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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to investigate what rhetorical strategies are applied in pre-election speeches of two presidents – the president of the United States Mr. Donald Trump and the president of the Republic of Lithuania Ms. Dalia Grybauskaitė. To achieve this aim qualitative rhetorical analysis was employed and the following objectives were set: to identify rhetorical strategies used in political speeches by the two presidents in order to determine the patterns of the usage of rhetorical strategies; to investigate the differences in the employment of rhetorical strategies in two politicians’ pre-elective speeches; and to interpret and explain the choice of rhetorical strategies applied in political speeches. The results of the study demonstrated that in the pre-election speeches, D. Trump mostly refers to ethos in order to persuade the audience, whereas D. Grybauskaitė appeals to pathos in her pre-presidency addresses. In addition, both presidents apply the same rhetorical tropes, however, these stylistic devices transfer different messages. Further studies on the implementation of rhetorical strategies in political discourse must be conducted in order to relate particular events or situation in the country with the politicians’ application of different rhetorical strategies in their speeches.
INTRODUCTION

Politics is a struggle among politicians in order to gain power and implement particular political, economic and social intentions. In this process, language is of great importance and it certainly plays a crucial role since every political action is set, conducted and affected by language (Schäffner, 1997: 1). As Fairclough (1989: 23) goes further, “politics is not just conducted through language, but much of politics is language”. Political leaders are apprehensive about their use of language and consequently, they pay attention to miscellaneous rhetoric techniques which serve as reinforcement of politicians’ ideas. In other words, the use of various rhetorical strategies in language helps to flatter the public image of politicians and influence the beliefs and attitudes of the audience.

The study of political discourse has been around for as long as politics itself and how language is used in politics is a relevant topic of public debate. The very language is a significant tool of persuasion and the purpose of the politicians is to introduce their ideologies the way they would satisfy people’s needs, desires, social and personal beliefs. While some politicians are accused of misusing language and are ridiculed as being injudicious and shallow, others are incriminated of using it too well while being skillful manipulators of the mind.

Politicians use a number of mechanisms that the language grants in order to develop the oldest of democratic arts, the art of persuasion (Partington, 2010: 9). In fact, political persuasion was born with the first democracy in Ancient Greece and the Greeks developed what they called art of rhetoric. Rhetoric had three major areas of application: for politics (agora, that is “public space”), for law (forensic) and for speeches of public praise (epideictic). Aristotle defined rhetoric as the “arts of persuasive discourse”, that is, “the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents” (Cockcroft and Cockcroft 1992: 3). In addition to this, three distinct elements were asserted by Aristotle in order to achieve effective persuasion. These were the orator’s personality (i.e., ethos), the sentiments of the audience (i.e., pathos) and the rationality of the orator’s reasons (i.e., logos) (Beiner 1999: 745). With the help of these artistic proofs orators are able to sell their views and affect the listeners’ beliefs and attitudes. Nevertheless, modern studies of rhetoric are more self-conscious and interrelates with social theory, communication science, historical aspect and political science.
Knowledge of how to employ the strategies of persuasion is considered to be one of the principal ways in order for the politician to gain a favorable public opinion. For this reason, politicians adjust appropriate linguistic techniques in their political speeches, such as stylistic devices. Figures of speech help to embellish the speech and to attain success in public debates or in political discussions. Political leaders apply stylistic devices in their remarks in order to strengthen their thoughts and arguments on an issue or to create an impression of an authoritative leader. These mechanisms serve as the most effective way for political leaders to communicate the ‘voice within’ to their audiences.

The study of rhetorical strategies offers the hypothesis that presidential candidates implement a wide range of rhetorical strategies in their pre-election speeches in order to gain the audience’s benevolence and win the election.

The object of the present research is rhetorical strategies used by present President of Lithuania Dalia Grybauskaitė and present President of the USA Donald Trump in their electoral speeches. In order to execute the research, the paper focuses on relevant literature survey and the practical analysis of English and Lithuanian electoral speeches.

The research questions of the paper are: What rhetorical strategies do presidents Donald Trump and Dalia Grybauskaitė imply in their political speeches; What means of linguistic implementation are used in presidents’ addresses; How do the implemented rhetorical strategies help the presidents gain the audience’s attention and persuasion?

The aim of this research is to examine and to compare/contrast the use of rhetorical strategies, as well as the employment of different rhetorical tropes in order to attain these rhetorical techniques indicated in pre-election speeches of Donald Trump and Dalia Grybauskaitė.

To achieve the aim, the following objectives were set:

1. To identify rhetorical strategies used in political speeches by the two presidents in order to determine the patterns of the usage of rhetorical strategies;
2. To investigate rhetorical tropes applied in the political speeches of the two presidents in order to determine the linguistic implementation of rhetorical strategies;
3. To compare and contrast the choice of rhetorical strategies, as well as their linguistic realization in the speeches by the two presidents.

The method used for the research was qualitative rhetorical analysis of the language used by Dalia Grybauskaitė and Donald Trump in their discourses in the electoral speeches in order to investigate, analyze and address the peculiar research questions of this study. The foundation for the data analyses of this study was the Aristotelian rhetorical strategies ethos (i.e., ethical appeals), logos (i.e., rational appeals), and pathos (i.e., emotional appeals).

The data collected for this research is the corpora of 33 025 words in 8 pre-election speeches of D. Trump and 35 pre-election speeches of D. Grybauskaitė. The scope of data used in the research paper is 18 598 words of 8 speeches by D. Trump which were delivered in the time of first election and 14 427 words of 35 speeches by D. Grybauskaitė which were delivered in the period of re-election.

The paper is significant because the research seeks to explain how the implementation of carefully chosen words in political discourse can help a politician persuade and manipulate public, as well as gain political power and even win the audience’s votes in presidential election. Simultaneously, the research provides a deeper perception of the realization of rhetorical tropes while comparing politicians of two different countries, i.e. Lithuania and the USA. Furthermore, this research is valuable for all politically active individuals to understand how the politicians achieve their audience’s favour.
1. DEFINING DISCOURSE

1.1. Analyzing political discourse

As this paper concentrates on the political speeches of two presidents, D. Trump and D. Grybauskaitė, it is of great importance to firstly define political discourse and its object.

Assuming that the very term *discourse* is broad with a number of definitions, as well as it consolidates a whole pallet of meanings, it is crucial to first of all understand the core of this concept. Discourse can be perceived as a whole process of communication in which a text is only a part. Discourse can be also realized as a way of expressing oneself with the use of words (Bayram 2010: 24). In other words, discourse is simply what we get when people use language while interacting.

According to Schaffner (1996: 201), political discourse is a sub-category of discourse, which is based on both functional and thematic criteria. The scholar explains that political discourse is a result of politics, which performs a number of functions regarding various political activities. Due to its topics, which are primarily connected with politics, political discourse is also considered to be thematic. Van Dijk determines political discourse in the most effortless way, explaining that “political discourse is identified by its actors or authors, i.e. politicians” (1997: 12). The scholar states that the studies of political discourse mainly focus on texts and talks of politicians and political institutions, for instance ministers, members of parliament or government, presidents, etc. In this sense, politicians are the group of people who are elected as the central players of the polity and who are getting paid for their activities. Nevertheless, this particular way of explaining political discourse could be also applied to any other kind of discourse, for instance medical or educational discourse with the corresponding participants in the field of medicine or education. For this reason, it is important to recognize and establish specific peculiarities in order to be able to differentiate political discourse from any other kind of discourse.

Therefore, van Dijk highlights the significance of interactional point of view of political discourse. In other words, various recipients as citizens, the public, and the “masses” also appear on the stage of the political communication, which make political discourse truly political. In addition, Schiffrin (et al., 2001: 420) adds to van Dijk and convinces that describing what is
actually considered to be political is rather challenging and the term *political discourse* remains to be ambiguous. Moreover, Ismail (2013: 2) claims that the word *political* is related to general issues such as power, control, conflict and domination and these concepts can be applied in any other kind of discourse, which actually means that all discourses might be potentially political. Therefore, in order to perceive the nature of political discourse, it is significant to differentiate the structure of this particular type of discourse from any other type of discourse.

According to van Dijk, particular structures of a text or a speech that are exclusively “political” should be taken into consideration when defining what belongs to the political discourse (1997: 25). These structures expose the political nature of a certain discourse since they primarily appear in this field (ibid. 24). The most overt aspect that distinguishes political discourse from other types of discourse is the lexicon (ibid. 25). In other words, there are some typical political words, which can be called *lexical jargon* that indicate a context as belonging to the political genre. For instance, various stylistic devices in political context have completely different functions than in for example, educational context and therefore, they help indicating political discourse. Schiffrin (et al., 2001: 411) adds that political discourse includes almost all levels of linguistics, starting from lexis and ending with pragmatics. At the lexical level, political discourse may include specific euphemisms or technical words, while pragmatic level involves such objects as metaphors, speech acts or implicatures. Furthermore, figurative language is applied in political discourse in order to effectively emphasize political views, to manipulate public’s opinion, parliament debates, legitimate political power, etc. A conclusion can be made that specific lexical items are selected not only to meet the requirements of political criteria and make either a talk or a text official but also in order to emphasize political opinions and attitudes, manipulate the audience or render political ideologies. This only proves that language possesses an ability not only to generate power but also to become a field where this power can be employed (Bayram 2010: 27).

As far as the differentiation of political discourse from other discourse is considered, the topics of political discourse are necessary to be discussed. Van Dijk (2001: 203) emphasizes that political discourse is primarily related to politics and its major subjects, i.e. political systems, ideologies, organizations, political actors, events, etc. What the author distinguishes is that political discourse is rather reflexive and this reflexivity is not quite true to the types of other discourses, for example, legal or educational discourse:
“Campaigning politicians will speak about themselves as candidates, about the elections, about voting for them, and the policies they promise to support when elected. They speak about opponents and political enemies and about the bad politics and policies of previous presidents, governments or parliaments” (van Dijk, 1997: 25).

Political discourse and the very definition of politics itself possess a strong bond and one cannot escape the other. Consequently, Van Dijk provides some pivotal properties that indicate what is actually political and what is not. These categories are societal domain or field, political systems, political values, political ideologies, political institutions, political organizations, political groups, political actors, political relations, political process, political actions, political discourse, and political cognition.

Societal domain or field is the notion that includes all the domains of politics, e.g., Education, Health, Law, Business, etc., which play a crucial role in defining political actions and discourse. Political systems are ranks of the sphere of politics in terms of the distribution of power and decision making principles. These systems are the most evident commonsense categories, e.g., communism, the social democracy, fascism, etc. Political values are shared cultural values that are considered to be typical for political systems (freedom, justice, tolerance, etc.). Political ideologies are fundamental ideologies and beliefs shared by members of groups. Political institutions are the institutions which organize the political sphere, political actors and political actions (e.g. government, Ministries, Parliament, etc.). Political organizations are organizations that form political action, political parties being as an example. Political groups are independent from political organizations and form permanent groups such as opponents, diques, etc. Political actors are not only the very politicians but this term also includes all people who are actually engaged in politics, in other words, all the political figures. Political process is permanent, sophisticated continuance of political actions. Political actions are concrete, typical actions in political domain, such as voting, demonstrations, revolutions and so on. Political discourse is apolitical text or speech of any genre or form that includes “…propaganda, political advertising, political speeches, media interviews, political talk shows on TV, party programs, ballots, etc.” (van Dijk, 1997: 18). Political cognition is political and social attitudes which are shared towards particular political events or actions.
Nevertheless, it is important to notice that even though political discourse refers to diverse elements of political sphere and there is a number of categories defining and distinguishing political discourse from other types of discourse, political discourse also includes other societal domains. In other words, political discourse topics interrelate with other social domains. Political discourse is not a straightforward matter and therefore, it is not an easy task to make a decision whether a text belongs to political discourse or not.

1.2. Critical discourse analysis

“What is Critical Discourse Analysis” is the question that is initially answered in this chapter in order to provide an overview of what exactly Critical Discourse Analysis is. The most generally accepted definition of Critical Discourse Analysis is set below:

“Critical Discourse Analysis sees discourse – language use in speech and writing – as a form of „social practice”. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s), which frame it: The discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. That is, discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned – it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people” (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997 in Wodak et. al. 2008: 5).

Critical discourse analysis (henceforward CDA) is a sub-area that has developed from Discourse Analysis since 1970s and that recognizes discourse as a configuration of social practice (Rashidi and Souzandehfar 2010: 56). Rashidi and Souzandehfar also clarify the distinction between discourse analysis (DA) and CDA. According to the authors, DA concentrates on the “connection between forms of language and a restricted sense of context, while also orienting to limited understanding of the higher cultural and social forces which affect our lives”. Meanwhile, CDA tends to proceed much further toward undertaking the ideological aspects of discourse. In other words, CDA “is a version of discourse that does not posit language use free of ideological conditions” (ibid., 56). In addition, CDA includes a number of views towards the analysis of social discourse which possess differences in theory, system of methods,
or research problems to which they tend to give significance. The theory of CDA emerges from various theoretical backgrounds, such as Philosophy, Anthropology, Rhetoric, Literary Studies, Sociolinguistics and Socio-Psychology (Ferati 2012: 9). As Fairclough and Wodak (1996: 15) state, CDA views the employment of language in speech and writing as a configuration of social practice. Defining discourse as social practice represents an analytic relationship between a precise discursive occurrence and the situation, social framework and institution that construct it. Furthermore, discourse is not only socially governed but also socially formed. Discourse forms situations, targets of knowledge, relationships groups of people. Discourse is also governed in the way that it helps maintain and recreate the social status, as well as rearrange it.

As a further matter, van Dijk (1995: 17) continues to explain that CDA has become a universal term defining a particular approach to the exploration of text and speech coming into being from critical semiotics and linguistics and in general, taking into account social and political factors while analyzing language, interaction and discourse. Davis (2014: 281) adds that CDA has a connection among three levels of analysis: (1) the factual text, (2) the discursive standards, norms, rules, practices and intellectual modes of socially admissible behaviour in particular roles and (3) relationships that generate, obtain, and render messages. Generally, CDA is a challenging and complex subject since it requires multi-methodological and multidisciplinary terms by which the opaque relationship between speech, power, culture, society and social cognition is disclosed (Davis 2014: 280, Ferati 2012: 9, Mengibar 2015: 39). Therefore, Mengibar (2015: 39) highlights the relation between power and knowledge, as well as building the societal knowledge and identity while analyzing discourse. Despite the fact that as in any other approach or field of language and discourse study, it is not easy to strictly determine the limits, theories, special principles, aims, objectives or methods of CDA, van Dijk (ibid. 18) proposes the criteria to characterize the work in CDA:

- Problem-oriented, rather than paradigm-oriented. Any theoretical or methodological viewpoint is appropriate to apply as long as the study of social problems, such as racism, sexism, colonialism is effective.
- CDA characterizes an explicitly critical point of view in terms of studying text and speech.
● The studies in CDA are not limited to only oral approaches to discourse but they also focus on other semiotic facets of interaction (movie, gestures, music, pictures, etc.)
● A lot of operation in CDA deals with implemented or legitimated strategies and structures of governance and rebellion in social relationships of race, language, religion, nationality, gender or ethnicity.
● CDA pays attention to the relationship between society and discourse, which also includes social recognition, culture and politics. This helps achieve an adequate analysis of social issues.
● CDA studies focus on all levels of discourse, such as style, rhetoric, speech acts, syntax, phonology, pragmatic strategies (van Djik 1995: 18, Ferati 2012: 9).

To conclude, since critical discourse analysis focuses on a variety of discourses and rhetorical approach to the delivery of language also belongs to the coverage of the study, it is necessary to define what rhetoric actually is in order to be able to look at political discourse through rhetorical prism.

2. ON THE CONCEPT OF RHETORIC

2.1. History of Rhetoric

Considering how long rhetoric truly lasts both as an art and as a science, the answer would be more than 3000 years. The origins of rhetoric can be traced back to Mesopotamian times, which was the earliest civilization in the human history. In addition, rhetoric also had its existence in ancient Egypt in the period of 2080-1640 B.C. As for ancient Greece, the earliest mention of rhetoric and oratorical skills can be indicated in Homer’s pieces of art, such as Iliad and Odyssey (Kennedy 2007: 8). To be more precise, rhetoric can be regarded as having been discovered in the fifth century B.C. in the democracies of Athens and Syracuse. Having been discovered actually means that the first attempts were made to delineate the peculiarities of an effective speech, as well as to teach other people how to plan and introduce one. From that time, a theory of public speaking developed together with a large technical vocabulary to depict characteristics of argument, style, arrangement and delivery (ibid. 3).
Back in ancient times, public speaking was a significant field since it took a highly important part in people’s social lives. For this reason, not every single person could be an orator. Frankly speaking, a good orator had to possess specific qualities. First of all, a proper orator was considered as a well-educated man with the knowledge of history, literature, psychology, medicine, and most importantly philosophy and law. DiCicco (2003: 19) adds that an ideal orator should have managed both public and private business. What is even more important, the author stresses that the aim of education in ancient times was actually to develop an excellent orator. In addition, Murray (1993: 1) affirms that rhetoric was first used in the law courts, as well as it could be also indicated as consultative rhetoric of public and legislative assemblies. What is more, a good orator had to be a charismatic man who would be able to model both his gestures and voice as an actor.

Because of public speaking and the importance of application of rhetoric in these speeches, rhetoric as a subject was a field of interest to a number of philosophers. The first tutors of rhetoric were sophists, teachers of fifth century Greece. Sophists were a group of Sicilian wanderers who started to teach people in Athens how to speak persuasively with the goal of governing senate and the courts (Keith & Lundberg 2008: 6, Crick 2014: 1). Protagoras (b. ca. 486) and Gorgias (ca. 483-374) were two major sophists in ancient Greece times, who took up rhetoric and even charged fees for making speeches for others, training how to win a legal case or teaching how to actually argue and talk persuasively (Murray 1993: 2, Keith & Lundberg 2008: 6, Lauer 2004: 13). As for two philosophers Aristotle and Plato, they focused on rhetorical communication and its high standards. Their attitude towards rhetoric was that the task of rhetoric was to inculcate and teach neither about particular truths nor about ethico-political values in general.

Furthermore, it was emphasized by Roberts (2008: 6) that even nowadays, in the theory of rhetoric, the pivotal formative work remains to be Aristotle’s Rhetoric, which has its significance for more than twenty-five hundred years. Even though Aristotle’s work was criticized and thought to be redundant and messy, consisting of poorly written collection of lecture notes (Floyd-Lapp, 2014: 2), this work remains to be an initial outline of the field of rhetoric, consisting of major terms and definitions. In his work, Aristotle argues that rhetorical studies are mostly related to modes of persuasion and for this reason, he defines rhetoric as a skill of observing the approachable means of persuasion in any given context. Crick (2014: 13) agrees
that Aristotle is the one who points out the fundamental quality of the spoken word, i.e., its unique eligibility to grip the emotional character of a particular situation with only a few gestures or words and make this work in such a way that can powerfully converge the auditorium through their shared experience. Nevertheless, Floyd-Lapp (2014: 1) debates that the significance of rhetoric, especially its purpose of persuasion has dimmed since Aristotle’s times and in order to bring rhetoric back to life, a reclamation should be implemented by scholars. In spite of this, an assertion that rhetoric neither exists, nor it is relevant as a subject nowadays would be too drastic. Although there are no public forums existing in the modern society anymore in order to resolve disputes like Athenians did in ancient times, the rhetorical notions emerging out of Aristotle’s tradition helps us speculate about our own times, challenge and status:

“Through the lens of rhetoric we can gain important insights about the contemporary world in three important areas: identity and power, visual and material symbols, and the public and democracy” (Keith & Lundberg 2008: 9).

In addition, Lauer (2004: 19) claims that Aristotle constructed several principles for examining the discourse situation and categorizing its subject. Recently, the concept “metarhetoric” has been introduced to describe a theory of rhetoric contrary to the practice or adaption of the art in a certain discourse (Kennedy 2007: 10). In general, Covino and Jolliffe (1995: 8) suggest that when it comes to rhetoric, it is all about competency that humans have - corrigible and teachable competency - for inventing structures of “reality” that others may consider as such. Briefly, rhetoric is the proficiency of knowledge-making. Some scholars have indulged themselves to learning and understanding how the art of rhetoric was comprehended and taught since antiquity, how the definition and objectives of rhetoric have transformed through the ages, and have attached these transformations to political and epistemological biases. Other scholars explore the effectiveness of real past and present texts thus adapting themselves in rhetorical criticism (ibid. 8).

On the basis of the above, it can be concluded that since ancient times rhetoric has been considered a central domain in terms of persuasion. Therefore, it is requisite to discuss the application of rhetoric in practice.
2.2. Rhetoric in practice

The term *rhetoric* is not simple to be defined. The difficulty in explaining this concept begins with the fact that in its most general meaning, rhetoric does not form a concrete body of knowledge in a particular content, like chemistry or physics for instance. As a matter of fact, rhetoric shapes content (Covino & Jolliffe, 1995: 4). According to the authors, “rhetoric is the functional organization of discourse, within its social and cultural context” (ibid. 3). Koženiauskienė (2009: 223) adds that rhetoric is the competency of saying things properly, at the right time and place in order to achieve the speaker’s goal. Tatolyté (2014: 26) emphasizes that rhetoric seeks to pay attention to the power of word and an individual’s ability to change the world through the use of the words. Furthermore, the term rhetoric is often considered to have relationship with the use of linguistic features of a text in a manipulative manner. In other words, the rhetoric of either spoken or written text is related with fraud and is seen as a technique to gain power over readers or listeners. Looking from this perspective, the definitions of rhetoric in *American Heritage Dictionary of English Language* can be considered as an example:

Rhetoric, n.: 1a. The art or study of using language effectively and persuasively. b. A treatise or book discussing this art. 2. Skill in using language effectively and persuasively. 3a. A style of speaking or writing, especially the language of a particular subject: fiery political rhetoric. b. Language that is elaborate, pretentious, insincere, or intellectually vacuous: *His offers of compromise were mere rhetoric*. 4. Verbal communication; discourse.

These descriptions given in the dictionary reveal the core idea of the concept of rhetoric, i.e. the presence of an irrefutable interrelation between language and persuasion in rhetoric. In other words, persuasion and language are inseparable in terms of the orator’s ultimate motive and recognition of the speaker with reference to the words said or written and the circumstances of the speech act: whether this motive is simply to influence or actually persuade the addressee (Koženiauskienė, 2009: 225). Furthermore, even Aristotle in ancient times viewed rhetoric as a foundation of a persuasive speech and claimed that every single person pursued rhetoric either as a listener or as a speaker (Hansen, 2003: 2, Floyd-Lapp, 2014: 4). Aristotle also defined rhetoric as a capacity of finding reasonable arguments appropriate in a given context or situation (Iqbal 2013: 10). Peleckis and Peleckienė (2015: 414) and Bankauskaité-Sereikienė (2013: 7) add that rhetoric can be defined not only as an art of persuasion but also as a science that embodies a
concrete structure, terminology and rules of a persuasive language. This is due to the fact that rhetoric is a sophisticated process containing various philosophical, psychological, pedagogical, linguistic, and sociological issues. In addition, Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė (ibid. 6) lists specific aims that rhetoric focuses on while being considered as a science of persuasion. These aims are meant to affect listeners’ (or readers’) minds, to influence listeners’ (or readers’) will, to impact their feelings, and to attain persuasion.

Since rhetoric as a concept can be overlooked from different angles, it is necessary to consider all these aspects in order to be able to comprehend rhetoric clearly. As a matter of fact, Keith and Lundberg (2008: 3) explain that rhetoric refers to a variety of matters and describe these matters more thoroughly. To start with, in terms of public speaking, rhetoric is fundamentally considered to be all about style and capacity of one to present his/her ideas persuasively. As for rhetoricians (people who study rhetoric), they might designate rhetoric as specific word choices or argument strategies in a text. Ultimately, a claim that all language is rhetorical, which refutes the idea that rhetoric is only about rules and syntax also exists. In other words, language is related to context and language is used by people to elucidate meaning within that context (ibid. 4). Moreover, Kennedy (1992: 2) proposes that in the most general sense rhetoric might be determined by the energy innate in communication: “the emotional energy that impels the speaker to speak, the physical energy expended in the utterance, the energy level coded in the message, and the energy experienced by the recipient in decoding the message” (ibid., 3).

Simultaneously, Keith and Lundberg (2008: 4) declare that rhetoric distinctly ties two notions: discourse and persuasion. As for the meanings of these two concepts, discourse is generally understood as any kind of speech, either written or spoken, while persuasion can be explained as the process or action of convincing someone or of being convinced. In this case, rhetoric can be analyzed as both a production of discourse and interpretation of how and why this discourse is persuasive (ibid. 4). In addition, Keith and Lundberg (ibid., 4) propose that more often than not one persuades others in case he or she wants a person or a group of people to take up his or her position or preferred course of action. The scholars explain that everything that one does with other people certainly implicates cooperation and this kind of cooperation assuredly takes a principle of persuasion. To be more specific, every level of social or political action (from family and friends or national and international politics) requires some kind of cooperation and
persuasion. Moreover, Keith and Lundberg (ibid. 5) divide persuasion into two categories: active and passive. Active persuasion is one’s attempt to change another person’s opinion or decision. An example of passive persuasion can be any kind of advertisement or commercial, which has a purpose to influence a consumer and purchase an advertised item. This substantiates that persuasion is the foundation of a coordinated action, no matter if it was a political, social or any other sphere. “Persuasion is the glue that holds people to a common purpose and therefore facilitates collective action” (ibid. 5).

All in all, persuasion is the major aim of the subject of rhetoric. Accordingly, it must be evident that different strategies can be applied in order to achieve persuasive goals. Thus, different rhetorical strategies will be introduced in the following chapter.

2.3. Rhetorical strategies by appeal

Every single speech has different objectives. Some speeches might have a purpose to inform somebody about something, other speeches seek to convince or draw attention to something. Taking into consideration these objectives, it is obvious that they are addressed to persuasive goals. For this reason, it is not difficult to indicate rhetoric in most of the discourse since in any case the speaker usually, perhaps even unknowingly, takes up ethical, logical or pathetical reasoning (Berlanga et. al., 2013: 131).

As it was already discussed in the previous chapter, persuasive influence is the most notable function of rhetoric. Lunsford (1993: 54) and Ko (2015: 116) state that Aristotle was the first one who discerned persuasion into three rhetorical appeals that may affect the audience: authority of the orator (ethos), emotions and feelings of the audience (pathos) and logical reasoning (logos).

2.3.1. Ethos

How we are looked over has a direct influence on either we succeed or fail to persuade the receiver of the message. If the public is not convinced by the speaker’s personality, they are unlikely to be inclined by his/her arguments. Baker (2015: 2) explains that ethos is reliability that the orator builds up in his/her communication. It is the degree to which people are perceived to be sound, ethical, accountable and sincere. Ethos is not only important for most communications but
it also has great significance for relational messages established to generate benevolence and create relationships.

Aristotle acknowledged the innate truth that people’s perception weather a person is good or not plays a significant role in terms of persuasion (McCormack, 2014: 136). In other words, if people believe a person is decent, they are prone to believe him/her more readily and more fully than others. Thus, in a case where there is no explicit logical resolution or even in the case where there may not be such a resolution, the audience’s comprehension of the trustworthiness of the persuader plays a crucial role in achieving persuasion. Baker (2015: 2) provides three major ways which make the speaker’s credibility evident:

1. The quality of the message: the orator must recognize the public’s needs and reasons, the message must be clear, meaningful, logical, contain all the necessary facts and figures;
2. The audience’s apprehension of the speaker as a communicator: the orator needs to make his/her own look right by showing confidence, knowing the subject, being well prepared, building close relationship with the audience;
3. The speaker’s image as a communicator regardless of the message: the orator refers to appropriate sources of trustworthiness such as common ground, reputation, amicability, erudition.

Furthermore, ethos, or in other words ethical appeal, implies convincing an audience of the orator’s reliability or character. An orator applies ethos in his/her speech to show and prove the listeners that he/she is a sound source, who is worth listening to. Peleckis and Peleckienë (2015: 417) define ethos as faithfulness to oneself, as well as everything what is connected to etiquette and ethics. The general values of the orator, the competency to both listen and understand the interlocutor, to adjust the words of a specific topic, circumstances, audience, while respecting either the law, the ordinary civilian, the listener or the opponent are the key points of ethos. The capability to respect any kind of audience is shown by the speaker’s behaviour and expressed in suitable words. ”Ethos arguments appeal to the speaker’s and the listener's moral norms (justice, fairness, a sense of responsibility) commonality” (ibid. 417). Simultaneously, ethos may be referred to the orator’s moral qualities. This proves that it is not enough for the speaker to have common sense and to be able to grasp a particular topic in order to persuade the audience. Honesty, good will, open-mindedness, kind-heartedness lie at the heart of appealing to the
audience, as well as convincing people with one’s ideas. For this reason, Peleckis and Peleckienė (ibid. 417) distinguish two major competences for seeking ethos: the choice of a discursive manner which would be suitable for the top of the society and demonstration of a splendid understanding of a subject.

In addition to this, ethos can be also achieved by applying appropriate language for a particular audience, together with the topic, including an eligible level of vocabulary. The use of proper grammar and syntax, introduction of the orator’s erudition or even provenance, as well as the speaker’s effort to make himself/herself sound objective and fair equally promotes the development of ethos. As Edlund (2011: 55) suggests, since ethos is most often the very first thing that we notice, it actually creates the first impression that affects the way we perceive the rest.

2.3.2. Pathos

People tend to make decisions based not only on rational thought but also their feelings and emotions. Accordingly, appeals to people’s senses usually have a great influence and are very common in our society. Nevertheless, it does not mean that such appeals are illicit or false. Feeling strong emotions about some powerful events, victories or tragedies is completely natural. Due to this fact, even the majority of political decisions are emotionally motivated. Such emotions as fear, anger, pity and the opposite ones powerfully shape people’s reasonable judgements (Edlund 2011: 57). There is always an emotional aspect in most situations: some communications can be neutral, while others may be highly charged. In case logical reasons fail, emotions possess the power to make people respond and the very understanding which emotions to obviate and which to enable is one of the most important dimensions of communication strategy. In fact, Baker (2015: 2) stresses that the analysis of the audience’s concerns and needs is actually the easiest way to set the most efficient emotional appeal, which helps understand which appeals create affirmative response to the speaker’s message.

Pathos is what is called an appeal to an audience’s emotions, sentiments and beliefs. The appeal to pathos induces the audience not only to react emotionally, but also to identify with the orator’s attitude (ibid. 2015: 2). Aristotle explained that pathos is both an appeal to feelings and the ability of the speaker to put himself/herself in the listener’s emotional state. To be more specific, pathos seeks to achieve mutual feelings of balance and fulfillment between the speaker.
and the listener’s senses, which is called relevance criterion (Koženiauskienė 2009: 26, Nauckūnaitė 2007: 135). Relevance criterion demands the orator to know the emotions of the audience and what to expect, as well as for the orator to be sincere, tell the truth and stick to the subject. Emotional appeal can be fulfilled in a number of ways, for instance, by storytelling or the use of metaphor, by the general passion in presentation and an overall feeling and anticipation of the speech as ascertained by the audience. What is even more significant, the pathos of the tongue is only ultimately ascertained by the hearer.

To continue, Garver (1994: 98) states that since pathos reflects a variety of different problems that an audience has and feels, pathos has to be taken into consideration in order to convince an audience adequately and to be persuaded actually means to receive an answer to one’s problem. Additionally, the author names pathos as passions and explains that a passion is a measure of the span between individuals, what makes them diverse and also, the state of their identity. To put it in a nutshell, pathos or in other words, passions are the aspects of one’s individuality, his/her differences, as much as it implements one’s receptivity towards the replies emerging from those who provoke his/her passions in life (ibid., 99).

2.3.3. Logos

Originally, the word logos have a meaning of "a plea", "a ground", "reason", "an opinion". Later, it became a scientific term in philosophy and was used as the concept for a principle of knowledge and order (Roberts 2008: 15).

Koženiauskienė (2009: 28) and Nauckūnaitė (2007: 137) submit the most important peculiarities of logos by suggesting that logos is generated for the sake of the speaker with clear and precise words to convince hearers, as well as influence them by a logical speech, common sense, truthful words. Correspondingly, Hansen (2003: 3) determines logos as what makes a reason of an orator’s speech convincing and worthwhile. In contemplation of convincing the audience, logos possess a principle that declares that the speaker must consistently impart the evidence and follow regular process of reasoning. In addition, Hansen states that logos is an evidence of the message that is consolidated within the message. Consequently, logos involve proofs and facts that, from an academic perspective, might lack inequity that flows from subjectivity.
Furthermore, Covino and Jolliffe (1995: 17) clarify that *logos* can be described as logical transaction. A rhetor gets into a certain rhetorical context either knowing or ready to reveal, what the rhetor and his/her audience maintains as common presumptions about a particular subject that will be discussed. Subsequently, the rhetor proceeds to render a proposition or remark about the present situation or the subject of the message knowing that he/she will have to employ common presumptions either implicitly or explicitly in his/her message. Taking into account the common presumptions adjusted and the premise put into practice, the rhetor can then postulate a conclusion which the speaker expects the audience will trust or act upon.

After considering Aristotelian appeals to rhetorical strategies, it is necessary to consider the means of realizing rhetorical strategies. This will be conducted in the following chapter.

2.4. Rhetorical tropes in political discourse

Since Aristotelian times orators had an interest in improving their public speaking. Therefore, there is no surprise that since ancient times it was already possible to take lessons in rhetorical skills that would include different stylistic approaches to the language and explain the application of various stylistic devices in order to persuade the audience. (Lakoff and Johnsen, 2003: 8). In addition, McQuarrie and Mick (1992: 182) stress that the main concern of rhetoric has always been technique and mode, i.e. how to find out the most efficient way to render the orator’s thoughts and how to change its expression in order to adapt it to different situations. Therefore, figures of speech have always been associated with the use of rhetorical strategies and the study of stylistic devices is undoubtedly necessary in order to understand how rhetorical strategies are realized in public speeches.

According to King (2012: 1), means of figurative language fall into two categories: schemes and tropes. As for the schemes, these are stylistic devices that change conventional word order or pattern. Considering tropes, the author explains that these are figures of speech that change the literal meaning of a word or phrase, i.e. they possess an unexpected twirl in the meaning of the words (ibid. 1). Both schemes and tropes are the means of persuasion since they definitely help the orator glamorize the language and the audience is keen on finding it entertaining.
Politicians’ language is highly interesting to analyze since they aim at convincing their audience by vivifying their words and it is sometimes not that easy to grasp what is literally meant. The application of different stylistic devices help politicians achieve persuasion since they tend to render their ideologies by changing the literal meaning of their words. Therefore, in this research only rhetorical tropes will be considered in order to be able to disclose how the politicians render their ideologies through different rhetorical strategies and implementation of stylistic devices.

Hernández-Guerra (2012: 98) states that one of the most prominent stylistic devices in political discourse are metaphors, metonymies, allusions rhetorical questions. Metaphor is a hidden comparison between two things of unlike type, yet possessing something in common. Metonymy is a figure of speech that substitutes an attributive word for what is literally meant. Allusion is a stylistic device that makes a real or imaginary reference to some particular event, person or place. Rhetorical questions are questions that do not have a purpose of eliciting the answer, rather asserting or denying something. Since these rhetorical tropes are one of the most frequent in political discourse and a number of examples have been indicated in the analyzed political discourse in the paper, these stylistic devices will be analyzed further in the research.
3. THE METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

The material used in the work is the data collected from fifty-two electoral speeches of two presidents, President of Lithuania Dalia Grybauskaitė in the period of re-election and President of the USA Donald Trump in the period of election. The scope of data used in this research is 16 427 words of Dalia Grybauskaitė’s speeches which were delivered in the time of her re-election as the President of Lithuania in 2014 and 18 598 words of Donald Trump speeches which were delivered in the time of recent elections in the USA in the time interval from September 2016 till August 2016. The data for the study were taken from three sources. The data for the English speeches were drawn from two websites, “The American Presidency Project. 2016 Presidential Election Speeches and Remarks” website http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/2016_election_speeches.php?candidate=45&campaign=2016TRUMP&doctype=5000 and “The White House: Home Page” website https://www.whitehouse.gov/. The data for the Lithuanan speeches were collected from the website of “Lietuvos Respublikos Prezidentė” https://www.lrp.lt/lt/prezidentes-veikla/kalbos/6588/2017-11. The corpus for the present study was compiled manually. Donald Trump’s remarks were collected taking into account the audience that the remarks were dedicated to, i.e. all 8 speeches were presented for American electorates. However, since Dalia Grybauskaitė’s speeches are considerably short (the longest speech is 1400 words), in order to balance and, subsequently, compare data, all Dalia Grybauskaitė’s addresses available on the website were included into the corpus.

In order to carry out the rhetorical analysis in the paper, two scholars were referred to so as to get a deeper insight into the substance of indicated rhetorical strategies and the following steps were taken: firstly, Aristotelian strategies were divided into certain types that have been introduced by Lunsford (2010). According to Lunsford (ibid. 322), *ethos* can be expressed through reference to one’s skills or titles, research from reliable sources or personal experience and/or interest in the topics, and indication of credible individuals; *pathos* is embodied through vivid language, examples or stories and imagery; *logos* is accomplished when applying statistics, examples and cause and effect structures. Furthermore, Reisigl (2006: 597) states that rhetorical tropes fulfill a number of aims in politics. They help to render a politician’s message, build political tangibility, invigorate, impersonate and illustrate political ideas. Therefore, such rhetorical tropes as metaphor, metonymy, allusion and rhetorical questions were investigated in
the paper through which rhetorical strategies were achieved. Last but not least, rhetorical strategies implemented by two presidents were compared and contrasted in order to reveal the differences between the use of rhetorical strategies and their linguistic realization.

4. RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN DONALD TRUMP’S PRE-ELECTION SPEECHES

4.1. Ethos

Since ethos is considered to be a vital aspect in one’s arguments in terms of the speaker’s attempt to convince the audience, there is no surprise ethos appears to be one the major rhetorical strategies chosen and implemented in the President of the United States Donald Trump’s pre-elector political speeches. While referring to his skills and titles, personal experience, showing interest in a particular topic, invoking reliable sources, as well as including references to credible individuals in his speeches, D. Trump seeks to prove the listeners he is a person to be believed and trusted as a future President of the United States.

4.1.1. Reference to skills or titles

Striving for persuasion of the audience with his credibility, D. Trump exposes his skills by presenting examples of what he has already achieved considering such momentous issues in America as employment and education. Moreover, he displays his authority by referring to his future title as the President of the United States and showing his understanding of the major responsibilities he will have to take while occupying this position.

D. Trump convinces the listeners he fights for gender equality by providing a number of workplaces not only in his own organization but also in his campaign for President. Moreover, Trump demonstrates his deep understanding of the importance of equality between men and women by providing high positions not only for males but also for females.

(1) At the Trump Organization, and in my campaign for President, women occupy some of the highest positions. I have employed thousands of women in my company. Women of different backgrounds. Women of different talents. (DT, 4)

In addition, D. Trump strengthens his credibility by bringing up civil rights and ensuring that he has already made changes in order to guarantee a better living for American people.
(2) *I have outlined a new civil rights agenda for our time – the right to a safe community, a great education and a secure job.* (DT, 1)

Trump also takes a role of the future president of the United States and promises to produce a number of workplaces in the country.

(3) *As your president, I will pursue a complete reform of our economy to bring back millions of new jobs into our country - millions of new jobs.* (DT, 1)

### 4.1.2. Personal experience and/or interest in the topic

The President Donald Trump reinforces his arguments also by mentioning recent events in Louisiana and other cities, which have suffered severe floods lately. In this case, it is obvious that the President embraces personal experience in order to both establish a personal relationship between him and the people who underwent these natural disasters and to show his support towards casualties.

D. Trump registers his experience by asserting that he has witnessed the flood devastated neighborhoods by paying a visit to these places. The President also praises people whose homes have been destroyed for being brave and still having faith after such disastrous events in their lives, showing his empathy towards victims and proving his concern in the situation. In both examples D. Trump stresses his attendance in the devastated places since he tries to create a connection with hurt people.

(4) *And we all express our support for Tony as he deals with the aftermath of the terrible floods in Louisiana, where two weeks ago I spent some time, and I saw some incredible, incredible people.* (DT, 1)

(5) *It's the same spirit of resilience I have seen visiting the flood-ravaged towns in Louisiana, or meeting with the incredible but hard-hit people in cities and towns like Flint, Michigan.* (DT,4)

### 4.1.3. Research from reliable sources

Examples of credible sources play a crucial role in the American President’s pre-election speeches for the purpose of persuading the audience with the president’s authority. It was noticed that in some examples D. Trump provides a concrete source of his familiarity with a particular
issue, while other instances illustrate a blend of the president’s personal opinion with a hint of the matter dealt with in his speech, even though the concrete source of the piece of information is not mentioned.

D. Trump introduces the Pew Research Center that administers public voice polling, demographic research and other research of social science and grounds his ideas about the existing results considering people’s positive views toward capital punishment in their countries.

(6) *Pew polling shows that in many of the countries from which we draw large numbers of immigrants, extreme views about religion - such as the death penalty for those who leave the faith - are commonplace.* (DT, 3)

Furthermore, Trump accuses H. Clinton of the situation with the Islamic State in the country and seeks to prove that precisely Clinton’s political strategies provoked ISIS’s emersion in America, although Trump does not specify the source of these findings.

(7) *All this disaster with ISIS happened on Hillary Clinton’s watch. Her policies in Iraq, Libya and Syria are responsible for the rise of ISIS.* (DT, 3)

4.1.4. References to credible individuals

In his speeches, D. Trump not only pursues to introduce himself as a credible person but he mentions other reliable and well known individuals that American people acknowledge. However, by referring to other politicians, D. Trump actually seeks to disclose their weaknesses and failures, simultaneously holding himself in very high regard.

The President strongly criticizes his opponent in the presidential election Hillary Clinton for her political strategies that she desires to introduce. He claims that Clinton’s health care strategy would have a negative effect on American people’s freedoms.

(8) *Hillary Clinton wants to have completely government-run health care, which would be a disaster for the liberties and freedoms of all America. That’s what she wants. That’s what she’s aiming at. That’s what Obama wanted. He didn’t quite get there, but he got this, and you see how bad this has been.* (DT, 1)

Besides, D. Trump attacks the former President of the United States Barack Obama for the same policy, exalting its disadvantages. At the same time, D. Trump makes an attempt to reveal
Clinton’s low opinion towards American people, transferring a message that he possesses a totally opposite point of view.

(9) How can Hillary Clinton try to lead this country when she has such a low opinion of its citizens? How can she lead a country when she thinks America is full of racists, deplorables and irredeemables? (DT, 5)

Taking everything into consideration, Trump employs *ethos* in his speeches to display his expertise, erudition, experience and credibility while talking about immigration issues, education, and employment. Mostly, in his speeches D. Trump has an intention to show his skills to the audience and display what he has or is going to achieve in the future. Furthermore, D. Trump strengthens his authority by criticizing other politicians, for instance, his opponent H. Clinton.

4.2. Pathos

D. Trump employs *pathos* in order to direct his speeches toward moving audience’s feelings and emotions. The practice of examples/stories, vivid language and imagery help the President achieve the emotional response from the audience, as well as identify the listeners with his point of view. For clarification, it should be mentioned that in this chapter vivid language will be considered as an example of *pathos*, i.e. a thorough analysis of linguistic realization of vivid language will be discussed in Chapter 4.

4.2.1. Examples/stories

Emotional dimension is achieved through the president’s narration about the present situation in the country among American people.

Even though D. Trump stresses the significance of the nation’s unity, he states that there is a huge division among American people and people actually try to avoid this issue. In addition, D. Trump brings up a religious aspect taking into account the Nation’s future and alliance by inviting people to believe in God and the goodness in every individual.

(10) Our nation today is divided. Nobody likes to say it, but we’re living in a very, very divided nation. It will be our faith in God and his teachings, in each other, that will lead us back to unity. (DT, 1)
What is more, D. Trump accentuates the value of every single person in America, reminding that everyone counts in terms of a united country in the future. With this statement, D. Trump secretly renders the idea of voting for him in presidential election convincing the audience he has shared values and purposes with the American people.

(11) Each of here today has a role to play in bringing our country together, united in common purpose and in common values. (DT, 1)

4.2.2. Vivid language

The usage of vivid language not only induces emotions but also creates a conducive emotional affection of the audience towards the purpose of the orator’s speech. In his addresses, D. Trump seeks to attain the arousal of feeling from the public by vividly describing the past, present and future of America. Trump establishes the significance of the unity of the nation, as well as he promises the audience a better future in America.

The President fosters the listeners that nowadays, it is highly important to perceive that the whole American nation must be united since all Americans share the same roots and values.

(12) It is time to break with the bitter failures of the past, and to embrace a new, inclusive and prosperous American future. (DT, 2)

Besides, D. Trump evokes the nation’s feelings by promising to ensure safety, security in financial status and strength as a country while collaborating together with all American people.

(13) We Will Make America Wealthy Again. We Will Make America Strong Again. We Will Make America Safe Again. We Will Make America Great Again. (DT, 1-8)

4.2.3. Imagery

Imagery is another mean of persuasion in terms of emotional appeal. Nonetheless, imagery is more related to creating mental pictures in the listeners’ minds, rather than provoking inner emotions. Implementing visual representation of his ideas, D. Trump describes a particular situation or event in such a way that it appeals to the audience’s physical senses.

In the example given below, it is evident that D. Trump attempts to describe the crimes that ISIS committed so that it appeals to the listeners’ sense of sight. D. Trump speaks about the situation of illegal immigration in the country and its consequences in terms of a number of
deaths of innocent American people who have been murdered by illegal immigrant criminals. D. Trump portrays the assassinations by giving concrete details of it (using imagery), for instance, narrating that the victims were hung from meathooks and their throats were ultimately slit.

(14) The victims were dragged, then hung from meathooks, and then their throats were slit. (DT, 2)

Another imagery example conveys the picture of the crime scene where an American girl was shot down and died while her father was holding her in his arms, which happened in the middle of the day. The audience is able to visualize the crimes and is induced by the earnestness of the situation since D. Trump aims at creating striking pictures in the minds of his listeners.

(15) Kate Steinle was gunned down in her father’s arms in broad daylight on a San Francisco pier. Her killer had been deported 5 times before. (DT, 3)

To sum it up, D. Trump’s applies pathos in his pre-election speeches in order to appeal to the listeners’ emotions and to induce their feelings that already dwell in them by bringing daylight to such issues as decay of the nation or delinquency in the country. D. Trump carries out the emotional appeal by the use of vivid language, stories or even imagery that can be called as a “hook” in order to both draw the audience’s attention and colorize the given situation. Particularly, the President exploits vivid language, where he uses a number of descriptive adjectives that bring his experience to life for the listener and activates the urge of the audience to respond.

4.3. Logos

By the use of logical reasoning, D. Trump shows the heart of his argumentation. In other words, the President applies logos in order to persuade listeners by rationality and logical thought. Proving an argument through sound reasoning is highly important in political discourse since facts are of utmost importance in political persuasion. For this reason, D. Trump includes statistics, examples, as well as cause and effect examples, which are compelling evidence that substantiate Trump’s rationality.
4.3.1. Statistics

In exchange for the audience’s attention and solicitude, Trump provides statistical data on such relevant issues as poverty and crime rate in America.

D. Trump displays the concrete number of African-American children who suffer deprivation, convincing the audience with the magnitude of this particular issue. To stress his worry about unemployment in America, D. Trump presents a high percentage of unemployed youth in the country.

(16) *Nearly 4 in 10 African-American children live in poverty, including 45% of African-American children under the age of six. 58% of African-American youth are not working.* (DT, 3)

Furthermore, D. Trump refers to increasing numbers of assassinations in Washington and Baltimore in order to highlight earnestness of the subject.

(17) *Violent crime rose in America’s fifty largest cities last year. Homicides are up nearly 50% in Washington, D. C. and more than 60% in Baltimore.* (DT, 3)

4.3.2. Examples

Likewise, the American President invites people to think about examples of past events in America, as well as consider the recent state in American universities.

D. Trump highlights the past victories of the States against such political ideologies as Fascism or Communism, as well as mentions a more recent issue - terrorism, that according to the President must be defeated. D. Trump tries to prove that while being a President, he is going to dispose of this problem.

(18) *In the 20th Century, the United States defeated Fascism, Nazism, and Communism. Now we must defeat Radical Islamic Terrorism.* (DT, 4)

Speaking about universities in America, D. Trump emphasizes the existing problems in educational system by illustrating the injustice of distributing considerable federal funds for students. At the same time, he obscurely proposes his actions against this iniquity.

(19) *Universities get massive federal funds, and huge tax breaks for their endowments - but then they don’t spend those funds or those endowments on their students.* (DT, 2)
4.3.3. Cause and Effect

Additionally, to enlarge his concern about poverty and unemployment in the country, D. Trump stresses his strong negative viewpoint toward his opponent in presidential elections Hillary Clinton and the outcomes of her political activities. Simultaneously, by disclosing what kind of damage his opponent has done to the nation, the President renders the message that he would take actions in order to get completely opposite results.

Applying cause and effect examples, D. Trump strongly criticizes Democratic Party’s political views. He states that Democratic Party is responsible for increasing poverty, unemployment and delinquency in the country that have been continuing for more than 70 years. At the same time, D. Trump seeks to condemn H. Clinton and incriminate her for such outcomes.

(20) Democratic Party has run the inner cities of America for 50, 60, 70 years, some cases over a hundred years - over a hundred years. Their policies and their politics, and in particular the politics of Hillary Clinton, have produced only poverty, joblessness, and rising crime. (DT, 1)

Simultaneously, D. Trump declares that H. Clinton made an unfortunate deal with Iran and Iraq, as a result raising the recovery price to $1.7 billion. Altogether, in cause and effect examples D. Trump expresses a negative attitude toward his opponent in presidential elections.

(21) Hillary also started the negotiations that led to the Iran deal – and thus ultimately leading to the $1.7 billion ransom for American hostages. (DT, 6)

In conclusion, the President D. Trump’s speeches frequently contain logos not only showing his rationality and knowledge about unemployment, education questions, rising criminality, but also supporting his statements and critical view toward other political parties. In terms of statistics, it was noticed that the President always presents concrete numbers, basing his knowledge of a certain issue.

5. RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN DALIA GRYBAUSKAITĖ’S PRE-ELECTION SPEECHES

5.1. Ethos

In the president of the Republic of Lithuania Ms. Dalia Grybauskaitė’s pre-election speeches ethos played a crucial role since the president had an intention to attain the audience’s
favour before the presidential election. By emphasizing her authority in her speeches, D. Grybauskaitė seeks to convince the audience she is competent to speak on the particular issue. Similarly, as the president of the United States Mr. Donald Trump, D. Grybauskaitė refers to her abilities and proves her accomplishments during her first-term presidency. The president also marks trustworthy people well-known by the Lithuanian nation and appeals not only to reliable sources but also expresses her interest in a discussed topic.

5.1.1. Reference to skills and titles

In her remarks, D. Grybauskaitė is confident about her achievements and boldly tells about the work done in order to improve the situation in Lithuania. The president seeks to display her great achievements for Lithuania during her first-term presidency, as well as D. Grybauskaitė makes effort to convince the audience with her skills and abilities as the head of the country.

D. Grybauskaitė praises the period of presidency of the Council of the European Union held by Lithuania. The president assures the audience that Lithuania has fulfilled all the necessary duties during the presidency and even exceeded all the expectations by making European Union more powerful and sound.

(22) Atlikome visus darbus, kuriuos turėjome atlikti, ir net nuveikėme daugiau, nei buvo tikėtasi. Po šešių Lietuvos pirmininkavimo mėnesių turime stipresnę, patikimesnę ir labiau savimi pasitikinčią Europos Sąjungą. (DG, 2)

Beside this, D. Grybauskaitė expresses her strong concern about insolvent banks. She highlights the importance of achieved agreement regarding the mechanism of general restructuring of bank, which is necessary for Lithuania’s economy and financial stability.

(23) Prieš pat Kalėdas pasiektas susitarimas dėl bendro bankų pertvarkymo mechanizmo padės pertvarkyti nemokius bankus. Tai būtina norint užtikrinti ekonominį atsigavimą ir finansinį stabilumą. (DG, 2)

5.1.2. Research from reliable sources

Consequently, to support her ideas about financial status in the country and perform authoritatively, D. Grybauskaitė refers to reliable sources that prove the increase of economics in Lithuania. Hence, the president considerably strengthens her statements about economic stance in Lithuania.
The President introduces the results of Annual Growth Survey as a reliable source of evaluating financial market in the country and states it shows steady progress and purchases and sales become more approachable for both enterprises and customers.

(24) Komisijos metinė augimo apžvalga rodo, kad pamažu grįžta augimas, finansų rinkos stabilizuojasi, vartotojai ir įmonės labiau tiki ateitimi.... (DG, 2)

In her speech in innovation conference, D. Grybauskaite relies on such prominent companies as “GetJar”, “VINTED”, “Pixelmator” and others, successfully founded by young Lithuanian innovators and claims the significance of establishing such international companies. The President also fosters people to be courageous to generate ideas, be initiative and not to tremble to seek for similar results.


5.1.3. Personal experience and/or interest in the topic

D. Grybauskaite reinforces her ethical appeal to the audience while delivering a speech by showing her interest in the topic. In contradistinction to D. Trump, D. Grybauskaite hardly mentions her own experience, rather she reasons her words by expressing her knowledge and concern on a particular issue.

In her speech for in “Leader of the Year” awards, the President mentions telecommunication sector in Lithuania and expresses her knowledge about it while ensuring the audience this sector combines both modern technologies and reasonable prices for Lithuanian citizens.

(26) Telekomunikacijų sektorius Lietuvoje - vienas geriausių efektyvaus valdymo pavyzdžių. Čia puikiai dera ir naujausios technologijos, ir gyventojams prieinama kaina. (DG, 21)

Moreover, in her address in Marijampolė to the monument of Kristijonas Donelaitis, D. Grybauskaite flatters the residents of this region for building monuments dedicated to Lithuanian linguists whose aim was to nourish and preserve Lithuanian language. In this way, the President exposes her interest in the topic and her preparation for the speech, as well as shows the listeners she appreciates people’s contribution to Lithuania’s heritage and history.
Per Nepriklausomybės metus Marijampolėje pastatėte ne vieną paminklą, skirtą gimtąjā kalbā kūrusiems ir puoselėjusiems žmonėms, kurie stiprina mūsų Tautos istorinę ir kultūrinę atmintį. (DG, 11)

5.1.4. References to credible individuals

Referring to such well-known Lithuanian poet Kristijonas Donelaitis, as well as relying on people from foreign countries, D. Grybauskaitė both shows her faithfulness to her country’s history and heritage and proves her skills to build advantageous relationship with important people from all over the world in terms of Lithuania’s future.

The President refers to a prominent Lithuanian personality Kristijonas Donelaitis and strengthens her thoughts about the importance of patriotism and respecting and cherishing Lithuania as one’s homeland.

Donelaitis mus išmokė pagarbos sau, savo kraštui, jo savitumui. (DG, 11)

Furthermore, in her speech in the European Parliament D. Grybauskaitė speaks about a strong and secure European Union and mention names of a few commissioners from different countries that she successfully has been collaborating with in order to work for a stronger and more self-confident EU. Providing concrete names of solid individuals, D. Grybauskaitė consolidates and proves her power as a ruler of the country.

Kartu su komisarais Fule ir Ashton, pasiuntiniais Patu Coxu ir Aleksandriu Kwasniewskiu, taip pat didžiule visų šitųose rūmuose esančių narių parama, mes įdėjome savo širdis ir sielas rodydami Rytų kaimynams, kad mūsų partnerystė nuoširdi. kad Europa yra jų gravitacijos centras. (DG, 2)

To summarize, D. Grybauskaitė establishes her authority by displaying what has been done in order to improve economic state of Lithuania, as well as to reinforce European Union. However, D. Grybauskaitė obviates speaking in first person. When talking about the work done for the country the President constantly points that a number of people who work for the country contributes to great achievements. Moreover, even though the President proves her interest in a certain issue, she does not spotlight her participation in the situation. When making statements about finances and innovations in Lithuania, as well as stressing the importance of both
Lithuania’s heritage and solidarity among European countries, the President proves she has done research from reliable sources in order to base her reasons and invokes trustworthy individuals.

5.2. Pathos

A number of examples of pathos can be indicated in D. Grybauskaitė’s addresses. The president seeks to establish a connection with the audience and engage its emotions by expressing pathos through examples or stories, vibrant language and picturesqueness. In addition, pathos is a mean of appealing to the listeners’ beliefs and values and it is sometimes thought as a part of the public in the argument. Consequently, it is not surprising this rhetorical strategy is frequently employed in the politician’s speeches.

5.2.1. Examples/stories

In her speeches, D. Grybauskaitė gives examples of past events in the country that caused great achievements of the country in terms of independence. The president appeals to the listeners’ emotions by narrating about the struggle that the country faced while seeking for independence, as well as tries to induce a response from the audience concerning the importance of liberty in every person’s life.

D. Grybauskaitė invites people to think about the past situation in the country and criticizes people who did not believe Lithuania can be independent country, as well as she praises signatory who fought for self-government and consolidation of the country.

(30) Prieš devyniasdešimt šešerius metus taip pat buvo žmonių, abejojusių nepriklausomos Lietuvos idėja. Tačiau dvidešimt signatarų sugebėjo pažadinti ir suvienyti Tautą. (DG, 5)

Simultaneously, D. Grybauskaitė stresses that with the help of every single citizen of Lithuania, the country has already been independent for more than two decades. The President asks people not to forget to continue creating a sovereign nation since only a united nation that works for the same purpose can make a strong and self-sufficient country. In other words, by speaking about liberty of the country, the President seeks to appeal to the audience’s solidarity and emphasize the relevance of working together to preserve people’s unity.
5.2.2. Vivid language

Figurative language prevails in all D. Grybauskaitė’s speeches. Undoubtedly, D. Grybauskaitė ingeniously implements vivid language in her remarks when appealing to the audience’s *pathos*. For instance, the President tends to use vibrant language in order to accentuate the magnitude of patriotism, doing good deeds for one’s country and feeling love for Lithuania while endeavouring to defeat past hardship.

The President makes great efforts to touch the hearts of her audience by vividly naming all patriotic citizens of Lithuania heroes. D. Grybauskaitė utters that every single person who is cautious about his/her country and takes responsibility for not only his/her own actions but also for his/her motherland contributes to prosperity of the country. The president also seeks to evoke the audience’s sense of solicitude stating that every citizen of the country should be willing to support and help each other because every kind action adds to great changes in the country.

Further, the President appeals to eternal love for one’s country that has not disappeared from people’s hearts by inviting people to recall such hard times for the country as Teutonic Order invasion or Soviet deportations from Lithuania.

Since D. Grybauskaitė employs vivid language in her speeches seeking to create an emotional response to a significant plea, she also inevitably uses imagery to describe relevant issues for Lithuania in order to make the listeners feel what the President desires them to feel. She figuratively illustrates the events surrounding the country and makes the audience visualize the situation by creating vivid images in the listeners’ minds.
In her speeches, D. Grybauskaitė engages both auditory and visual senses with the help of imagery. First of all, the President evokes auditory imagery by stimulating people to imagine clanging guns. By mentioning clanging guns, the President depicts the situation in Ukraine, where Russia has made military invasions into Ukrainian territory. In order to adjust visualization of the context, D. Grybauskaitė compares Russia’s actions with high-handed redrawing of European map.

(34) *Visai netoli Lietuvos sienų žvanga ginklai, okupuojama suverenios valstybės teritorija ir brutaliai perbraižomas Europos žemėlapis.*

In addition, the President’s examples of visual imagery pertain to picturesque scenes in Kiev. D. Grybauskaitė describes the atmosphere in the capital of Ukraine where peaceful citizens of various age stand in the cold and try to oppose hostile intruders. Moreover, she visually describes a lonesome Ukrainian pianist who plays a piano painted in European Union flag’s colours and in this way tries to stand against the opponents in order to convey the mood in the country.

(35) * [...] ko pasaulyje nejaudinti vaizdai paprastų įvairaus amžiaus žmonių šąlančiame Kijevo Euromaidane, taikiai besipriešinančių gausiai riaušių policijai; o tarp jų - vienišas pianistas, grojantis Europos Sąjungos vėliavos mėlyna spalva su geltonomis žvaigždėmis dažytu pianinu? (DG, 2)*

All things considered, *pathos* helps D. Grybauskaitė create an emotional connection with the audience. The President invites people to think about Lithuania’s past and how Lithuanian people had to fight for the right to be an independent country. Furthermore, D. Grybauskaitė uses both vivid language and imagery to make people sense the importance of patriotism and to better visualize and feel the terror of such recent events as occupation of Crimea. The President also praises Lithuanian people who seek to create a better future for their country, showing that she values people’s love for their country.

5.3. Logos

To establish her skills in reasoning, D. Grybauskaitė grounds her arguments on *logos*. While appealing to reason, the President shows she has delved deeply into certain topic or issue
she is talking about. Both presidents D. Trump and D. Grybauskaitė back up their claims with statistical data, examples, as well as logical structures of cause and effect.

5.3.1. Statistics

With the help of statistics, D. Grybauskaitė supports her ideas by strong arguments and credible evidence that are arranged in a well-reasoned manner. Nevertheless, in comparison with examples of statistical data displayed in D. Trump’s speeches, D. Grybauskaitė does not provide concrete numbers; she rather mentions statistics as a general conception for giving a logical reasoning to her arguments.

D. Grybauskaitė persuades the audience with the economic growth in Lithuania by presenting affirmative results on the economic recovery and growth. The President also praises and thanks entrepreneurs, as well as employees in various companies for their input and contribution to the improving economic situation in the country. However, D. Grybauskaitė does not introduce exact rate of the growth of economic in Lithuania.

(36) Statistika rodo, kad Lietuvos ekonomika atsigavo ir stabiliai auga. Už šį rezultatą turime būti dėkingi būtent sumaniems ir atkakliems verslininkams, įmonių darbuotojams. (DG, 4)

Furthermore, the President bases her arguments on world business conditions ranking, asserting that Lithuania has made progress in a few years and now is among 20 countries providing best conditions for founding a business all around the world. The President also compares Lithuania with Scandinavian countries that are well-known for their developed business facilities and claims that Lithuania outruns Central and Eastern Europe countries.

(37) Per kelerius metus padarėme didelę pažangą: pagal verslo sąlygas „Doing Business” reitinge pakilome į 17 vietą pasaulyje. Esame tarp Skandinavijos šalių bei lyderiai Vidurio ir Rytų Europoje. (DG, 33)

5.3.2. Examples

The President transfers the arguments of the relevance of education, as well as foreign investments in Lithuania through tenable examples. D. Grybauskaitė provides concrete examples
of what has been done in order to elaborate education in Lithuanian universities and also how the situation of foreign countries’ investments in Lithuania is rapidly improving.

D. Grybauskaitė draws the audience’s attention by raising the topic of education in Lithuania. The use of *logos* in this case helps the President sound trustworthy since D. Grybauskaitė gives an assurance that huge amounts of European funds are invested in Lithuanian universities and educational system. To make this argument even more influential, D. Grybauskaitė mentions that these investments have paid off and Lithuanian academic institutions meet all the necessary standards.

(38) *Investuojame milijardines europinių fondų lėšas universitetams ir mokslui atnaujinti. Lietuvos mokslo institucijos jau atitinka aukščiausius standartus.* (DG, 10)

D. Grybauskaitė proposes another notable argument that investments from foreign countries in a variety of areas in Lithuania are expanding, which amends Lithuania’s economic status.

(39) *Augantį Lietuvos ir investuotojų tarpusavio pasitikėjimą geriausiai liudija besiplečianti investicijų į Lietuvą kilmės geografija, sritys ir mastai. Mūsų šalies kontūrai tampa vis ryškesni patrauklių investuoti šalių žemėlapyje.* (DG, 10)

5.3.3. Cause and Effect

A number of cause and effect examples on various issues can be identified in D. Grybauskaitė’s addresses. The President speaks about such international actions as Lithuania joining NATO and the outcomes of this decision. Likewise, the President stresses the importance of education in Lithuania.

On the occasion of the decade of NATO membership, D. Grybauskaitė delivered a speech for Lithuanian nation to remind about the decision made ten years ago for Lithuania to join NATO. The President reminds people about the expectations to become a more secure country ten years ago have been fulfilled after becoming a member of NATO and there is no doubt NATO will defend Lithuania if necessary.

(40) *2004 - iais visi tikėjome NATO ir neabejojome, kad tai - viena didžiausių galimybių Lietuvai tapti tikra saugaus Vakarų pasaulio dalimi. Mūsų lūkesčiai dėl Lietuvos saugumo išsipildė. NATO partneriai parodė, kad grėsmės akivaizdoje nesame vieni.* (DG, 8)
In her speech devoted to senior students, D. Grybauskaitė addresses to young people in Lithuania and states that cultivated and educated youth is the future of Lithuania and they will affect such areas in Lithuania as economics, culture and social welfare, so the choice of education and future profession at the moment is highly important.

(41) Lietuvos ateitį kurs išsilavinęs, kūrybingas jaunimas. Todėl nuo to, kokias specialybes šiandien pasirinks abiturientai, priklausys Lietuvos ekonomika, kultūra ir socialinė kiekvieno gerovė. (DG, 28)

To sum it up, D. Grybauskaitė frequently refers to the logical appeal in terms of describing the situation of business, investments or education in Lithuania. The President provides statistical data, a number of examples what has been done for the country and explains the consequences of taken specific action. Even though the President sounds reasonable giving examples and using cause and effect structures in her speeches, there is a lack of concrete numbers when statistics is mentioned.

6. LINGUISTIC IMPLEMENTATION OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN DONALD TRUMP’S SPEECHES

The investigation of rhetorical tropes has been closely associated with political rhetoric. Since implementation of rhetorical tropes is an efficient rhetorical mean of building and representing political ideology, politicians tend to apply these figures of speech in their remarks not only to construct political reality but also to attain positive self-presentation in front of public. In other words, tropes are devices that involve concrete appeals to the audience, they impact the audience. Therefore, a number of examples of rhetorical devices can be indicated in politicians’ speeches.

In his speeches, D. Trump intensifies the appeal to ethos, pathos and logos while applying metaphors, metonymies, allusions and rhetorical questions under the topics of immigration, corruption, presidential election, religion.

6.1. Metaphor

The President D. Trump through metaphors reinforces his principal arguments about the existing issues caused by the present President of the United States, as well as he draws public’s
attention by making an accusation against the government in terms of corruption. The President metaphorically calls the responsibility to maintain the country a journey that must be conducted on a righteous path. Nevertheless, D. Trump expresses a firm negative attitude towards the present-day head of the country B. Obama asserting that America is ruled improperly and B. Obama does not meet the requirements needed for the position of the president.

(42) ...our country is really headed in the wrong direction with a president who is doing an absolutely terrible job. (DT, 8)

In several of his speeches, the President strongly criticizes the present American government. He equates the existing corruption in the American government with a swamp and promises to change the situation once he is the President of the United States.

(43) ...we are going to drain the Swamp of Corruption in Washington, D.C..... (DT, 3, 8)

D. Trump openly tells the audience about his experience while meeting the evangelical community and calls it one of the best experiences during his presidential candidacy. In addition, D. Trump vividly calls his presidential candidacy a journey.

(44) One of the greatest privileges of my journey has been the time I’ve spent with the evangelical community. (DT, 1)

Moreover, as a future president of the country, D. Trump persuades the audience he will fight for the ability to choose educational institution and programs. Expressing his support, the President metaphorically compares himself to a cheerleader.

(45) As your president, I will be the biggest cheerleader for school choice you’ve ever seen. (DT, 1)

Continuing to speak about the future D. Trump stresses the inequality among people living in America in terms of their race and religion and promises to fight for African-American children who are excluded from the society. He vividly compares good living conditions and quality of life to the American dream that every foreigner strives for.

(46) I will fight to make sure every single African-American child in this country is fully included in the American Dream. (DT, 4)
Similarly, strengthening his arguments on the issues of African-American community D. Trump makes his reasons touching by adding colour to his language and metaphorically describing African-American church. He states that truthfulness and fairness are spread by African-American church, which is the core of the country’s real values.

(47) ...African-American church – and this is all across the country – for centuries have been the conscience of our nation. (DT, 1)

In addition, the President remarkably illustrates the values that are necessary for the united America. D. Trump stresses that the genuine values in people’s hearts and the belief in a country actually created American nation.

(48) Your values of love, charity and faith built this nation. (DT, 1)

Even though D. Trump does not frequently use metaphors for emphasizing logical reasoning, he metaphorically describes America’s economy calling family farms the backbone of the country. Making this statement, the President stresses the benefit family businesses bring to the economy of the United States and praises their contribution to the prosperity of the country.

(49) Family farms are the backbone of this country. (DT, 7)

To conclude, D. Trump employs metaphors mostly to express displeasure against other politicians or present unsatisfactory situation in America’s government, at the same time exalting his own credibility. Besides, he makes promises that he will improve educational system in the country and fight against racism.

6.2. Metonymy

Metonymy is a type of stylistic device in which a concrete item or object is addressed not by its own title, but by the name of something closely connected with it instead. As a consequence, metonymy serves D. Trump perfectly when appealing to logos. The President constantly uses a place or company to stand in for the entire industry.

(50) AT&T is buying Time Warner and the CNN. (DT, 2)

(51) Ford is moving all of its small car production to Mexico. (DT, 2)

(52) And Apple, and our other major companies, will start making their iPhones, computers and other products inside of the United States – not in China, and all over the world. (DT, 2)
D. Trump also highlights employment problems in America and states that Mexican government is taking away work places from American people.

(53) *Mexico's taking our jobs.* (DT, 2)

In his speech in Washington, DC, D. Trump accentuates the importance of America’s national security. He shows his worries about the threat to the security of the country by providing veritable facts on North Korea government’s nuclear tests.

(54) *Just today it was announced that North Korea performed its fifth nuclear test.*

(DT, 1)

Argumentative force of metonymies is explicit in the President’s remarks when D. Trump addresses to the citizens of America while speaking about presidential elections. The President persuades the American nation not to vote for his opponent in presidential election Hillary Clinton since H. Clinton possesses a low opinion on her country’s citizens. By the use of metonymy, D. Trump convinces his audience that every single American contributes to a better future of the country and every single citizen is a significant part of America.

(55) *America can never elect a President, like Hillary Clinton, who apparently, with her choice of words, thinks decent American citizens are a bigger threat than Radical Islamic Terrorists.* (DT, 3)

D. Trump seeks to show that he shares the same values and beliefs with the audience by calling himself “people’s voice”. The President aims at demonstrating his trustworthiness while assuring that he understands the needs and desires of American people, that he feels what every single person, every woman or man living in America feels and is ready to fight for a better living. Therefore, D. Trump induces the listeners’ trust in him as he promises to be a credible representative of the country.

(56) *I Am Your Voice.* (DT, 4)

(57) *I am running to be the voice of the forgotten men and women.* (DT, 4)

Simultaneously, in the same speech D. Trump repeatedly uses the same metonymy, however, in this case he tries to persuade the audience his opponent H. Clinton is only considered about her own special interests and for this reason, she cannot be an eligible representative of the United States of America.

(58) *Hillary Clinton is the voice for the global special interests.* (DT, 4)
Moreover, D. Trump persuades the audience that once he is a president of the United States, the government will faithfully serve people’s needs and fix the problems in the country that have gone unsolved for a long time.

(59) **The White House will become the People's House.** (DT, 2)

D. Trump frequently highlights two issues in his addresses: religion and the division of the country. The President raises the problem of churches not being able to express their opinion and endorse political candidates because of the almost 70 years ago initiated policy stating that tax-exempt groups are not allowed to support political parties. He encourages people to think how the power of church has been recklessly taken away and promises to make pastors more powerful and able to express their beliefs.

(60) **The first thing we have to do is give our churches their voice back.** (DT, 1)

As for the division of the country, D. Trump repeatedly stresses that every single citizen of the country contributes to the future of America and convinces the audience that precisely they are able to make a change and recreate the unity by electing D. Trump a President of the United States.

(61) **American hands will rebuild this nation.** (DT, 2)

In his political speeches, D. Trump takes metonymies for granted as a significant facet of realizing rhetorical strategies. Metonymies comprise a considerable part of all discussed rhetorical tropes applied in the President’s speeches. D. Trump uses this stylistic device to base his logical reasoning on employment issues in the country and the importance of profitable industries inside and outside the country. In addition, the President applies metonymy to reinforce his authority and prove his listeners’ he shares the same feelings and values with them.

**6.3. Allusion**

The President uses a great number of allusions in his speeches when showing the audience his authority, too. D. Trump makes references to credible individuals to prove he is worth listening to.

D. Trump intends to persuade the audience claiming that while being a president, he will make sure taxes will be considerably reduced for American citizens that has not happened for almost 40 years since the 40th President of the United States was running the country.
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(62) Here are some of the amazing things we are going to do for our country starting in 2017: the biggest tax cut since Ronald Reagan... (DT, 7)

Besides, D. Trump makes another allusion to the 16th President of the United States Abraham Lincoln, expressing his worry about a divided American nation. He reminds the audience about the historical disputes in the country and alludes to the Civil War, being the greatest division of the nation. D. Trump compares this past situation of the States with the division of the country nowadays and encourages people to strive for solidarity. In addition, D. Trump boosts his authority by indirectly promising people to work for improving this situation in America if he becomes the head of the country.

(63) President Lincoln served at a time of division like we've never seen before. It is my hope that we can look at his example to heal the divisions we are living through right now. (DT, 6)

President D. Trump shows a deep sorrow for the educational system in America and utters his negative voice towards common core, i.e. the most important subjects of the curriculum. The President convinces his audience he will change the situation and will bring education local.

(64) Common Core – we’re going to end it. (DT, 1)

To enlarge his concern about the actions of his opponent in the presidential election H. Clinton, as well as prejudice the politician, D. Trump states that H. Clinton’s operations are corrupt and compares her actions with the Watergate scandal. The President alludes to the major political scandal that occurred in America in the early 1970s that put into publicity such election law violations as bribery and false testimony and convinces the audience that his opponent’s crimes are even more serious.

(65) This is a far bigger scandal than Watergate ever was... (DT, 2)

The rhetorical device of allusion helps D. Trump compare the recent issue in America - a multitude number of refugees entering the country with one of the greatest deceptions in the history of the world - the Trojan horse. The Trojan horse stands for the subterfuge that in Ancient times the Greeks used to invade the independent city of Troy. The President hints at refugees being the Trojan horse in America and calls them a tremendous threat for the country. D. Trump
worries that even if America will take care of these people, refugees will bring only a catastrophe for the country.

(66) *This could be the all-time great Trojan horse.* (DT, 1)

Furthermore, to express his compassion and deep feelings for his country, D. Trump alludes to one of the most horrible, painful and impossible to forget events in the history of the United States the September 11 attacks coordinated by Islamic terrorist. D. Trump reminds the audience about this tragic event that cost thousands of lives and invites people to think about the remaining consequences of the attack in terms of expanding terrorism in the United States.

(67) *Since 9/11, hundreds of immigrants and their children have been implicated in terrorism and terrorist-related activity in the United States.* (DT, 3)

Furthermore, D. Trump makes indirect references to his opponent in the presidential election Hillary Clinton and her husband, former American president Bill Clinton when providing concrete numbers in terms of factories in the country. The use of metonymy helps the President not only strengthen the appeal to the audience’s rational but also draw people’s attention to marketing issues. At the same time, the President indicates his strong negative opinion towards the Clinton family.

(68) *We’ve lost 70,000 factories since China’s entry into the World Trade Organization – another Bill and Hillary-backed deal.* (DT, 2)

Further, speaking about America’s imports and exports D. Trump accentuates poor situation of market and alludes to the period of Great Depression in the country, i.e. a major fall in stock prices in America.

(69) *We have nearly an $800 billion dollar annual trade deficit in goods with the world, and the worst so-called recovery since the Great Depression.* (DT, 3)

To sum it up, D. Trump mostly employs allusion in order to appeal to people’s emotions. He reminds the audience of moving past events such as 9/11 attacks or the Great Depression that caused hurtful consequences to the country. Furthermore, D. Trump expresses his concern about such long lasting problems in America as illegal immigration and corruption in the government, as well as remaining education issues and seeks to also induce the audience’s feeling of anxiety and injustice.
6.4. Rhetorical question

D. Trump’s applies rhetorical questions in his speeches to reinforce the audience’s emotions by bringing racism and inequalities in America to the daylight. The President addresses to African-American community who according to the President are outsiders, i.e. they are treated unequally in the country. He attempts to convince the community they have nothing more to lose, so they have to vote for D. Trump.

(70) *To the African-American community, I say: what do you have to lose?* (DT, 3)

Additionally, D. Trump seeks to get to American people’s hearts asking if they feel and comprehend what unfair things are happening in the present government.

(71) *You see what’s going on?* (DT, 1)

Rhetorical questions assist D. Trump’s logical reasoning very frequently. A number of examples of rhetorical questions can be indicated in the President’s speeches that help the President aim at the audience’s intellect. D. Trump’s explanations, numbers and facts are constantly followed by a questions that invites people to take into account the given situation. D. Trump sits in judgement upon the former president B. Obama’s health insurance policy and invites people to think about promises for American people to have patient protection and affordable health care that according to the President, were not actually fulfilled.

(72) *All lies, just like Obamacare was a big lie, remember?* (DT, 7)

To highlight the importance of school choice programs in the country, D. Trump speaks about financial status in the field of education and asks the audience to evaluate the proposed grant for improving school choice programs.

(73) *This proposal begins with a $20 billion block grant from the federal government for states to pursue school choice programs. However – that’s good, right?* (DT, 1)

Rhetorical questions play a significant role in D. Trump’s speeches in order to build a communicative tension between the orator and the audience. For instance, in terms of implementing rhetorical questions, D. Trump refers to *ethos* by demonstrating his interest in the topic. He asks a question to himself to show his willingness to understand a particular issue or express his interest on the subject and stimulates the audience to think about it too.

(74) *And I said, what’s going on here?* (DT, 1)

(75) *And I said, what’s the punishment?* (DT, 1)

(76) *When did it happen?* (DT, 1)
While asking a rhetorical question, D. Trump also encourages the audience to think about his opponent H. Clinton and her husband B. Clinton and evoke their vigilance about their obscure actions when it comes to the state money.

(77) *But can you imagine these people sitting there and they see $1.7 billion (dollars) in cash?* (DT, 3)

To summarize, the President’s speeches often contain rhetorical questions which not only builds a relationship between him and his audience but also invites people to think about the issues discussed. Rhetorical questions help the President sound credible since by asking questions and immediately giving the answer, D. Trump displays his interest in the topic and ambition to gain knowledge. Besides, D. Trump asks people to think about other politician’s failures and vague actions.

### 7. LINGUISTIC IMPLEMENTATION OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN DALIA GRYBAUSKAITĖ’S SPEECHES

D. Grybauskaitė uses a number of metaphors in her speeches to gain people’s attention. As a matter of fact, metaphors is one of the most common and widely applied linguistic tools in the President’s speeches that help D. Grybauskaitė flatter her language and vividly describe various issues in Lithuania such as Lithuania’s independence, alliances with NATO and the European Union, education issues, make arguments about patriotism. This particular rhetorical trope plays a special role in D. Grybauskaitė’s speeches when she seeks to gain an emotional response from the audience, i.e. the President applies metaphors in order to appeal to the audience’s beliefs and values, as well as to the compassionate imagination and feelings.

#### 7.1. Metaphor

The President metaphorically describes European Union by calling it the home of Lithuania and other European countries and talks about the budget that is necessary for the Union. Hence, D. Grybauskaitė proves her authority stating that a budget has been determined that corresponds to the aims and the timing of the country.

(78) *Namuose - Sąjungos viduje - jis palengvina katastrofinių potvynių ir sausros aukų padėtį. O už jos ribų numato didžiausią kokią yra matęs pasaulis vystymosi ir humanitarinės*
D. Grybauskaitė compares the success in demanding negotiations with other countries with the process of “breaking the ice”. The President conveys the message that even though it is rather challenging to deal with certain questions every now and then, especially when these questions are either legally complex or politically sensitive, together with her associates she manages to overcome these difficulties.

(79) ...mūsų derybininkams pavyko pralaužti ledus šiuo politiškai jautriu ir teisiškai sudėtingu klausimu. (DG, 2)

Through metaphors, D. Grybauskaitė enhances her arguments about the importance and value of patriotism. The President vividly compares Lithuanian people who defended the country when it was necessary and who aspire to Lithuania’s culture and prosperity with “lighthouses”. A lighthouse is a tower that has a beacon light to caution and guide ships at sea. Therefore, the D. Grybauskaitė appeals to the audience’s emotions by saying that Lithuanian people are the ones who guide their country to a better future.

(80) Tėvynės gynėjai, jos gerovės ir kultūros kūrėjai yra švyturiai... (DG, 5)

In addition, the President highlights that every single Lithuanian person contributes to making Lithuania a strong country and without its citizens, it would be impossible to have such powerful and independent country as Lithuanian people have today.

(81) Lietuvos stiprybė ir yra kiekvienas Jūsų. (DG, 5)

D. Grybauskaitė likes to flatter Lithuanian people for their contribution to building Lithuania as a strong and brave country. In this case, she brightly compares Lithuanian people’s will to the flame burning in every citizen’s heart.

(82) Ačiū Jums, kad kuriate didvyrišką Lietuvą. Tegul Jūsų tvirta valia kursto herojiškumo ugnį kiekviename. (DG, 3)

To strengthen her ideas about the European Union, D. Grybauskaitė metaphorically entitles the aim and major duties of this alliance a journey. D. Grybauskaitė states that European Union does not fulfill all the aspirations and expectations and it needs a guidance in order to be able to accomplish its functions and pledge for all European countries.

(83) ...Europos Sąjunga pametė savo kelią... (DG, 2)
Furthermore, D. Grybauskaitė gives a logical reasoning when talking about Lithuania’s future. She states that such facets as science, innovations and well-educated people contribute to maintaining an advanced country. The President expresses her assurance of having a bright future for Lithuania stating that Lithuania has a number of cultivated people and is advanced in innovation and science sphere.

(84) *Lietuvos ateitis – pažangi valstybė, kurios pagrindiniai varikliai yra mokslas, inovacijos ir išsilavinę žmonės.* (DG, 5)

The President also metaphorically describes investments from foreign countries and highlights the investors’ contribution to producing jobs for Lithuanian people, strengthening the field of business and social guarantees.

(85) *Įleisdami čia šaknis, investuotojai įdarbina mūsų šalies gyventojus, stiprina verslo kultūrą ir kilsteli socialinės atsakomybės kartelę.* (DG, 31)

All in all, it is obvious that metaphors are an integral part of D. Grybauskaitė’s speeches. This rhetorical trope contributes to embellishing the President’s words in order to appeal to the audience’s emotions. With the use of metaphor, the President seeks to touch Lithuanian people’s feelings in terms of patriotism, the sense of responsibility for their country and the bright future of Lithuania. Further, D. Grybauskaitė often metaphorically describes not only the country but also Lithuanian people, stating that Lithuanian citizens make Lithuania great and every Lithuanian is important for the well-being of the country.

7.2. Metonymy

The use of metonymy assists D. Grybausakaitė in her arguments when she seeks to go straight to the point. Instead of using long expressions, the President masterfully replaces them by a word that is closely associated with a particular phrase. Consequently, by the use of metonymy D. Grybauskaitė is able to perfectly glamorize her language.

D. Grybauskaitė frequently applies metonymy in order to appeal to the audience’s *ethos*. In the statement about her meeting in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the President replaces the word “government” or “country representatives” by the name of the state.

(86) *...norėčiau padėkoti Nyderlandų Karalystei už puikiai suorganizuotą susitikimą.* (DG, 2)
When speaking about Lithuanian presidency of the Council of the European Union, D. Grybauskaitė shows her skills by displaying the positive outcomes and improved situation in the European Union. In this case, D. Grybauskaitė uses metonymy when she mentions people who represent the European Union countries.

(87) Jos patvirtina teiginį, kad **Europa** brenda iš krizės, kad **Europa** įgyvendina savo piliečiams duotus pažadus, kad **Europa** dirba. (DG, 2)

In addition, the President praises the work of the European Union government and its endeavour to defend peace, people’s rights and democracy in each country.

(88) **Europa**, kuri gynė taiką, demokratiją ir žmogaus teises. **Europa**, kuri po 50-ies konfliktų ir dalijimosi metų siekė vėl suvienyti žemyną. (DG, 2)

Very frequently D. Grybauskaitė the President uses metonymy when she seeks to point out Lithuanian people. The President replaces the words “Lithuanian people” or “Lithuanian citizens” with the name of the country for the purpose of evoking people to believe that they are a part of all the processes in the country and they help the government succeed when facing challenges.

(89) **Lietuva** įveikė šį išbandymą. (DG, 15)

Moreover, D. Grybauskaitė refers to people’s sense of responsibility stating that Lithuanian people are accountable to creating and fostering an open and conscientious Lithuanian society.

(90) Tegul ši atsakomybė Jus lydi kasdien. Puoselėjant miestą ir jo bendruomenę, stiprinant pasitikėjimą vienas kitu, kuriant atvirą ir sąžiningą **Lietuvą**. (DG, 26)

In addition to this, the President foregrounds people’s ideas and actions which are crucial in order to have a dashing and secure Lithuanian society.

(91) Atvirą, veržlią ir patikimą **Lietuvą** savo idėjomis ir darbais kasdien kuriame mes visi. (DG, 26)

Besides, in her speech for young Lithuanian scientists, the President embodies her belief in young educated people who according to the President will glorify Lithuania as a developed and well-educated country.

(92) Tikiu **Lietuva** ir jos kūrėjais. (DG, 30)

As far as metonymies in D. Grybauskaitė’s speeches are considered, the President constantly applies this rhetorical device as a substitution of Lithuania or other country or
continent for the residents or government representatives of that particular country. For instance, by stating that “Lithuania has expressed its support” the President speaks about the politicians representing Lithuania in the meeting in Seoul.

(93) Seule Lietuva išreiškė savo paramą... (DG, 2)

Continuing to speak about the necessity and meaning of the budget, D. Grybauskaitė states that the budget imparts measures that secure a bright future for Lithuanian youth, as well as helps combat cybercrime in all European countries. In this case, the perception of the value of European Union is motivated among the audience by the President since D. Grybauskaitė seeks to prove her authority and convinces that she works for the good of the country when it comes to dealing with the budget.

(94) Biudžetas suteikia mums priemones, leidžiančias mūsų jauniems žmonėms įskurti viltį dėl ateities. Jis suteikia Europai galimybę kovoti su kibernetiniais nusikaltimais. (DG, 2)

As far as metonymies in D. Grybauskaitė’s remarks are concerned, the President both expresses her trustworthiness and aims at achieving emotional appeal to the audience. D. Grybauskaitė introduces the Lithuanian government’s national and international achievements, as well as she emphasizes how every educated, responsible and conscious Lithuanian citizen creates a strong, powerful country.

7.3. Allusion

D. Grybauskaitė rarely applies allusion in terms of strengthening her authority and credibility. However, the President uses this rhetorical trope when she focuses on the past events in the country that helped creating a strong and independent country. This reinforces D. Grybauskaitė’s authority since being the president of the country, D. Grybauskaitė is responsible for taking care of the membership in NATO and the European Union and therefore, she mentions these two alliances.

(95) Nuo Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės iki pokario partizanų, nuo Baltijos kelių iki mūsų narystės NATO ir Europos Sąjungoje, esame nepriklausomi, gerbiami ir stiprūs... (DG, 5)

In addition, the President stresses that even though there were times when Lithuania lost its independence, there was always a way to recover Lithuania’s freedom. At the same time,
Grybauskaitė seeks to ensure the audience that in case some power encroaches upon the freedom of Lithuania, there will always be the way to save Lithuania’s independence.

(96) Per knygnešius, per partizanus ir rezistentus, mes visada iš kiekvienos aklavietės randame kelią į laisvę... (DG, 5)

Wars, deportations, occupations and splitting of the country make the history of Lithuania that cannot be forgotten. Therefore, D. Grybauskaitė reminds her audience about these events and asks people to honour people who dedicated their lives to fight for their country’s freedom.

(97) Išgyvenę karus, trėminus, okupacijas ir skaldymus, jauskime atsakomybę prieš tuos, kurie telkė ir vienijo Lietuvą. (DG, 6)

When the President emphasizes historical events that have shaped Lithuania, she aims at appealing to the audience’s sense of freedom and patriotism. In this case, D. Grybauskaitė also implements allusion. This rhetorical trope is highly beneficial when there is a purpose of make an indirect reference to an event or figure. For example, D. Grybauskaitė alludes to twenty signatories who according to the President, united Lithuania. The President does not provide much detail about this reference since she expects people to understand the event without explanation. With this example, the President engages the listeners’ emotions about the significance of a united nation.

(98) Tačiau dvidešimt signatarų sugėbėjo pažadinti ir suvienyti Tautą. (DG, 5)

The President also alludes to the same historical event by mentioning the date of signing the Act of Independence of Lithuania. D. Grybauskaitė stresses that a dream of having an independent country already existed decades ago and twenty people made a great effort to make this dream come true.

(99) Į Vasario šešioliktosios parašą kiekvienas įspaudė savo Tėvynės viziją... (DG, 5)

In addition, D. Grybauskaitė emphasizes the value of liberty in people’s hearts by reminding the audience about one of the most severe events in the country – Soviet deportations from Lithuania.

(100) Birželio 14-oji taip pat yra diena, kurios negalime pamiršti. (DG, 14)

The President also reminds the audience of the Day of Restoration of Lithuania's Independence. She claims that this date is significant for every patriot and every person who cherishes his/her country’s freedom.
The President does not frequently use allusion in order to express her logical reasoning. Nevertheless, D. Grybauskaitė mentions a historical event in the country – Lithuania's membership in NATO. By mentioning the event that happened ten years ago, the President makes a clear indirect reference to the occasion.

To sum up, D. Grybauskaitė obviously appeals to the audience’s *pathos* when applying allusion. The President arouses people’s feelings when alluding to significant events that contributed to Lithuania’s struggle for independence through different times. The President mentions occupations and Soviet deportations to remind people about the sorrow that the country had to experience, as well as she glorifies people who believed in independent country.

**7.4. Rhetorical question**

In terms of rhetorical questions, the President seldom uses this rhetorical device in her addresses. Nevertheless, when proving her skills and achievements, D. Grybauskaitė rhetorically asks her audience what has been accomplished and introduces the tasks fulfilled for the well-being of the country.

As it was mentioned before, mostly, the President applies other rhetorical tropes instead of rhetorical questions when she seeks to appeal to the feelings of the audience. However, when the President seeks to make her speech more influential in terms of encompassing the emotional effect, she calls the audience to think about the future of Lithuania. D. Grybauskaitė asks a provocative question in order to evoke her listeners’ sense of responsibility.

To conclude, rhetorical questions are not frequent in D. Grybauskaitė’s speeches. However, in case the President rhetorically asks a question, she either proves her accomplishments or stimulates people’s sense of responsibility in terms of Lithuania’s fate.
CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of pre-election speeches delivered by present President of Lithuania Dalia Grybauskaitė and present President of the USA Donald Trump showed that the same rhetorical strategies are applied in both presidents’ addresses in order to persuade the audience, however, through application of a particular strategy each president transfers different messages. Therefore, based on the results of this research, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- The qualitative analysis of the presidents’ remarks disclosed that D. Trump applies *ethos* to prove his credibility and trustworthiness as a future President of the United States. D. Trump emphasizes what he has done in order to contribute to the prosperity of the country in terms of employment and education. The President also makes promises to achieve even more in the future in the mentioned areas. In addition, proving his authority, D. Trump strongly criticizes his opponent in the presidential elections Hillary Clinton. Last but not least, D. Trump seeks to prove he is a reliable person by mentioning his personal experience on a certain topic.

- As for *ethos* in D. Grybauskaitė’s speeches, Lithuanian President most frequently refers to what she has already accomplished in terms of the growth of economics in Lithuania, strengthening the power of European Union and making alliances with other European countries. Besides, the President refers to reliable sources such as Annual Growth Survey or shows her interest in advanced sectors in Lithuania like telecommunication and innovations. Nevertheless, there is no surprise the President invokes her achievements for the country since D. Grybauskaitė aims at the second term of her presidency in Lithuania.

- Both presidents appeal to their audience’s *pathos* by referring to the most important and touching recent issues in the countries. D. Trump highlights the problem of a divided nation and seeks to evoke the belief of a united America in people’s hearts. Moreover, the President seeks to arouse the feelings of fear and worry by constantly mentioning immigration problems that according to the President have caused rising delinquency rates in the country. In terms of D. Grybauskaitė, the Lithuanian president uses *pathos* to move people’s emotions on patriotism and prove the importance of taking responsibility for the country. In addition, D. Grybauskaitė
relies on people’s sentimentality considering the importance of preservation of Lithuania’s independence.

- Since logic and rationality are highly valued in the society, consequently, logical reasoning plays a crucial role in both presidents’ speeches. Speaking about D. Trump, the President strengthens his arguments by providing statistical data when he seeks to enlighten people about the situation in unemployment and delinquency in the country. Nevertheless, even referring to statistics, D. Trump usually expresses his negative attitude towards his opponent H. Clinton and seeks to display her failures. As for D. Grybauskaitė, Lithuanian president logically grounds her statements about the situation in the field of education in the country, as well as she bases her plea in terms of the importance of European Union and NATO for Lithuania by providing a number of examples. However, even though D. Grybausakité mentions statistical data, the President does not provide concrete numbers on a particular issue, rather uses the term statistics in broad sense.

- The analysis of implementation of rhetorical tropes in Presidents’ addresses disclosed that rhetorical strategies are expressed differently by the two Presidents. Through metaphorical language D. Trump appeals to ethos when he expresses criticism towards other politicians and American government, whereas D. Grybauskaitė appeals to pathos by emphasizing patriotism and the value of united nation. In terms of the use of metonymies, D. Trump embodies logical reasoning on employment issues in the country, as well as he emphasizes his authority by persuading the audience he comprehends what needs to be done for a better future of the country. Similarly, D. Grybauskaitė highlights the importance of alliances and international relationships between countries. Besides, by the use of metonymy Lithuanian President to people’s sense of responsibility and the value of education. Furthermore, allusion helps D. Trump evoke people’s feelings shocking historical events in America, whereas D. Grybauskaitė emotionally stresses the struggle for Lithuania’s independence. As for rhetorical questions, D. Trump frequently applies this stylistic device in order to criticize his opponents and establish his authority, whereas even though D. Grybauskaitė rarely uses this rhetorical trope, however,
when applying this stylistic device, the President invites people to evaluate her accomplishments or to think about taking responsibility for the country.
SUMMARY

Magistro darbo tikslas buvo išnagrinėti retorinių strategijų taikymą Jungtinių Amerikos Valstijų prezidento Donaldo Trampo ir Lietuvos Respublikos prezidentės Dalios Grybauskaitės priešrinkiminėse kalbose. Šiam tikslui pasiekti, buvo išsikelti tokie uždaviniai: išanalizuoti dviejų politikų taikomas retorines strategijas, susiejant jas su komunikaciniu tikslu, įstirti retorinių strategijų lingvistinį realizavimą skirtingomis stilistinėmis priemonėmis, bei palyginant dviejų prezidentų taikomas retorines strategijas išsiaiškinti, kurios jų yra skirtingos ir kodel. Tyrimu buvo naudojamas kokybinės retorinės analizės metodas gautų rezultatų apibendrinimui ir įvertinimui.
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