

# Can Translation Alter Political Persona? The Case of the Rhetorical Repertoire of Obama and Trump Translated From English to Indonesian

Rida Nurlatifasari

Doctoral Program of Linguistics, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

Riyadi Santosa

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

Tri Wiratno

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

Ida Kusuma Dewi

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

**Abstract**—As rhetoric in political speeches represents a particular persona that political figures strive to cultivate, that rhetoric should project the same image as the original when translated. Therefore, this study aims to explore the shifts in rhetorical strategy categories as seen in the translation of the political speeches of former U.S. Presidents Barack Obama and Donald Trump from English to Indonesian, how they affect message correctness, and how they may change the orator's political character. In multiple case studies covering the acceptance and inauguration speeches of both Obama and Trump, some rhetoric maintains their original identities. Moreover, there are five different shifts found in the rhetoric of their speeches: 1.) a shift from rhetoric to non-rhetoric; 2.) a shift from rhetoric to lost or deleted rhetoric; 3.) a shift from a particular type of rhetoric strategy to another; 4.) lessening rhetorical power or degree of the same strategy; and 5.) a shift of propositional message. Furthermore, the study reveals that retaining rhetorical categories in the translation results in higher accuracy, whereas any shift has the opposite effect, as it changes the original rhetorical message. As a result, this raises the possibility that a particularly rhetorical-style political identity may change if a large number of alterations occur.

**Index Terms**—rhetorical strategy, political persona, accuracy, shift

## I. INTRODUCTION

Other than to prompt people for certain causes or to generally persuade them to believe in certain issues (Borgstorm, 1982; Walton, 2007; Schaffner, 2014), politicians also make use of their rhetorical repertoire in political speeches to forge and polish their political persona (Cockroft & Cockroft, 1992). Hence, every politician has their own style of persuasion, or, in other words, their own rhetoric-based political persona. This type of image is important for them since it distinguishes them from other politicians, resulting in more people supporting their causes and voters on their side (Knudsen, 2014; Haoming, 2019). For example, Barack Obama is said to speak of logic in his speech and to use aesthetically pleasing syntactic order as a rhetoric tool (Knudsen, 2014), while Donald Trump is portrayed as someone who stirs emotion when he delivers his speeches and is known to make a great number of repetitions in his speech as his trademark rhetoric strategy (Haoming, 2019).

Considering the importance of the rhetoric-based political persona they exhibit and maintain in public, it has never been more important for the specific sets of rhetoric in their speeches to remain in the target text when translated. Along with properly translating the propositional message to the target text, the expressive type of message known as the rhetorical message is equally important to render (Baker, 2018). This means that rhetoric is a message to be sent in political speeches as well, both as an expressive and a propositional message, and ignoring the importance of one can compromise the translation's veracity (Nababan, 2012; House, 2015; Baker, 2018; House, 2021). However, the consequence of this goes far beyond simple inaccuracy; it even goes so far to the extent that an alteration in the rhetorical message may ultimately change the category of rhetorical strategy, which in turn may affect the orator's rhetorically based political identity.

As a result, this study attempts to unfold the shifts in the rhetorical strategy of Obama and Trump in both their presidential victory acceptance and inauguration speeches in their translation from English to Indonesian, along with their impact on the accuracy of the translation and their effect on the possible political persona alteration in the target text.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

For this study, rhetoric refers to the art of influencing others and is determined by communication skills (Knudsen, 2014). Furthermore, it reveals itself in rhetorical approaches and strategies (Cockroft & Cockroft, 1992). Methods of rhetoric are determined by the basis upon which the rhetoric is presented; for example, they may be based on the audience's personality (ethos), emotion (pathos), or reasoning (logos). Rhetorical strategies are the linguistic realizations that involve lexical choices (literary lexis and functional lexis), sound patterning, figurative language (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, irony, and catachresis), and schematic language (antithesis, syntactic device, repetition, and amplification). Of the two categories, strategies of rhetoric are deemed to be clearly distinguishable in terms of frequent use by the orators. Since they are manifested in linguistic representations, it is easier to track and note which strategies are often used by a political figure that reflect his political persona (Cockroft & Cockroft, 1992; Barucello, 2015). As a result, analyses of rhetorical strategies in texts have been conducted several times; still, they are holistically analyzed as they only focus on particular strategies in a text (Kulo, 2009; Hidayat, 2014; Phelan, 2014; Baruchello, 2014; Gruber, 2016; Fengjie et al., 2016; Heracleous & Klaering, 2017; Taping et al., 2017; Haoming, 2019; Ross & Caldwell, 2019; Yang, 2019; Ruiz dan Ibanez, 2020). As such, partial analysis fails to capture the whole phenomenon of rhetoric within a text and cannot meet what it takes to reconstrue the rhetoric style of the text or of the orator of a speech. Therefore, this study aims at a more thorough analysis by incorporating all types of strategies and their sub-strategies into the analysis.

Rhetorical translation must adhere to the definition of translation, which is the transfer and re-expression of a message from the source text to the target text with the closest natural equivalency in terms of message or meaning and linguistic style (Nida & Taber, 1962). As rhetoric contains two types of messages, namely proposition and expressive (Baker, 2018), their translation must convey and retain those messages in the target text. The propositional message in rhetoric is the semantic meaning or factual and actual meaning of the clause, while the expressive message is the rhetorical strategy identity included in the clause of the rhetoric. Missing or changing one of the messages can reduce the level of translation accuracy. Hence, keeping the rhetoric message as it is in the source text is fundamental, as the rhetoric in a text does not only speak for itself but may also be a collective rhetoric that construes the rhetoric style of a figure, or, in this case, a political persona based on the rhetoric style of a politician. Translation analysis of rhetoric in texts has been previously carried out by the likes of Valentino et al. (2017), but, as discussed earlier, they are reserved for only a particular type of strategy discussion. On top of that, the analysis only goes as far as how the rhetoric is conveyed in the target text without discussing how it impacts the translation quality. Therefore, this study will answer the leftover question as to how the retention or alteration of rhetoric identity in the target text affects the translation quality, especially the level of accuracy.

In discussing the quality of translation in this study, the theory proposed by Nababan et al. (2012) is applied. According to their theory, there are three aspects of quality in assessing the translation: accuracy, acceptability, and readability. Accuracy deals with how precisely the message is transferred and conveyed in the target text. Acceptability is about the naturalness of the language of the translation, adhering to the target culture and target linguistic behaviors. Readability is the level of ease with which the translation can be understood by target readers. Every aspect has three categories of assessment that are realized in scoring that are scored from three to one, with three being the most accurate and one being the least accurate. For instance, when a translation has a score of three for its accuracy level, it means that it is accurate; the whole message is transferred and conveyed perfectly. If a translation is rated a two, it means that it is less accurate; there are some messages that are not conveyed or have mistakenly been conveyed in the target text. When a translation is rated a one, it means that it is inaccurate; the whole message was not conveyed or was mistakenly conveyed in the target text. This also works with the other two aspects. Overall, this theory adheres to some other theories concerning translation quality assessment (House, 2015). However, this theory is more structured by explicitly pointing to three aspects of quality and the method to assess them. In addition to that, this theory is more practical as it adopts scoring that helps in the assessment itself.

Based on the above, this study aims to answer the following research problems:

- (1) What types of rhetorical strategies are used by Obama and Trump in their victory acceptance and inauguration speeches?
- (2) What types of rhetorical strategy shifts are found in the translation of the victory acceptance and inauguration speeches of Obama and Trump after they are translated from English to Indonesian?
- (3) How do the rhetorical strategy shifts affect the accuracy of the translation and the political personas of Obama and Trump in the target text?

In order to close the research gap, this study maps the shifts and maintenance of the original rhetoric in the target text, analyzes all of the rhetorical strategies used by both Obama and Trump in their inauguration and victory acceptance speeches, explains how these strategies affect the accuracy of the translation, and finally investigates how these strategies changed the rhetoric-based political personas of the two former US presidents.

## III. METHODOLOGY

This research is guided by a multiple-case study methodology within a qualitative paradigm. Furthermore, according to Saldanha and O'Brien (2014), there are also both participant- and product-oriented translation studies. It is a multiple-case study because this study employs four document data sources: the victory acceptance and inauguration speeches of Obama and Trump. After careful consideration, these four speeches were selected for a couple of reasons: first, they are comparative, showing how Obama and Trump practice their rhetoric in similar contexts. Second, as they are political texts in nature, they contain a lot of rhetoric, which is the main data of this study.

Next, this study is product-oriented translation research because it deals with the product of the translation of the four speeches. Furthermore, it is participant-oriented translation research, as this study involves three raters or informants to assess the quality of rhetorical translation. The informants were required to score the translation accuracy of the rhetoric to avoid bias in personal assessment and, at the same time, to strengthen the triangulation of the data sources. Because the three informants were chosen for their specific knowledge in translation studies—particularly in the area of translation quality assessment—their ratings were considered to be more reliable. Moreover, they were all experienced in using the translation model proposed by Nababan et al. (2012).

The methods of collecting data are document analysis and focus group discussion. Document analysis was used to gather linguistic data—the rhetoric of Obama and Trump in their victory acceptance and inauguration speeches after their Indonesian translation. A focus group discussion was held to get data concerning the scoring of the translation accuracy of rhetoric. It should be noted that informants were involved in the focus group discussion as well.

Additionally, Spradley's method of analysis was used in this study. It consists of domain analysis, taxonomy analysis, componential analysis, and finding cultural values. The domain of the data, such as which speech and to whom the rhetoric belongs, was identified in domain analysis. Subsequently, a taxonomy analysis was conducted to classify different types of rhetorical strategies, score translation accuracy, and determine rhetorical shifts. The categorization of rhetorical strategies is based on the theory of rhetoric (Cockroft & Cockroft, 1992). Determining the shifts in rhetorical strategies is based on translation notions (Baker, 2018) and rhetoric categorization (Cockroft & Cockroft, 1992). In this step, the rhetoric of the source text is compared to the translation in the target text. Finally, the scoring of rhetorical translation accuracy is based on the translation quality assessment theory (Nababan et al., 2012).

#### IV. RESULTS

##### A. *Types of Rhetoric Used by Obama and Trump*

Based on the categorization of rhetoric using the theory of rhetoric (Cockroft & Cockroft, 1992), the tables below display the results:

TABLE 1  
THE TYPES OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES USED IN OBAMA'S VICTORY ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

No.	Rhetoric Strategy	Sub-Strategy	Sum	%
1	Schematic Language	a) Syntactic Device	28	36.84
		b) Repetition	25	32.89
		c) Antithesis	16	21.05
		d) Amplification/Hyperbole	2	2.63
2	Figurative Language	Metaphor	3	3.95
3	Sound Patterning	-	2	2.63
Total			76	100

TABLE 2  
THE TYPES OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES USED IN TRUMP'S VICTORY ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

No.	Rhetoric Strategy	Sub-Strategy	Sum	%
1	Schematic Language	a) Repetition	48	72.72
		b) Syntactic Device	15	22.73
		c) Anti-thesis	1	1.51
2	Figurative Language	Metaphor	1	1.51
3	Sound Patterning	-	1	1.51
Total			66	100

TABLE 3  
THE TYPES OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES USED IN OBAMA'S INAUGURATION SPEECH

No.	Rhetoric Strategy	Sub-Strategy	Sum	%
1	Schematic Language	a) Repetition	48	41.38
		b) Syntactic Device	42	36.21
		c) Antithesis	6	5.17
		d) Amplification/Hyperbole	2	1.72
2	Figurative Language	Metaphor	9	7.76
3	Sound Patterning	-	6	5.17
4	Lexical Choice	a) Functional Lexis	2	1.72
		b) Literary Lexis	1	0.08
Total			116	100

TABLE 4  
THE TYPES OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES USED IN TRUMP'S INAUGURATION SPEECH

No.	Rhetoric Strategy	Sub-Strategy	Sum	%
1	Schematic Language	a) Repetition	40	43.48
		b) Syntactic Device	26	28.26
		c) Antithesis	15	16.30
		d) Amplification/Hyperbole	3	3.26
2	Figurative Language	Metaphor	3	3.26
3	Sound Patterning	-	3	3.26
4	Lexical Choice	Functional Lexis	2	2.17
Total			92	100

The four tables above show the frequency of the appearance of rhetorical strategies used by former U.S. presidents Barack Obama and Donald Trump in their presidential victory and inauguration speeches. Both Obama and Trump tend to frequently use schematic language strategies in their victory and inauguration speeches. These are followed by other strategies such as figurative language, sound patterning, and lexical choice as the least used strategies.

In his victory speech, Barack Obama most often used the syntactic device sub-strategy, while Donald Trump most often used repetition in his victory speech. Meanwhile, in their inauguration speeches, it is interesting to note that both Barack Obama and Donald Trump used the repetition sub-strategy most often. The variety of sub-strategies they use in both speeches is almost the same, only differing in the level of frequency of use.

In their victory speeches, the difference lies in the discovery that the amplification/hyperbole strategy was used by Obama but not by Donald Trump. Meanwhile, in his inauguration speech, Barack Obama was found to have used literary lexis, whereas Donald Trump was not found to have used it.

Thus, it can be concluded that, in general, the use of rhetorical strategies for the two figures in the two different speeches is almost the same, only differing in the level of frequency of appearance, as well as the existence of one rhetorical strategy that is only used by Obama and was not used by Trump in either of his speeches. The following are examples of data that represent the use of this rhetorical strategy.

The two phrases in bold in the data above are phrases that have a schematic language relationship with the syntactic device type. Both phrases have the same structural sequence, namely question word, predicate, and object, followed by a complement. The similarity and equal order of the constituent elements make this sentence have similar syntax, which was used as a rhetorical strategy by Obama in his inauguration speech.

(a). *Schematic Language: Syntactic Device*

This type of rhetorical strategy occurs if the syntactic structure in several sentences is the same.

Example: “**What makes us exceptional—what makes us American**—is our allegiance to an idea, articulated in a declaration made more than two centuries ago.”

The two phrases typed in bold in the data above are phrases that have a schematic language relationship and fall under the syntactic device type. Both phrases have the same structural sequence, namely question word, predicate, and object, followed by a complement. The similarity and equal order of the constituent elements make this sentence have similar syntax, which was used as a rhetorical strategy by Obama in his inauguration speech.

(b). *Schematic Language: Repetition*

Repetition is the repetition of words, phrases, or clauses that aim to emphasize or strengthen the statement of a proposition.

Example: “We are **very, very, very** ready to tackle what is ahead of us.”

The repetition of the adverb “very” in the data sentence is a form of repetition. The purpose of this repetition is to strengthen the proposition conveyed by the speaker, Donald Trump. Such repetition is done to emphasize or strengthen the message conveyed. As a result, Trump's audience increasingly believed that Trump was very ready to face America's challenges at that time. Trump is known as a politician who often uses this repetition strategy in giving speeches.

(c). *Schematic Language: Antithesis*

Antithesis is the use of opposing concepts in stating a proposition.

Example: “**Washington flourished – but the people did not share in its wealth.**”

The first and second statements in the data above are the opposite; in other words, they have an antithetical strategy. An antithetical statement between the people in power in Washington who reportedly said they were getting ahead and reaping the benefits while, on the contrary, most of the civilians did not enjoy these benefits at all. This antithesis was used by Trump to attack the government and convince the masses that their situation was not good in the hands of the previous administration, namely the Obama administration. Trump creates a narrative that the people are suffering by using the antithesis of the situation between government and society.

(d). *Schematic Language: Amplification/Hyperbole*

Amplification means stating a proposition excessively. One realization of amplification is the use of hyperbole.

Example: “**You came by the tens of millions** to become part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before.”

Donald Trump used amplification in the form of hyperbole when conveying the number of Americans who came to his inauguration as President of the United States. He said that there were tens of millions of people present at his inauguration who supported his inauguration as president. In reality, the number present was far from the stated number. The hyperbole used by Trump is intended to enhance his persuasion about the amount of support he receives. This hyperbole strengthened his image as a figure supported by many Americans.

(e). *Figurative Language: Metaphor*

This type of rhetorical strategy uses figurative language to compare one entity with another.

Example: “Our brave men and women in uniform, **tempered by the flames of battle**, are unmatched in skill and courage.”

This data is a statement delivered by Obama in his presidential inauguration speech. Obama used the metaphor “tempered by the flames of battle” to describe the strength of the United States military. The meaning of the “forged by the fire of war” metaphor means that the United States military is strong because it has experienced many fierce wars and risked many lives. The fire aspect of this metaphor refers to the fierceness and extraordinariness of the war that these soldiers have gone through. As a result, the use of this metaphor strengthens the proposition conveyed by Obama.

(f). *Sound Patterning*

This rhetorical strategy is a persuasive language style that utilizes alignment or plays on the sounds of words used in persuasive sentences.

Example: “And to those who have wondered if America's beacon still burns as bright: Tonight, we proved once more that the true strength of our nation comes not from the might of our arms or the scale of our wealth, but from the enduring power of our ideals: **democracy, liberty, opportunity**, and unyielding hope.”

Obama uses the /-y/ sound pattern in the words “democracy”, “liberty”, and “opportunity”. The use of this sound pattern makes the proposition conveyed by Obama stronger and easier to remember for the audience that listened to his victory speech. This repetition of sounds with the same pattern also makes people more interested in the speech delivered by Obama.

(g). *Lexical Choice: Functional Lexis*

This rhetorical strategy uses specific and technical lexis in a specific field.

Example: “For the American people can no more meet the demands of today’s world by acting alone than American soldiers could have met the forces of **fascism** or communism with muskets and militias.”

Obama used a functional lexis in his inauguration speech as president. The word is “fascism” in both English and Indonesian. This word means the principles or ideology of extreme nationalist groups that advocate authoritarian government. This word is a technical term used in the field of nationalism and politics. Its use is specific to the political context. The use of political technical terms like this is useful for increasing Obama's political persuasion power in his speech.

(h). *Lexical Choice: Literary Lexis Example*

This rhetorical strategy is a strategy that uses lexis that is literary or has beauty in form and use.

Example: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are **endowed** by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

In his inauguration speech, Barack Obama used the literary lexis term “endowed”. The word means given or gifted, but the form is a literary word. This case is the same as the word “snake” which has a literary form, namely “serpent”. The use of this literary form gives the power of persuasion to the proposition conveyed. The use of the word “endowed” is mainly because the subject who gives rights to humans is God. Therefore, the terms used are grand and literary.

B. *Shifts in the Rhetoric of Obama and Trump in the Indonesian Translation of the Speeches*

The translation of the rhetorical repertoire in Barack Obama's and Donald Trump's victory and inauguration speeches was not carried out without obstacles. The results of the analysis show that there are problems in maintaining the rhetorical repertoire, as indicated by the shift in rhetorical strategy found in the four cases of speech translation.

The shifts seen in the four speech translation scenarios generally involved multiple shifts. First, the changes from rhetoric to non-rhetoric included changes from syntactic devices to non-rhetoric, from repetition to non-rhetoric, from antithesis to non-rhetoric, from metaphor to non-rhetoric, from sound patterning to non-rhetoric, and from literary lexis to non-rhetoric. Secondly, there were shifts made in the rhetoric that involved the deletion or loss of syntactic devices and repetitions. Third, changes occurred within the rhetorical strategies, such as changes from syntactic devices to repetition, sound patterning to syntactic devices, and repetition to syntactic devices. Fourth, changes occurred in the case of a reduction in the degree of rhetorical strategy in translation; for example, there was a reduction in the degree of syntactic devices, repetition, and sound patterning in translation. Finally, changes occurred in the propositional message of the rhetorical repertoire from the source language into the translation.

TABLE 5  
SHIFT OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN OBAMA'S VICTORY ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

No	Type of Shift	Sub-Type of Shift	Sum	%
1	Rhetoric – Non-rhetoric (12)	<i>Syntactic Device – Non-rhetoric</i>	4	16
		<i>Repetition – Non-rhetoric</i>	3	12
		<i>Antithesis – Non-rhetoric</i>	3	12
		<i>Sound Patterning – Non-rhetoric</i>	1	4
		<i>Metaphor – Non-rhetoric</i>	1	4
2	Reduction in the Degree of Rhetoric (7)	<i>Syntactic Device – Syntactic Device</i>	4	16
		<i>Repetition – Repetition</i>	3	12
3	Shift of Propositional Message (4)	-	4	16
4	Rhetoric – Rhetoric (Different Strategy) (1)	<i>Syntactic Device - Repetition</i>	1	4
		<i>Repetition - Deleted</i>	1	4
Total			25	100

TABLE 6  
SHIFT OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN TRUMP'S VICTORY ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

No	Type of Shift	SUB-TYPE of Shift	Sum	%
1	Rhetoric – Non-rhetoric (30)	<i>Repetition – Non-rhetoric</i>	19	48.72
		<i>Syntactic Device – Non-rhetoric</i>	9	23.08
		<i>Sound Patterning – Non-rhetoric</i>	2	5.13
2	Rhetoric – Deleted (7)	<i>Repetition - Deleted</i>	6	15.39
		<i>Syntactic Device - Deleted</i>	1	2.56
3	Rhetoric – Rhetoric (Different Strategy) (1)	<i>Sound Patterning – Syntactic Device</i>	1	2.56
4	Reduction in the Degree (1)	<i>Repetition - Repetition</i>	1	2.56
Total			39	100

TABLE 7  
SHIFT OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN OBAMA'S INAUGURATION SPEECH

No	Type of Rhetoric	Sub-type of Rhetoric	Sum	%
1	Rhetoric – Non-Rhetoric (20)	<i>Syntactic Device – Non-rhetoric</i>	8	33.33
		<i>Sound Patterning – Non-rhetoric</i>	6	25
		<i>Repetition – Non-rhetoric</i>	4	16.67
		<i>Metaphors – Non-rhetoric</i>	1	4.17
		<i>Literary Lexis – Non-rhetoric</i>	1	4.17
2	Rhetoric – Rhetoric (Different Strategy) (2)	<i>Repetition – Syntactic Device</i>	2	8.33
3	Reduction of Degree of Rhetoric (2)	<i>Repetition - Repetition</i>	1	4.17
		<i>Sound Patterning – Sound Patterning</i>	1	4.17
Total			24	100

TABLE 8  
SHIFT OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN TRUMP'S INAUGURATION SPEECH

No	Type of Shift	Sub-type of Shift	Sum	%
1	Rhetoric – Non-Rhetoric (10)	<i>Repetition – Non-rhetoric</i>	4	30.77
		<i>Syntactic Device – Non-rhetoric</i>	3	23.07
		<i>Sound Patterning – Non-rhetoric</i>	2	15.38
		<i>Metaphor – Non-rhetoric</i>	1	7.69
2	Shift of Propositional Message (1)	-	6	46.15
3	Rhetoric – Rhetoric (Different Strategy) (1)	<i>Repetition – Syntactic Device</i>	1	7.69
4	Rhetoric – Deleted (1)	<i>Repetition – Deleted</i>	1	7.69
Total			13	100

The tables above illustrate variations in rhetorical strategy shifts that occurred in the four cases of speech translation. It can also be concluded that shifts were found in all cases of translation. In the case of the translation of Barack Obama's victory speech, 25 shifts were found, or 29.41% of the total rhetorical data found (85 data). In the case of the translation of Donald Trump's victory speech, 39 shifts were found, or 56.22% of the total rhetorical data found (69 data). In the case of the translation of Barack Obama's inauguration speech, 24 shifts were found, or 20.51% of the total rhetorical data found (117 data). Then, in the case of the translation of Donald Trump's inauguration, 13 shifts were found, or 14.13% of the total data found (92 data).

It can be concluded that the most shifts were found in the case of the translation of Donald Trump's victory speech at 56.22%. This was followed by the case of the translation of Barack Obama's victory speech at 29.41%. Next came the case of the translation of Barack Obama's inauguration victory speech at 20.51%, and finally, shifts in the translation of Donald Trump's inauguration speech came in at 14.13%.

The following explains the shift in rhetorical strategy that occurred in the four translation cases, summarized in the tables above:

(a). *Rhetoric – Non-Rhetoric Examples*1. *Syntactic Device – Non-Rhetoric Example*

ST: “Hillary has worked **very long** and **very hard** over a long period of time, and we owe her a major debt of gratitude for her service to our country.”

TT: “Hillary telah bekerja **berjam-jam** dan bekerja **keras** untuk waktu yang lama, dan kita harus berterima kasih padanya untuk segala yang dilakukannya pada negara kita.”

Actual Translation: “Hillary has worked **in hours** and worked **hard** over a long period of time, and we owe her a major debt of gratitude for her service to our country.”

In the source language, there is a syntactic device strategy of “very long” and “very hard”. These two words are translated without maintaining their rhetorical strategy. The word “very long” is translated by means of particularization, namely as “hours”, while the word “very hard” is translated as only “hard” with the removal of the adverb “very”. As a result, the formation of syntactic devices failed in the translation, resulting in a shift from the source language to the target language.

2. *Repetition – Non-Rhetoric Example*

ST: “We're going to dream of **things** for our country, and beautiful **things** and successful **things** once again.”

TT: “Kita akan memimpikan **hal-hal** indah untuk negara kita dan kembali sukses.”

Actual Translation: “We're going to dream of **things** for our country and regain success.”

There is a repetition of the word “things” three times in the rhetorical sentence of the original. However, the word is only translated once as “things” in the target language, so that the sentence construction loses its repetition as a rhetorical strategy. Such a reduction makes the translation lose its identity as a rhetorical repertoire due to the loss of its rhetorical strategy.

3. *Antithesis – Non-Rhetoric Example*

ST: “And to all those watching tonight from beyond our shores, from parliaments and palaces to those who are huddled around radios in the forgotten corners of our world — **our stories are singular, but our destiny is shared**, and a new dawn of American leadership is at hand.”

TT: “Dan untuk semua yang malam ini menyaksikan dari luar pantai-pantai kita, dari gedung-gedung parlemen dan istana-istana, bagi mereka yang mendengarkan dari radio di sudut dunia yang terlupakan, **cerita kita satu dan nasib kita saling terhubung**. Fajar baru kepemimpinan Amerika sedang menyingsing.”

Actual Translation: “And to all who watch tonight from beyond our shores, from the halls of parliament and palaces, to those who listen on the radio in forgotten corners of the world, **our stories are one and our fates are intertwined**. A new dawn of American leadership is dawning.”

Here, the researchers found the use of an antithesis strategy in the source language: “our stories are singular, but our destiny is shared”, which shows that there is an antithesis between the different stories of each person, but the goal to be achieved is the same. However, this aspect is translated literally so that the message does not match the context, to “our story is one and our fates are connected.” The loss of context results in the loss of the contrastive aspect or antithesis between the initial part of the clause so that its rhetorical power is lost in the translation.

4. *Metaphor – Non-Rhetoric Example*

ST: “And to those who have wondered if **America’s beacon still burns as bright**.”

TT: “Dan untuk mereka yang masih bertanya-tanya apakah **pemancar-pemancar Amerika masih menyala terang**.”

Actual Translation: “And to those who still wonder if America’s transmitter still shines bright.”

The metaphor strategy “America's beacon still burns as bright” is used in the original. The meaning of this metaphor is that the spirit of the American people is still burning. However, the translation of the metaphor is mistaken. It is literally translated.

5. *Sound Patterning – Non-Rhetoric Example*

ST: “It's the answer that led those who have been told for so long by so many to be **cynical**, and **fearful**, and **doubtful** of what we can achieve to put their hands on the arc of history and bend it once more toward the hope of a better day”.

TT: “Jawaban ini diberikan oleh mereka yang selalu dipandang dengan **sinis** oleh banyak orang, dianggap **penakut**, dan **peragu** tentang apa yang bisa kita raih, untuk meletakkan tangan mereka di atas gerbang sejarah dan sekali lagi menuju harapan hari yang lebih baik”.

Actual Translation: “This answer is given by those who have always been viewed with **cynicism by many**, **considered timid, and doubtful** about what we can achieve, to lay their hands on the gates of history and once again head towards the hope of better days.”

The translation fails to recreate the sound patterning in the target text, so it loses its rhetoric message.

6. *Literary Lexis – Non- Rhetoric Example*

ST: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are **endowed** by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.”

TT: “*Kita memegang kebenaran ini untuk menjadi bukti, bahwa semua orang diciptakan setara, bahwa mereka **diberi** oleh Pencipta hak-hak tertentu yang tidak terpisahkan, diantaranya adalah Kehidupan, Kebebasan dan mengejar Kebahagiaan.*”

Actual Translation: “We hold these truths to be evident, that all men are created equal, that they **are given** by the Creator with certain inalienable Rights, among which are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”

The translation loses the nuance of literariness due to translating the literary lexis into common word ‘*diberi*’ (given).

(b). *Rhetoric – Deleted Example*

1. *Syntactic Device – Deleted Example*

ST: “Gov. Chris Christie, folks, was unbelievable. Thank you, Chris. The **first man, first senator, first major,** major politician.”

TT: “*Gubernur Chris Christie juga sangat luar biasa. Terima kasih, Chris.*”

Actual Translation: “Governor Chris Christie is also incredible. Thank you, Chris.”

The phrases typed in bold in the source text are not translated in the target text so the message is lost.

(c). *Rhetoric – Rhetoric (Different Strategy) Examples*

1. *Syntactic Device – Repetition Example*

ST: “And **that cannot happen** if we go back to the way things were. **It cannot happen** without you.”

TT: “*Dan itu tidak bisa terjadi bila kita kembali ke saat-saat sebelumnya. Perubahan itu tidak bisa terjadi tanpa Anda.*”

Actual Translation: “And that cannot happen if we go back to previous state. The change cannot happen without you.”

The translation of subject “that” and “it” are the same in the target text so they become repetition.

2. *Repetition – Syntactic Device Example*

ST: “Because today we are not merely **transferring power from** one Administration to another, or from one party to another – but we are **transferring power from** Washington, D.C. and giving it back to you, the American people.”

TT: “*Karena hari ini kita tidak hanya **mentransfer kekuasaan dari** satu pemerintahan ke yang lain, atau dari satu pihak kepada pihak lain - tetapi kita sedang **memindahkan kekuasaan dari** Washington, DC dan memberikan kembali kepada Anda, Rakyat Amerika.*”

Actual Translation: “Because today we are not merely **transferring power from** one Administration to another, or from one party to another – but we are **moving power from** Washington, D.C. and giving it back to you, the American people.”

The translation of “transferring” differs in the target language; therefore, the translation shifts the repetition to syntactic device.

(d). *Reduction of Rhetoric Degree Examples*

1. *Reduction of Syntactic Device Degree Example*

ST: “There are mothers and fathers who will lie awake after their children fall asleep and wonder how they'll **make the mortgage, or pay their doctor's bills, or save enough for college.**”

TT: “*Ada orangtua yang tetap terjaga setelah anak-anak mereka tertidur dan bertanya bagaimana cara **membayar hipotek rumah, atau membayar tagihan kesehatan, atau menabung agar dapat menyekolahkan anak-anak mereka ke perguruan tinggi.***”

Actual Translation: “There are parents who stay awake after their kids are asleep and ask how they're going to pay their mortgage, or pay their medical bills, or save so they can send their kids to college.”

The last part clause of the syntactic device clauses is not maintained in the same syntax as in the original. The structure of the translation gets longer. Therefore, it can only maintain two pairs of syntactic device clauses instead of the original three pairs.

2. *Reduction of Repetition Degree Example*

ST: “**To those who** would tear this world down: We will defeat you. **To those who** seek peace and security: We support you. **And to those who** have wondered if America's beacon still burns as bright...”

TT: “***Kepada kalian yang** meruntuhkan dunia, kami akan mengalahkan kalian. **Kepada kalian yang** mencari perdamaian dan keamanan, kami mendukung kalian. Dan untuk mereka yang masih bertanya-tanya apakah pemancar-pemancar Amerika masih menyala terang.*”

Actual Translation: “To those of you who brought down the world, we will defeat you. To those of you who seek peace and security, we support you. And for those who still wonder if America's transmitters are still burning brightly.”

The translation can only maintain two phrases of repetitions instead of three.

### 3. Reduction of Sound Patterning Degree

ST: “America’s possibilities are **limitless**, for we possess all the qualities that this world without boundaries demands: youth and drive; diversity and **openness**; an **endless** capacity for risk and a gift for reinvention.”

TT: “Ada berbagai kemungkinan **tidak terbatas** bagi Amerika, karena kita memiliki semua persyaratan yang dituntut oleh dunia tanpa garis batas ini: kaum muda dan motivasi, keragaman dan **keterbukaan**; dan kapasitas **tak terbatas** untuk menempuh risiko dan bakat untuk melakukan penemuan baru.”

Actual Translation: “There are endless possibilities for America, because we have all the requirements that this borderless world demands: youth and motivation, diversity and openness; and an unlimited capacity for risk and a talent for making new discoveries.”

The translation can only maintain two clauses that have the same sounds in their ending syllables.

### 4. Change of Propositional Message in Rhetoric Example

ST: “**We’ve defended other nations’ borders while refusing to defend our own.**”

TT: **Kita telah membela perbatasan negara lain sementara menolak untuk membela perbatasan kita sendiri.**”

Actual Translation: “**We have defended the borders of other nations while refusing to defend our own border.**”

The original is intended to mean to take care of the borders, while the translation means to defend an argument. The verb is literally translated without paying attention to the context.

### C. Accuracy Level of Translation of the Rhetoric of Obama and Trump

According to the results of a focus group discussion (FGD) with translation quality raters, the rhetorical translation is generally accurate. This shows that most of the translations of the rhetorical repertoire succeed very well in conveying the message of the source text. Moreover, the lowest level of translation accuracy is found in the rhetorical translation of Trump in his victory speech, as shown in the tables below:

TABLE 9  
TRANSLATION ACCURACY LEVEL OF OBAMA’S RHETORIC IN HIS VICTORY ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

Accuracy Level	Sum	Average
Accurate	59	2.67
Less Accurate	24	
Inaccurate	2	

TABLE 10  
TRANSLATION ACCURACY LEVEL OF TRUMP’S RHETORIC IN HIS VICTORY ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

Accuracy Level	Sum	Average
Accurate	32	2.36
Less Accurate	30	
Inaccurate	7	

TABLE 11  
TRANSLATION ACCURACY LEVEL OF OBAMA’S INAUGURATION SPEECH

Accuracy Level	Sum	Average
Accurate	94	2.80
Less Accurate	23	
Inaccurate	-	

TABLE 12  
TRANSLATION ACCURACY LEVEL OF TRUMP’S INAUGURATION SPEECH

Accuracy Level	Sum	Average
Accurate	75	2.80
Less Accurate	16	
Inaccurate	1	

In the tables above, it can be seen that there is more accurate data than less accurate or inaccurate data. Only in the case of Table 10 (Donald Trump’s victory speech) was it discovered that the amount of accurate data was nearly equal to the amount of less accurate data and that the overall amount of inaccurate and less accurate data exceeded the amount of accurate translated data. In this case, numerous message omissions or misappropriations of messages from the source language to the target language were discovered.

#### (a). Accurate Data Example

ST: “If there is anyone out there who still doubts that America is a place where all things are possible; who still wonders if **the dream of our founders is alive** in our time; who still questions the power of our democracy, tonight is your answer.”

TT: “*Jika masih ada yang meragukan Amerika adalah sebuah tempat di mana segala sesuatu mungkin untuk terjadi, yang masih bertanya-tanya apakah **impian para pendiri negara ini masih hidup** sampai saat ini, yang masih meragukan kekuatan dari demokrasi kita, malam ini adalah jawaban untukmu.*”

Actual Translation: “If there is anyone out there who still doubts that America is a place where all things are possible; who still wonders if **the dream of our founders is alive** in our time; who still questions the power of our democracy, tonight is your answer.”

The source text is a rhetorical repertoire that uses metaphoric strategies or is in the form of a metaphor. Metaphors in the source language are transferred accurately while maintaining the form of the metaphor and the message of the metaphor so that the translation also has the same rhetorical and propositional message as the target language does.

(b). *Less Accurate Data Example*

ST: “We are **very, very, very** ready to tackle what is ahead of us.”

TT: “*Kita **sangat** siap untuk menghadapi apa yang ada di depan kita.*”

Actual Translation: “We are **very** ready to face what is ahead of us.”

The source text is a rhetorical repertoire that uses a repetition strategy, the repeated use of the word “very”, which was used by Trump to strengthen his rhetorical proposition. The translator translated the word only once, even though the word was repeated three times. This translation results in the loss of two repetitions, so the message of the rhetorical strategy is lost in the translation. This kind of message reduction makes the translation of the rhetorical repertoire less accurate.

(c). *Inaccurate Data Example*

ST: “On our victory, and I congratulated her and her family on a **very, very, very** hard-fought campaign.”

TT: “*Untuk kemenangan kita, dan saya memberikan selamat untuknya dan keluarganya untuk kampanye yang sulit.*”

Actual Translation: “For our victory, and I congratulated her and her family for the hard campaign.”

In this case, the repetition of the word “very”, which is repeated three times in the source language, is not translated at all by the translator in the target text. The omission or deletion of this repetition construction makes the rhetorical and propositional messages of the word completely lost in translation. As a result, the translation of the rhetorical repertoire becomes inaccurate.

## V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study clarifies earlier research on the rhetorical identities of Obama and Trump, which was only seen from an assumption-based perspective and did not provide evidence of concrete linguistic elements. It also describes the rhetorical character of Obama and Trump with clear linguistic benchmarks (Soraya et al., 2019).

This research confirms and strengthens the results of previous research which states that Obama tends to use syntactic device strategies with many other strategic choices, while Trump tends to use repetition and several variations of rhetorical strategies more than Obama (Kayam, 2014; Allen & Flynn, 2016; Rahayu et al., 2018; Theodorepoulou, 2020). Obama is described as a president who is very good at rhetoric and is said to have won two elections because of his skills in rhetoric (Rahayu et al., 2018). Apart from that, and more specifically, Trump's choice in the use of dominating repetition is confirmation of his rhetorical style which has been presented in previous research (Savoy, 2016; Savoy, 2018; Holtzman, 2018; Perez-Curil et al., 2021).

The translation of rhetoric has some patterns that show that there is rhetoric that maintains its type in the source text, but there is also a lot of rhetoric whose type has shifted in the translated text. Based on the results, it can be concluded that every shift in rhetorical strategy that occurs in any type of rhetorical strategy will definitely have a negative impact on aspects of the accuracy of the message. Moreover, shifts that change the type of rhetorical strategy, shifts that reduce the degree or strength of a rhetorical strategy, or even those that eliminate the rhetorical strategy itself in translation definitely have a negative impact on aspects of the accuracy of the message. This happens because the identity of the source text's rhetorical strategy is the rhetorical message that must be conveyed in the target text. If the identity changes or shifts in category type, then the rhetorical message conveyed will also be different, so it can change the message in the target text.

The negative impact of the rhetoric category shift in the translation toward the translation accuracy level actually deems that any shift of rhetoric identity in the translation is undesirable to keep the rhetoric and what they construe intact. In other words, rhetorical strategies are also fundamental messages as much as propositional messages in the rhetoric construct. They become the plane that construes and carries the political persona of Obama and Trump in this case, or any other orators of political speeches. If they shift in the translation, the possibility is also high for the political persona of the orator to alter as well. The more rhetorical strategies shift, the greater the chance there is for the political persona of the orator to change. However, considering the number of shifts found and the accuracy level of rhetorical translation in the four speeches, it is safe to say that there is no major change in political persona in this case. If any, the highest chance for a persona to alter is in the case of rhetorical translation in Trump's victory acceptance speech as it has the lowest score of accuracy compared to the others. In addition to that, the average score of accuracy in that regard

points more toward a less accurate state. Nevertheless, there is no indication of a total change in political persona in this study.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. New York: Taylor and Francis Library. 22-45.
- [2] Baruchello, G. (2015). A classification of classics. Gestalt psychology and the tropes of rhetoric. *New ideas on psychology 36 by Elsevier*. 10-24.
- [3] Borgstorm, B. E. (1982). Power structure and political speech. *Jstor & Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*. Diakses dari <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2801816>. Retrieved on 9.23 pm, March, 23<sup>rd</sup> 2023.
- [4] Cockcroft, R & Cockcroft, S. M. (1992). *Persuading people: An introduction to rhetoric*. Brighton: Macmillan Press. 68-120.
- [5] Fengjie, L., Jia, R., & Yingying, Z. (2016). Analysis of the rhetorical devices in Obama's public speeches. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4, 141-146.
- [6] Gruber, D. R. (2016). Persuasive speech: A stronger affective defense of rhetoric and politics of cognitive poetics. *Language and Communication*, 49, 36-44.
- [7] Haoming, L. (2019). A stylistic analysis of Donald Trump's inaugural address. *Studies in literature and language*, 19(3), 75-80.
- [8] Heracleous, L. & Klaering, L. A. (2017). The circle of life: Rhetoric of identification in Steve Job's Stanford speech. *Journal of business research*, 79, 31-40.
- [9] Hidayat, H. (2014). Pemanfaatan fitur metafora dalam teks pidato politik Shinzo Abe sebagai perdana Menteri Jepang ke-96: Analisis wacana kritis. *Metalingua*, 12(2), 165-178.
- [10] Knudsen, R. A. (2014). *Homeric speech and the origins of rhetoric*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- [11] Kulo, L. (2009). *Linguistic features in political speeches*. Tesis. Lulea University of Technology. 18-19.
- [12] Nababan, M., Nuraeni, A., dan Sumardiono. (2012). Model penilaian kualitas terjemahan. *Jurnal kajian linguistik dan sastra*, 24, 1, 39-57.
- [13] Nida, E. A. & Taber, C. R. (1982). *The theory and practice of translation*. Netherland: BRILL. 45-50.
- [14] Phelan, J. (2014). Voice, tone, and the rhetoric of narrative communication. *Language and literature*, Vol 23(1), 49-60.
- [15] Ross, A. S. & Caldwell, D. (2019). 'Going negative': An appraisal analysis of the rhetoric of Donald Trump on Twitter. *Language and Communication oleh Elsevier* diakses dari <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2019.09.003>. Retrieved on 11.32 am, April, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2023.
- [16] Saldanha, G. & O'Brien, S. (2014). *Research methodologies in translation studies*. New York: Routledge.
- [17] Schaffner, C. (1996). Editorial: Political speeches and discourse analysis. *Current issues on language and society*. Volume 3, Issue 3, 1-4.
- [18] Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. United States of America: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- [19] Taping, M. G., Juniardi, Y., & Utomo, D. W. (2017). Rhetorical devices in Hillary Clinton concession speech. *The journal of English language studies*, 02(02), 225-240.
- [20] Valentino, R. S., Emery, J., Forrester, S. E. S., & Kuzmanoviq, T. (2017). Rhetoric, translation, and rhetoric of translation. *Poroi*, Volume 13, Issue 1. DOI: 10.13008/2151-2957.1263. <https://works.swarthmore.edu/fac-russian/246>
- [21] Walton, D. (2007). *Media argumentation: Dialectic, persuasion, and rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 23-24.
- [22] Yang, M. (2019). The application of English rhetorical devices in speechwriting: taking the preliminary of Kunming university in 2018 "FLTRP cup" English public speaking contest as an example. *Advances in economics, business, and management research*, 96, 399-400.



**Rida Nurlatifasari**, born in Sragen, 21 May 1993. She completed her bachelor degree in (S1) in Department of Teacher Training and Education with English Major in 2016, and obtained Master Degree (S2) in the same major in 2018. In 2020 she enrolled in Doctoral Degree in Linguistics Department with Translation Studies major. Currently she works as a freelance English tutor and translator.



**Riyadi Santosa**, born in Blora 28 March 1960. He is a Professor of Linguistics in the English Literature Department, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret. He has been working as a lecturer at Universitas Sebelas Maret for 32 years to date. He obtained his bachelor's degree in English Literature from the Faculty of Literature, Universitas Sebelas Maret in 1995. He then obtained a TEFL diploma and a Master of Applied Linguistics in TESOL in 1992 and 1993 respectively from the University of Sydney, Australia. Finally, he earned his Doctor of Philosophy degree in 2010 in the field of Applied Linguistics from the College of Arts and Science, Universiti Utara Malaysia.

He specializes in Systemic Functional Grammar and Discourse Analysis in mass media texts. His articles and books are closely related to the analysis of printed and visual mass media discourse, focusing on genre, register, and their applications in communication and translation.



**Tri Wiratno**, born on 14 September 1961, is a professor of linguistics who has been working as a lecturer at Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia for 37 years. He got his MA in linguistics from The University of Sydney in 1993, and earned his PhD also in linguistics from Universitas Sebelas Maret in 2009. His current position is Vice Dean for Academic, Research, and Student Affairs.

He is responsible for teaching the courses of Systemic Functional Linguistics, Sociolinguistics, and Discourse Analysis in both undergraduate and postgraduate programs. His research interest includes systemic theory of language, genre-based approach, language teaching, translation, language and the media, and social aspects of language.



**Ida Kusuma Dewi** was born in Pacitan on May 25, 1971. She is currently a lecturer in the Department of English at Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jl. Ir. Sutami No. 36 A, Surakarta. She has been working as a lecturer at Universitas Sebelas Maret for 26 years to date. She earned her Bachelor's degree in English from Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia, graduating in 1997. She obtained her Master's degree in Translation Studies from the University of Birmingham, United Kingdom, in 2000, and later received her Doctoral degree in Linguistics with a focus on Translation from Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia in 2019.

Her research interests are primarily in translation studies, including the translation of literary works, linguistic books, museum texts, popular science texts and children's books.