

## Lexical Relation Analysis Referring to Muslims on Donald Trump's Speech; *Ban All Muslims Travel to United States of America*

Husnul Yaqin

English Literature, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya  
[husnulyaqin@mhs.unesa.ac.id](mailto:husnulyaqin@mhs.unesa.ac.id)

### Abstract

This research reviews Donald Trump's dictions which refer to Muslims in his campaign speech. He keeps arguing that terrorism attacks in America are mostly performed by Muslims which leads to be one of his campaign concerns on banning Muslims travel to America. It becomes issue of debate over the world since the policy program hits sentimental field. Thus, knowing how the tight-loose expression level of them turns to be the interest of this study. The study focuses on semantic relation theory by Riemer and uses qualitative method to reveal the goal. There are various lexical relation terms arise over Donald Trump's dictions to refer Muslims. They provide variant meanings which can be variation terms to use by speaker. Those terms come over four lexical relations, Antonym, Synonym, Meronym and Hyponym. Donald Trump tended to use tighter meaning words to address Muslims. Hyponymy covers more semantic components than others on componential analysis which indicates looser meaning among others. While in turn, Donald Trump should not use antonymy form to avoid misunderstanding on his audiences. It also indicates tighter meaning since it mostly does not cover any component.

**Key terms:** Diction, Campaign speech, Semantic relation, Lexical relation, Tight-Loose expression

### Abstrak

Penelitian ini meninjau diksi Donald Trump yang merujuk pada Muslim dalam pidato kampanyenya. Dia selalu berargumen bahwa serangan terorisme di Amerika sebagian besar dilakukan oleh umat Islam yang mengarah pada salah satu kebijakan kampanyenya tentang pelarangan Muslim datang ke Amerika. Hal ini menjadi topik perdebatan dunia karena kebijakan tersebut mengarah pada bidang sentimental. Dengan demikian, mempelajari bagaimana tingkat *tight-loose* dari istilah-istilah tersebut menjadi minat pada penelitian ini. Studi ini berfokus pada teori *semantic relation* (relasi semantik) oleh Riemer dan menggunakan metode kualitatif. Terdapat berbagai istilah *lexical relation* yang muncul dari diksi yang digunakan oleh Donald Trump dalam merujuk Muslim. Hal tersebut menawarkan variasi kata bagi pembicara dengan variasi makna yang berkaitan. Variasi kata tersebut muncul dari empat *lexical relation*, Antonim, Sinonim, Meronim dan Hiponim. Donald Trump cenderung menggunakan kata-kata yang mengandung makna *tight* untuk merujuk kaum Muslim. Hiponim mencakup lebih banyak komponen semantik daripada yang lain pada *component analysis* (analisis komponen). Sementara sebaliknya, Donald Trump tidak dianjurkan menggunakan bentuk antonim untuk menghindari kesalahpahaman pada audiensnya. Hal ini juga dikarenakan antonim menunjukkan makna *tighter* karena sebagian besar tidak mencakup komponen apa pun pada *componential analysis*.

**Kata Kunci:** Diksi, Pidato kampanye, *Semantic relation* (relasi semantik), *Lexical relation* (relasi leksikal), *Tight-loose expression*.

## INTRODUCTION

A campaign speech plays a great role in convincing people related to the speaker and his or her visions and missions to which the voters will consider who they vote. Because language is used as a main media in campaign speech to convince the voters, lexical relation in speech especially among Donald Trump's campaign is a good idea to analyze. It is because the campaign speech is a good media to show up the one's capability in leading a particular country. When listening to the speech, people can understand what the purpose exactly is. It also happened in Donald Trump's speech for his policy in banning all Muslims traveling to US. By listening to the speech, people tried to know how Trump would lead the country to be.

The speech was delivered in December 7<sup>th</sup> 2015, which explained the campaign of Donald Trump's new policy speech to ban Muslims come to US in order to have a complete and total shutdown of terrorism attacks if voted to be the new American president. It became a hot issue at the time. Lots of media through the world turned to make this news to be the headline. Thus, understanding the lexical relations of the speech turns into a good idea to discuss. Trump argued that there was such hatred among Muslims around the world towards Americans. "Until we are able to determine and understand this problem and the dangerous threat it poses, our country cannot be the victims of horrendous attacks by people that believe only in Jihad, and have no sense of reason or respect for human life," he said.

There is a research with similar discussions. The first study was written by McClay on March 2017. The paper aims to expose Donald Trump's strategies in constructing a reality and legitimizing an ideology resonating large number of electorate. The study tries to contextualize such representations over social actors which is implemented by Donald Trump to create a specific reality for establishing his own status and power through interaction and reality production. The objective is to make explicit the values of Donald Trump's discourse and the ways he uses ideological strategy of the word *us* vs *them*. The gap between the previous studies and this research is the specificity of Donald Trump's speech. They all discuss about the same person but with different speeches. Yet the first previous study is to reveal Donald Trump's certain term, *us* and *them* in some of his campaign speeches, which mark the beginning, middle and end of his presidential run.

## METHOD

The method consists of how to collect the data, the sources, and the procedure of how to analyze them in

proper and rhetorical ways. The data of this study is the utterances in the forms of words, phrases, or sentences which are taken from the script of Donald Trump's speech. The data is composed from YouTube channel to get the video of Trump's speech. There are several videos showing the same campaign, but the one taken from them is the full version one.

The object of this analysis is all about lexical relations of Donald Trump's speech in the video. The data were directly downloaded from YouTube while the transcriptions of the video were adopted from *haaretz.com*. Thus, the data objectivities cannot be guaranteed from any individual's perspectives but the *haaretz.com* as the source itself.

Here is the data display of research problem

**Table 5.1. Componential analysis of English furniture terms.**

	with back	with legs	for a single person	for sitting	with arms	rigid
<i>chair</i>	+	+	+	+	-	+
<i>armchair</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+
<i>stool</i>	-	+	+	+	-	+
<i>sofa</i>	+	+	-	+	+	+
<i>beanbag</i>	-	-	+	+	-	-

The research problem seeks to have meaning level of the lexical relations created over the speech. All lexical relations will be switched in some tables with semantic details (components). Component rows will be filled up with definition details of the base data. The base data (terms used by Trump to refer Muslims) are then switched based on data context, while other lexical relations are switched based on their dictionary meanings.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section contains several tables of each data as delivered in the previous section in order to answer the research question 2. The tables are structured with some data which are then followed by their lexical semantics relations. There will be some columns consisting the data and some rows consisting the components of the base data meaning according to Cambridge dictionary. The information contained in componential analysis like this is essentially similar to the information contained in a definition; in principle, anything that can form part of definition can also be rephrased in terms of semantic components (Riemer, 2010). Each them all will then be matched to recognize which data is looser among others by matching more components over them. The words with more "+" indicate looser meanings. While in return, the words with more "-" indicate tighter meanings. Words with looser meaning will be easier to accept in public because the tighter ones sometimes hurt a certain community.

The first data in each columns of all tables as shown below are the base data uttered by the speaker. The second ones are the *antonymy* pairs of the base data. The third column consists of *synonymy* pairs, the following column is for *meronymy* pairs, and the last one is for *hyponymy* pairs. Basic data, including other lexical relations with the same words, will be matched to the components based on the context meaning while the rest ones will be matched under their dictionary meanings.

### 1. Componential analysis of *sister*

Based on the table below, there is a word matching to the most components including what the speaker uttered in front of audiences. This means that he used the proper word pointing one of family members through bomb makers in San Barino. Other words, *family* have the same rank from *sister*, which means that this word can replace the speaker's diction. *Family* does not change any information the speaker tried to deliver. *Sister* in the data is just a supporting information which people do not need some more details to know. The word *family* reflects enough to inform that somebody mentioned by the speaker has blood correlation with the bomb makers. It will be different when *sister* is replaced by the rest words left, *brother* and *female*. The message will absolutely be variant since *brother* is not a female one while *female* does not show that the one intended by the speaker is a part of bomb makers' family member.

DATA	COMPONENT					
	Same Parent	Kind Treat	Share Interest	Nurse	Nurse	Girl or Woman
Sister	+	+	+	-	-	+
Brother	+	+	+	-	-	-
Relative	-	+	+	-	-	+
Family	+	+	+	-	-	+
Female	-	-	-	+	+	+

Table 1 *Sister*

### 2. Componential analysis of *quiet majority*

There are two *quiet* in this table with different functions. The difference comes along their use in different situation. *Quiet* at first column comes from the speaker as the base data which indicates *little act* and *not talk too much* based on the data context. The speaker tended to compare Muslim majority with other religion majority in America as delivered in previous sentence, "you know we have a noisy majority" (00:12:03 - 00:12:07). This clearly shows that *quiet* here refers to Muslims with *little act* and *not talk too much* in expressing their thought among others. This situation is

quite different from the second *quiet* in the column. This *quiet* comes since there are no *meronym* for adjective words. Comparing to other words left, this *quiet* is one of the strongest words with most "+" in component rows. This brief explanation gives such a conclusion that the speaker used the proper word to describe Muslims in his campaign speech.

DATA	COMPONENT		
	Little noise	Little act	Not talk much
Quiet	-	+	+
Noisy	-	-	-
Muted	+	-	+
Quiet	-	+	+
Little sound	+	-	+

Table 2 *Quiet*

The second table below shows the comparison over the word *majority* as the base data. There are three *majority* words with variant meanings. The first one comes over what the speaker uttered in his speech representing larger number meaning even though not large enough seeing there is *quiet* before. Yet the first *majority* does not cover the whole component meanings. This *majority* was intended to all Muslims in America, not only for the adult ones but all ages as well. It signifies that the word was not pointed out just for number of votes even in campaign speech since the legal voting age in America is 18. However the third *majority* absolutely includes all component meanings as long as its definition is originally taken from dictionary. This word is too general to compare with the rest words in the column, *mass* and *society*. They both can actually replace *majority* in context because at least they all refer to the same object (larger number). Yet the safest word to use in public is the looser one. This means that the speaker used the proper word along his speech.

DATA	COMPONENT		
	Larger number	Number of votes	Age of adult
Majority	+	-	-
Minority	-	-	-
Mass	+	-	-
Society	+	-	-
Majority	+	-	-

Table 3 *Majority*

### 3. Componential analysis of *stupid leaders*

*Stupid* in this case can be replaced by any other words in each column but *intelligent*. They include all components of base data meaning. The speaker tried to reflect *leaders* by saying *stupid*. Based on the context, the speaker aimed to say that the leaders are *silly* and *unwise*.



*Lack intelligent* does not fit to describe the word *leaders* because leader(s) is the one with the high intelligent among others. The only word which cannot replace *stupid* is *intelligent*. Its definition is totally different among others since it runs as an opposite of *stupid*. In conclusion, *foolish* and *poor judgment* may be the best choices to switch *stupid* referring to *leaders*.

DATA	COMPONENT		
	Silly	Unwise	Lack intelligent
Stupid	+	+	-
Intelligent	-	-	-
Foolish	+	+	+
Stupid	+	+	-
Poor judgment	+	+	+

Table 4 *Stupid*

Best choice to replace *leaders* in this data goes to *controllers*. It covers same number of definition components, *person in control* and *most important*, as the word *leader*. It is different from two other word, *followers* and *Talibans*. *Follower(s)* exactly has no same component as *leader* because they are an opposite pair. Another word, *Taliban* cannot replace *leader* as well because it is too specific. It is a certain name to refer a certain group. It definitely does not have any similarity to *leader*. That is why it cannot be used to change *leader* position.

DATA	COMPONENT		
	Person in control	One winning race	Most important
Leaders	+	-	+
Followers	-	-	-
Controllers	+	-	+
Talibans	-	-	-
Leaders	+	-	+

Table 5 *Leaders*

#### 4. Componential analysis of *greatest killers*

Based on the data context, *greatest* has two similar words in the column with the same definition components as well. Those two are *best* and *largest in degree*. The word *best* may be the best choice to replace *greatest* because they all are almost the same in any divisions. Instead of having the same rank in definition component, *greatest* is also in one syllable form. However syllable is not categorized to determine correct word choice. This indicates that *largest in degree* can also replace the word *largest* to modify main noun *killers* since they have the same rank in the meaning components. The only word which cannot change *largest* position is

*weakest*. And again, it is because *weakest* takes a role as an antonym of *largest*.

DATA	COMPONENT						
	Large in amount	Very good	Large in size	Large in degree	Famous	Powerful	Important
Greatest	-	+	-	+	-	+	+
Weakest	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Best	-	+	-	+	-	+	+
Greatest	-	+	-	+	-	+	+
Largest in degree	-	+	-	+	-	+	+

Table 6 *Greatest*

The speaker has already used the correct word in this data. It has no proportional comparison in the rank. *Killer* is the looser word to use among others. *Victim* is the antonym of *killer* which means they have no similarity at all. *Assassin* might be able to replace *killer* if they both only refers to person since *assassin* is not a word used to refer thing. While *Taliban* does not have any reasons to replace *killer* because it is a name referring to a certain group and is too specific.

DATA	COMPONENT				
	One kills another	Thing kills one	Thing destroys thing	Skillful person	Causing one/thing die
Killers	+	-	-	+	+
Victims	-	-	-	-	-
Assassins	+	-	-	+	+
Talibans	-	-	-	-	-
Killers	+	-	-	+	+

Table 7 *Killers*

#### 5. Componential analysis of *bad guys*

The word *bad* used by speaker to address *guys* in this data can be replaced by all words in the column but *good*. *Bad*, *dangerous*, and *negative* almost have the same elements in their definition. They all reflect *unpleasant*, *low quality*, *unacceptable*, *causing pain*, and *disappointing*. Although their ranks are the same, *negative* still stands as the looser word among them. It is because the components in the row are based on base data (*bad*) definition, while anything contains “not” meaning always refers to *negative*. This means that even though the speaker used the proper word to point out *guys*, he should better change the word *bad* to *negative* to smooth the language for public consumption. The only word in the column which is not compatible to replace *bad* is *good* since again it has opposite meaning through other words in the column.

DATA	COMPONENT				
	Unpleasant	Low quality	Unacceptable	Causing pain	Disappointing
Bad	+	+	+	+	+
Good	-	-	-	-	-
Dangerous	+	+	+	+	+
Bad	+	+	+	+	+
Negative	+	+	+	+	+

Table 8 *Bad*

*Guy* (without *s* in it) is this looser word among others if it is defined based on the dictionary meaning. When there is *s* in it, it will be same level as others in the column. They all contains the same components, *group of people* and refers to *either sex*. The only definition they do not cover is *a man* because *guys* itself is in informal form of *guy* (with no *s*). *Guy* means a man, while with *s*, it refers to *group of people of either sex*. Instead of *guys*, *people* might be the most acceptable word to use since it has the looser meanings out of the content in row above. It is different from *enemies* and *terrorists*. They cover some contents above because they are in plural form. When they are in single form, they will cover *either sex* only, meaning that they get tighter meanings.

DATA	COMPONENT		
	A man	Group of people	Either sex
Guys	-	+	+
Enemies	-	+	+
People	-	+	+
Terrorists	-	+	+
People	-	+	+

Table 9 *Guys*

#### 6. Componential analysis of *the guy with the dirty filthy hat*

Data of this table has the same subject as the previous one, but different in discussion. *Guy* in this table is the original form with no *s* which indicates plural form. Those two have the same components of dictionary meaning, *a man*, *group of people* and *either sex*. Considering to the table above, *ISIL* consist of the most components among others, *group of people* and *either sex*. Yet it is because *ISIL* is the only word representing either singular or plural meaning, while the others are in singular form. The components *ISIL* covers are also something in plural circumstances. The rank will be different if *ISIL* is just intended to a single *ISIL* member. It will be the tighter word among other. This means that replacing *guy* with *ISIL* is not a good idea for the speaker. The speaker would seem to directly accuse a certain group instead for

something he did not certainly know the truth. Thus keeping the word *guy* or changing it to the word *man* is the correct way.

DATA	COMPONENT		
	A man	Group of people	Either sex
Guy	+	-	-
Girl	-	-	-
Man	+	-	-
ISIL	-	+	+
Man	+	-	-

Table 10 *Guy*

Data of the table below clearly shows that the speaker used the proper word to describe something not clean. *Grubby* and *unwashed* have the same rank as *dirty* in data context. They also represent something not clean but not as loose as *dirty* based according to dictionary. *Grubby* is such an informal form of *dirty* while *unwashed* describes something not cleaned using water (Cambridge dict). *Dirty* has more than just not clean meaning as shown in the component row below.

DATA	COMPONENT					
	Not clean	Unfair	Not honest	Not polite	Unkind	Unhealthy
Dirty	+	-	-	-	-	-
Clean	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grubby	+	-	-	-	-	-
Dirty	+	-	-	-	-	-
Unwashed	+	-	-	-	-	-

Table 11 *Dirty*

*Filthy* means extremely or unpleasantly dirty (Cambridge dict). This indicates that *filthy* just runs as an emphasize to the previous word, *dirty*. *Squalid* is almost the same as *filthy*, but the difference is that *squalid* represents extremely dirty caused by lack of money condition. While *disgusting* means extremely unpleasant or unacceptable. Those three words almost have similar definitions in any aspects. However looking back at the context, *squalid* cannot replace the word *filthy* in the speech. It is because the mass of the guy's hat did not come along his wealth condition. So that the only word compatible to change *filthy* is *disgusting*.

DATA	COMPONENT	
	Dirty	Offensive
Filthy	+	-
Sterile	-	-
Squalid	+	-
Filthy	+	-
Disgusting	+	-

Table 12 *Filthy*

### 7. Componential analysis of *foolish people*

This table shows how the speaker had chosen the perfect diction in the speech. The words *foolish* and *people* are the looser ones among their comparisons. Trump could easily change *foolish* to any words in the column but *wise* if he wished. It is because *foolish*, *stupid* and *unwise* clearly have the same rank and definition component details. *People*, *society*, *Americans*, and *group* also have the same rank. However the speaker could not replace *people* to *Americans* even though it completes all the component aspects. It is because *Americans* represents a concrete name and addresses to certain group which leads to be a specific aspect.

DATA	COMPONENT		
	Unwise	Stupid	Not good judgment
Foolish	+	+	+
Wise	-	-	-
Stupid	+	+	+
Foolish	+	+	+
Unwise	+	+	+

Table 13 *Foolish*

DATA	COMPONENT				
	Men	Women	Children	Group	Nation
People	+	+	+	+	+
Person	-	-	-	-	-
Society	+	+	+	+	+
Americans	+	+	+	+	+
Group	+	+	+	+	+

Table 14 *People*

The analysis above provides componential analysis over the lexical relations discussed in the previous result. The componential analysis seeks to know which lexical terms indicate tighter meaning, and which indicate the looser meaning. The terms with tighter meaning are dominated by Antonymy forms. It is because antonymy forms carry out opposite meanings from the base data which lead them to have the lowest number of definition details or components. While in turn, the terms with looser meaning are mostly dominated by Hyponymy forms. Based on the analysis above, Donald Trump tended to use the tighter meaning words to refer Muslims. 12 out of 14 tables are dominated by hyponymy with most matched components among others. This means that hyponymy form conveys the loosest meaning sense among other lexical relation forms.

Based on the analysis above, Donald Trump tended to use the tighter meaning words to refer Muslims.

12 out of 14 tables are dominated by hyponymy with most matched components among others. It is because he spoke in a small group with the same perception which indicates high homogeneity among them. The group is then called as a speech community because it has all four criteria of speech community; number of the members, reason to group, temporary or permanence of group and the membership of individuals. The number of members is clearly more than one or two persons. There were thousands people in the hall or even millions in all around United States of America. The reason to group is absolutely because of political movement, in which they all come together to support Donald Trump to be number one person in America. This group is temporal since the support will last until the presidential election finally comes. While the membership of individuals, who support Trump, does not only come from the people around the hall, but outside the hall as well.

He and his audiences agree that terrorism attacks especially in America are mostly performed by Muslims. This opinion leads him to have lack innovation in language use to refer Muslims. He tended to use firm words to judge Muslims with his perception that they are such bad people as long as he believed that they were the source of chaos. All lexicons he used to address Muslims (as data of this study) are labeled with negative adjective or modifier except *greatest killers*. It is because he had to tell the truth that there was a deal of prisoner exchange between American sergeant Bergdahl who was held captive by Taliban in 2009 and Taliban's five greatest killers who were held at the detention center at Guantanamo Bay.

Meanwhile other data; *the sister*, *quiet majority*, *stupid leaders*, *bad guys*, *the guy with the dirty filthy hat* and *foolish people* are clearly followed with such negative modifiers. *The sister* is not exactly followed by any adjective, but the speaker then continued his statement with a clear sentence referring to *the sister*; "*believe me in my opinion she was lying like crazy*". He tried to deliver that *the sister* was a bad and liar person. The action will be different if the audiences come from multiple groups with lower homogeneity. For examples, his opponent's supporters, neutral people, or even other people who do not agree or have other perceptions with his framing idea about terrorism attacks. He would not probably use straight lexicons referring to Muslims in order to regard their thought towards Muslims.

As a politician, Donald Trump should use good dictions in delivering such a speech even they have similar or close meanings. People will consider the sameness of meaning he conveys as long as he is a public figure. Moreover, the speech discussed in this study refers to such a sentimental circle, which is Muslim. It will be



different if the sameness of meaning comes over unsophisticated speakers. A given word or phrase is accepted as having the same meaning as another word or phrase if its substitution keeps at the same context (Lyons, 1968). In this speech context, the speaker should use the looser words to address a certain group of people, Muslims.

The result chapter of the study shows that Donald Trump should use lexical relations of hyponym. It is because the rank tables in the previous discussion are mostly dominated by hyponymy form. Table 4.1 shows that the word *sister* he used in the speech is not the only proper word to use. There is meronymy form (*family*) with the same level of rank. It completes four out of six components while the rest words do not. This is the only data in which hyponymy form does not compatible to replace the word *sister*. Table 4.2 and 4.3 point out that *quiet majority* can be replaced with *little sound majority*. The word *little sound* takes position as hypernym of *quiet* in modifier form. While the main noun, *majority* still stands as it is as long as *majority* has no broader category name. The following table describes how hyponym overcomes along the speaker's diction. The word *stupid* is not good enough to use other than *poor judgment* based on the rank level. Those comparisons above are just such examples. The rest tables show the same result, in which all hyponymy forms turn to be the best lexical relation word choice. The only table which hyponymy form does not take over the most component rows is table the first one. *Female*, hyponymy form of table 4.1, neither have the most components nor cover important elements to refer to correct person in speaker's mind.

It is easy to see that each successive level in such a hyponym simply adds a further semantic specification (or component) to the previous one (Riemer, 2010). This means that every word with more semantic specification represents smoother meaning because it contains looser meaning. Thus hyponym, which overcomes the speaker's diction as discussed in the previous paragraph, deserves to be the more appropriate one in Donald Trump's speech. This substitution will not change the message that speaker try to refer. Riemer (2010) said in his book that sometimes people are unable to retrieve the most accurate, precise term for the referent they have in mind, that is why hyponym takes a crucial communicative function in such a kind of this case.

This discussion supports one of previous studies, *The hidden danger of Trump; how Trump changed the language of game of politics and its effect on truth and democracy*, written by Paul A. Giuliani. It is said that others ought to consider Trump as a bullshitter other than a liar because having insufficient concern for the truth can

lead to an epidemic of bullshit which can disenfranchise voters and impede people from being engaged politically (Giulianti, 2018). Hyponymy form strengthens the study to avoid such a lie in delivering information the speaker did not exactly know the truth. He could better utter such words with looser meanings (hypernym) instead of having the tighter ones.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

### Conclusion.

The rank procedure raises several discussions. The first one is about lexical relations which overcome the base data. Lexical relation with the most "+" is dominated by Hyponymy. That is why Hyponymy form is the "safest" term to use in such a public discourse or utterance especially in a speech. Moreover in political speech which mentions a certain group (Muslim). It makes sense because Hyponymy reflects broader meaning term of a word. It is described in English by the phrase *kind of*. Donald Trump's pattern of hyponymy turns be the following discussion. He tended to use Hyponymy form with an exact term other than using another form with phrasal hyponymy term. There are 12 out of 14 data with exact hyponymy term. This pattern signifies that Donald Trump used tighter terms more than the looser ones. It is because hyponymy form with modifier indicates that the main noun stands too general and is not accurate to reflect the referent in speaker's mind as discussed in the previous chapter. The last interesting result to discuss is lexical relation with the lowest rank which indicates the tightest terms. The lexical relation mentioned is Antonymy form. This form almost does not cover all component details since it has opposite definition with the base data. Such a doubt arise whether the antonymy form is possible be used to replace the base data or not. Yes it is since the antonymy form is applied in modifier of the main noun only.

### Suggestion.

As the study is using donald trump speech when he has a gampaing and talking about banning all moeslem, it is very interesting to conduct a new research when donald trump commence his speech in United Arab Emirate attended by the king itself. By comparing the result of two using same method and theory, the compared result will shows whether trump still uses tight semantic relation or in contrast.

## REFERENCES

Cruse, D. Alan. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruse, D. Alan. (2002). "Paradigmatic relation of inclusion and identity III: Synonym." In *Lexicology - An international handbook on the nature and structure of words and vocabularies* (HSK 21/1), Alan Cruse, Franz, Hundsnurscher, Michael Job and Peter Rolf Lutzeier (eds), 485-497. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Dictionary (2018). *Thesaurus.com*. New York: InterActiveCorp

Goodenough, W. H. (1956). Componential analysis and the study of meaning, *Language* 32: 195-216.

Litosseliti, Lia. (2010). *Research Methods in Linguistics*. London: Continuum.

Lyons, John. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John. (1977). *Semantics*, vol. I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miles, Matthew, Huberman Michael, Saldana Johnny. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (3 ed.). London: Sage Publication.

Murphy, M. Lynne. (2003). *Semantic relations and the lexicon. Antonymy, synonymy and other paradigms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Press, C. University (2018). *Cambridge Dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riemer, Nick. (2010). *Introducing Semantics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sunarto. (2001). *Metodologi Penelitian Ilmu-ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan*. Surabaya: Unesa University Press.

Wardhaugh, Ronald (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wierzbicka, Anna. (1984). Apples are not a kind of fruit: the semantics of human categorization, *American Ethnologist* 11: 287-313.

Winston, Morton E., Chaffin, Roger and Herrmann, Douglas. (1987). A taxonomy of part-whole relations, *Cognitive Science* 11: 417-444.

