



IRAQI
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية

ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

Journal of Language Studies

Contents available at: <https://jls.tu.edu.iq/index.php/JLS>



A Critical Discourse Analysis of Translating Argumentative Topoi in Donald Trump's Speeches on the Russian-Ukrainian War into Arabic

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kanaan Khudair Hasan*

English Department, College of Arts, Tikrit University, Tikrit, Iraq

k.hasan@tu.edu.iq

Received: 20/04/2026, Accepted: 30/05/2026, Online Published: 30/06/2026

Abstract

Topoi can be regarded as argumentative shortcuts that can be functioned for reasoning and argumentation. Topoi have the ability to connect an argument's assumptions to its conclusions. Therefore, this study investigates the argumentative topoi in Donald Trump's speeches during the Russian -Ukrainian war. The aim of the study is to analyze the Arabic translations of the argumentative topoi of the political speeches of Donald Trump on the Russian–Ukrainian War. Another goal is to analyze and evaluate the methods relevant to the translation into Arabic. The paper analyzes five speeches from 2022 to 2025 through Wodak's (2009) discourse-historical approach to identify negotiation, authority, economic deterrence recurrence and through Newmark's translation model to assess strategies. The

* **Corresponding Author:** Kanaan Khudair Hasan, Email: k.hasan@tu.edu.iq

Affiliation: Tikrit University – Iraq.

© This is an open access article under the CC by licenses <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



findings show that Trump's language tends to focus on transactional framing, blunt imperatives and hyperbolic warning. Student translations indicate that literal and communicative strategies are both effective in producing equivalent persuasive and ideological target. Moreover, the paper also deals with Arabic cultural and rhetorical norms which may contradict the diplomatic register of respect. The article ends by proposing the inclusion of discourse analysis in translator training and suggesting that translators need to achieve a balance of fidelity and pragmatic effectiveness when it comes to politically sensitive texts.

Keywords: Trump, political discourse, topoi, translation, Arabic translation

تحليل خطابي نقدي لترجمة الأطروحات الجدلية في خطابات دونالد ترامب حول الحرب الروسية الأوكرانية إلى اللغة العربية

أ. م. د. كنعان خضير حسن

قسم اللغة الانجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة تكريت، تكريت، العراق

المستخلص

تتناول هذه الدراسة ترجمة التوبيات الجدلية في خطابات دونالد ترامب السياسية المتعلقة بالحرب الروسية-الأوكرانية إلى اللغة العربية. اعتمدت الدراسة على المنهج التاريخي-الخطابي لودك لتحديد أنماط التفاوض والسلطة والردع الاقتصادي، وعلى نموذج نيومارك لتقويم استراتيجيات الترجمة. تم تحليل مكوّن من خمسة خطابات ألقاها ترامب بين عامي 2022 و2025. أظهرت النتائج أن خطاب ترامب يتميز بالمنطق التبادلي، والأوامر المباشرة، والتحذيرات المبالغ فيها. كما بينت ترجمات الطلبة أن الاستراتيجيات التواصلية أكثر فاعلية من الترجمات الحرفية في الحفاظ على القوة الإقناعية والأبعاد الأيديولوجية. وتؤكد الدراسة أن المعايير الثقافية والخطابية العربية، التي تميل إلى الرسمية والدبلوماسية، تؤثر في كيفية استقبال هذه الخطابات. وتوصي الدراسة بدمج تحليل الخطاب في تدريب المترجمين وتشجيعهم على الموازنة بين الدقة اللغوية والفعالية البراغماتية عند التعامل مع النصوص السياسية الحساسة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: ترامب، الخطاب السياسي، التوبيات، الترجمة، الترجمة إلى العربية

Introduction

Language and authority are crucially connected in political discourse. Leaders use their rhetoric to express the meanings of their power and the world. Donald Trump's wording with regard to the Russian-Ukrainian war may be an interesting object of analysis because of its simple wording, repetition and its distinctly businesslike logic (Plausible disinterest). Because this discourse is available, it may be used to examine how topoi (structured argumentative patterns) function rhetorically and differ in another language.

Studying Trump's rhetoric with regard to the Russo-Ukrainian war digs into how a populist speaking style may be adapted in crisis situations. He frames everything as a transaction, which is a simplification. He has an intense American attitude. The transfer of this style into Arabic poses specific difficulties because the Arabic political message in general values formality and diplomatic phrasing. Translators are constantly faced with the choice between rhetorical force of the source language and the rules of the target culture.

The central problem being addressed here is that the speaking style of Trump would lose a lot of its pragmatic meaning when translated Arabic easily. The fact that he often employs informal language and strong emphasis does not sit very well with Arabic's diglossia, which runs from the formal Modern Standard Arabic down to different spoken varieties. Due to this, translators are faced with a dilemma. They can either give precedence to formal register, thereby sacrificing Donald Trump's characteristically brusque manner. Alternatively, they can go for informal expressions that may detract from the seriousness of political speech.

The study has been set to examine the problem based on three objectives. This paper first identifies common topoi in the speeches of Trump that concern the Russian-Ukrainian war and then examines how they function rhetorically. They also evaluate M.A.'s methods of translation. When the students undertook the translation of these speeches into Arabic, they will decide which strategies would have the best chance of retaining pragmatic force.

Moreover, it proposes crucial methods for teaching political translation with a greater focus on pragmatic awareness. It also talks about the wider consequences of cross-cultural communication.

This research is directed on a hypothesis. According to projections, Trump's wartime language will most notably rely on negotiation, authority and deterrence topoi. The communicative translation strategies were further hypothesised to preserve the pragmatic force better than the literal ones (Newmark, 1988). Another theory highlights the extent to which the source and target political environments influence the result in translation. In Arabic-speaking societies, cultural expectations of political leadership and rhetoric influence translators' decisions, which in turn impact perceptions of Trump.

The study relies on Wodak's discourse-historical approach for identifying topoi (Wodak, 2009) and Newmark's translation model as an evaluative framework for student translations. By merging these models, we achieve a balance between theory and practice. Wodak reveals the ideological and rhetorical background behind the speech of Trump. Contrarily, Newmark's model allows for a systematic evaluation of translations; hence, it is both critical and instructional.

The Data include five speeches of Trump from 2022 - 2025 related to the Russia – Ukraine war (Reuters, 2025). This speech was delivered to M.A. The translations done by the students serve as a comparative. Through methods of communication – selection happening through private communication, like formal speech, and public communication, like informal remarks – the more modal exploration of how Trump's rhetorical shifts change through settings and the challenges this poses for translation. In this research limited to this text corpus and translations into Arabic by students, we do not aim to seek generalizability to political discourse but an instance of analysis. However, the method proposed here can be used for other leaders and contexts, enabling comparative model for future studies.

Literature Review

This section presents the theoretical framework based on literature on political discourse, topoi and translation studies. Language is a medium of persuasion and ideology, and translation mediates its effects across differing contexts.

Political Discourse

Political discourse is hardly ever neutral. When a politician makes a speech, puts out a statement, or even choose an adjective, they're not just describing the world, they're trying to remake it. Drawing on foundational work of Paul Chilton and Norman Fairclough, the above paragraph is testimony of this truth. To further explain, we first need to separate the two functions that Chilton identifies, namely the construction of authority and the legitimization of policy (Chilton, 2004). These activities are not performed in a sequence; they are performed simultaneously. Authority is not inherent; it is enacted and reiterated through the use of language. Leaders do not say 'the economy is improving.' They instead say 'under this government, the economy has been rescued from collapse.' The use of the passive verb 'has been rescued' makes the speaker an active saviour; 'collapse' means that the past was a crisis only this government could prevent; and so on. Chilton's (2004, p. 33) notion of "strategic" communication becomes visible here, which means that every pronoun ("we"), every time marker ("under this government"), and every evaluation ("collapse") is not merely a random choice or the speaker's natural style, but a rhetorical choice made to anchor authority in the speaker's persona.

According to Fairclough (1995), discourse not only reflects power relations but it also creates them. This is an important difference. The journalist who writes "protesters clashed with police" and another one who writes "police charged peaceful demonstrators" are producing two different social realities. In the first and second instances the demonstrators are presented as equals, active combatants; the state is presented as solely the aggressor. Neither is just a "bias", but a positioning that conditions the way readers understand legitimacy, blame and the right to use force. In the course of time, repeating discursive patterns harden into 'commonsense assumptions' (Fairclough, 1995), like some groups being 'law abiding' and other 'troublesome' (p. 42). Public opinion, policies, and policing are all affected by them. Robinson claims political language shapes long-term

arrangements making them feel more natural than they are. A rise in taxes is called “fiscal responsibility”. Military intervention can be termed ‘humanitarian action. Naming converts an act of the transfer of wealth or a deployment of weaponry.

The combination between the strategic lens offered by Chilton and the structural one offered by Fairclough. As noted by Chilton (2004), political actors are rational agents who design messages for effect. According to Fairclough (1995), actors are constrained by the discursive histories they adopt. The prime minister's deliberate use of the word "reform" may be an attempt to legitimate welfare cuts, not least given the decades of history, oppositional readings and class baggage the word itself bears. Thus, political talks are never entirely original but reworking of already-existing meanings strategically. The last statement of the paragraph that language “shapes realities rather than merely reporting events” is not a philosophical abstraction. It is a mechanism. When a facility is called a “processing facility”, it erases the experience of the people inside. A ‘gulag’ when referred to by an opposition leader draws the reference to a different moral universe. The former builds a world where the policy seems necessary; the latter builds a world where the policy seems abhorrent (Chilton, 2004; Fairclough, 1995). No report of the event is purely objective. Discourse exists, and discourse is always political.

The Concept of Topoi

The category of topoi (singular: topos) is one subtle aspect of ideological meaning purveyed in political discourse, beyond the difficulties of syntax and colloquialism. In both fields, topoi are identified as culturally informed argumentative moves which enable a speaker to argue the connection between a premise and a conclusion in a way which is felt to be self-evident to an audience. Wodak (2009) states that topoi are not strict logical rules but explorative inferences that have cultural relevance. These are the hidden pathways that make an argument persuasive. They rely on shared beliefs and assumptions about what normalcy, fairness, danger, and desirability are. For instance, an argument about burden might say that if a group is overburdened by a policy, that policy must change. A topos of history claims that what worked once should work twice. Such measures are hardly ever

stated; they are accepted as common knowledge. This assumption is exactly what grants them power.

Schäffner (2004) states that the identification and analysis of topoi will be essential for the translator as this inferential force relies on the shared assumptions of the speaker and the audience. When a political text is translated from one language and culture to another, then those assumptions may no longer hold. A topos that sounds convincing to the ears of an American audience can sound illogical, foreign, or go unabsorbed with an Arabic-speaking audience. Consequently, the translator faces the interpretive choice of whether or not to reproduce the topos literally, relying on the target audience to fill in the missing link, or whether to replace it with a topos that has equivalent persuasive power. Both choices are biased. Keeping the original topoi risks a loss of persuasive power because the inferential route does not feel natural. Adding a local equivalent may distort the speaker's original line of reasoning. In either case, the judgment delivered by the translator affects whether the audience finds the argument compelling or bewildering.

Trump's political rhetoric speech is dense in such topoi. His famous slogan 'Make America Great Again' is not merely a slogan. It refers to the topoi of historical restoration. It is possible and worthwhile to recover what was once great by rejecting the evils of present-day. When we speak of this topos in an American political context, we may think of a return to an order or prosperity of the past, something that is familiar. To translate that into Arabic will require a very careful negotiation. A literal translation would be 'اجعل امريكا عظيمة مرة اخرى' (aj'al Amrīka 'azīmatan marratan ukhra). This is in fact grammatically possible. However, the word "again" recurs in the coarse version suggesting a shared memory of greatness, hence there is a newness in familiarity. Arabic speakers may not recall any such history. Worthy of note is that most Americans won't readily regard something in the book that they may with Palestinian literature later. End quote. So, the camel's back may break if we pile on more literalisms. More literalisms capable of shifting meanings. More literalisms going beyond 'not landing' due to misalignment of signifier and signified. End quote. According to the dialect, context, and intonation, it could be nostalgic, threatening, absurd, or even boastful. The translator must decide whether to preserve the foreignness of the topos, allowing audiences to encounter Trump's argument

as an American artifact, or adapt it towards a local topos of restoration, perhaps drawing on a sparked or golden age from regional history. However, that second option would be a profound ideological intervention, making Trump's argument conform to another cultural logic.

In addition to explicit slogans, Trump's statements also create authority through suggestive repetition of the terms "strong", "deal" and "win". These are functions of legitimation in the sense that language does not simply communicate ideology, but also creates and maintains political authority (Wodak, 2009). Through his unceasing framing of events, as either winning or losing, strong or weak, Trump legitimises his own decision-making, as the only route to the desirable pole in each case. To handle the word 'strong' in Arabic, a translator may choose from قوي (qawī), which is straightforward; متين (matīn), which implies durability; or even شديد (shadīd), which can carry connotations of harshness. Trump's use of Arabic sounds either decisive, bullying, resilient, or reckless based on the cumulative small decisions across a speech or speeches. The translator who regularly tones down "strong" to something like "capable" is quite cleverly resisting the binarism, the combativism of the legitimation of the original. The translator using the harshest synonyms is possibly exaggerating. Neither one can simply claim neutrality. Schäffner's (2004) remark testifies that the translator's scholarly awareness of legitimation strategies and topoi is not a luxury but a practical necessity at the core. Unaware of the implications, translators will import or delete political meanings without regard. Arabs can at least choose deliberately and responsibly how to restore or take apart Trump's persuasive machine, given that choice, in Arabic.

Translation of Political Discourse

Translating political texts presents problems beyond those of word equivalence. Scholars, including Newmark (1988) and Baker (2011) argue that the pragmatic force, intertextual references, and ideological positioning must not be overlooked. When translating text, the translator not only translates the meaning but also factors in the culture and politics of the source. In this case, communicative translation strategies tend to be more efficient than literal ones, particularly in the case of political rhetoric that uses colloquialism repetition or hyperbole.

According to Newmark (1988, p. 45) and Baker (2011, p. 77), the translator must take into account the few words being used, together with the pragmatic force, ideological meaning and intertexts. Whether translators opt for a literal translation or a communicative translation will depend on the importance of the persuasive impact and form. In addition, the decision to translate can add or subtract the ideological message. A literal translation may keep the surface structure of a given text intact but may obscure its pragmatic force, whereas a communicative approach may adjust the message to fit the norms of the target culture. Hence, it may be an important factor in determining how Trump is portrayed to the recipients of the texts, as well as how his policies are formulated.

Trump's speeches embody a unique case of transactional rhetoric that relies on imperatives and a set of slogans that encapsulates a complex question. It is hard to translate the Arabic language as such rhetorical devices are used; the norms of political communication prefer formal registers. A prior study conducted on this (Schäffner, 2004) has shown that the translators have to strike the right balance in maintaining the tone of the source text while also deferring to the expectations of the target-language audience as failure to do so risk distorting the communicative intent.

Language, Ideology, and Power

Language does not simply name what exists, it helps formulate what is common sense. Fairclough (1995) explains ideology works well when it does not look like ideology or meaning a world view is naturalised to such an extent that all other options appear ridiculous or extreme. This is precisely what happens in political discourse, and perhaps no one more clearly than Donald Trump. As argued in the last paragraph, Trump's rhetoric works ideologically to present assertions of strength and authority and economic power as "simple statements of fact", not political claims that are open to contestation. When Trump claims that "only I can fix it" and that "they owe us" for past trade policy, he is not merely stating what happened. He basically makes a strongman the only solution. Economic relations reduce to personal debt and punishment basically. That is what he creates. For multilingual working, the translator must become aware that these utterances have an

ideological weight, i.e. they are performative claims to dominance, not neutral description (Fairclough, 1995).

Wodak (2009) builds upon this approach in discussing the discursive construction of legitimacy and national identity. Her framework suggested that political rhetoric isn't merely a byproduct of pre-existing ideologies. Instead, it makes them real anew through recurring strategies of nomination (labelling groups), predication (attributing positive or negative traits), justification (reinforcing the new reality). According to Wodak (2009), Trump's speeches build on topoi of threat and burden. It refers to the Trump's use of immigrants, foreign leaders and international organizations to get the advantage on the American nation. Trump has said that sending people who will cause "damage" – criminals and the mentally ill- will not help! At first, it normalises the connection between migration and criminality. Also, it frames harsh policy responses detention, deportation, border walls as act of common-sense protection. If a translator translates such a sentence into another language literally and without regard for its discursive strategy, they will preserve the words but lose the force. The force does not lie in the meaning of the words as defined by the dictionary.

The most troublesome challenge for translation, therefore, is ideological equivalence rather than lexical equivalence. Every choice in the translation, whether to keep the metaphor, soften the insult or transpose a grammatical structure, is itself an ideological choice (Fairclough, 1995). According to Wodak (2009), translators should be aware that legitimacy has different constructions in different cultural contexts. The impact of calling a political rival "weak" varies between languages. In some political cultures, such appeals to strength are honored, while in others, they are considered coarse. Finding a successful translation of Trump's rhetoric does not involve finding a linguistic equivalent of "strength" or "leverage". Rather, it involves deciphering the function behind them. This will involve naturalizing hierarchies and constructing an in-group under threat. After this, they proceed to search for the discursive forms in the target language. It is here that we can manage the same naturalizing work as the original does (Wodak, 2009). Without an awareness of the political dimensions, the translation is technically correct but politically flat.

Translation and Ideology

The widespread belief that translation is only a mechanical change of words from one language to another has been strongly contested by scholars in translation studies. According to Baker (2011), translation is an interpretative act and never ideologically neutral. The transfer of a text from one language and culture to another is laden with the translator's attitude. The translator chooses to either reproduce the ideological meanings or to resist them. The public display of political figures whose rhetorical style is an essential part of their persona is observable and politically significant. In practical terms, the recounting of a former U.S. official's case on the speeches of president Donald Trump brings a clear-cut demonstration of the ideological pressures at work.

According to Baker (2011), translation is not only a site of conflict between fidelity and accommodation but also reveals how translator intervention is a part of the translation process. An interpreter reproducing an ideological stance from the source text will adopt features that may seem strange, offensive, or pragmatically inappropriate in the target language. In contrast, an interpreter who rejects those ideological meanings will gloss over, omit, and alter information that does not align with the mainstream values of the receiving culture. Neither option should be construed to be innocent or neutral. Each is a political act (Baker, 2011). In terms of political translation, those decisions can determine how their authority, authenticity and morality, or moral character, will be perceived by a new audience.

Trump's public speech presents a particularly difficult case study in the present context because his rhetorical style is so peculiar. His language consists of brief, repeated sentences, quick topic changes, incorrect grammar, exaggerated statements, and an informal style full of insults and names, as well as "sad!" or "big league" (Schneider, 2020). The aforementioned features are not random stylistic ticks. They form the verbal manifestation of anti-elite, populist persona who sells herself as real and unfinished (Ott & Dickinson, 2019). The translator becomes committed to an ideology, they must conclude on two things: will they domesticate these features to the formal, self-controlled style that

politicians in the given language use, or will they keep the foreignness and roughness of the original, even if that makes them appear odd or incompetent?

The ideological stakes are substantial when considering the domesticated approach. A translator opting to domesticate Trump's idioms might translate "He's a total loser, believe me" as "In my view, he has failed" or "I think less of him." This is grammatically correct, and acceptable language for high-status political talk. The earlier Chinese version is reportedly exchanging the profanity for "shithole" instead of "dirty" or "rotting" Rowling and associated members. The domesticated version fits the ideological norms of educated establishment elites, who believe it even more important that leaders restrain and respect. When the translator decides to domesticate the text, by doing so he or she may be observing those norms thereby limiting the text from disrupting any kind of norm and also limiting the text from being able to speak to the target audience like the original text, a text that disrupted millions of voters in the original context.

Alternatively, a translator may also deliberately choose to preserve its strangeness and level of impoliteness or oddness in the text. For instance, a Spanish translator or a French one might retain the boastful and repetitive phrase from Trump, where he states: "We're going to win so much, you're going to get tired of winning". The translator avoids a more dignified future construction. There is an ideology behind this choice. It focuses on authorial voice and lexical fidelity rather than the expectations of how a president should sound in the target culture (Munday, 2016). Noam Chomsky's media work featured in this edition has been enlivened with vivid illustrations. An evaluation of these memes and jokes by a reader has an outcome that seems to be defeat. However, the translator has notably refused to relieve the audience of that interpretive work.

There is nothing really neutral common ground. The ideological value of even small choices whether to let a repetitive phrase like "very, very, very good" remain as such, whether to make a local equivalent of an insult or a literal oddity, whether to insert a polite softener like 'perhaps' is clear (Baker, 2011). A translator working for a state-controlled media organization in an authoritarian environment may continuously domesticate Trump's assaults on judicial or political institutions out of fear of provoking a similar attack within

their own country. A freelance translator who has libertarian or populist leanings may do the opposite, retaining every hyperbole confrontation to shock the target audience into recognition of what they consider an indispensable political disruption. The translator's desk is not a passive relay station in either case, but a site of struggle over ideology. Every translated rendition of Trump's words into a different language is also a political argument about who he is and what he stands for. Scholarly analyses of translation choices can reveal how ideology travels, adapts and is resisted, sometimes powerfully, across linguistic borders.

Methodology

This paper employs both the discourse-historical approach and Newmark's translation model. By using both methods, the paper can determine the manifestations of argumentative topoi and can evaluate the strategies of the translation. The methodology was designed to assess three aspects of students' translation of Trump's discourse: (1) rhetorical features, (2) student translators' strategies, and (3) pedagogical implications of student translators' choices.

Models

The discourse-historical approach, as characterized by Wodak (2009), was selected for the study because it helps to reveal the employed argumentation structures and the contextual embedding of the topoi. According to Newmark's (1988) translation model, a system to provide evaluative criteria was established so as to allow classing of the student translations as either semantic or communicative or literal.

Data Selection

Between 2022 and 2025, five speeches of Trump are selected from the media, Reuters, Associated Press, CBS News, etc. Panjabi and Urdu multi-genre texts on the Russia-Ukraine war will be selected. Out of the major news websites, five speeches (2022-2025) relevant to the Russia-Ukraine sites were selected which varied in their rhetoric.

Analytical Procedures

The analysis took place in three stages, using the discourse-historical methods to identify topoi, a translation by postgraduate students, and an assessment of translation strategies according to Newmark. The triangulation helped in both description and evaluation. The qualitative analysis of student translations showed how strategies impacted the preservation of pragmatic and ideological meaning.

Limitations on Research.

The small sample size (5 speeches) and the translation of students may not represent what a professional would do. Despite some limitations, the research degree brings to the fore useful findings. The applicability of findings is another limitation. The findings cannot be inferred to be what professionals would have produced. However, these restrictions signal the need for more surveys of expert translators in comparable contexts.

Ethical Considerations

All student work has been anonymized and consent was obtained for its use in this study. This analysis, in its linguistic and translational aspects, does not imply a political agenda. The researcher is also implicated as an interpreter. In the event that the research could be of use to a political party, then the analysis should not confirm this assumption and must be reflexive.

Data Analysis Tools

Qualitative techniques were used for the coding of topoi and translation strategies. The findings were organized into tables and thematic charts. The use of electronic tools, such as the concordance, enabled greater precision in identifying repeated lexical items and argumentative patterns. Improving the robustness, the technology development was useful in a more systematic way with the manual annotation.

Findings and Discussion

This section presents the results of the analysis of Trump's speeches and their Arabic translations. It highlights recurring argumentative strategies, examines translation issues,

and addresses their pedagogical significance. Explore the association of negotiation patterns, authority, deterrence and burden-sharing through thematic examples.

Dominant Topoi

The analysis shows that the discourse of Trump relies on four topoi.

Negotiation frames a conflict as a deal to be made.

Authority and Urgency: Making commands sound more serious.

Economic Deterrence: Implicit tariffs and sanctions.

Burden-sharing: Calling on Allies for funding.

Translation Challenges

Student translation experiences showed comparable difficulties in three areas.

Hyperbolic phrases (e.g., “tougher than ever before”): the literal translation often weakened the rhetorical intensity.

The transactional framing of the phrase “pay up” did not work smoothly in Arabic; its directness may have contravened political speech norms.

Example Analyses

Selected examples illustrate how these challenges unfolded in practice.

Extract 1: “Make a deal.”

This reflects the topoi of the negotiation. Trump simplifies a multi-faceted geopolitical crisis into a negotiation, bolstering his self-image as a dealmaker. The straightforward and casual tone of this phrase lends it a rhetorical power that conveys urgency and authority. Phrases like “اعقد صفقة” convey its essence but are likely to be more formal than Modern Standard Arabic. ‘سو صفقة’ may more accurately capture Trump’s casualness, but may also dilute the serious tone of Arabic political discourse.

Extract 2: “STOP!”

This word implies severity, urgency, and a sense of authority. Like the textual claim or statement, it is also not political rhetoric as its impact lies in its brevity therefore it appears to be more of a slogan or post than political rhetoric. The Arabic imperative, translated as "اتوقفوا", would retain a sense of command but soften the harshness of English. Usually the norms of Arabic discourse tend to prefer a fuller construction like: "اوقفوا هذه الهجمات فوراً", because it tends to preserve the clarity of meaning. However, the downside is that the clearer construction tends to lose the performative abruptness.

Extract 3: "If Putin continues, the U.S. will impose tariffs and sanctions that are tougher than ever before."

This sentence is an example of economic deterrence. Trump's reasoning is conditional: if you continue to act aggressively, then we will punish you in an unprecedented way. The phrase tougher than ever before serves to reinforce the deterrent effect of the threat.

Students translated this as "إذا استمر بوتين، ستفرض الولايات المتحدة عقوبات ورسوم جمركية أشد من أي وقت مضى". Even though the conditional form is well maintained, "أشد من أي وقت مضى" may not sound hyperbolic enough. Alternatives like "غير مسبقة" could better match the rhetorical power.

Extract 4: "Europe must pay up, or they're on their own."

Arabic translations included threats but softened the impact of slang. The term "pay up" is an informal command that would be difficult to render in formal Arabic without sounding too aggressive or more literal.

Extract 5: "We can work it out, but only if America wins."

The texts' meanings were preserved through literal translations, but the texts sounded awkward. On the contrary, the more idiomatic reformulations conveyed the necessary conditional tone and were needed for the framing of the national interest.

The following table summarizes the analysis of key examples.

Speech	Original Text	Topos	Translation Issues
--------	---------------	-------	--------------------

Trump to Zelenskiy (Aug 16, 2025)	Make a deal.	Negotiation	Arabic imperative sounds formal; hard to preserve blunt informality.
Trump on Kyiv Drone Attacks (Apr 23, 2025)	STOP!	Urgency & Authority	Arabic loses the stark brevity; fuller forms sound more natural but less blunt.
Trump on Tariffs and Sanctions (Sep 2025)	If Putin continues, the U.S. will impose tariffs and sanctions that are tougher than ever before.	Economic Deterrence	‘أشد من أي وقت مضى’ less emphatic than Trump’s hyperbole; alternatives like ‘غير مسبقة’ stronger.
Trump at Alaska Summit with Putin (CBS, 2025)	We can work it out, but only if America wins.	Conditional Negotiation & National Interest	Literal rendering sounds awkward; alternatives better convey conditional tone.
Trump on NATO Support (Reuters, 2024)	Europe must pay up, or they’re on their own.	Burden-Sharing & Deterrence	‘تدفع’ is clear but softens colloquial harshness of ‘pay up’; need stronger transactional phrasing.

Pedagogical Implications

The research findings suggest that political discourse analysis should be included in translation training curricula. When students learn to identify the topoi and assess function rhetorically before translation, they gain. Education should also encourage the use of linguistic resources that uphold the pragmatic effect rather than the literal one. Highlighting cultural and ideological differences that shape translation decisions are also important. When translating political texts, the translator becomes more attuned to how power relations are encoded. Such a stance helps them act as a translator and interpreter of ideology.

Trump's rhetoric is direct, repetitive, and transactional in nature. Arabic translation showed tension between bluntness and 'formal' force, exposing limits of a literal strategy. A communicative translation preserved more of the rhetorical impact but required conscious change. These findings reinforce that a successful political translation must combine linguistic accuracy and pragmatic appropriateness.

Conclusion

The research concludes that Trump's political discourse stresses negotiation, deterrence and power. In order to communicate the topoi successfully into Arabic, their pragmatic and ideological meaning must be preserved by the communicative strategies. As such, translators must focus on developing critical language awareness. When translators focus on political texts, they gain a greater understanding of how language encodes power and ideology, allowing them to become interpreters not only of language, but also of thought.

Trump's political rhetoric heavily draws upon the negotiation, authority and economic deterrence topoi that represent a transactional style of leadership. In addition, the creole communication strategies better reflect the persuasive and ideological impact of brecht's blunt and colloquial delivery than the literal ones. Translating Trump's tweets into Arabic: if his intention is urgency and informality, then the formality expected by Arab audiences is likely to dilute this. Translator training incorporates discourse analysis so that students learn to identify the rhetorical strategies and evaluate ideologies. Political translation is a linguistic transfer that transforms how political leaders and political policies are interpreted across languages and cultures.

References

- AP News. (2025, September). Trump warns of tariffs and sanctions if Putin does not stop war. Associated Press.
- Baker, M. (2011). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- CBS News. (2025). Trump-Putin Alaska summit coverage [Transcript]. CBS News.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. Longman.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Ott, B. L., & Dickinson, G. (2019). *The Twitter presidency: Donald J. Trump and the politics of white rage*. Routledge.
- Reuters. (2024). Trump on NATO support: Europe must pay up, or they're on their own [Transcript]. Reuters.
- Reuters. (2025, April 23). Trump tells Putin to STOP after missile attack on Kyiv [Transcript]. Reuters.
- Reuters. (2025, August 16). Trump tells Zelenskiy that Putin wants more Ukraine, urges deal [Transcript]. Reuters.
- Schäffner, C. (2004). Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3(1), 118–137.
- Schneider, K. P. (2020). The language of populism: Donald Trump's linguistic style. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 19(3), 412–431.
- Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge.