger in 2016 as the author mentions which in my opinion does not influence the speech that much. The purposes of these two talks are the same, as well as the tone. Even though they differ in the content, both give similar messages. Clinton's story telling strategies are akin to one another, too.

Where I notice the difference, is in distinctive language. In 2016, Clinton's language carries more features of informality. Nonetheless, similarly to the 2008 speech, she has rich vocabulary, if not even richer. One of the signs of informality is also the figurative language, which to some extent occurs in 2008 talk too but it is large-scale in 2016.

It follows that, although these two speeches are much alike, there is still some progress in Clinton's language and tactics. She was trying to gain larger connection with the listeners by the applying the informal language. Whereas in 2008 she focused predominantly on the power of words, her experience and stories with sentimental appeal.

6 INTERVIEWS

This chapter is going to focus on analysis of interviews with Hillary Clinton. On the grounds of great distinctiveness and differences between individual interviews, I was not able to find two interviews in both campaigns, which would be similar enough, as it was with the speeches, to proper comparison. Interviews that I found varied in one aspect or another. They had different interviewers, were broadcasted on different TV stations, had questions covering different topics, were from different parts of the campaign, or had different length and therefore the depth of the covered subject differed, etc. All these aspect influence the questions that Clinton is asked, and the responses that she gives.

Thus, I decided to choose two interviews from each campaign, analyse them separately, and compare them not as two pairs like in the previous chapter with speeches but as interviews from 2008 vs. interviews from 2016. I tried to select interviews whose questions are about the same nature, which have similar length, and are from about the same time of the campaign.

I am going to focus just on Clinton's responses and her language. I assume the audience is mostly the same since all the interviews were transmitted by national televisions. The purpose of giving interviews is to prove that the candidate suits the best for the president, and it might help to convince people to support the candidate based on how well she is responding and dealing with the questions asked.

6.1 Interview with Bob Schieffer on CBS News' "Face the Nation"

This interview with Hillary Clinton was made on 27th January 2008 for the CBS News. The interviewer is a television journalist Bob Schieffer. It falls into a deliberative and judicial genre because Clinton just reacts on the questions and affairs from the past, and provides her future intentions if she is elected.

Clinton follows grammatical rules but her vocabulary is not that wealthy as during the pre-prepared speeches. The language is informal. Clinton addresses the commentator with his first name, and use contractions, colloquialisms and empty words, in particular "*you know*". It is a sign of spontaneity and some kind of a proof that she has not received the questions in advance. It is supposed to gain some time for the speaker to organise thoughts. However, in some parts she uses it so often that it gives an impression that she does not how to react to the question, especially when she is trying to defend and somehow excuse her husband's aggressive comments towards Barack Obama. In addition, it could be disturbing as well, because it breaks the flow of the talk.

In the first question she is asked what did she learned from her loss over South Carolina. In her response, she shows good manners by saying that she congratulated Senator Obama on his victory but she does not answer the question. Instead, she immediately says that she won in Michigan, and changes the topic by starting to talk about her efforts and big challenges for the country.

In another case, she provides an ambiguous and vague reaction to the Obama's accusation of partisanship and verbally attacking him during her campaign. She is even trying to deny it first, by saying "*that's not how I heard it*". Eventually, she trivialize it by saying "*I think that's part of a, you know, vigorous election*", and in order to not leave a negative picture of herself she adds, "*at the end of the day, we will come together as Democrats*", which creates an image of them as a unified "teammates".

Clinton also uses trivialization when her husband was accused of aggressive comments. She says that he has got "*a little carried away*". Moreover, she excuses it with a sleep deprivation, human nature, with the fact that he loves her, and then changes the topic again to Bill Clinton's contributions for the country.

During the whole interview Clinton engages a rather defensive attitude but tries to appear positive and above it. She often uses phrases, such as "*I am honoured, humbled, grateful, or proud*", which have an emotional appeal and show her politeness. Her arguments, however, are not very strong and that is probably the reason why she often tries to avoid direct answers that might hurt her image.

To sum up, the logos in this interview is poor and Clinton attempts to save her image by pathos. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it more likely hurts her credibility and makes her less trustworthy. She is often evasive and her answers are sometimes ambiguous. On the other hand, she does not criticise or attack opposition; it is more the other way around. She is trying to be polite and to convince the interviewer and the listeners that they are all "on the same boat".

6.2 Interview with Charlie Gibson of ABC News

On 14th May 2008 Clinton is interviewed by journalist Charlie Gibson for the ABC News. The genre is a blend of judicial, ceremonial and deliberative type. Some passages have a praising function (questions concerning her chances to win), some have justifying function (financing of her campaign, an impact of her gender and race of Barack Obama on election), and in some she makes promises.

The language is informal with similar features to the previous interview – contractions, colloquialisms, informal addressing of the interviewer, empty words. This time, however, Clinton frequently use hesitation sounds “*uh, um*”. It has the same reasons like using the phrase “*you know*” and again the frequency increases when she is asked an unpleasant or difficult question. There is also an occurrence of repetition. Nevertheless, in this case, it does not function as a tool for emphasizing but it means that the interviewee is thinking about her answer and tries to formulate her thoughts.

In about the half of the instances, Clinton answers directly to the question she is asked but in the other half, she is rather evasive, trying to avoid the answer. For example, when Gibson asks her how much in the debt her campaign is. She does not give a concrete answer. Instead, she tries to change the topic by boasting herself, claiming, “*I’ve raised more money, uh, for a primary election, than anybody ever in American history [...]*.” She frequently acquires this tactics of turning the talk to herself, even though she has already answered the question. It is one of her ways to convince people that she is the only suitable candidate.

She also refuses to accept that Barack Obama is in better position to be nominated, and insists on her conviction that it is not decided yet, and that she is going to be a stronger candidate against the Republican McCain. Moreover, she often stresses that she and Obama agree on many things, that they both face race or gender prejudices. Thus, she wants to create an impression that they are both in the same position, and have the same conditions but she might be distorting the reality.

Simultaneously, she tries to persuade the hearers that she is more suitable for the post of president. However, her arguments in those passages do not seem to be convincing because of her uncertainty, frequent usage of hesitating sounds, and simply the fact that some of her arguments are based on clichés such as, “*I’m going to work hard, I want to represent all fifty states, I believe strongly in bringing people together, etc.*”

To sum up, Clinton evidently wants to appear confident in this interview and convince the listeners that she still has a chance to win so people should support her. However, her evasiveness, in some instances, decreases her trustworthiness. On the other hand, she does not criticize anybody, and it even seems to me that she does not want to insult anyone. She is trying to be polite and tactful, especially when the interviewer accuses some groups of voters from racism, Clinton provides an ambiguous response, and reverses it with giving the credit to those who look on what the candidates stand for instead of their race.

6.3 Interview with Wolf Blitzer of CNN

It is an interview led by journalist Wolf Blitzer on 2nd February 2016 for CNN. It is mixture of ceremonial, judicial and deliberative genre. At the beginning, Clinton comments on her victory in Iowa caucuses and expresses gratefulness to her team, later on she explains some of her previous claims, and mentions her plans.

Language of Clinton's is informal, using colloquialisms, contractions; however, she does not use the empty words that often and speak fluently and smoothly. Additionally, she uses extensive vocabulary. This might mean that she knew the questions in advance and that she prepared for it. Nonetheless, in one part she is evidently surprised by one question where she was asked whether she agrees with checking the Iowa voting. Her response starts with *"You know, look, I – they – I can say that I believe [...]."* Hence, I think that her answers were not pre-prepared.

She is never interrupted during her talk. One of the reasons might be that she usually does not avoid direct answers, which gives an assertive and confident impression. Nevertheless, in one case, she is evasive – when Blitzer asks her why does she think that Bernie Sanders is more popular than she is among young people. Clinton does not answer the question at all; she immediately starts to talk about her plans about reaching to young voters and her intentions to help young people with student debts and other issues.

As far as a criticism of opposition is concerned, there is no occurrence from her part, even though she has opportunities for negative reactions when Blitzer's questions her about Senator Sanders and Senator Rubio. She refers to Bernie Sanders as a friend. In the case of Marco Rubio, she plainly conveys her experiences as a reason, which should guarantee her victory over him. She has one comment about the Republicans running ads against her, though, which she turns into an argument about her strength as a candidate.

To sum up, during this interview, Clinton appears positive and confident, partially with the contribution of her way of speaking. She puts emphasis on ethos when she mentions her experience and contributions to the society while making arguments, too. Pathos is engaged mainly with conveying her happiness over the victory in Iowa. In majority of the cases her statements are logical and relevant.

6.4 Interview with George Stephanopoulos of ABC News "This Week"

Journalist George Stephanopoulos interviews Hillary Clinton on 7th February 2016 for the ABS News. The genre of this interview is judicial because most of the time Clinton explains

herself from some accusations by her opponents, and accuses them in return, specifically Bernie Sanders.

The language is informal, again with typical contractions, fill ups “*you know*”, and addressing the interviewer by his first name. Stephanopoulos often interrupts her and I think it has an impact on frequent use of empty words, and repetitions. Her vocabulary seems to be wealthier than in 2008 but still comprehensible. Furthermore, there are phrases typical for spoken informal language, for example “*George, look, I – look, [...].*”

She was questioned over two major issues. First, Clinton faces the accusation by Marco Rubio, which concerns her opinions on abortion. Her response seems to remain calm, and after commenting on the Rubio’s statement, she turns against Republicans and accuses them from an effort to defund Planned Parenthood. She closes the whole reaction with a claim “*it’s just so unfortunate that politicians like Senator Rubio are trying to politicize these kinds of very difficult concerns*”. With the relation to the previous context, she is demonizing Senator Rubio, and pictures him as an ignorant politician, who does not understand to the complexity of the problem and to the tough choices that women have to make. However, she expresses it in a polite sophisticated way, yet still appealing to the listeners’ emotions.

Then she is asked to react on a record, which should apparently prove that Clinton has changed her position on the bankruptcy bill in 2001, due to Wall Street contributions. Again, she responds with confidence. Her arguments make sense, and she provides back-story to this case, where she portrays herself as a strong woman who is not afraid to take responsibility and make hard choices. Eventually, she criticizes Sanders for questioning her records.

When the interviewer interrupts her, she lets him to ask her another question for the first time but when it happens several times, she is uncompromising and rather sharply claims “*but let me finish, George*”. It might appear rude but it also makes her look confident and assertive. Moreover, Clinton is trying to employ her credibility by referring to her experience, and as well as in her speeches, she engages emotional stories.

To sum up, during the whole interview, Clinton appears to be confident, and critical. She adopts not only defensive strategy but also fights back. She does not avoid answers, her arguments are logical and she engages ethos, as well as pathos with the way she works with the real life examples and her experiences.

6.5 Comparison of Interviews from 2008 and 2016 Campaigns

All four analysed interviews had different interviewer and various questions, which, I assume, reacted on the different contexts and events during the two campaigns. However, selected interviews cover all the genres, and that makes the comparison possible.

The language that Clinton uses in both years of campaigning is informal with similar features. However, it seems that Clinton tries to abandon the use of empty words and hesitation sounds, whose occurrence decreases in the 2016 interviews. As opposed to confident and assertive manners in 2016, Clinton appears uncertain in some cases of the 2008 interviews. It may have been caused by the lack of experience in her first presidential run.

Furthermore, in the interviews of the first campaign Clinton tries to be polite and to avoid attacks on other candidates. In the second campaign, a criticism of her opponents is not rare, and she often falls for attacks when she faces her own criticism. Despite that, she tries to be polite and not aggressive, probably because she wants to give a positive impression.

In the first campaign, she frequently avoids the answers to the questions that might put her in a negative position. The analysis shows a few examples of evasion in 2016 but in the majority of instances Clinton provides the listeners with the answer. The last major difference is in her argumentation, which appears to be weaker in 2008 where the analysis discovered trivialization, clichés and ambiguity. It can be caused by her lack of experience again.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to analyse and compare Hillary Clinton's rhetoric during her political campaigns in 2008 and 2016.

The first chapter of theoretical part is devoted to classical rhetoric with an application to the present day oratory. It explains rhetorical genres, rhetorical appeals and five canons of rhetoric. Next chapter focuses predominantly on the rhetorical style and linguistics. The last chapter describes Clinton's political career.

The analytical part examines two kinds of Clinton's rhetoric – speeches and interviews that she gave during her two presidential campaigns. The corpus consists of a total number of eight transcripts, four from each year and each kind. The analysis was followed by the comparison of Clinton's language, tone and her rhetorical strategies in both years, which monitors her rhetorical development.

The outcome of the analysis indicates Clinton's higher assertiveness and confidence in the 2016 campaign. She is also more criticising in her second presidential run, especially in her speeches. Furthermore, her language in speeches showed more aspects of informality in that year, probably in order to gain larger connection with the listeners because informal language appears more trustworthy. That correlates with the primary purpose of her rhetoric – to mobilize supporters of her candidacy.

In conclusion, rhetoric of Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign evolved proved to be stronger in terms of persuasive strategies, which have subsequently impact on the result and success rate of persuasion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Abrams, Dennis. 2009. *Hillary Rodham Clinton: politician*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Aristotle. 1924. *Rhetoric*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle. 1991. *The Art of Rhetoric*. H. Lawson-Tancred (trans). London: Penguin.
- Clinton, Hillary Rodham. 2004. *Living history*. New York: Scribner.
- Cockcroft, Robert, and Susan M. Cockcroft. 1996. *Persuading People: An Introduction to Rhetoric*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Corbett, Edward P. J., and Robert J. Connors. 1999. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Demirdogen, Ulku D. 2010. "The Roots of Research in (political) Persuasion: Ethos, Pathos, Logos and the Yale Studies of Persuasive Communications." *International Journal of Social Inquiry* 3: 189-201.
- Edwards, Janis L. 2009. *Gender and Political Communication in America: Rhetoric, Representation, and Display*. Lanham, MD.: Lexington Books.
- Epstein, Dwayne. 2010. *Hillary Clinton*. Detroit: Lucent Books.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne. 2013. *Rhetorical Style the Use of Language in Persuasion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, Norman, and Isabela Fairclough. 2012. *Political Discourse Analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Chafe, Wallace, and Jane Danielewicz. 1987. "Properties of Spoken and Written Language." In *Comprehending Oral and Written Language*, ed. Rosalind Horowitz and S. Jay Samuels, 83–113. New York: Academic Press.
- Johnstone, Barbara, and Christopher Eisenhart, eds. 2008. *Rhetoric in Detail: Discourse Analyses of Rhetorical Talk and Text*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.
- Larson, Charles U. 2013. *Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility*. Boston, Mass.: Wadsworth Publ..
- Lawler, Peter, and Robert Schaefer. 2016. *American Political Rhetoric: Essential Speeches and Writings*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lotko, Edvard. 2004. *Kapitoly ze současné rétoriky*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého.
- Lynne Lewis Gaillet and Michelle F. Eble, 2016. *Primary Research and Writing: People, Places, and Spaces*. Routledge.

- Martin, James. 2014. *Politics and Rhetoric: A Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- May, James M. 2002. *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. Leiden: Brill.
- Quintilian. 1996. *Institutio Oratoria: Books I-III*. Translated by Harold Edgeworth Butler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walker, John. 2008. *A Rhetorical Grammar: In Which the Common Improperities in Reading and Speaking Are Detected and the True Sources of Elegant Pronunciation Are Pointed*. Kessinger Publishing.
- Yoos, George. 2009. *Politics & Rhetoric: Coming to Terms with Terms*. New York: Springer.
- Žantovská, Irena. 2015. *Rétorika a komunikace*. Praha: Dokořán.

ONLINES SOURCES

- Aristotle. "Book I - Chapter 3." Aristotle's Rhetoric. March 15, 2004. Accessed March 11, 2017. <http://rhetoric.eserver.org/aristotle/rhet1-3.html>.
- Burton, Gideon. "The Canons of Rhetoric." Silva Rhetorica. 2016. Accessed March 11, 2017. <http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Canons/Canons.htm>.
- Quintilian. "Book 3 - Chapter 3." Quintilian's Institutes of Oratory. May 25, 2004. Accessed March 11, 2017. <http://rhetoric.eserver.org/quintilian/3/chapter3.html>.
- Rorty, Amélie Oksenberg. 1992. "The Directions of Aristotle's "Rhetoric"" *The Review of Metaphysics* 46: 63-95. Accessed March 30, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20129293>.