

Parallelism in One of Hillary Clinton's Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Saleema AbdulZahra Almeahmdawi *

Al-Muthanna University - College of Education for Humanities

article info

Article history:

Received 5/11/2017

Received in revised form 3/1/2018

Accepted 14/2 /2018

Available online 11/7/2018

Keywords:

Critical Discourse Analysis

Parallelism

Political Discourse

Rhetoric

socio-cognitive approach

abstract

Parallelism is a linguistic phenomenon. It refers to the use of the same pattern of words for two or more ideas having the same degree of importance arranged in successive lines and in a balanced manner, enabling the reader to understand the meaning or grasp the relation among ideas. Stylistically, parallelism, with its different types, is used by politicians to persuade audience to sympathize with their views, and make their speech more memorable. This paper studies parallelism as a rhetorical device from a critical discourse perspective following van Dijk's (1993) socio-cognitive approach and his notion of Ideological Square (2006a). The present study investigates how Hillary Clinton (Democratic presidential nominee) has made use of parallelism in her political speech during "the fourth and final night of the Democratic National Convention" in December, 2016. The study has concluded that parallelism is an important devise used to show and reflect dominance, the central intention of this approach, in the political context. Moreover, it is used by Hillary to reflect the positive properties and others' negative ones, hence it helps her in expressing her ideology.

© All rights reserved to Muthanna University 2018

Introduction

1. Political Discourse

Fairclough (1989), Wilson (1990), and van Dijk (1993) conducted studies on political discourse; however, their

approaches were either based on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) or Pragmatics. Political discourse can be defined not only in textual terms but also in contextual terms

i.e. location, timing, and roles of participants and aims of the political process. Van Dijk (2002: 225) states that "Political discourse is not primarily defined by topic or style, but rather by who speaks to whom, as what, on what occasion and with what goals". Political language plays an important role in politicians' success helping them get the manipulation and support of audience. Nowadays, through different types of media, politicians may have more chances to gain votes and change public opinion. Hence, what is important in political achievement is the predetermined layout of political language by which politicians convey their messages. Fairclough (2001:61) distinguishes between two types of discourse and power: power behind discourse and power in discourse. Concerning the first type, power is manifested in the hands of power-holders in an institution rather than in the hands of the institution as the relation between a lecturer and his students. As for discourse types where power lies in discourse, relations of power are manifested and exercised in discourse. An example would be the discourse of the mass media, where it has power over its viewers.

Concerning language and politics, Orwell (1969:225) has illustrated "the political aspect of language" explaining that language can efficiently be used to affect thought. The study of language has been discussed by different philosophers and linguists as relating to the research in political science. 'Political language' is a term introduced first by those who are

interested in both the social sciences and propaganda research. When the aim is to manipulate power, and there is some effect upon power, one speaks of the political function of language (Lasswell, et al., 1949: 8). Politicians try to get the allegiance and support of their people through manipulating the communicative and sociolinguistic nature of the political discourse, which can be achieved via the use of linguistic features to stir peoples' emotions and persuade them.

Fairclough (1995: 172-181) points out that political speech is thematic since topics are basically related to political ideas, activities, and acts including the techniques and strategies to submit the political ideas of the speaker. One of these strategies used in political speeches is rhetoric which is the art of persuasive and effective speaking or writing. It has always been an important part of the study of language and considered as a main part of political science and an essential means of persuasion by the Greek and the Romans. Rhetoric has been investigated by many scholars including Aristotle (1926), Whately (1963), Black (1978), Campbell (1988), Nakayama and Ktizek (1995), and van Dijk(1997).

Rhetoric is seen by Aristotle as the ability of observing the available tools of persuasion in any given case the available means of persuasion. This is not to say that the orator would be able to convince under all circumstances unless he discovers the means of persuasion to employ them in his

attempts to convince his audience (Roberts, 2004:7).

Hu (2001: 6) has discussed rhetoric in politics in his article "Rhetoric in Politics and its Knowledge Spreading". Studying different political speeches, he explains that certain forms of rhetoric are widely used such as metonymy, metaphor, repetition, euphemism and parallelism as well as antithesis or contrast parallelism. These devices have a vital role on spreading political knowledge in the political speeches. Thus, parallelism is one of the rhetorical devices employed in political discourse.

Metcalf (1998: 398) states that "Persuasion can be defined as communication which influences and changes the beliefs, feelings, or behaviour of a listener. Persuasive speeches convince, stimulate, and actuate".

Van Dijk (1997a: 35) elaborates that rhetoric has considerable contextual political significance and persuasive function. He (1997a: 12-13) characterizes political discourse in terms of three aspects. First, political discourse is approached by politicians: actors or authors. Most studies of political discourse focus on the speeches and texts of politicians, for instance presidents, ministers, members of parties, members of parliament, etc. However, determining political discourse first by its participants also requires the inclusion of equally important people, the public and different categories and groups, such as the pressure groups, voters, etc. Second, political discourse might be identified by

the practices or activities being accomplished by the political speech and text rather than its interlocutors. Third, the context may be regarded as crucial tool for classifying discourse as political or not. Resultantly, political discourse is mostly determined contextually in relation to certain political practices, aims, goals, and functions.

Van Dijk adds that "politicians talk politically also (or only) if they and their talk are contextualized in such communicative events such as cabinet meetings, parliamentary sessions, election campaigns, rallies, interviews with the media, bureaucratic practices, protest demonstrations, and so on" (1997: 14).

2. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) "is the uncovering of implicit ideologies in texts. It unveils the underlying ideological prejudices and therefore the exercise of power in texts" (Widdoson, 2000). Fairclough (1995: 132-3) defines CDA as the discourse analysis which aims to investigate systematically and explore how discursive practices, texts and events arise out of and how they are ideologically figured by relations of power and struggles over power. Van Dijk (2006b: 115) notes that studying ideology is the core of CDA because "people acquire, express and reproduce their ideologies by text or talk." Moreover, he adds that ideologies are acquired personally but they are socially reproduced mainly through discourses (2006a: 730).

2.1 Major Approaches to CDA

1. Norman Fairclough: Discourse as Social Practice

According to The British sociolinguist Norman Fairclough, CDA is a method to examine the modifications (both social and cultural) that can be used against the control and power of an elite group on the others. Fairclough(1989, pp. 26-27)believes that language which shapes our social identities and interactions, knowledge systems, and beliefs, is also shaped by them in turn. The aim of his approach is to reveal the significance of language in creating, maintaining and changing the social relations of power and how language can influence the dominance of one group of people over the others.

2. Ruth Wodak: Sociological and historical approach to CDA

Ruth Wodak has chosen to work within the sociological model for her CDA studies. Her model is based upon sociolinguistics and Frankfurt School. In accordance to this model, Wodak has studied the institutional relations in courtrooms, school, and hospitals; she worked on sexism, anti-semitism, and racism. Wodak and her colleagues choose “historical approach” to CDA, because of her Anti-Semitism studies after the Second World War (2001b: 69-70). She considers the historical approach to CDA as being interdisciplinary. This approach considers written and spoken language as forms of social behavior.

Moreover, Wodak distinguishes between discourse and text. She considers discourse as a complex set of synchronic and coherent linguistic acts which text is seen as their production.

3. Teun Van Dijk: A Socio-cognitive Approach

Teun Van Dijk is one of the key figures and pioneers in CDA. Most of his critical works are concerned with prejudice and racism in discourse. According to him, the topics that people talk about are mental and personal attitudes towards ethnic events. In his (2003, 2006a, 2008, 2009, 2014)works, van Dijk adds the attitude that studying cognition is significant in CDA and he labels his methodology as socio-cognitive discourse analysis.

Van Dijk believes that the relationship between social structures and discourse structures is through personal and social cognition (van Dijk, 2014: 3). This relationship is not concentrated on; therefore, he offers the triangle of society, cognition, and discourse. Van Dijk(2014:3) indicates that cognition refers to mental structures such as personal and social cognition, beliefs, goals ,etc. , and society refers to local micro-structures and political and social macro structures which are related to the relationships among groups such as dominance and inequality. Context of discourse in this triangle is of two types: micro and macro. Macro context refers to the political, cultural, and social structure whereby a communicative event occurs, whereas micro context shows the features

of the actual situation and interaction in a communicative event. Van Dijk regards micro context as a form of a mental model. The notion of mental models is adopted to explain "the hypothesis of socially shared attitudes and their refutation" (van Dijk, 1998: 45). It is a significant element in the socio-cognitive approach because of its importance to society and discourse structure. These models are of two types: event and context models. According to the semantic event models, properties of discourse (lexical choices, syntactic structures, rhetorical devices, etc.) are identified (van Dijk, 2003: 329). Context models are pragmatic; they identify what is relevant for people in a communicative situation (Van Dijk, 2014: 6).

In his notion of Ideological Square, van Dijk(2006b) believes that the major premise in talking about others includes positive self-representation or boasting (reflecting the ingroup ideology) and negative other-representation or derogation(reflecting the outgroup ideology). The first represents US (de)emphasizing our good/bad properties while the second represent THEM (de)emphasizing their bad/good qualities. Positive self-presentation is used for keeping social face and negative other-presentation is concerned with in-groups and out-groups; they are semantic macro-strategies (van Dijk, 2006a: 738-739).

Van Dijk (1993: 264) clarifies that powerful speakers show their power in discourse by the discursive structures and strategies required in that process of

persuading and influencing their audiences. The discursive reproduction of dominance is of two major aspects: production and reception. That is, the distinction is between the legitimation of dominance in the structures of text and the functions and consequences of these structures for the recipient's mind. The more subtle representations of dominance may be observed at some levels, e.g. in intonation, and other persuasive moves such as "Argumentation (the negative evaluation follows from the facts), rhetorical figures; hyperbolic enhancement of their negative actions and our positive actions; euphemisms, understatements of our negative actions, denials. Lexical style: choice of words that imply negative (or positive) evaluations. Story telling: telling above negative events as personally experienced; giving plausible details above negative features of the events. Structural emphasis of their negative actions, e.g. in headlines, leads, summaries, or other properties of text schemata (e.g. those of news reports), structures of sentence syntax (e.g. mentioning negative agents in prominent topical position).Quoting credible witnesses, sources or experts, e.g. in news reports".(Ibid.)

Van Dijk (1980) sets out the semantic macrostructures theory to investigate the macro(global) and micro(local) structures of discourse. Macro-level analysis deals with thematic and schematic structures which denote the general topic or global meaning. The micro-level is concerned with the analysis of words, phrases,

clauses, sentences and the relation among them. It deals with the local meaning of discourse. Van Dijk (1997a: 32-33) elaborates on various linguistic means at various levels by which politicians can reflect their positive properties and other's negative ones: semantic level where the lexical style is investigated, syntactic level where the sentential analysis is applied, rhetorical level at which certain rhetorical devices are dealt with such as repetition, parallelism, rhyme, hyperbole, metaphor, etc. Pragmatic level deals with the speech acts that affect the social interaction. Mainly, this study is concerned with investigating the use of parallelism as a rhetorical device.

To sum up, the major approaches to CDA aim at representing the dialectic relationship between language, power, ideology, and the important role that language plays in the emergence of power and legitimizing social inequalities.

3. Parallelism

Parallelism refers to the use of words, phrases, clauses, or sentences that are similar in structure, sound or meaning. Its effect is clear in the sense that it allows a writer or a speaker to show an idea, image, or relationship, and to attract reader's attention.

The word 'Parallelism' is derived from Greek 'paralelas' which means phrases or sentences of similar construction and meaning placed side by side, balancing each other (Cuddon, 1992). Parallelism has the power to produce foregrounding in a

text by inviting the reader to search for the meaning connections between parallel structures. Thus, foregrounding is not only a result of linguistic deviation but also a result of repetition and parallelism (Short, 1996: 15). The connection between parallelism and political speeches lies in the fact that politicians rely on linguistic repertoire in order to obtain and achieve their objectives and aims, one of these linguistic configurations is parallelism.

Many linguists suggest various types of parallelism; Johnstone (1991: 102-106) classifies parallelism into two types: listing parallelism and cumulative parallelism. The former is used to describe structures that are similar in syntax but different in content. The latter describes a structure that is semantically built on previous structure. It is not only a rhetorical device, but also a text-building device.

According to Ivany (1993: 55-56) parallelism can be divided into five overlapping types: syntactic, semantic, morphological, prosodic and phonic; where the other dominates none of them.

Ochs' (1979) classification of parallelism, discussed in Johnstone (1991: 29), includes phonological parallelism and morphological or syntactic parallelism. Mac Coinnigh (2012:122) has shown that parallelism can be both structural and semantic; structural or syntactic parallelism, the interest of this study, is "a rhetorical device used for the purpose of emphasis or foregrounding. It involves the contiguous juxtaposition of syntactically parallel elements of a text, such as

individual lexical items, phrases, clauses, or sentences for the purpose of suggesting analogical relationships or comparisons".

On the other hand, Kane (2003:170) emphasizes that structural parallelism occurs when "two or more words or constructions stand in an identical grammatical relationship to the same thing...parallel constructions are subject to a strict rule of style: they must be in the same grammatical form".

The above-mentioned types of parallelism have one thing in common which is repeating the same structure that has been called syntactic parallelism which includes repetition of the same structure. Hence, the present study deals with the structural or syntactic type.

Parallelism or parallel constructions can be explained with reference to different other linguists such as (Anson and Robert, 2000; Hacker, 2003, and Margret, 2006) as follows: Parts of a sentence that have the same idea, function or value have to be balanced; in the same way, these parts have to have unified grammatical form .When two or more parts of a sentence have the same grammatical structure, they are said to be parallel. For example:

1. "I came, I saw, I conquered".

These well-known words of Julius Caesar would not have the effect they do if he had said , "I came , I was seeing , I wanted to conquer ." Since they all have the same importance in his statement, they all do the same function .The similar structural forms were used for each so that the sentence is

balanced and parallel. Conjunctions such as "**and ,or ,nor ,for, so, yet, and but**" connect thoughts, ideas ,and expressions that are of equal importance. Therefore, those equal thoughts are to be expressed in similar or equal patterns. Constructions with "**both...and , either...or, not only ...but also, not ...but, whether....or**" may be used to connect similar thoughts.

2. **Both** running **and** swimming are great forms of sport.

The sentence pattern that introduces a list with numbers or letters should be parallel construction.

3. The experts researched the following aspects:1) **how** the students responded on the questionnaires and 2) **what** the school board recommended.

It is worth mentioning that words such as conjunctions "**that, what, how, because**", prepositions "**of , in by**", and other introductory words are to be repeated to emphasize a parallel construction .

Sentences that are used to express contrasts or comparisons should also be written in balanced or similar patterns .Usually, these ideas are connected by words including "**than ,as, or as well as** ".

4. It is more difficult to get up on a rainy day **than** on sunny day .

Clauses or complete sentences should be used consistently. For example, the following sentences are not parallel with the following parallel ones.

5.a)Not parallel: "Three reasons were given for the concert's cancellation: **the lead singer was sick, low ticket sales, and because the drummer had left the band.**"

5.b) Parallel Sentences: "Three reasons were given for the concert's cancellation: **the lead singer was sick, ticket sales were low, and the drummer had left the band.**"

For the flow of writing or the overall style, parallelism is used to reinforce the relationship among sentences. The following are parallel sentence openings and participial clauses link examples:

6. Writing is an accurate activity. **It needs to** think deeply with **both** mental **and** emotional energy. **It also needs to** pay careful attention to details, double checking **both** word choice **and** punctuation.

To sum up, it is explicit that parallel structures are important to achieve economy, clarity, and equality.

4. Previous Studies

Parallelism has been studied from different perspectives; most commonly stylistically. Thus, it is interesting to refer to some studies that dealt with parallelism.

Pu's (2007) is a pragmatic interpretation of President George W. Bush's speech delivered at Tsinghua University in 2002. Pu claims that one of the themes of the study is the construction of Americanism, explaining that Bush uses powerful rhetorical devices to draw an idealized picture of the American values. Pu clarified that Bush uses the parallel structures as a persuasive strategy to convince the audience and as a constructive strategy to show the American values.

Mohsen Ghadessy & Ye Zhizhi (2011) investigates parallelism as an example of coordination in grammar by which two or

more grammatical structures of the same kind are joined. The aim of their paper is to go beyond the sentence and deal with what can be called 'textual parallelism' in an English text and its translation into Chinese, i.e. parallel texts. A Systemic Functional Approach (Halliday, 1994) is used for the analysis of the texts. The main research question of the paper is: What happens to textual parallelisms established by the above systems when one language is translated into another?

Porntida Chaysin (2011) considers parallelism as a figure of speech. Sixteen types of figurative languages are referred to in this study, among them is parallelism. Qualitative methodology and content analysis method are applied in analysing the use of figures of speech in print advertising of food product. It concludes that alliteration and repetition which shared the same rank are the frequently used figures in advertising.

Shamaileh (2011) investigates parallelism in both Arabic and English political speeches as a stylistic device especially in the English translation. The study concludes that parallelism is an effective rhetorical device and it occurs in high frequency in Arabic political speeches.

Rana Naji Aziz (2012) conducts a contrastive study to investigate parallelism as a cohesive device in English and Arabic prayers. Parallelism is distinguished into three principal kinds: 1. Synonymous Parallelism 2. Antithetical Parallelism 3. Synthetic (epithetic) Parallelism. This study deals with this linguistic phenomenon that may occur at different levels of a language:

phonological, lexical, morphological, syntactic and semantic.

Balogun Sarah's (2015) is a stylistic study of parallelism in the presidential speeches of presidents Barack Obama and Goodluck, in terms of Crystal and Davy's (1969) model of stylistics. It concentrates on the significant relationship between language and politics. This study analyses the linguistic devices used in political speeches, most especially parallelism. The data is analyzed phonologically, lexically, syntactically and semantically. The study concludes that parallelism is used to motivate the audiences and to explicate important information. Additionally, parallelism is not a stylistic device assigned for only literary studies; it can be also obtainable in linguistic studies.

Fawwaz and Nazek Al-Sleibi's (2015) aim to determine how King Abdullah II employs four persuasive strategies of political discourse: creativity, reference, circumlocution, and intertextuality in his three speeches, in terms of the main principles of the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The study finds out that these strategies are employed to deliver the King's messages. The study recommends applying other strategies of political discourse analysis to these speeches such as, parallelism, euphemism, indirectness, etc. Their study is somehow like the present study, however they do not tackle with parallelism.

Li Fengjie et.al (2016) analyze rhetorical devices and their effects in four of Obama's speeches from the perspective

of lexical devices, phonological devices and syntactical devices ; parallelism is one of the syntactical devices that is discussed in Obama's speeches. The study concludes that parallelism is Obama's frequently used weapon in his speeches to emphasize his themes.

It is obvious from the previous studies that parallelism has been considered as a linguistic device studied mainly stylistically according to different models and approaches. Moreover, it is one of the effective persuasive devices used by politicians to convey their themes. However, the present study examines parallelism as a rhetorical device from the critical discourse perspective, following van Dijk's (1993) socio-cognitive approach and his notion of Ideological Square (2006a).

5. Analysis and Discussion

This section presents the analysis of the parallel constructions identified in Hillary 's speech, a Democratic presidential nominee, during "the fourth and final night of the Democratic National Convention" in December 2016. The identified parallel constructions (1-22) are analysed according to van Dijk's (1993) socio-cognitive approach and his notion of Ideological Square (2006a).

1."America is **stronger because of President Obama's leadership, and I'm better because of his friendship.**"

2. "from city council and mayor, to Governor and now Senator".

3. "the young people who threw **their hearts and souls** into our primary".

4. "You've put **economic and social justice issues front and center**".

5. "And to all of your supporters **here and around** the country: I want you to know, I've heard you. Your cause is our cause. Our country needs **your ideas, energy, and passion**".

6. "Bonds of **trust and respect** are fraying".

7. "He's taken the Republican Party a long way **from "Morning in America" to "Midnight in America."** He wants us to fear the future and fear each other".

8. " **We will not build a wall.** Instead, **we will build an economy** where everyone who wants a good job can get one".

9. "We will work with **all Americans** and **our allies** to **fight and defeat** terrorism".

10. "**Too many** people haven't had a pay raise since the crash. There's **too much** inequality. **Too little** social mobility. **Too much** paralysis in Washington. **Too many** threats at home and abroad".

11. "**We have the most tolerant** and **generous** young people we've ever had. **We have the most powerful military.** **The most innovative entrepreneurs.** **The most**

enduring values — **freedom and equality, justice and opportunity**".

12. "So **don't let anyone tell you** that our country is weak. We're not. **Don't let anyone tell you** we don't have what it takes. We do".

13. "Really? I alone can fix it? Isn't he forgetting troops on the front lines? **Police officers and firefighters who toward danger? Doctors and nurses who care for us? Teachers who change lives? Entrepreneurs who see possibilities in every problem? Mothers who lost children** to violence and are building a movement to keep other kids safe?".

14. "Remember: Our founders **fought** a revolution and **wrote** a Constitution so America would never be a nation where one person had all the power".

15. " This is what I mean: None of us can **raise a family, build a business, heal a community or lift a country** totally alone".

"America needs every one of us to lend **our energy, our talents, our ambition** to making our nation better and **stronger.** I believe that with all my heart ".

16. "**That's** the country **we're fighting** for. **That's** the future **we're working** toward. And so it is with **humility, determination, and** boundless **confidence** in America's promise that I

accept your nomination for President of the United States! ".

17."Children like Ryan **kept me going** when our plan for universal health care failed and **kept me working** with leaders of both parties to help create the Children's Health Insurance Program that covers 8 million kids in our country".

18."**If you believe that** every man, woman, and child in America has the right to affordable health care, join us. **If you believe that** we should say "no" to unfair trade".

19."**Trump ties in** China, not Colorado. **Trump suits in** Mexico, not Michigan. **Trump furniture in** Turkey, not Ohio. **Trump picture frames in** India, not Wisconsin".

20." **I'm proud that** we put a lid on Iran's nuclear program without firing a single shot. **I'm proud that** we shaped a global climate agreement".

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

22."Thank you and **may God bless you and the United States of America!**".

From the previous survey of the parallel constructions used in Hillary's speech in her election campaign, several points can be assigned:

Hillary Clinton has used many parallel constructions during her speech; this supports what is called rhetoric art of speaking . One of the techniques used by her is the repetition of sentences. This repetition attracts the audience. Van Dijk (1993) termed this technique as alliterations and rhymes at sound level and as parallelism when the repetition operations are at sentence forms . It is worth mentioning that the whole coming discussion based on the parallel structures used by Hillary Clinton since the focus of the study is the structural parallelism. She has used structurally equivalent words and phrases in the same part of speech (parallel nouns ,adjectives, adverbs, and verbs in the same form). In addition to that, she has used parallel clauses and complete sentences . As it is mentioned before, van Dijk (1993: 264) elaborates that powerful speakers show their power in discourse by the discursive structures and certain strategies in the process of persuading and influencing their audiences. Hillary Clinton employs these strategies in her speech.

She tries to build strong relationship with her audience by talking about their associated past and future, and also by using the pronouns (our and we) as in (8, 9) to convey her belonging to them. She has been proud of her friendship with Obama in: (1) to give a message of the good relationship with the black president; she thanks her family and friends in(2) .To gain emotional attachment, Hillary Clinton has talked of her people who are waiting to

be helped and she talked about inequality as in (10), moreover she highlights the effective role of the young people who would make the glorious future of their country America (3) and (5); She has declared that children are those who kept her going on and working(17). She tried to motivate the public by praising the founders of America (14);van Dijk calls this ideological discourse strategy as national self- glorification (2006a: 738). She tries to connect herself all the time with the well -known American politicians such as Clinton, Obama and his wife, Joe Biden and Tim Kaine as in (2); this is one of the ways to get support of the voters. Hillary expresses her thanks and pride of all her audience and supporters (20). Finally, she calls for unity for the sake of their country in (21) and she has balanced America with its people by saying "may God bless you and the United States" (22)

Verbose Style of speaking is a technique termed by van Dijk (1993) where irrelevant information is coded in the political speeches to get the sympathy and support of the audience by building on the past events. Hillary has used it, surveying her past life and her family life.

Obviously, the prominent strategy in the form of ideological square is represented here by the parallel structures; Hillary tries to (de)emphasize Our good/bad things(the positive self- representation) and (de)emphasize Their bad /good things (negative other-presentation). It is shown in (7), (11), (12) (13), (15), and (19) where

Hillary has used Donald Trump's words "I alone can fix it" to criticize him and to present him negatively whereas she has tried to give the positive self-representation .

6. Conclusions and Findings

The current study has arrived at the following concluding remarks:

1. Politicians try to employ all forms of linguistic features for their propagandistic discourse of speech; parallelism is one of these persuasive devices. This study has concluded apparently that parallelism is an effective rhetorical device used to show and reflect dominance, the central intention of van Dijk's approach, in the political context.

2.The literature review shows that parallelism has been used frequently in different texts; however, it has been studied from a stylistic point of view.

3. The practical part of the study has made it clear how Hillary Clinton has made use of parallel structures as to convey expressive messages to her voters. It has been shown that parallel structures have been employed to reinforce and support Hillary's ideology and political strategies in her election campaign against Trump.

4.Van Dijk's notion of ideological square is introduced clearly through the use of parallelism in Hillary's speech. It is revealed that she is represented positively whereas the other candidate (Trump) is

represented negatively, it is used by Hillary to reflect the positive properties and others' negative ones, hence it helps her in expressing her ideology.

References

- Anson ,Chris M., and Robert A. Schwegler. (2000).*The Longman Handbook for writers and Readers*. New York: Longman. 387-398.
- Aristotle. (1926). *The Art of Rhetoric*. Translated by Freese, J.H. London: Heinemann.
- Black, E. (1978). *Rhetorical Criticism: a Study in Method*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Campbell, G. (1988). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Crystal, D. and Davy, D. (1969). *Investigation English Style*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Chilton, Paul & Christina Schäffner. (2002): *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cuddon, J.A.(1992). *Dictionary of literary terms and literary theory*. London: Penguin Books.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- .(1995).*Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- .(2001). "Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research". In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Wodak,R. and Meyer,M.(eds.)121-138. London: Sage Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1984). "The order of discourse". In M. Shapiro (ed.) *Language and Politics*. New York: New York University Press, pp. 108–138.
- Hacker, Diana. (2003).*A Writer's Reference*. 5th ed .Boston/ New York: Bedford/ St. Martin's.81-84.
- Harris P. B. (1979). *Foundation of Political Science*. Melbourne Sidney: Johannesburg
- Hu Jintao. (2001). "Speech by Vice President Hu Jintao of the People 's Republic of China at Dinner Hosted by China-Britain Business Council, 30/10/2001." Available: www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng20060.html
- Ivany, T. 1993. *Dynamic vs. Static- a Kind of Parallelism in Al-Hamadani's Maqamat. Colloquium on Arabic Lexicography and Lexicography*.49-58. Budapest, Hungary.
- Johnstone B. (1994)." Repetition in Discourse: A Dialogue". In Johnstone, Barbara (ed.). *Repetition in Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Vol. One. New Persey: Alex Publishing Corporation.
- Kane,T.S.(2003).*The Oxford Essential Guide to Writing*. Oxford :Oxford University Press.
- Li Fengjie, Ren Jia, Zhang Yingying. "Analysis of the Rhetorical Devices in Obama's Political Speeches". *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 4, No. 4, 2016, pp. 141-146. doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20160404.11
- Lasswell ,H.D ,Nathen Leites ,et al.(1949)."Style in the Language of Politics" .In *Language of Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics*. New York: George Stewart.
- Mac Coinnigh,M.(2012).*Syntactic Structures in Irish-language Proverbs*. Proverbium :yearbook of international proverb scholarship 29,95-136.

Margaret, J. Benner. (2006). *Self Teaching Unit*

: *Parallel Structure* .www. towson.

edu/ows/module.parallel.htm.

Metcalf, S. (1998). *Building a Speech*.

Philadelphia: The Harcourt Press.

Ghadessy, Mohsen & Ye Zhizhi. (2011). *Textual Parallelism in Parallel Text*. Zhongshan University, Guangzhou P R China.

Nakayama, T. and Krizek, R. (1995). 'Whiteness: a Strategic Rhetoric', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 81 (3): 291-309.

Naji, Rana. (2012). *Parallelism as a Cohesive Device in English and Arabic Prayers: Contrastive Analysis*. *Alustath Journal* vol 201. Baghdad University.

Ochs, E. (1979). "Social foundations of Language". in *New Directions in Discourse*

Processing. Vol. 2, Norwood, N. J.: Ablex..207-221.

Orwell, G. (1969) "Politics and the English language" . In W. F. Bolton and D. Crystal (eds), *The English Language* .Vol. 2: Essays by Linguists and Men of Letters, 1858–1964 . Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 217 19.

Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*. Essex, Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.

van Dijk, T. A. (1980) *Macrostructures: an interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction and cognition*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

-----.(1993). *Principles of critical discourse analysis* . *Discourse & Society*. SAGE (London. Newbury Park and New Delhi), vol. 4(2): 249-283

-----.(1993a). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

-----.(1993b) "Discourse, Power and Access" . In C.R. Caldas (ed.) *Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge .

-----.(1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction* .Vol. 1. London : Sage Publications Ltd.

-----.(1997a)."What is Political Discourse Analysis?". In *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. Vol .1, No.11: 11-52.

-----.(1997b). *Discourse as Structure and Process*. In London: SAGE Publications.

-----.(1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.

-----.(2002). "Political Discourse and Political Cognition". In Chilton, P., and Schaffher, C. *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

-----.(2006a)."Politics, Ideology and Discourse". In *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Wodak,R.(ed.):728-40 .

-----.(2006b)."Ideology and Discourse Analysis". In *Journal of Political Ideologies*.Vol.1, No.2:115-40.

-----.(2008). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----.(2014)."Discourse-Cognition-Society: Current State and Prospects of the Sociocognitive Approach to Discourse". In *Contemporary Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis*. Hart.C. and Cap,P.(eds.)121-146.London: Bloomsbury.

Wodak, R. (2001b). "The discourse of historical approach". In *Methods of CDA*. (ed.) by R. Wodak and M. Meyers. London: Sage Publication, 63-94

Whately, R., 1963. *Elements of Rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. 2000 [1996]. *Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Wilson, J (1990). *Politically Speaking: The Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language*. Oxford: Blackwell

Jones J. and Peccei S.J. (2004) What is language and what does it do? Language and politics. Language society and power.

Fawwaz Al-Abed Al-Haq and Nazeq Mahmoud Al-Sleibi (2015). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Three Speeches of King Abdullah II, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan. <http://www.davidpublisher.com/Public/uploads/Contribute/55823dfe54f29.pdf>

Pu, China Chang, Discourse Analysis of President Bush's Speech at Tsinghua University, University of Texas San Antonio. <https://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/20-Chang-Pu.pdf>
Roberts, W. Rhys (translator), Rhetoric by Aristotle <http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/Aristotle-rhetoric.pdf>

Shamaileh, SF 2011, *The translation of parallelism in political speeches*, PhD thesis, Salford : University of Salford <http://usir.salford.ac.uk/26907/>

<http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-hillary-clinton-convention-speech-transcript-20160728-snap-htmlstory.html>

المستخلص

يشير التوازي، أو البناء الموازي إلى استخدام نفس النمط من الكلمات لفكرتين أو أكثر لها نفس الدرجة من الأهمية مما يمكن القارئ من فهم المعنى أو فهم العلاقة بين الأفكار. قد يكون على القارئ أن يعيد القراءة لفهم المعنى أو قد فهم العلاقة بين الأفكار. يستخدم السياسيون التوازي مع أنواعه المختلفة

اسلوبيا لإقناع الجمهور بالتعاطف مع آرائهم، وجعل خطابهم أكثر تميزاً. هذه الدراسة تدرس التوازي، كوسيلة بلاغية، من منظور الخطاب النقدي. ويتم ذلك من خلال اعتماد نهج فان دايك (1993) الاجتماعي المعرفي ومفهومه الأيديولوجي (2006). تدرس هذه الدراسة كيف استفادت هيلاري كلينتون (المرشح الديمقراطي للرئاسة) من التوازي في خطابها السياسي خلال "الليلة الرابعة والأخيرة من المؤتمر الوطني الديمقراطي" في ديسمبر 2016. خلصت الدراسة إلى أن التوازي هو ابتكار مهم يستعمل لإظهار وتأكيد الهيمنة (الهدف المركزي لهذا النهج) في السياق السياسي؛ وعلاوة على ذلك، تم استخدامه من قبل هيلاري لتعكس الصفات الإيجابية لها و السلبية للغير، وبالتالي فإنه يساعدها في التعبير عن إيديولوجيتها.