

Prefazione agli *Occasional Papers del CeSLiC* – ISSN 1973-221X

Quaderni del CeSLiC

General Editor – Donna R. Miller

Local Editorial Board - L'attuale comitato di redazione bolognese comprende:

Paola Filippi, Valeria Franzelli, Louann Haarman, Anna Mandich, Marina Manfredi, Donna R. Miller, Catia Nannoni, Ana Pano, Monica Perotto, Rosa Pugliese, Maria José Rodrigo Mora, Eva-Maria Thüne, Valeria Zotti

Full Editorial Committee - L'attuale comitato scientifico completo comprende:

Hans Bickes (Leibniz Universität Hannover, Germania), Maria Vittoria Calvi (Università degli Studi di Milano), Luciana Fellin (Duke University, USA), Paola Filippi (Università di Bologna), Valeria Franzelli (Università di Bologna), Maria Enrica Galazzi (Università Cattolica di Milano), Lucyna Gebert (Università la Sapienza, Roma), Louann Haarman (Università di Bologna), Jean-Marie Klinkenberg (Université de Liège, Belgio), Anna Mandich (Università di Bologna), Marina Manfredi (Università di Bologna), Donna R. Miller (Università di Bologna), Elda Morlicchio (Università Orientale di Napoli), Antonio Narbona (Universidad de Sevilla, Spagna), Gabriele Pallotti (Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia), Ana Pano (Università di Bologna), Monica Perotto (Università di Bologna), Rosa Pugliese (Università di Bologna), Maria José Rodrigo Mora (Università di Bologna), Viktor Michajlovich Shaklein (Rossijskij Universitet Druzhy Narodov (RUDN), Mosca, Russia), Joanna Thornborrow (Cardiff University, UK), Eva-Maria Thüne (Università di Bologna), Nicoletta Vasta (Università di Udine), Valeria Zotti (Università di Bologna)

La serie degli *Occasional Papers* è una collana collocata all'interno dei *Quaderni del Centro di Studi Linguistico-Culturali (CeSLiC)*, il centro di ricerca del quale sono responsabile scientifico e che svolge ricerche nell'ambito del Dipartimento di Lingue e Letterature Straniere e Moderne dell'*Alma Mater Studiorum* – Università di Bologna.

Gli *Occasional Papers*, nati nel 2005, sono accessibili all'URL

http://www.lilec-ceslic.it/?page_id=12

Finora sono stati pubblicati i seguenti saggi:

(2005) **Fusari, Sabrina**, Il direct mail per le organizzazioni nonprofit: analisi retorica interculturale italiano-inglese

(2005) **Louw, Bill**, Dressing up waiver: a stochastic collocational reading of 'the truth and reconciliation' commission (TRC)

(2005) **Nobili, Paola**, 'Saper vivere' con gli altri

(2006) **Witalisz, Alicja**, English Linguistic Influence on Polish and other Slavonic Languages

(2006) **Larisa Poutsileva**, Raccontare il mondo in lingue diverse: Sara' lo stesso mondo?

(2007) **Mette Rudvin**, Stereotypes of 'primitivism' and 'modernity' in immigrant-related discourse in the Italian media

(2007) **Ana Pano**, Anglicismos en el lenguaje de la informática en español. El "misterioso mundo del tecnicismo" a través de foros y glosarios en línea.

(2007) **Sabrina Fusari**, Idioletti e dialetti nel doppiaggio italiano de I Simpson

- (2008) **Alida Maria Silletti**, La traduzione del futuro verbale in ottica contrastiva italiana-francese-inglese
- (2008) **Jane Helen Johnson**, Corpus Stylistics and Translation
- (2009) **Sabrina Fusari**, Il filmato turistico multilingue come discorso specializzato: il caso di studio della Val Gardena
- (2009) **Alida Maria Silletti**, Analisi della "futurità" verbale in ottica comparativa italiana-francese-inglese
- (2009) **Antonella Luporini**, *Frames, Transitivity Structures* e gerarchie di potere tra personaggi: Harry Potter affronta Lord Voldemort in *The Sorcerer's Stone*
- (2009) **Jane Helen Johnson**, Towards an identification of the authorial style of Grazia Deledda. A corpus-assisted study
- (2010) **Cinzia Spinzi**, 'How this holiday makes a difference': the language of environment and the environment of nature in a cross-cultural study of ecotourism
- (2010) **Goranka Rocco**, Das Gerundium in italienischen Gesetzestexten und seine Umsetzung ins Deutsche
- (2010) **Sabrina Righi**, L'African American Vernacular English: una varietà linguistica sovra-regionale
- (2011) **Fabio Regattin**, Qu'est-ce que la mémétique? Et quel rôle peut-elle jouer pour la traductologie?
- (2011) **Mette Rudvin**, Colonialismo, letteratura per l'infanzia e traduzione. Lo sguardo coloniale: Una lettura del testo e delle illustrazioni del *Libro della Giungla*
- (2012) **Ilaria Biondi**, Traduzione e transfert culturale
- (2012) **Cinzia Bevitori**, How green is "green"? A corpus-assisted analysis of environmental discourse across forms of journalism
- (2012) **Giulia Grata**, Traduire la poésie: l'action du style. Erba et Luzi traducteurs de Michaux
- (2013) **Davide Vago**, Traduire le Tartuffe de Molière. L'inscription de l'oralité
- (2013) **Sandra Petroni**, Advermational territories on the web: Hybridity or resemiotisation?
- (2014) **Peter R. R. White**, The attitudinal work of news journalism images – a search for visual and verbal analogues
- (2015) **Martina D'Avalos**, Vox Populi vs Vox Political: un confronto linguistico tra elettori e candidati francesi per le elezioni europee 2014
- (2015) **Mariangela Picciuolo**, European Identity: a Multimodal Perspective
- (2015) **Marina Manfredi**, The language of popular science from the printed page to the Web: The case of the Table of Contents
- (2016) **Antonella Luporini**, Spotlighting fantasy literature with the tools of Frame Semantics and Systemic Functional Linguistics: A case study

A questi *papers* si aggiungono le altre pubblicazioni del CeSLiC – ossia, gli **E-Libri** – che includono:

1) la serie di manuali dei Quaderni del CeSLiC: Functional Grammar Studies for Non-Native Speakers of English, nata nel 2005, che già vanta sei volumi pubblicati (ISSN 1973-2228), il più recente dei quali è:

Miller, Donna Rose (2017) **“Language as Purposeful: Functional Varieties of Text. 2nd Edition”** a

<http://amsacta.unibo.it/5504/>

2) gli Atti dei Convegni patrocinati dal centro, nati nel 2005 (ISSN: 1973-932X):

- a cura di D. Londei, D.R. Miller, P. Puccini, Gli atti completi delle giornate di studio del CeSLiC del 17-18 GIUGNO 2005:

“Insegnare le lingue/culture oggi: Il contributo dell’interdisciplinarietà”, a <http://amsacta.cib.unibo.it/archive/00002055>,

disponibile anche in versione cartacea:

Londei D., Miller D.R., Puccini P. (eds) (2006) *Insegnare le lingue/culture oggi: Il contributo dell’interdisciplinarietà*, Atti di Convegni CeSLiC 1, Bologna: Edizioni Asterisco.

e

- a cura di Miller D.R. e Pano A., *Selected Papers* di quelli presentati al convegno internazionale CeSLiC del 4-5 dicembre, 2008, dal titolo:

“La geografia della mediazione linguistico-culturale/ The Geography of Language and Cultural Mediation”, a

<http://amsacta.cib.unibo.it/2626/>

disponibile anche in versione cartacea:

Miller D.R. e Pano A.(eds) (2010) *La geografia della mediazione linguistico-culturale, Selected Papers*, Atti di Convegni CeSLiC 2, Bologna: Dupress.

e

- a cura di Miller D.R. e Monti E. (2014) *Selected Papers* di quelli presentati al convegno internazionale CeSLiC del 12-14 dicembre, 2012, dal titolo **“Tradurre Figure / Translating Figurative Language”**, a

<http://amsacta.unibo.it/4030/>

disponibile anche in versione cartacea, pubblicata da BUP, Bologna, 2014.

E, infine il quarto volume:

- a cura di Cervini, C. (2016) *Selected Papers* di quelli presentati al seminario CeSLiC del 3-4 febbraio, 2014, dal titolo **“IN A TRA – Progetti per l’apprendimento linguistico: pluralità di obiettivi, metodologie e strumenti”**, pubblicati col titolo: **“Interdisciplinarietà e Apprendimento linguistico nei nuovi contesti formativi. L’apprendente di lingue tra tradizione e innovazione”**, a

<http://amsacta.unibo.it/5069/>

Altri due volumi sono attualmente in preparazione.

Inoltre gli **E-libri del CeSLiC** comprendono anche i volumi compresi in:

3) la collana di Studi grammaticali, dal 2008 (ISSN: 2036-0274);

e

4) la collana di Altre pubblicazioni – AMS Acta, nata nel 2010 (ISSN: 2038-7954).

Tutte le pubblicazioni del centro CeSLiC sono disponibili a:

http://www.lilec.it/ceslic/?page_id=12

Oggi ho il grande piacere di presentare un nuovo *Occasional Paper*, scritto da un giovane studioso, Alberto Biondi, che nasce a Rimini l'11/03/1992. Appassionato di letteratura e scrittura creativa, nel 2010 vince il premio nazionale Subway IULM Under-19 con il racconto 'Dieci Secondi'. Nel 2011 si diploma presso il Liceo Classico "G. Cesare" di Rimini con voto 100/100. Si iscrive alla Facoltà di Lingue e Letterature Straniere dell'Università di Urbino "Carlo Bo", dove nel 2014 si laurea con voto 110/110 e lode (tesi in lingua 'Conceptual Metaphors in Newspaper Headlines'). Parallelamente agli studi, collabora con alcune testate giornalistiche nella sezione Cultura (La Voce di Romagna, La Piazza della Provincia etc.) e partecipa come interprete a due edizioni dello IeiMedia Project (Urbino). Nel 2014 pubblica il suo primo romanzo storico per ragazzi, *Le pietre di Tiberio* (Guaraldi Editore), e l'anno successivo traduce il romanzo di D.J. Taylor *The Windsor Faction*, tradotto come *L'altro discorso del re* (21 Editore). Nel 2016 consegue con voto 110/110 e lode la laurea magistrale in "Lingua, Società e Comunicazione" presso l'Università di Bologna, con una brillante tesi dal titolo 'Framing the Candidate: a Corpus-based Rhetorical Analysis of the 2016 Democratic Primaries in the USA', vincitrice del Bando Tesi all'Estero 2016, dalla quale è tratto il *paper* che segue. Dopo la laurea, ha iniziato a insegnare come supplente lingua e letteratura inglese nei licei di Rimini.

Il saggio che presentiamo, ricalcando il titolo della tesi magistrale dell'autore, s'intitola:

Framing the Candidate: a Corpus-based Rhetorical Analysis of the 2016 Democratic Primaries in the USA

In questo studio il Biondi analizza la retorica dei due principali sfidanti nelle primarie democratiche 2016: Hillary Clinton e Bernie Sanders. Per riuscire a tracciare un profilo politico-linguistico dei due candidati, sono stati raccolti e esaminati i discorsi tenuti durante la campagna elettorale, sia nei comizi che nei dibattiti televisivi. Le trascrizioni che hanno costituito i corpora di studio sono state reperite sia online sia presso gli Archivi Digitali della Library of Congress (Washington DC).

Attraverso gli strumenti tipici della linguistica dei corpora (keyword lists, semantic preferences, n-grams), si è dedicata particolare attenzione ai *frame* utilizzati da Clinton e Sanders per legittimare la propria candidatura e guidare il partito nelle elezioni generali di novembre: l'analisi svela che, da un lato, l'ex First Lady e Segretario di Stato ha puntato tutto sulla propria esperienza e pragmatismo, mentre dall'altro ne emerge che il Senatore del Vermont ha insistito maggiormente sui temi della disegualianza economica e sociale. La retorica di Hillary Clinton, fortemente incentrata sulla sua persona, ha caratterizzato una campagna più autoreferenziale, mentre lo stile di Bernie Sanders ha trasmesso un messaggio più inclusivo.

Ciò che emerge dall'analisi delle parole chiave, delle metafore concettuali e dei pattern linguistici più ricorrenti è che Clinton si è costruita come una politica esperta e combattiva, che risolve problemi, sa mediare con i repubblicani al Congresso e propone un cambiamento graduale e moderato; d'altro canto, Sanders si è rappresentato come il leader di una rivoluzione politica, un candidato anti-establishment in cerca di una svolta radicale.

Infine, l'analisi delle figure retoriche (sintattiche e lessicali) presenti nei corpora di studio si è dimostrata fondamentale nell'evidenziare le differenze tra Hillary Clinton e Bernie Sanders, tanto dal punto di vista linguistico come programmatico.

Keywords: rhetoric, metaphors, electorate, media, politics, Clinton, Sanders



Donna R. Miller

Responsabile scientifica del CeSLiC e *General Editor* dei Quaderni del CeSLiC

Bologna, lì 28 marzo 2017

Framing the Candidate: a Corpus-based Rhetorical Analysis of the 2016 Democratic Primaries in the USA

Alberto Biondi
University of Bologna

1. Introduction

This paper aims to identify the rhetorical strategies that Hillary Rodham Clinton and Bernard “Bernie” Sanders adopted during the 2016 Democratic primaries in the US. In order to analyze their different persuasion techniques, we focus on the speeches they delivered during their electoral campaigns and televised debates. After a brief theoretical premise, we analyze our corpora consisting of textual materials collected at the Library of Congress in Washington D.C.¹ Using AntConc (Version 3.2.4), a common freeware corpus analysis toolkit, we look for the most relevant keywords, conceptual metaphors and n-grams characterizing the two candidates’ style. In this way we want to explore the different frames and persuasive strategies used by Clinton and Sanders during the campaign. Regardless of the elections’ result, what stands out in our analysis is that voters in the US are more likely to choose their political leaders by their charisma rather than their agenda, meaning that personality politics exerts a deep influence on modern American society. Besides, Sanders’ rhetoric helps us to understand the anti-establishment wave that brought to Donald Trump’s rise in popularity in 2016 and, perhaps, it explains why Clinton lost in the general election.

In the next section we will provide the background of the study, in which we discuss politics in the US, the role of the electorate, the personalization of politics and the influence of gender. Then we will consider the Democratic primary process and the features of the 2016 race. Finally, after presenting a brief theoretical framework, we will analyze our corpora of speeches and find the rhetorical strategies used by Clinton and Sanders during the campaign trail.

2. Background to the study

Our public life is shaped by the strong correlation between language and power, with political leaders using their discourse in order to legitimize their claims (Thomas et al. 1999). When we talk about rhetoric we are referring to this capacity of persuading the audience and gather

¹ The research project was funded by the *School of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Interpreting and Translation* of the University of Bologna (Bando Tesi all’Estero 2016).

consensus, which may be seen as both an art based on natural charisma and a science relying on the use of certain figures of speech. Aristotle provided the first definition of rhetoric, i.e. “the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion” (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* [1355 b 25, 1356 a 19-20]). *Ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* (the appeal to the audience’s morality, emotions and reason) have been the cornerstones of rhetorical studies for twenty-five centuries, and in many ways these norms still apply to modern political discourse.

In our rhetorical analysis we will highlight several figures of speech exploited by Clinton and Sanders during the campaign; but now let us focus on the American electorate in order to better understand the ‘target’ of the candidates’ persuasion techniques.

2.1 *Politics in the US: the Values and the Electorate*

According to Lakoff (1996: 8), Republican and Democrat are not two monolithic ideologies, but rather complex categories with many nuances and variations. Unlike Europeans, most Americans are not ideologically polarized, but possess both a conservative and progressive stance which they may apply to different political issues in different circumstances of their lives (Lakoff 2004: 42). Indeed, two major factors have been identified (Lakoff 2006) as the pillars of all American values –*family* and *morality*– which affect most of the frames in political discourse. THE NATION IS A FAMILY, for instance, is a very common political metaphor used to conceptualize society in moral terms. Americans are conservative or progressive according to the family model they hold, which can be the “Strict-Father” model or the “Nurturant Parent” model (Lakoff 1996), and they usually project them on political leaders running for president. As mentioned above, most people are somewhere in the middle between the poles of this wide ideological spectrum and these are mere generalizations for the sake of clarity.

As Campbell maintains in his now-classic *The American Voter* (1968), participating in the political process is positively regarded in the US. For some people politics is still viewed as an ivory tower beyond the power of citizens to enter, but the majority consider voting as the most effective way to influence society (Campbell 1968: 58). However, in the last decades modern democracies have faced a widespread depoliticization of the electorate, namely the disenfranchisement caused by lowering voter turnouts and shrinking participation in the political process (Wattenberg 2008). As indicated in a recent survey, with a 53.6% voter turnout in the 2012 presidential election, the US rank 31st among the 35 countries in the

OECD.² On an estimated voting-population of nearly 241 million, only 129.1 million attended the polls in 2012 and in the subsequent midterm elections of 2014, voter turnout was a meagre 36.7%.³ Even though it seems to characterize the whole electorate, this phenomenon particularly affects two social groups: minority voters and the young. If, as Frey et al (2016) claim, multi-ethnic demographics and the *millennial* generation may determine the outcome of the next election cycles, as they did in 2008 with Barack Obama, the extent of their voting turnout becomes crucial. For this reason candidates design specific campaign strategies to appeal to these groups, but an overexposure to campaign ads sometimes has the side effect of turning many of them off politics (Fischer 2003).

We believe that depoliticization is not caused by civic indifference alone: the young seem to demand more choices in the political arena than older voters, who are traditionally more satisfied with the status-quo (Wattenberg 2008: 149). Young people are more ideologically flexible and often inclined to support third-party candidates and liberal agendas, hence voting for Democrats or Independents in the US. The widespread dissatisfaction with the establishment, both on the political left as well as on the right, may very well explain the rise of Donald Trump (who eventually became the Republican nominee and the president elect) and Bernie Sanders.

2.2 *The Personalization of Politics*

It is not possible to discuss American politics without taking into account the influence of newspapers, radio stations, TV and, more recently, the Internet in providing political information. Though politics, media and business have always been interdependent in the US, nowadays the boundaries between information and entertainment, campaigning and advertising are gradually blurring (Wodak 2015). During a presidential election the candidates' major battleground happens on TV, where debates, political ads, and newscasts turn election coverage into the so-called 'horse race' (Hart 1999), i.e. a struggle between individuals instead of a genuine comparison of platforms. In fact, the very nature of TV enables issues and agendas to be simplified, favoring the growth of personality politics and sensationalizing the democratic process.

According to Fischer (2003), American presidential campaigns are the clearest example of the personalization and mediatization of public life. As citizens perceive politics as a

²<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/08/02/u-s-voter-turnout-trails-most-developed-countries/> (accessed August 6, 2016).

³ <http://www.electproject.org/2014g> (accessed July 22, 2016).

competition between individual actors, political rhetoric adapts to more personalized and candidate-centered messages (Poguntke, Webb 2005: 10). Today, more than ever, the success of a political leader is determined by his or her campaign strategists, consultants, ghost writers and video makers, hence by the team of professionals that take care of a candidate's public image. In these terms, character becomes a creation of the media, no longer having anything to do with actual personal traits. Politicians try to dominate the voters' emotional lives through projecting their own emotional lives, replacing the sterility of logical arguments with a passionate, direct involvement in the issues (Hart 1999: 26). Regardless of their ideology, politicians connect with their electorate by adopting authoritarian or sympathetic features, i.e. what scholars have labeled the "strong leader" and the "empathic leader" models. Most of the time politicians try to balance both models in order to appear tough but also compassionate, firm as well as tolerant. Since in this study we will focus on Hillary Clinton's rhetorical strategies, we are particularly interested in how these models are applied by female politicians when constructing their public image, a topic we will discuss in the next section.

2.3 Does Gender influence Rhetoric?

The speech of female politicians has often been described in relation to a set of gender stereotypes held by opposite segments of society: there are those who believe politics is not suited for women, and those who see women politicians as generally more reliable and honest than men (Thomas, Wilcox 2005: 45). Neither of these stereotypes are true *per se*, yet they shape citizens' perception of women candidates running for office. If gender stereotypes involve ideas and judgements about what is proper or expected from women and men, they inevitably affect also the balance between strong leader and empathic leader in women's political charisma. Given that women are commonly perceived as more empathic than men, it has been demonstrated (Leeper 1991; Sapiro 1981;1982) that even when their message is aggressive, women sound warm and tender. Therefore, in order to strengthen their leadership skills, women politicians may feel encouraged to adopt more "masculine" traits. As Fairclough (1989: 182) puts it, women that manage to reach positions of power in the workplace or in politics have to behave like men in order to look like leaders, but if they do not succeed in finding a fair balance, they may be seen as "unfeminine" for abandoning their gender identity.

Hence, women politicians tend to use every rhetorical strategy that helps them appear "task-oriented, managerial, assertive, skilled in interpersonal dealings, frank, direct, and team-oriented" (Thomas, Wilcox 2005: 207). It is not surprising that, during her electoral

campaign, Hillary Clinton made the phrase ‘getting things done’ her personal motto. As we shall see in our analysis, her main persuasive strategy was mostly based on stressing her pragmatism.

3. Clinton vs. Sanders: the 2016 Democratic Race

In the previous section, we offered a multifaceted perspective on the American political system and on the role of personality in the ‘manufacturing of consent’ (Herman, Chomsky 1988). Let us now look closer at the object of our investigation, namely the 2016 Democratic primaries that saw former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton challenged by the Independent Senator from Vermont, Bernie Sanders.

On April 12, 2015, Clinton announced on YouTube that she would run for president in 2016, making her second attempt after the 2008 defeat against Barack Obama. Her bid for the Democratic nominee was soon echoed by Bernie Sanders (Senator from Vermont), Martin O’Malley (former Governor of Maryland), Lincoln Chafee (former Governor of Rhode Island), Jim Webb (former Senator from Virginia) and Lawrence Lessig (a Law Professor at Harvard). As the primary season approached, Chafee and Webb dropped out before the Iowa caucuses due to low polling, and Lessig also withdrew because his participation in the Democratic debates was vetoed by a change in the rules. After the virtual tie between Clinton and Sanders in the Iowa caucus, O’Malley also dropped out, leaving the former Secretary of State and the Senator from Vermont the only two contenders.

Before describing the theoretical framework of our corpus-based analysis, we shall list the general features of primary elections in the US, underlining the strategic role of leadership skills, as well as the main differences between primaries and general elections.

3.1 A “Primary” Concern: Winning the Nomination⁴

Primary elections in the US are important because they select the party’s candidate running for office and because they lay the foundations for the horse race narrative between the Republican and the Democratic frontrunner. We shall present the main differences between a primary election and a general election as outlined in Benoit (2001). Our analysis is not meant to be exhaustive, but rather a general introduction to understand how primaries are run in the US.

⁴ The following data about the Democratic primaries were collected from several websites, including The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Guardian, Politico, CNN and BBC among others.

First of all, considering that primaries are contests between representatives of the same party, rhetorical and leadership skills play a greater role than in general elections (because party affiliation does not affect the ballot). The success of a presidential candidate is closely tied to his or her popularity among primary voters, and so in order to secure the nomination politicians spend time and resources to win the popular vote. Delegates are in fact pledged to candidates according to the results of the popular vote in their states (Polsby, Wildavsky, Hopkins 2008: 33) and so charisma and name recognition are crucial in this phase. In order to gather votes, candidates take advantage of all the image-crafting strategies that increase their appeal within the electorate. Although some people argue that with the so-called ‘superdelegates’ (unbound to the popular vote, but likely to follow it) the Democratic Party has established a form of control over the nominees, charisma is always the determining factor in presidential campaigns, as in 2008 when Hillary Clinton lost against Barack Obama despite the endorsement of the party establishment.

Differently from general elections, in primary campaigns politicians concentrate their attacks on their fellow party leaders. Given that there can be multiple contenders in the early stages of the primaries, candidates need to distinguish themselves from their opponents, since it is harder for voters to choose their favorite one if the differences are not starkly underlined. Another difference with general elections is that primary races are not static, but in a “constant state of flux” (Benoit 2003: 4). Not only do the less charismatic contenders drop out of the race before the national convention, but others may join the primaries *in medias res*. Furthermore, the site of the campaign constantly changes over time and forces the candidates to travel all across the country. Considering the wide disproportion in each state’s importance, successful candidates are those who gain momentum through winning in consecutive primaries and caucuses, better if early ones. In the US primary system, the chronological order of the voting schedule is in fact more important than the states’ size or population, which leads to the paradox of relatively small states with fewer electoral college votes (like Iowa or New Hampshire) being more strategic than bigger ones.

Many have criticized this system, but Gangale (2008) has a point when he underlines that a low-budget campaign could never take off if large states such as California or Texas went first, because “it takes Big Money to win in a big state” (Gangale 2008: 33). Conversely, what determines the general elections’ outcome are the so-called ‘swing states’ or ‘purple-states’ (e.g. Ohio, Florida, Nevada etc.), where Republicans and Democrats are even, and candidates have more delegates to grab. While the Republican Party adopts a “winner take all” or “winner take most” model, Democrats assign delegates proportionally.

Politicians running for president have to announce their candidacy in a public event that will officially launch their campaign. It is the moment to introduce themselves to the general electorate and present their political agenda, as segments of their speeches will be broadcasted on national TV networks. Presidential announcements are perhaps one of the most pivotal moments of the entire campaign because they make up the first impression voters receive of a given candidate. It is the baptism of fire before a primary election cycle, where rousing speeches aim at attracting new supporters and media coverage. If Clinton insisted on the American exceptionalism, diversity and openness, picturing herself as a fighter, a champion, a problem-solver, Bernie Sanders stressed the huge differences between himself, the underdog, and Hillary, the frontrunner, launching a campaign centered on the issues rather than the candidate's personality. He addressed the issues of income inequality, campaign financing and the fight against the "top 1%" as moral issues, trying to expand the Democratic Party base where Hillary was politically weaker: among the young and to the left. Conversely, due to her neo-liberal positions on several issues (e.g. taxes, homeland security, and foreign policies), some pundits suggested that Hillary's message aimed at expanding the Democratic Party base by looking more to the center-right.

4. Theoretical framework

As we have previously mentioned, skilled orators are those who know how to exploit certain figures of speech to create an empathic bond with their audience. Before moving on to our corpus-based analysis, let us introduce very briefly some of the figures of speech we will analyze in this study as well as the notions of conceptual metaphor and frame (Fillmore 1982; Lakoff 1980, 2004).

Among the figures of speech most widely employed in contemporary rhetoric we distinguish syntactical figures of speech (i.e. parallel structures, repetitions etc.) and lexical figures of speech (i.e. synecdoche, metonymy, personification etc.) which, for methodological purposes, we shall call 'metaphors'. Even though a wide spectrum of persuasive strategies is used by politicians to legitimize their claims (Thomas et al. 1999), here we focus specifically on metaphors due to their strong conceptual effects (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Burgers 2016). For instance, when Clinton described the political gridlock in Congress during her presidential announcement, she used the figurative expression "to turn the tide so these currents start working for us more than against us" entailed by the conceptual metaphors POLITICS IS A SEA VOYAGE and IMPEDIMENTS ARE ROUGH WATERS, which is also where the common "sea of troubles" metaphor comes from.

Whether used by poets or public speakers, metaphors can manipulate the audience in virtue of their capacity of revealing previously hidden similarities, as Aristotle wrote in *Poetics* (1457b [6-9], translated by S.H. Butcher).⁵ With the development of the Cognitivist paradigm in the last thirty years (Lakoff, Johnson 1980), linguistics has ceased to treat metaphors as fancy embellishments belonging to literary discourse alone: in fact, the whole conceptual system which we use to think with is said to be structured – unconsciously, for the most part – by metaphors (Lakoff, Johnson 1980; 1999). In the cognitive vision of human thought, metaphorical expressions are key in establishing frames, i.e. highly-persuasive networks of coherent ideas (Johnson-Cartee 2004: 24). When our brain is involved in a framing process, we basically select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more relevant, which is exactly what conceptual metaphors also do. As Lakoff (2004) puts it, frames are fundamental in political rhetoric because they highlight some aspects of reality while obscuring others. Hence their effect is greater when metaphors create an overlapping between clashing semantic domains and forge new meaning through “blending” operations (Fauconnier, Turner 2002).

We suggest that the role of metaphors, as outlined by Cognitivism and Relevance Theory (Sperber, Wilson 1986; 1995), is to make some messages more salient, more visually effective, hence increasing the persuasive power of their frames (Burgers et al. 2016). Our rhetorical analysis will thus include identification of the features of Clinton and Sanders’ figurative language.

5. Corpus-based rhetorical analysis

In this final section we present our corpus-based rhetorical analysis of some of Clinton and Sanders’ speeches during the 2016 primaries. Using the software AntConc, we look for keyword lists, n-grams and the more typical collocations of the lexical items triggering the candidates’ frames. To broaden the scope of our study and analyze the candidates’ rhetoric more thoroughly, we shall also analyze two general corpora which include Clinton’s 2008 campaign speeches and Sanders’ 2015 interventions in the U.S. Senate. In fact, rather than being incidental, certain linguistic patterns (i.e. the n-grams) are features of their rhetoric as a whole. Our analysis treats keyness values, semantic preference and clusters as linguistic evidence of the candidates’ framing process. We built three major corpora: Clinton and Sanders’ 2016 *campaign corpus* (henceforth, CC), the candidates’ *general corpus* (GC) and a *reference corpus* (RC). Clinton and Sanders’ CC amount to 207,599 and 119,504 word tokens

⁵ <http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/aristotl/poetics.pdf> (accessed 15 May, 2016).

respectively; their GC, which include the 2008 campaign speeches (Clinton) and the 2015 Senate interventions (Sanders), amount to 436,103 and 246,820 word tokens respectively; finally we used a nearly 2-million-word corpus as our RC, combining the untagged version of the Brown Corpus and all the corpora we created for our study (for a total of 1,928,343 word tokens).

The speeches were collected from the digital archives of the Library of Congress in Washington D.C. (Thomas Jefferson Building and James Madison Building Room 242), while the transcripts of the televised debates were downloaded from three websites (CNN, *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*). The transcripts were sorted so that only the candidates' interventions, excluding the interviewer and the public's remarks, became part of their CC and GC. Furthermore, as typical when studying oral language, the queries in AntConc were carried out treating all data as lowercase. As far as keywords are concerned, we generated the first 100 from Clinton and Sanders' CC with the log-likelihood method⁶ and then we compared the two lists. The CC was also investigated in relation to the semantic preference of some significant keywords and lexical items that were particularly relevant in the candidates' speeches. Then we broadened our study of Clinton and Sanders' rhetoric focusing on the n-grams extrapolated from the GC.

5.1 Clinton's Keyword List – Table 1⁷

Clinton's keyword list reveals that she framed her message around two main topics: her character and foreign policy. Expressions such as “I'm going to set the goals”, “I want to make sure that [...]” underline her pragmatism, while the several references to the Middle-East reveal her strong diplomatic position.

In her first 25 keywords, the words with the highest keyness value compared to the RC are the pronoun *I* (3676.292) and the inclusive pronoun *we* (1307.088). As we were expecting, Clinton's rhetoric was heavily self-centered and her speeches show the personalization of her campaign. The other top keywords are strictly related to the doer/pragmatist frame we described previously: *do* (419.100), *get* (386.475), *want* (318.127) and *try* (235.224) say much about Hillary's practical approach to politics, while the presence of *going* (413.042), embedded in the phrases “I'm going” or “we're going” and usually followed by “to have”, “to make”, “to fight”, “to deal with”, conveys the image of a strong leader that plans and “gets

⁶ In corpus analysis, the log-likelihood method is a statistical tool combining the different frequencies of a word token between two corpora (the corpus of study and the reference corpus).

⁷ The tables (keyword lists and n-gram lists) are located after the Conclusions to the paper.

things done”. Other important keywords appearing among the top 50 are *really* (319.326), *lot* (314.919), *hard* (176.074) and *very* (151.459), which Clinton used to emphasize her message: e.g. “But for me, I really love this country”, “we really have focused on issues”, “working as hard as I can” etc.

What stands out immediately among her top 100 keywords are those related to foreign policy and the Middle-East: *iran* (178.853), *isis* (155.243), *syria* (109.572), *israel* (97.921), *terrorist* (97.022), *assad* (76.490), *sanctions* (64.648), *coalition* (64.124), and *sunni* (52.155): e.g. “Our strategy should have three main elements. One, defeat ISIS in Syria, Iraq and across the Middle East; two, disrupt and dismantle the growing terrorist infrastructure that facilitates the flow of fighters, financing arms and propaganda around the world; three, harden our defenses and those of our allies against external and homegrown threats”. The experience Clinton gained as Secretary of State was one of her strongest legitimizing factors, and it is clear how she focused her communication strategy on foreign policy to sound like a Commander-in-Chief. Certainly the high keyness value of these lexical items is due to their low incidence in the RC, but in Sanders’ keyword list we find only *isis* (169.889) relating to foreign policy in his top 100, meaning that foreign policy was not at the core of his message. On the other hand, Clinton’s deep knowledge of the geopolitical situation in the Middle-East was crucial in shaping her rhetoric and framing her interventionist, pro-Israel and anti-Russian stance as the most reasonable and well-advised strategy possible.

Regardless of her views, Clinton’s keyword list shows how emphasizing a traditionally “masculine” field such as foreign policy helped her to reinforce her charisma and overcome the stereotypes commonly associated with women politicians (as described in 2.3.). Her linguistic choices also fit in the “fighter” frame she tried to build during her campaign, sometimes emphasizing an aggressiveness that her detractors ascribed to her hawkish positions.

Clinton also talked a lot about domestic issues: keywords such as *kids* (101.955), *gun* (88.394) and *comprehensive* [immigration reform] (86.866) reveal that improving child-care, passing legislation for gun control, and reforming immigration policies were all top priorities in her agenda: e.g. “to get your kids the opportunities they deserve”, “help kids develop and flourish”, “90 people a day dying for gun violence”, “I will fight for comprehensive immigration reform” etc. What is more, *republicans* (149.460) appeared with a high keyness value and analysis of the concordances suggests that Clinton tried to delegitimize them by attacking their views and legislation: e.g. “The Republicans have voted to repeal it 60 times”,

“The Republicans marshaled the votes against it”, “The Republicans still want to privatize it” etc.

It is interesting to note how in her keyword list *obama* (126.013) has a very high keyness value, suggesting that her references to his administration were an attempt to continue his legacy: e.g. “President Obama and I [...]”, “I don’t think President Obama gets the credit he deserves” etc. However, the same is not true for Sanders: in fact, the log-likelihood generation method does not even include *obama* among his CC keyword list. This may be due to Sanders’ intention to transform the American political system and fight against the establishment (which the President in part represents), or simply because he used a different strategy to address the African-American electorate, as shown in the next section.

5.2 Sanders’ Keyword List – Table 2

Bernie Sanders proved to be an outsider also according to the rhetorical standards of traditional US politics. His top 100 keywords could be read as a compendium of his democratic-socialist revolution. He framed his message around two major topics: fighting income inequality and reforming the American political system.

If we look at the relatively low keyness of *I* (195.953), ranking 16th, and at the high keyness of *we* (686.527), the second highest keyword, we see how Sanders’ message was more inclusive and less personalized than Clinton’s: e.g. “This has got to change and, together we will change it”, “We are fighting for the planet” etc. Also, the absence of *me* or *my* (which appeared within her top 50 keywords) is telling of his de-personalized rhetoric. *Country* (719.699) is the word with the highest keyness value, mostly because of the frequent cluster Sanders used to compare the US to other nations: e.g. “we now have more income and wealth inequality than any other *major* (187.303) country on *earth* (88.708)”.

Unlike Clinton’s, Sanders’ core message did not leverage on American exceptionalism and he never missed a chance to expose the problems of the US. Wall Street, *wall* (396.125) and *street* (381.390), ranking in his top 10, was the main target of his critiques: big *banks* (82.890) and *financial* (131.818) institutions are directly responsible for the growing *income* (136.772) and *wealth* (199.691) *inequality* (76.286). In fact, the *system* (139.583) does not work for all Americans, but just for those at the top, and in this way the *billionaire* (123.504) *class* (147.523) has *rigged* (72.729) not only the *economy* (104.193) but also the campaign finance system with their *super-pacs* (85.781). The *greed* (102.256) of the *wealthiest* (101.874) has brought *disastrous* (108.730) effects on the American economy and *democracy* (83.984), and he underlined the gap between the 99% and the top 1% by repeating *handful* (91.300) when

talking about billionaires and *millions* (338.817) when talking about the people: e.g. “Our government is going to work for all of us, not just a handful of billionaires”, “And we can do that when millions of people stand up, fight back, and create a government that works for all of us, not just the 1 percent” etc.

Sanders’ most typical feature is the use of numbers, percentages and proportions, which explains the high keyness of *percent* (217.788). Furthermore, the keyness value of word tokens such as *campaign* (380.475) and *political* (269.977) *revolution* (83.376) demonstrate how central these issues were in his rhetoric. The keywords we have selected here, all ranking within the top 100, define his fight for radical change. Sanders also pushed forward other progressive battles: reforming the criminal justice system;⁸ passing an immigration bill;⁹ raising the minimum wage;¹⁰ and making public colleges and universities tuition free,¹¹ among others. In his rhetoric there seems to be an interdependence between the economic system and the political system, and what his keyword list tells us is that he focused more on his platform rather than his personality. Sanders managed to frame himself as the inspiring leader of a democratic-socialist revolution, introducing a terminology (e.g. “working-class”, “oligarchy”, “redistribution of wealth” etc.) that was almost unconceivable in traditional American rhetoric. He concentrated his non-partisan attacks on the *establishment* (158.622) rather than delegitimizing Republicans as Clinton did. While she went for a more traditional campaign with the support of longtime Democrats and party officials, Sanders tried to broaden the progressive electorate by appealing to millennials and Independents, calling for a larger voter *turnout* (67.891). As we have already said, *obama* is not so crucial in Bernie’s rhetoric. This is telling of his strategy of addressing minority voters (especially African-American) who supported Obama in 2008 and 2012: Sanders pushed forward the reform of the criminal justice system, stressing the need to implement *jobs* (115.414) and education in low-income neighborhoods and inner-cities, while Clinton mentioned the President more often as a means of continuing his legacy: e.g. “We must become the country in the world which invests in jobs and education, not in jails and incarceration”.

Let us now focus on the conceptual implications of Clinton and Sanders’ figurative language. Keywords alone are not sufficient to fully understand the persuasive effects of a candidate’s rhetoric, and we need to broaden the scope of our linguistic investigation by looking at the semantic preference (i.e. the lexical environment) and conceptual metaphors

⁸ *african* [American] (107.484), *jail* (105.232), *justice* (88.977), *criminal* (68.210).

⁹ *latino* (72.305), *immigration* (66.815).

¹⁰ *wage* (106.014), *minimum* (49.152).

¹¹ *tuition* (68.414).

entailed by certain relevant words. We begin by looking at Clinton's, then we describe Sanders' in a comparative way.

5.3 Conceptual Metaphors in Clinton's CC

Given that Clinton has been represented as fighter, doer within pragmatist frame, we investigated the semantic preference of *fight**, *going to**, *try** and *everybody* in her CC; then we searched *hard**, *more* and *strong** in order to identify the figurative language associated to these words.

When we analyzed *fight**, we focused on the verbal tenses and secondly on the names appearing in the concordances. We noticed that Clinton made an extensive use of the present perfect continuous and quite often employed the verb "to keep" to frame herself as a champion who has been fighting throughout her career and will continue to do so: e.g. "I've been fighting for children and families my entire adult life", "I've been talking to a lot of these families", "I will keep standing up for you" etc. Hillary associated her image as a fighter with the experience she gained in the White House and in the U.S. Senate. In the semantic preference of *fight** we encountered several instances of *children and family*, which is not incidental: e.g. "families need a champion who will fight for them every single day" etc. In fact, having worked at the Children's Defense Fund, Clinton employed various forms of "to fight", as well as "to defend", "to support", "to help", at a higher frequency when talking about family policies: e.g. "help families get ahead", "I'm going to defend, protect, and improve the Affordable Care Act" etc. We shall not forget that, as the first woman candidate running for president, Clinton has generated empathy in many female voters, and to gain their support it is paramount for her to leverage on gender consciousness. When in her speeches Clinton has repeated "when families are strong, America is strong", she was not simply using an effective epistrophe: Clinton evoked the conceptual metaphor the nation is a family and created a parallelism between the role of mother and the role of Commander-in-Chief. This is perhaps the most powerful identification metaphor in Hillary's rhetoric, but it ended up being successful only within a certain demographics (Sanders won the millennial women's vote by a big margin¹²).

Another verb that we found in the semantic preference of *fight** is "to stand up": although *stand up and fight* is a very common cluster in English, it is nonetheless an entailment of the

¹² As *Politico* reports, in New Hampshire Bernie Sanders won the votes of 82% of women under age 30 and nationwide the percentage was always above 70%. <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/02/hillary-clinton-2016-woman-problem-213621> (accessed 23 May, 2016).

orientational metaphor good is up and bad is down. The vision of heroes rising and villains falling is so deeply rooted that Hillary used several orientational metaphors of this kind to reinforce her image of a champion: e.g. “I want to stand up and fight for people”, “let us resolve that we will go forward together”, “I am the strongest candidate to go up against any Republican” etc. The motto she repeated during the campaign was “breaking through the glass ceiling”, which is obviously a movement upward representing women breaking barriers.

We studied the “doer” frame by searching the subject of *going to** and *try**. With the phrases “I’m going to/we’re going to” Hillary introduced most of her action verbs (*do, make, get, work, build, deal with, solve* etc.) and *try** usually preceded verbs related to understanding (*figure out, determine, decide* etc.). In both cases, she added “as hard as I can” (ten times in her CC) as a means of emphasizing her message. In the semantic preference of *going to** and *try** it is not uncommon to find *better, harder, stronger* usually associated to policy making, the economy or the military: e.g. “No other country is better equipped to meet traditional threats”, “It’s why I supported stronger defense systems” etc. Clinton’s extensive use of “more” gave a sense of incremental growth to her speeches, framing her rhetoric as the movement forward or upward we have already described. The idea behind Clinton’s rhetoric is that strong power is effective power, change is a top-down movement, and bold leadership is the key to a fairer society. Hillary insisted on the necessity of building strong relationships at home (the nation is a family) but especially abroad (alliances are buildings), stressing her diplomatic skills and expertise. This leads us to our next query, aimed at analyzing Clinton’s “pragmatist” frame.

To identify the linguistic features triggering her ability to “get things done”, we looked into the semantic preference of the keyword *everybody*. It was not uncommon to find words such as “Republicans” and “Independents” in the semantic preference, meaning that Clinton tried to frame herself as a non-divisive leader: e.g. “I work closely with everybody, including Republicans”, “There is a lot Democrats and Republicans can and should agree on” etc. She repeated the expressions “to work/to reach across the aisle” several times to highlight her capacity to bridge the gap with her political opponents (POLICY MAKING IS COLLABORATION). In this sense, her approach to politics was completely opposite to Sanders’: while the Senator from Vermont remained ideologically consistent throughout his career, the former Secretary of State changed her mind on different occasions, on various issues – as in opposing and then promoting same-sex marriages and voting for the Iraq war –, in order to find an agreement (or compromise) with the Republicans. Her persuasive strategy, completely based on

pragmatism, was also an attempt to frame Bernie's more progressive and radical platform as "pie in the sky" that could never pass through a Republican-controlled Senate.

5.4 *Conceptual Metaphors in Sanders' CC*

Considering that Sanders' campaign focused primarily on the US economic and political system, we were interested in searching the semantic preference of keywords such as *wall street*, *wage**, *job**, *justice*, and *democracy*. We also looked into the qualifiers characterizing the word *establishment*, in order to understand which rhetorical devices Sanders used to attack his opponents. The conceptual metaphors we found relate primarily to income inequality, morality and change.

Sanders tried to convey the necessity of his political reform with a rhetoric centered on statistics, numbers and evocative adjectives. Instead of framing himself as the most suited candidate, he juxtaposed the problems America faces with the causes of these problems, i.e. the economic and political system. We started by studying the semantic preference of *wall street*, a metonymy that includes banks, insurance companies, financial institutions and corporate America: almost in every speech Sanders repeated the tricolon "greed, recklessness and illegal behavior of Wall Street" when referring to big money interests: e.g. "I believe that the greed, recklessness, and the illegal behavior of Wall Street drove this country into the worst economic downturn in the modern history of the USA". This negative personification was generated by the conceptual metaphors WALL STREET IS AN INSATIABLE MONSTER and WALL STREET IS A MERCILESS CRIMINAL that ideally constituted the pillars of Sanders' rhetoric. Capitalism was dehumanized and seen as taking advantage of a deregulated market, something that provided the legitimation of imposing a "tax on Wall Street speculation" to pay for welfare programs. In the semantic preference of *wall street* we found references to lobbyists and billionaires "buying elections" (ELECTIONS ARE GOODS), "rigging" the economic as well as the political system: e.g. "Wall Street and the billionaire class are able to buy elections", "This type of rigged economy is not what America is supposed to be" etc. The campaign finance system based on multimillion contributions, "dominated" by super-PACs, is *toxic* (MONEY IN POLITICS IS A POISON) and "undermines the foundations" of American democracy (DEMOCRACY IS A BUILDING). *Huge*, one of Sanders' favorite adjectives, appears mostly in front of words belonging to the semantic domain of money: deficit, bailout, tax breaks, campaign contributions, profits, banks etc. It served as a means of underlining the disproportion between the wealthiest and the disappearing middle-class.

The “disastrous” consequences of an economy that works just for the top 1% can be identified by looking at the semantic preference of *wage** and *job** in Sanders’ CC: instead of millions of “decent paying jobs” that could be created by investing in public infrastructures, Sanders claimed that trade agreements like NAFTA or the TTP were signed to help corporations move their production abroad. In the semantic preference of *wage** we found evocative qualifiers such as “starvation wages”, “Chinese wages”, “totally inadequate wages”, “working longer hours for lower wages” and the effective phrase “raise the minimum wage to a living wage” which derived from the conceptual metaphor THE MINIMUM WAGE IS A FORM OF SLAVERY. Framed in this way, Sanders’ proposal to raise the minimum wage to \$15 an hour ceased to be an economic issue and became a moral issue. This is the reason why Sanders’ rhetoric reverberated so powerfully among working-class people, because he framed income inequality in terms of social justice: he talked about the redistribution of wealth in moral terms, usually employing the anaphora “There is no justice when...” before denouncing the conditions of low-income families. The semantic preference of *justice* showed very clearly the correlation between poverty, unemployment and the overpopulation of jails. This bond between creating a fairer economy and reforming the criminal justice system was so entrenched in Sanders’ rhetoric that it ultimately defined his very idea of democracy: the economic gap and the political misrepresentation of low-income families are the causes of the decreasing voter turnout in the US, which is the symptom of a democracy that has turned into oligarchy. The conceptual metaphor DEMOCRACY IS A DYING PATIENT entails a whole set of linguistic expressions: “*strengthen* our democracy”, “he *reinvigorated* democracy”, “*revitalize* American democracy” etc.. Establishment politics and economics do not provide effective solutions and they are usually introduced by the phrase “it’s too late for...”: e.g. “It is just too late for establishment politics and establishment economics” etc. If we look into the semantic preference of *establishment* we find constant references to Clinton and the political revolution. As far as change is concerned, instead of framing it as a top-down movement brought by strong leadership, Sanders framed it as a bottom-up movement brought by “millions of people”.

Given that Sanders did not fit into the traditional two-party system, he gained the support of many young voters. Thanks to his remarks about college education and environmental issues, he won a demographics that considered Clinton the uttermost expression of the establishment. When we analyzed the semantic preference of *debt* in his CC, we found adjectives such as “outrageous”, “suffocating”, “horrendous”, and the resonant metaphor “a mountain of debt burdening students for decades”. Clinton used a similar language to talk

about student debt, calling it a “cumbersome” burden which makes students “drawn” (STUDENT DEBT IS A HEAVY WEIGHT); however, when proposing to “refinance” it she used a milder, more neutral tone than Sanders: e.g. “I’m going to set forth my plan to refinance student debt” etc. . Again, through the choice of semantically-charged adjectives, Sanders gave a moral connotation to the issue of student debt, as he did with income inequality in general. When talking about climate change, Clinton framed it as an opportunity to invest in renewable energies and create jobs, transforming the US into a “clean energy superpower” (CLIMATE CHANGE IS AN ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY), while he insisted more on the actual existence of the phenomenon, as opposed to Republicans that claim it is a hoax (CLIMATE CHANGE IS A REAL THREAT).

In the following paragraph we shall broaden the scope of our corpus-based rhetorical analysis by looking at the recurring patterns in Clinton and Sanders’ GC.

5.5 *N-grams in the Candidates’ GC*

We studied the thirty most frequent discursive patterns in Clinton and Sanders’ GC by looking at the more typical four-grams and six-grams. As we did for keywords, we treated all data as lowercase and sorted the lists by deleting the contracted forms of the same phrases. We also included the transitional probability as a means of displaying the predictability for adjacent elements to co-occur.

As far as Clinton’s n-grams are concerned, most of them are structures introduced by the pronoun *I*, phrases with “going to” or action verbs (Table 3.). What is interesting to note is how she repeated “as president I will” or “when I say solutions I mean”, to sound like a hard-working leader trying to accomplish her goals. Emphatic structures are also very frequent in Clinton’s GC, for example “to do more”, “do everything I can”, “we’ve got to do more” etc. that fit into the frame of incremental change and movement forward. The presence of “the affordable care act”, “the children s health insurance program” and “live up to his or her god given potential” is also telling of the relevance family policies and children have in Clinton’s GC. If we look at Sanders’ four-grams and six-grams (Table 4.), we notice that the typical structures Hillary uses to frame herself as a strong leader (i.e. pronoun *I*, action verbs) are not a feature of Sanders’ rhetoric. Instead, we find repetitions of “major country on earth” and “world” that Bernie employs to draw frequent comparisons between the US and other industrialized nations. What his n-grams reveal is a rhetoric centered on the issue of income and wealth inequality, and the phrases he repeats are: “the top one tenth of [1%]” and “the wealthiest people in this country” should start “paying their fair share of taxes”; citizens are

“working longer hours for lower wages” and the government should create millions “of decent paying jobs” by investing in public infrastructures. Some of his typical phrases relate to healthcare (i.e. “health care to all”, “highest prices in the world for prescription [drugs]”) and the criminal justice system (i.e. “more people in jail than any other country”). As we already said when analyzing his keywords and conceptual metaphors, Sanders legitimized his political revolution by framing income inequality and social justice as a moral issue.

6. Conclusions

At the DNC in Philadelphia Clinton was officially appointed the Democratic nominee for the 2016 presidential elections. She received a total of 15,805,136 votes, which gave her 2,220 pledged delegates, while Sanders earned 12,029,699 votes for 1,831 pledged delegates. Given that Clinton did not manage to reach the number of 2,383 pledged delegates necessary to win through popular vote, the superdelegates decided her nomination in Philadelphia. After the roll-call, Clinton ended up with 2,807 delegates (591 unpledged) and Sanders with 1,894 delegates (only 48 unpledged). If we look at the map of the primaries and caucuses’ results, we note that Clinton scored big wins in Southern states and in large cities, where communities are more ethnically diverse, while Sanders proved stronger in Northern states and in the Mid-West, especially in white, blue-collar towns and rural areas. Minority voters, especially African-Americans and Latinos, were more likely to support Clinton, but Sanders won the millennials’ vote and proved that it is possible to launch a vibrant campaign even without the help of a multimillion super-PAC. While it is true that Sanders managed to expand the Democratic Party base involving Independents and disenfranchised citizens, Clinton counted on die-hard Democrats, minority voters, Bill Clinton’s *aficionados* and party officials to consolidate her support and secure the primary race. Besides, being less polarized than Sanders, she was appreciated also by those centrist voters that did not feel the urge of a political revolution. In this sense, Sanders’ anti-establishment message was perhaps too radical for the so-called “moderates” that constitute the majority of the American electorate.

Clinton’s rhetoric that pictured her as a fighter, a doer, a pragmatist was exactly what TV was looking for. She fitted perfectly into the campaign narrative of traditional media, framing herself as a strong, charismatic leader able to “get things done”. Her speeches underlined these personal traits with an abundance of action verbs and comparatives, exploiting conceptual metaphors such as THE NATION IS A FAMILY and POLICY MAKING IS COLLABORATION that stressed her tenacity and political know-how. When it comes to decide which family model she incarnated, Clinton was probably a mixture of “Strict-Father” and

“Nurturant Parent”: in domestic policy, due to her long-standing commitment to promote welfare programs, she followed the Nurturant Parent model; however in foreign policy she assumed all the features of a muscular, Strict-Father (or maybe Strict-Mother) diplomat that is not afraid to take bold measures. As her keyword list reveals, the experience she gained serving as Secretary of State allowed her to put foreign policy at the core of her persuasive discourse; during the debates, her deep knowledge of the Middle-East was her forte, and on matters of national security she sounded more presidential than Sanders, although maybe not as progressive. Even though Clinton struggled to win the support of millennials, she nonetheless managed to stress the historical chance of electing a woman president for the first time in the US history. Some pundits labeled it as “playing the woman card”, but after all it turned out to be a good strategy. She framed her candidacy as a fight for gender equality, a message that resonated powerfully among women voters.

Sanders' rhetoric framed his fight against income and wealth inequality as a moral issue, focusing on America's problems and drawing frequent comparisons with other countries. Sanders' critiques of the economic and political system touched a raw nerve and were directed mostly towards Wall Street, conceptualized as an insatiable monster or a merciless criminal, and towards billionaires that “buy” elections (ELECTIONS ARE GOODS and MONEY IN POLITICS IS A POISON). American democracy was framed as a building that is being undermined by big money interests or as a dying patient that needs to be revitalized by increasing citizens' participation in the political process. His use of emotionally-charged adjectives and colorful expressions when talking about the establishment or the conditions of the middle-class revealed a genuine commitment to his cause and served to strengthen his personality. Furthermore, what contributed most in building his image of honest candidate was refusing donations from super-PACs, a rather unusual decision in modern American politics. If we had to apply a family model to Bernie Sanders, it would certainly be the “Nurturant Parent”: his plan to create a single-payer healthcare program, end mass-incarceration through jobs and education, and stop military interventions abroad were all good examples of empathy applied to policy making. His vibrant campaign, which channeled a surging wave of anti-establishment and protest votes, helps us understand the success of Donald Trump in the general elections, although his views of radical change were the complete opposite.

Our corpus-based analysis, with its focus on the candidates' syntactical and lexical figures of speech, conceptual metaphors and frames, proved invaluable in enabling the above features to be identified. Clinton and Sanders differed not only in matters of platform, but especially in

their persuasive discourse. Although eventually Clinton managed to win the primary race, her defeat in the general elections suggests that her traditional rhetoric was not as effective against Trump, who instead took advantage of the protest vote. Prospecting Democratic candidates for future election campaigns might well benefit by focusing more on the issues rather than personality politics, proposing bold measures to face the growing income inequality and citizens' disenfranchisement. We believe that nothing would damage the Democratic Party more than just attacking Trump on his personality, without proposing a viable alternative to tackle the above-mentioned issues.

Tables

Table 1. – Top 100 Keywords in Clinton’s CC

Rank	Frequency	Keyness	Word Token
1	6795	3676.292	i
2	4052	1307.088	we
3	1465	1158.365	know
4	1046	761.199	think
5	8657	684.361	to
6	2529	632.464	have
7	4816	595.780	that
8	2779	550.251	you
9	1419	540.761	so
10	695	516.342	m
11	1466	441.458	what
12	1229	419.100	do
13	844	413.042	going
14	784	386.475	get
15	842	368.804	because
16	616	340.620	ve
17	420	319.326	really
18	657	318.127	want
19	446	314.919	lot
20	686	278.660	re
21	2249	276.146	s
22	1167	270.859	people
23	682	252.130	well
24	242	235.224	try
25	966	197.985	can
26	343	196.204	look
27	238	193.623	yes
28	2696	181.191	it
29	154	178.853	iran
30	282	177.902	support
31	303	176.074	hard
32	1464	165.328	they
33	988	162.128	about
34	139	155.243	isis
35	556	151.459	very
36	169	149.460	republicans
37	467	147.729	don
38	643	147.359	me
39	593	146.038	just
40	485	134.433	need
41	356	133.358	got
42	564	127.077	president
43	525	126.233	make
44	191	126.013	obama
45	1013	125.302	t
46	7194	124.953	and
47	182	119.418	tryng
48	711	117.219	my
49	145	114.898	everybody
50	88	109.572	syria
51	462	107.306	work
52	72	106.171	incomes

53	158	101.955	kids
54	207	100.986	kind
55	97	97.721	israel
56	62	97.022	terrorist
57	161	94.046	everything
58	1136	93.539	our
59	470	92.808	how
60	118	88.394	gun
61	85	86.866	comprehensive
62	837	79.771	there
63	56	76.490	assad
64	364	74.847	go
65	279	71.602	against
66	108	69.596	affordable
67	184	69.080	doing
68	93	67.928	hampshire
69	454	67.250	us
70	154	66.567	actually
71	98	65.410	build
72	320	64.768	say
73	43	64.648	sanctions
74	81	64.430	absolutely
75	58	64.124	coalition
76	138	64.021	talking
77	205	63.804	big
78	308	62.686	take
79	127	62.668	deal
80	397	60.954	shuild
81	38	60.134	dodd
82	71	59.387	Businesses
83	198	59.292	done
84	138	58.537	mean
85	183	58.432	sure
86	89	58.174	agree
87	230	57.725	help
88	155	56.168	able
89	61	55.826	ok
90	123	55.711	worked
91	103	53.808	certainly
92	56	53.344	attacks
93	74	53.198	anybody
94	184	52.743	best
95	58	52.662	kinds
96	235	52.524	am
97	77	52.159	whatever
98	26	52.155	sunni
99	742	51.988	more
100	42	51.982	partners

Table 2. – Top 100 Keywords in Sanders' CC

Rank	Frequency	Keyness	Word Token
1	673	719.699	country
2	2244	686.527	we
3	993	615.293	people
4	2893	453.687	that
5	255	396.125	wall

6	2124	382.294	is
7	265	381.390	street
8	296	380.475	campaign
9	217	338.817	millions
10	1113	311.063	not
11	214	269.977	political
12	243	217.788	percent
13	263	210.294	united
14	790	206.621	what
15	126	199.691	whealth
16	2186	195.953	i
17	232	190.659	secretary
18	237	190.266	working
19	1249	188.213	have
20	159	187.303	major
21	85	178.136	billionaires
22	107	169.889	isis
23	250	169.757	today
24	212	167.321	money
25	308	162.671	america
26	72	158.622	establishment
27	254	156.562	got
28	150	150.920	workers
29	331	148.614	need
30	185	147.523	class
31	70	140.589	super
32	200	139.583	system
33	150	136.772	income
34	304	134.609	american
35	600	132.610	do
36	103	131.818	financial
37	225	129.717	believe
38	267	126.911	let
39	97	123.811	paying
40	47	123.504	billionaire
41	247	118.279	states
42	193	115.414	jobs
43	1008	108.803	are
44	50	108.730	disastrous
45	140	107.838	issue
46	69	107.484	african
47	92	106.014	wage
48	58	105.232	jail
49	331	104.478	very
50	167	104.193	economy
51	279	103.704	right
52	152	103.333	middle
53	371	102.934	think
54	42	102.256	greed
55	59	101.874	wealthiest
56	47	100.984	fossil
57	71	100.181	poverty
58	717	99.441	our
59	55	99.010	decent
60	37	95.662	corrupt
61	141	95.090	talk
62	62	92.636	corporate
63	990	92.325	this

64	44	91.881	guarantee
65	33	91.802	schultz
66	41	91300	handful
67	50	90.872	finance
68	208	89.150	must
69	85	88.977	justice
70	79	88.708	earth
71	52	88.544	contributions
72	70	87.976	huge
73	104	87.606	kids
74	41	86.951	voter
75	64	86.656	vermont
76	31	85.781	pacs
77	60	84.902	unemployment
78	32	84.655	pac
79	62	83.984	democracy
80	56	83.376	revolution
81	66	82.290	banks
82	39	82.049	media
83	86	81.777	dollars
84	68	79.823	reform
85	77	78.892	wages
86	613	78.863	all
87	130	77.822	tell
88	167	76.413	americans
89	44	76.286	inequality
90	82	75.156	legislation
91	347	73.863	going
92	28	72.729	rigged
93	30	72.305	latino
94	44	68.414	tuition
95	47	68210	criminal
96	34	68.194	transform
97	41	68.088	fuel
98	27	67.891	turnout
99	261	67.751	should
100	49	66.815	immigration

Table 3. – Top 30 N-grams in Clinton’s GC

Rank	Frequency	Prob	N-gram
1	460	0.006	we re going to
2	246	0.003	we ve got to
3	225	0.002	i m going to
4	171	0.002	i don t think
5	168	0.002	i think it s
6	128	0.002	that s why i
7	127	0.001	and i want to
8	113	0.001	to make sure that
9	97	0.001	to be able to
10	88	0.001	a lot of people
11	85	0.001	in the white house
12	81	0.007	when it comes to
13	65	0.000	the affordable care act
14	63	0.000	the war in iraq
15	58	0.001	we need to do
16	55	0.000	to be part of

17	54	0.003	as president I will
18	53	0.001	i also want to
19	52	0.005	president of the united states
20	52	0.000	to figure out how
21	49	0.001	i don t want
22	49	0.000	to do more to
23	48	0.003	do everything i can
24	47	0.006	one of the most
25	23	0.000	the children s health insurance program
26	21	0.000	we ve got to do more
27	20	0.002	when i say solutions i mean
28	18	0.025	live up to his or her god given potential
29	14	0.002	at home and around the world
30	14	0.000	we have a lot of work to do

Table 4. – Top 30 N-grams in Sanders’ GC

Rank	Frequency	Prob	N-gram
1	141	0.006	we are going to
2	119	0.005	in the united states
3	81	0.004	we have got to
4	73	0.020	at a time when
5	71	0.014	when we talk about
6	70	0.007	people in this country
7	68	0.046	major country on earth
8	67	0.012	all over this country
9	64	0.001	the united states of america
10	58	0.001	the affordable care act
11	51	0.009	all over the world
12	50	0.002	i don t think
13	50	0.002	of the american people
14	47	0.002	in the history of
15	43	0.022	health care to all
16	41	0.001	the top one tenth of
17	37	0.001	to make sure that
18	35	0.001	and by the way
19	34	0.009	going to the top
20	34	0.042	public colleges and universities
21	33	0.017	income and wealth inequality
22	33	0.001	of decent paying jobs
23	33	0.001	the middle class and
24	32	0.105	hundreds of thousands of
25	30	0.001	the wealthiest people in this country
26	29	0.001	the only major country on earth
27	22	0.014	working longer hours for lower wages
28	21	0.009	more people in jail than any other country
29	18	0.033	paying their fair share of taxes
30	17	0.096	highest prices in the world for prescription

References

- Aristotle, *Poetics* 1457b [6-9], translated by S.H. Butcher (2000)
<http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/aristotl/poetics.pdf>.
- Aristotle, *Rhetoric* [1407a] translation from: <http://rhetoric.eserver.org/aristotle/rhet3-4.html>.
- Anthony, L. (2011). AntConc (Version 3.2.4) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University.
- Barnstein, C. (2007). *A Woman in Charge: The Life of Hillary Rodham Clinton*. New York: Knopf Publishing Group.
- Benoit, W. (2001). *The Primary Decision: A Functional Analysis of Debates in Presidential Primaries*. London: Praeger.
- Benoit, W. (2003). *Campaign 2000: A Functional Analysis of Presidential Campaign Discourse*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Burgers, C. et al. (2016). "Figurative Framing: Shaping Public Discourse Through Metaphor, Hyperbole, and Irony", in *Communication Theory*. doi:10.1111/comt.12096 pp.1-21
- Campbell, A. (1964). *The American Voter*. New York: Wiley.
- Cicero, *De oratore* (Book 1, XXV 113-115). Translated by J.S. Watson.
http://pages.pomona.edu/~cmc24747/sources/cic_web/de_or_1.htm (accessed 26 June, 2016).
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fauconnier, G. and Turner, M. (2002). *The Way we Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fillmore, C. (1982). "Frame semantics", in *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Company. pp.111-137.
- Fischer, F. (2003). *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gilens, M. and Page, B. (2012). *Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gangale, T. (2008). *From the Primaries to the Polls: How to Repair America's Broken Presidential Nomination Process*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing the Brain: Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Hart, R. (1999). *Seducing America: How Television Charms the Modern Voter*. London: Sage.
- Herman, E. and Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing Consent*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Jaffe, H. (2015). *Why Bernie Sanders Matters*. New York: Regan Arts.

- Johnson, M. (1981). *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Johnson-Cartee, K. (2005). *News Narratives and News Framing: Constructing Political Reality*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Karvonen, L. (2007). *The Personalization of Politics*. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Katz, E. and Lazarsfeld P.F. (2006). *Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Kelley, C. (2001). *The Rhetoric of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't Think of an Elephant! How Democrats and Progressives Can Win*. Hartford, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Lakoff, G. (2006). *Thinking Points*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F., Berelson, B. and Gaudet, H. (1948). *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McCombs, M. and Shaw D. (1976). "Structuring the Unseen Environment", in *Journal of Communication*. Vol. 26, No. 2, pp.18-22.
- McGinniss, J. (1969). *The Selling of the President*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Mindich, D. (2005). *Tuned Out: Why Americans Under 40 Don't Follow the News*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Poguntke, T. and Webb, P. (2005). *The Presidentialization of Politics, A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Polsby, N. and Wildavsky A. with Hopkins D. (2008). *Presidential Elections: Strategies and Structures of American Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Popkin, S. (2012). *The Candidate: What It Takes to Win - and Hold - the White House*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1977). *The Rule of Metaphor*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Richards, I.A. (1936). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sanders, B. (1997). *Outsider in the House: A Political Autobiography*. New York: Verso.

- Scheufele, D. (2006). "Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models", in *Journal of Communication*. Vol. 57, No.1, pp. 9-20.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1995). Postface to the second edition of *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Swanson, D. and Mancini, P. (1996). *Politics, Media, and Modern Democracy*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers.
- Tendhal, M. and Gibbs, R. (2008). "Complementary Perspectives on Metaphor", in *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol.40, pp.1823-1864.
- Thomas, L. and Wareing, S. (1999). *Language, Society and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Thomas, L. and Wilcox, C. (2005). *Women and Elective Office: Past, Present, and Future*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wattenberg, M. (2008). *Is Voting for Young People?* New York: Pearson Longman.
- Wodak, R. (2015). *The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean*. London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. and Koller, V. (2008). *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.