

Naming and Describing Practices in Trump's 20-Point Gaza Peace Plan: A Critical Stylistic Analysis

Shatha Khuzaee

College of Education for Women/ Al Qadisiya
University

shatha.salih@qu.edu.iq

Abstract:

The present paper examines the different naming and describing practices that represent the world of events and participants involved in Trump's 20-Points Gaza peace plan announced on 29th Sept. 2025 as an outstanding example of political speeches. The study explores how various naming choices construct meanings of agency and power encapsulated in the nouns, noun modifications, and nominalisations. To uncover these meanings, the study follows Jeffries' (2010) textual conceptual function of naming and describing drawing on the centrality of the concept of *textual meaning* and its potential to suggest a *rigours* and *objective* analysis that conceptually present a portrayal of the world in a particular way using the resources of the linguistic system. Analysis reveals that noun and noun modification are major naming choices constructing the pattern of agency while nominalisation provides the basis for the pattern of power that prevails in the text under analysis. The findings demonstrate that the potential of *textual meaning* explains the conceptual uncovering of embedded ideologies in texts whether or not we agree with them. These findings also highlight the potential of critical stylistics as a discipline to provide the basis for a *rigours* and *objective* textual analysis. The study recommends that other critical stylistics tools are applied to this text, and others, to further test the potential of the textual level of meaning in uncovering ideological meaning.

Key words: *political speech, textual meaning, critical stylistics, rigor, objectivity*

المخلص:

تختبر هذه الدراسة ممارسات التسمية والوصف المختلفة التي تمثل عالم الأحداث والأشخاص المذكورين في خطة ترامب للسلام في غزة المكونة من ٢٠ نقطة والتي تم الإعلان عنها في ٢٩ سبتمبر ٢٠٢٥ كمثال بارز للخطابات السياسية. تستكشف الدراسة كيف تبني خيارات التسمية المختلفة معاني الوكالة والقوة المضمنة في الأسماء وتعديلات الأسماء والتسميات. ولتكشف هذه المعاني، تتبع الدراسة أداة جيفريز (٢٠١٠) المفاهيمية النصية للتسمية والوصف بالاعتماد على مركزية مفهوم المعنى النصي وإمكاناته لاقتراح وتحليل أكثر موضوعية وصرامة يشرح

مفهومياً الصور المقدمة عن العالم بطريقة معينة باستخدام موارد النظام اللغوي. يكشف التحليل أن الاسم وتعديل الاسم هما خياران رئيسيان للتسمية بينان نمط الوكالة بينما توفر التسمية الأساس لنمط القوة السائد في النص قيد التحليل. تُظهر النتائج أن إمكانات المعنى النصي تُفسر الكشف المفاهيمي عن الأيديولوجيات المُضمنة في النصوص، سواءً اتفقنا معها أم لا. كما تُبرز هذه النتائج قدرة الأسلوبية النقدية، كتخصص، على توفير أساس لتحليل نصي دقيق وموضوعي. وتوصي الدراسة بتطبيق أدوات أسلوبية نقدية أخرى على هذا النص، وغيره من النصوص، لاختبار إمكانات المستوى النصي في اختبار أهمية مفهوم المعنى النصي للكشف عن المعنى الأيديولوجي في النص.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الخطاب السياسي، المعنى النصي، الأسلوبية النقدية، الدقة، الموضوعية

1. Introduction:

The recent Tump's 20-point Gaza peace plan is an outstanding example of political speeches because of its treatment of the longest and most controversial conflict in the Middel East. Following Van Dijk (1997), political speeches are simply defined as "the text and talk of professional politicians or political institutions, such as president[s] and prime ministers and other members of government, parliament or political parties, both at the local, national and international levels" (p12). They are normally written "texts" in the sense of materially durable products of linguistic actions (Reisigl, 2013) and are distinguished for their "significant manipulative potential" (Tinceva, 2012, p. 1295). Al-Rikaby (2025) explains that political speeches play a crucial role in shaping public perception and legitimizing foreign policy (p. 349). In light of this brief introductory, examining Trump's 20-point Gaza peace plan proves to be crucial not only for its rich, dense and complex linguistic features, but also for how these linguistic features construct agency and power among the participants involved in this plan. The current research carries out a critical stylistic naming analysis to uncover the ideologies embedded in the text that portray the world of events and the participants involved through the patterns of agency and power.

The body of research on political speeches, in general, US presidents and Trump in particular, is extensive presenting diverse theoretical and analytical frameworks. Generally, the different approaches of Critical Discourse analysis (CDA) represented by Fairclough, Van Dijk, and Wodak set the pioneering theories that establish the foundations to linguistically explore political language and how political speeches construct ideology, form public opinion, and demonstrate power standards and legitimacy. To start with, Fairclough's (1989) seminal book 'Language and Power' introduces three dimensional-model of description, interpretation and explanation, a framework through which the micro md macro features of political texts are connected and examined to explore how language power relations, ideologies and public opinions are shaped and influenced. Fairclough's approach is pivotal in establishing the binding relationship that brings "together linguistic-oriented discourse analysis and social and political thought relevant to discourse and language (Fairclough, 1992, p.62) Moreover, Fairclough& Fairclough (2013) presented a

comprehensive analytical approach to political discourse by integrating major theoretical underpinnings from critical discourse analysis and argumentation theory in an attempt to equip advanced students working in the field of critical discourse analysis with a systematic method to investigate the complex structure between language, power and society. These works by Fairclough establish the *sociocultural approach* to political language which has been widely applied to analyse political speeches (See Handayani et.al ,2018; Hassan et.al, 2019, Li& Zhang,2019; Shadeed et.al. 2019, Ahmed & Malik,2024; and Al-Rikaby, 2025)

Van Dijk, the second most influential approach of the field, contributed his socio-cognitive approach stressing that “the relations between discourse and society always need the sociocognitive interface of actual language users” (2011: 617). The strength of Van Dijk's approach lies in its interdisciplinarity where he highlights the centrality of “combining linguistic, discourse analytical, psychological, and sociological analysis of news discourse and news processes” (Van Dijk, 1988, p. 15). While he also suggests a three part-analysis including text, social cognition and social context, he alters Fairclough's stages, mentioned above, by placing more emphasis on the rhetorical features as well as norms and values (Ulrike, (2013, p. 66). His approach was widely applied in diverse topics tackling the critical analysis of political speeches (See, Simonyan, 2016; Masroor e.al. 2020; Othman, 2023; Othman & Salih, 2024; and Jaafar, 2025)

The third major approach to political language is Wodak's (1989) discourse-historical approach (DHA) as further approach to CDA with a focus on the historical dimension of political language Krzyżanowski (2013). To this point, Yeo et al. (2025) state that while “critical discourse analysis broadly examines language and power, DHA specifically emphasises the historical context and how language reflects and shapes power dynamics over time”. Wodak states that the strengths of her approach are exemplified by its “interdisciplinary orientation” and its “historical analysis” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p. 119, 120). She also proposes a three-dimensional method of content, discursive strategies and linguistic means which are considered as an integration of Fairclough's and Van Dijk's models where she jointly used the former's linguistic analysis and the latter's rhetorical strategies. Research studies applying Wodak's triangulated approach, focus equally on the importance of both the macro-context of the discourse as much as the micro-context (Nagi, 2019, p. 82). Numerous studies analyse national and international political speeches following Wodak's historical approach (See Alemi et.al. 2018; Katea, 2018; and Rashid, 2023) The discussion of the three approaches to CDA presented above demonstrates their primary theoretical and practical importance in the analysis of political speeches and essentially participated in explaining how powerful the role of language is in the construction of ideologies in political speeches. However, still remains the gap of rigor and objectivity that was underestimated in a way or another in a number of the theoretical underpinnings of these three approaches. Some scholars have outlined this issue and argue for the necessity of bridging this gap. For example, Ulrik (2013) explains that although Van Dijk's (2006) analysis of Tony Blair's speech on the war

on Iraq in 2003 uses many different language features taken from text and conversation analysis, the analytical tools were subjectively selected without providing a systematic tool-kit which would make the analysis replicable and more objective. Other scholars argue that issues of bias, and methodological clarity, were major points that influence the features of rigor and objective analysis and findings (Hammersley 1997; Widdowson 1995, and Breez, 2011). A more important issue is that many CDA approaches analyse texts adhering the analysis to a particular political stance (Stubbs, 1997). In this context, Hammersley (1997) points out the Fairclough's emphasis on the need for critical analysis of political texts is driven by a Marxist political stance which is no longer considered by modern philosophers, historians, and economists (p. 237). In a similar vein, some stylisticians suggest that this sort of adherence in interpreting embedded ideologies in texts may bring doubts to the value of CDA's achievements which promote socio-political stances over some "linguistics' hard-won scientific credibility by giving up on all attempts at objectivity and replicability" (Jeffries, 2014: 408). This was one reason why Jeffries (2010a) approach to text analysis is selected in this study and also why she developed the critical stylistics framework as the one that offers "a method of finding the ideology in texts whether or not you agree with it" (ibid, 409). Therefore, the study, by adopting Jeffries' (2010) critical stylistics attempts to answer the following questions:

- What are the major naming practices used in Trump's 20-points Gaza peace plan?
- How these naming choices were used to construct the world of events and participant adhering to the concept of textual meaning?

The rest of the paper is structured to present details on the five major areas of the research. First, introducing a comprehensive account of critical stylistics and rationalise its selections on the theoretical and analytical levels. Second, outlines the concept of textual meaning and discussing its potential to carry out a rigorous and objective analysis that uncovers the implied ideologies whether or not we agree with them. Third, presents the tool of naming and describing as the selected tool of the analysis. Fourth, present details of the data collection and how they were prepared for the analysis. Fifth, present a detailed analysis that explores and uncovers the ideological meanings that results from the different naming choices and constructs the patterns of agency and power. Finally, outline major conclusion points depending on the analysis outcome commenting on main findings and recommendations for further research.

2. Critical Stylistics

Critical stylistics is a relatively recent text-based approach of stylistic analysis with "a particular (critical) purpose" (Jeffries, 2016, p. 159). It was first introduced by Jeffries (2007) but formally established in 2010 in Jeffries book *Critical Stylistics: The Power of English*. Generally, it is viewed as a development of joining perspectives from the

widespread field of Critical Discourse Analysis and Stylistics (Khuzaei, 2019, p. 46). The major aim of this approach is to provide rigor, and objective analysis that uncovers the ideologies embedded in texts by suggesting a set of more comprehensive tools which capture the different ways of what the text is doing in representing the world in a particular way. The interest in conducting an analysis that is primarily informed by a linguistically well-defined set of tools enhances the principles of rigorous and objective analysis.

Based on Halliday's theory of systemic functional linguistics, critical stylistics builds a distinguished theoretical and analytical framework that highlights the centrality of texts, presents a new perspective of the term 'critical' and provides a more comprehensive toolkit. The view of the 'centrality of the text' (Jeffries, 2016, p.157), adopting a broad sense of texts as the form of all language use, is understood in light of the idea that text is unavoidable element in all types of stylistic analysis (Jeffries & McIntyre, 2010). This bringing of the text to the forefront of textual analysis is proposed to address the issues of rigor and objectivity that arise from depending on the contextual factors followed by mainstream approaches of CDA. To this point, Jeffries (2014) adds that the range of texts analysed by critical stylistics include poems, novels, newspapers or political manifestoes because stylistic analysis is as "useful and insightful when the data was non-fictional as when it was literary in nature" (p. 408). While the term 'critical' was inspired by CDA, critical stylistics adopted it to highlight the potential of the different linguistic features in uncovering ideologies embedded in texts whether or not we agree with them addressing the issue of subjectivity arising from adhering the analysis to a particular socio-political stance. In this regard, Jeffries argues that following a particular political outlook to account for meanings in texts, which might be the view of some but not all those interested in these texts, is not part of the textual level of meaning (Jeffries, 2014, p. 408). She also stresses that not relating the interpretation of the analysis to a particular political view allows for less biased analysis results (p 409) and this was a major reason for following this approach to analyse the data in this research. One important side of critical stylistics is that it equipped the textual analysis with a more comprehensive set of tools, that are built on justified arguments relating to theoretical and methodological perspectives of the concepts of text, textual meanings and meaning making (Khuzaei, 2019, p.47). Jeffries distinguished ten tools which she calls textual conceptual functions and divided them as core and peripheral according to their importance in the construction of the clause (Hassan, 2024, p. 235). These tools are naming and describing, representing actions/events/states, equating and contrasting, exemplifying and enumerating, prioritising, implying and assuming, negation, hypothesizing, presenting others' speech and thoughts, representing time, space and society. This set of tools can be applied to any type of text and are considered an answer to the issue of CDA's lack of

well-defined toolkit (Jeffries, 2014). The above explained aspects of critical stylistics makes this approach a reasonable candidate to be selected to analyse Trump's 20-points related to Gaza peace plan. The tool of naming and describing is selected to analyse the data and is presented in section 4. At this stage of the research, there is a need to explain the concept of textual meaning as it is the main theoretical stand point that the current paper adopts to carry out the analysis and it is presented in section 3 below

3. Textual meaning

Jeffries introduces the concept of 'textual meaning' as an essential theoretical underpinning of her critical stylistics' approach to text analysis. She defines it simply as that level of meaning "which sits somewhere between the systematic (coded) meaning of what Saussure called the 'langue' and the contextual and relatively variable meaning of language in use, which Saussure called 'parole' (Jeffries, 2014, p. 409). Although her approach is basically informed by Halliday's (1994) systemic functional linguistics and its three metafunctions, she proposes the concept of textual meaning as a new perspective through which these metafunctions are explained to account for the central concern critical stylistics as uncovering "what the text is doing in representing the world in a particular way" (Jeffries, 2010, 2014, 2015, 2016). To this point, she argues that textual meaning is that level of meaning which mediates the de-contextual (semantic) meaning (Halliday's textual metafunction) and the contextual (pragmatic) level of meaning (Halliday's interpersonal metafunction). This level of meaning is taken out of the underlying system of language and linked with the use of language in context and is mainly interested in tying the ideational meaning to the textual level of language- not the underlying systems (Halliday's textual metafunction) nor the contextual uses of pragmatics (Khuzae, 2019, p. 51). This argument outlines two essential takes of critical stylistics on text analysis informed by Halliday's ideational metafunction. First, it proposes the concept of textual meaning as "the point at which conceptual worlds are constructed" (Jeffries, 2022, p.163). Second, it establishes a well-defined theoretical basis for the analytical tools of critical stylistics as part of the ideational function of language where they operate to investigate the way different linguistic features are used to represent a particular view of the world that a rigours and objective stylistic analysis can be attempted (Jeffries, 2014, p. 412).

This argument suggests the theoretical basis for the proposed toolkit of critical stylistics that consists of ten of what Jeffries (2010) textual conceptual functions (TCFs). The selected tool, as the other tools in this approach, depends on well-defined resources of the linguistic system in which the lexical, syntactic and semantic resources of language are considered objective means to examine how these resources could be used to package up, or slant, information with ideological consequences (Alaghbary,

2013: 138). The next section presents details of the tool of naming and describing to introduce it as the tool adopted for the analysis carried out in the current study.

4. The tool of naming and describing

Naming and describing is presented in critical stylistics as one of the core tools because it is available in each and every text where this ubiquity creates the conditions to produce significant textual effects (Jeffries, 2022, p. 29). Theoretically, it refers to a broad understanding of naming that covers three linguistic vehicles used to structure the noun or noun phrase which are, grammatically speaking, the subject or object in the sentence. These linguistic vehicles are the choice of noun, modification and nominalisation. Analytically, it investigates how these linguistic features are used to name people, events, places and things in a particular way focusing on the noun phrase as the basic unit of analysis (Jeffries, 2014, 2016, 2022). This focus on the noun phrase outlines the textual power of naming and describing and its ideological importance in packaging up a great deal of information in few selected words that would create a taken for granted portrayal as it “does not form the proposition of the clause or sentence, but instead labels something that is ...presupposed to exist” (Jeffries, 2010, p. 21). The centrality of the naming process in every text as an indispensable mechanism through which the world of events is constructed accounts for the reason why it is selected in the analysis of this study. In what follows, each of the linguistic vehicles of naming and describing mentioned above are presented commenting on their specific linguistic realisations and the different ideological consequences they entail. Within the linguistic practice of choice of noun, the specific selection of a word not only makes reference to someone, or something, but also suggests the text producer's opinion of that referent. For example, in my data, there is always a preference, of the choice of the noun 'Palestinian' over the choice 'Palestine' which entails the text producer's avoidance to officially refer to the land as an official country (Barkho, 2011). On the other hand, the choice of the noun 'Israel' is recurrently used entailing an evident bias to the way the text producer portrays the two sides involved in the last war on Gaza.

Modification exemplifies the basic unit of analysis in the tool of naming and describing, i.e., the noun phrase. The noun phrase, as mentioned earlier in this section, forms the grammatical subject or object in the sentence. The construction of a noun phrase with pre and post modifiers are used to further determine the nature of the referent (Jeffries, 2010, p. 21). For example, in the data under analysis, the noun phrase '*life sentence prisoners*' is used to encapsulate the interpretation that the Palestinians are criminals who receive juristic conviction. For clarity of analytical procedures, the analysis carried out in this paper considers the naming choices as part of modification process because, in numerous instances, the semantics of the noun on its own does not

present a full interpretation of its use and instead it needs to be examined within the whole process of modification.

Nominalisation is considered a broadening of the category of nominalisation traditionally used in CDA analyses (Khuzaei, 2019, p. 52). The importance of this linguistic vehicle lies in its potential for packaging certain ideological meaning in the head noun itself (Jeffries, 2007, p. 25). This is done by a morphological process which switches the verbal element to be the nominal one changing its status in the sentence structure from setting the sentence's proposition to be only its presupposition closing the space for challenging its truth value. Although this process results in a more formal presentation of actions and events, it definitely and ideologically draws away readers' attention to aspects of agency and power. It is seen in my data regularly and has set an interesting ideological meaning where intentions to blur readers' attention at the action and making it as part of the noun phrase which does not form the sentence proposition. For example, the nominalised verb 'governance' is used several times within different noun phrases in my data to avoid a clear mention of who is going to rule Gaza and to present it as a taken for granted information that Gaza has governance after the activation of the peace plan. The analysis of nominalisation instances, carried out in this paper, is presented in a separate section as they form one unit of ideological meanings that explains the pattern of power. More details of these naming practices are presented in section 6. The next section presents detailed explanation to the data collection and design elaborating on the procedures followed to prepare them for the analysis.

5. Data and Procedures

The data of this study consisted of the text that presents Trump's 20-points Gaza peace plan retrieved from the official website of the BBC¹. The text was selected due to three major reasons. The first is its rich, dense and unprecedented nature and number of nouns, noun modification and nominalisation which constitutes an outstanding sample to carry out naming and describing analysis. The second is that this document provides a practical opportunity to test and verify the argument of the concept of *textual meaning* and its centrality in conceptually presenting the world of events in a particular way. Finally, its recent status, as it has been only announced in Sept.2025, makes it an up-to-date sample of political speeches that a rarity of research is done to examine its different ideological aspects.

To arrange and prepare the text for the analysis, I followed three procedures. First, the instances of naming choices were highlighted, numbered and classified according to the three practices of naming and describing explained in section 4. Second, I divided the highlighted instances among the major three participants involved. These are: the

¹ <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c70155nked7o>

Palestinians (and any other entity referring to them), the Israelis (and any other entity referring to them), and Trump and the USA. The aim of labelling these participants is to arrive at an interpretation that arranges the patterns of meaning gained from the naming practices used. Finally, conclusions were outlined in accounting for the textual meaning portrayed through the different naming practices. In what follows, a detailed analysis of the data is presented with proper instances that exemplifies the potential of naming and describing in presenting a particular portrayal of the world of events through the patterns of agency and power.

6. Analysis, results and discussion

The analysis in this section is divided into two parts. The first part presents the results and discussion of the practices of noun and noun modification in relation to the three participants outlined in section 5. The aim is to account for the pattern of agency using these instances. The second part discusses the instances of nominalisation and its role in the formation of the pattern of power.

6.1 Noun and noun modification

The naming and describing practices of noun and noun modification calculate a total of 63 instances of which 47 instances are used to refer to the Palestinians (or other entities referring to them), 16 for the Israelis, and 6 for Trump and the United States. It is worth notifying that the analysis of the choice of noun is discussed in relation to its modification because modification is treated as part of the naming process in which both practices work together to produce the effects implied by referring to participants in a particular way. In what follows, the naming choices that construct Gaza and the Palestinians, the Israelis and Trump are presented separately.

6.1.1 Gaza and the Palestinians:

As mentioned in above, the Palestinians receive 47 nouns and noun modification practices in the text under analysis. This figure makes them the most recurrent participant in Trump's 20-points peace plan. The noun 'Gaza' was the dominant choice 29 occurrences making 61.70% of the total nouns used to refer to this participant. The nouns ' Hamas' and 'people' have 5 occurrence each making 10.63. The nouns 'Palestinians' and 'prisoners and factions' have 3 instances each making 6.38%. The least occurring noun was 'Gazans' which receive only 2 occurrences making 4.25% of the total instances allocated for this group. See table (1) below

Table (1) Choices of noun referring to Gaza and the Palestinian

Choice of noun	Without modifiers	head noun	Premodifier	Postmodifier	Total	Percentage
Gaza	7	9	2	11	29	61.70%
Gazans	0	2	0	0	2	4.25%
Hamas	2	2	0	1	5	10.63%
The Palestinians	0	1	0	2	3	6.38%
People	1	2	0	2	5	10.63%
Prisoners, factions	0	3	0	0	3	6.38%
Total	10	16	2	14	47	100%

Examining these figures shows that this high average frequency was implemented to present a negative and agentless construction depending on three textual factors. The first is exploring the nature of the modification these nouns receive. Second, the placement of the noun phrase in the sentence structure and third examining the connotative load of the selected nouns themselves which imply the construction of negative agentless meanings. For example, the dominant occurrence of the noun 'Gaza' has interesting ideological meanings that portray Gaza as agentless and powerless participant when placed as head noun, pre, and postmodifier of other head nouns. For example:

1. *Gaza* will be redeveloped for the benefit of the people of Gaza
2. Upon acceptance of this agreement, full aid will be immediately sent *into the Gaza Strip*
3. There will be *a process of demilitarisation of Gaza under the supervision of independent monitors*

While the noun 'Gaza' in the first example is the passive agent of the action 'will be redeveloped' where nothing is said to answer the question of 'who', the second example uses this noun as a premodifier of the head 'Strip' placing the whole phrase in a backgrounded position focusing on the passive action 'will be sent' again leaving the question of 'who' unanswered. In either case, an interpretation of passive and agentless meaning of this noun is constructed giving the impression that its affairs are in control of unstated agents who will redevelop and provide it with aids. The third example uses the noun 'Gaza' in an existential structure as a postmodifier of the noun 'process' where demilitarisation is to be supervised by 'independent monitors.' The noun phrase '*a process of demilitarisation of Gaza under the supervision of independent monitors*' presents a number of ideological implications. First, the noun

'demilitarisation' can linguistically indicate positive meaning as it intends to initiate peace, stability, and the reduction of conflict. However, implications of negative meanings are mainly exemplified in the increased vulnerability, external military threats, and internal security crises due to a reduced capacity for defenses (Lamb, 2000). Second, placing this phrase as the last compulsory element in the clause structure prioritising a taken for granted value of this process which already implies negative meanings. Third, the clear use of the preposition 'under' suggests a further meaning of agentless 'Gaza' that will be under the supervision of more powerful bodies described as 'independent' whose job is to 'monitor' the process.

The plural nouns 'Gazans', 'the Palestinians', 'people', 'prisoners' and 'factions' were also used to construct the pattern agentless participant adding the meanings of powerless, unauthentic and participants. While the use of nouns 'Gazans' 'the Palestinians' and 'people' highlights the national identity of the referents, their position in the sentence structure constructs the meaning of acted upon participants whose naming choice reflects nothing other than powerless agents. For example:

4. Israel will release *the remains of 15 deceased Gazans*
5. The States will establish a dialogue between Israel and *the Palestinians* to agree on a political horizon for peaceful and prosperous co-existence
6. We will encourage *people* to stay and offer *them* the opportunity to build a better Gaza.

The naming choices of 'Gazans', 'the Palestinians' and 'people' in examples 4-6 are placed in the object position which brings out two outstanding ideologies. First making these naming choices represent the most important piece of information in the sentence structure as they are part of the new information included in the sentence predicate capturing the readers' attention to what is being done to them. Second, it constructs the meaning of those who are acted upon and have no power to act or react to the actions of 'will release', 'will establish' and 'will encourage' which decreases the national identity value and increases the acted upon and powerless participants.

When examining the nouns 'prisoners' and 'factions', analysis shows that they construct criminalised and participants in dispute among themselves highlighting a negative portrayal of the Palestinians. Consider the following:

7. ...Israel will release 250 life sentence prisoners ...
8. A guarantee will be provided by regional partners to ensure that *Hamas*, and *the factions*, comply with their obligations and that New Gaza poses no threat to its neighbours or its people

In the examples above, the Palestinians are named 'prisoners' and 'factions' constructing them as convicted criminals who are serving a 'life sentence' judgement in example 7 and focusing on the meaning of conflict and disagreement among the

Palestinians themselves in example 8. While in both cases the meaning of agentless participants persists adding the meaning of with the criminalised and disagreement, the use of the noun ' Hamas', occurring in 5 instances, implied an illegitimate body who needs to be dealt with to implement the peace plan. Consider the following:

9. Once all hostages are returned, *Hamas members who commit to peaceful co-existence and to decommission their weapons* will be given amnesty
10. Hamas and other factions agree to not have any role in the governance of Gaza, directly, indirectly, or in any form

In example 9, the choice of 'members' as the head noun dissects the unity of the premodifier noun ' Hamas' where information about these members is enclosed in the relative clause 'who commit to peaceful co-existence and decommission their weapons'. The details in this relative clause encapsulate extra taken for granted information that constructs a demonising portrayal of these members in a way that an obligation of commitment of peaceful co-existence and decommissioning of their weapons is required so that they are given 'amnesty'. Absence of the agency of 'who' shall give this amnesty once again constructs the Palestinians as undergoers of others' actions that in turn results in an agentless image of the participants in this group. Moreover, in example 10, while the naming choice suggests a sort of disagreement that weakens the image of unity of the participants in this group, it also portrays them as doing nothing other than agreeing 'not to have any role in the governance of Gaza'. The complex use of choice of noun and nominalisation 'governance' downplay the agentive character of the group and imply an intention to dispose them from any reference to power. More discussion about this point is presented in section 6.2.

6.1.2 Israel:

Analysis of the naming practices of noun and noun modification attached to Israel reveals that there are 16 naming choices attached to this participant. See table (2)

Table (2): Choices of noun referring Israel

Choice of noun	Without modifiers	head noun	Premodifier	Postmodifier	Total
Israel	5	0	0	1	6
Israeli(s)	0		1	1	2
Israel Defence Force (IDF)	3	0	0	0	3
Hostage(s)	0	5	0	0	5
Total	8	5	1	2	16

Naming and Describing Practices in Trump's 20-Point Gaza Peace Plan

Examining these naming practices revealed two dominant ideological portrayals that construct the Israelis as powerful and agentive even when they are victimised. The first ideological meaning lies in the particular naming choices attached to the Israelis where the semantic connotations of the selected nouns victimise them. For example, there was a recurrent use of the noun 'hostage(s)' in the text which might emphasis the victimising ideology that construct them as victims rather than causing all the atrocities in the whole region of Gaza. The interesting point about this choice is that it suggests that the one who hostages them is criminal giving them the right to seek freedom which in itself implies a powerful aspect of their side in the plan.

The second ideological portrayal lies in strengthening the taken for granted powerful status of the Israelis. This is done through positioning the naming choices of the Israelis in the subject position with short and official noun phrases pointing out their official identity as country 'Israeli forces', 'Israel Defence Army' or simply 'Israel'. Consider the following

11. *Israeli forces* will withdraw to the agreed upon line to prepare for *a hostage release*

12....the Israel Defence Forces (IDF) will withdraw based on standards, milestones, and timeframe...s

13. *Israel* will not occupy or annex Gaza

In examples 11-13, the very positioning of the naming choices 'Israeli forces', 'Israel Defence Army' and 'Israel' in the subject position not only presupposes its existence as a taken for granted entity but also as that powerful naming choices of 'forces' and 'defence' which legitimise this existence.

6.1.3 Trump and the United States

The third participant in this analysis is Trump and the United States that receive the least naming choices in the text under analysis with only 6 instances

Table (3) Naming choices attached to Trump and the United States.

Choice of noun	Without modifiers	head noun	Premodifier	Postmodifier	Total
Trump	0	1	2	0	3
The United States	3	0	0	0	3
Total	3	3	0	0	6

Analysis of the naming choices that appears in the table above shows that they construct Trump and the United States as powerful and have legislative authority. For example:

14. *A Trump economic development plan to rebuild and energise Gaza* will be created by convening a panel of experts who have helped birth some of the thriving modern miracle cities in the Middle East

The unnegotiable content of the noun phrase in the subject position of the example above packaged up a number of positive nouns and adjectives that construct Trump as a powerful agentive participant. So, the head noun 'plan' is not only described as, in pre-modifier adjective, 'economic' one for the sake of development but is also a Trump's one. The to-infinitive non- finite clause as post-modification adds further powerful and agentive aspect to this unchallenged 'Trump's plan' to be for the aim of building an energising Gaza.

6.2 Nominalisation and its ideological implications

Although nominalisation is common in political speech as a marker of formal, bureaucratic, and political texts like peace plans (Weiss, 2005), its use in Trump's Gaza peace plan shows a number of ideological meanings that participates in constructing the pattern of power. The text under analysis comes up with 28 instances of nominalisation that were mostly used to hide agency and express sources of power to implement the peace plan. See table (4)

Table (4): nominalisation instances in Trump's peace plan

Nominalisation	Frequency
governance	4
withdrawal	1
demilitarisation	2
release	1
supervision	2
redevelopment	1
investment	3
coexistence	1
self-determination	1
statehood	1
deconfliction	1
distribution	1
reintegration	1
agreement	5

Naming and Describing Practices in Trump's 20-Point Gaza Peace Plan

humanitarian	1
guarantee	1
interfaith dialogue process	1
Total	28

Testing the placement of the nominalisations' instances shown in table (4) comes up with worth outlining ideological implications. First, when nominalisation instances refer to the Palestinians, they usually imply power disposal and imposition. For example, the choice of 'governance', which was used as follows:

15. Gaza will be governed under *the temporary transitional governance of a technocratic, apolitical Palestinian committee, responsible for delivering the day-to-day running of public services and municipalities for the people in Gaza*
16. This body will call on best international standards to create *modern and efficient governance*
17. Hamas and other factions agree to not have *any role in the governance of Gaza*, directly, indirectly, or in any form

From examples 15-16, it can be explained that while the nominalisation 'governance' was used to focus on the idea of ruling, this ruling is limited stating that it is '*temporary*' and '*transitional*'. There is also the use of postmodifiers that connote western standards to characterise this ruling as the one being '*technocratic*', '*apolitical*', '*modern*', and '*efficient*'. In addition, an emphasis on the limited authority of this ruling is stated once more in the post-modification '*delivering day-to-day running of public services.*' In example 17, the meaning of depriving Hamas from any chance to be part of Gaza governance is strengthened by its overlap with verbal process in the negative form 'agree not to have' which in turn constructs a powerless participant. Ultimately, the patterns of powerless participants persist in the constructions of the Palestinians.

Second, nominalising actions attached to the Israelis construct them as taking initiative and adds to the power of unnegotiable presupposed information that is not open to challenge. This textual effect is doubled by the recurrent placement of these nominalisation instances in subordinate clauses which maximises the effect of the taken for granted meaning of power. For space constraints, I will discuss the instance of 'withdrawal' to exemplify this point. Consider the example below:

- 18.... battle lines will remain frozen until conditions are met *for the complete staged withdrawal.*

In example 18, the nominalised action 'withdrawal' is placed in a subordinate conditional clause. This placement brings the overlap of backgrounding the information of 'withdrawal' with nominalising it giving a double effect of closing negotiation about the taken for granted value of its existence. In this regard, Jefferis (2010, p. 78) states that "the lower the level of the subordination, the less amenable the structure is to scrutiny and/or objection or disagreement". So, 'withdrawal' is not only nominalised action of power that is to take place only when 'conditions are met' but also is taken for granted due to its backgrounded position in a subordinate clause maximising the meaning of powerful participant where the truth values of the information is not open to argument.

The third important ideological meaning of nominalisation is presented by the recurrent use of the nominalised actions of 'agreement' (5 times) and 'investment' (2 times). This recurrent use drew the attention to the text producer's intention to force the Israelis conditions to activate the 'agreement' and to promote a financial interest in implementing this peace plan where Gaza is constructed as an investing opportunity. Consider the following:

19....the IDF will progressively hand over the Gaza territory it occupies to the ISF according to an *agreement* they will make with the transitional authority until they are withdrawn completely from Gaza.

20.Many thoughtful *investment* proposals and exciting development ideas have been crafted by well-meaning international groups...these *investments* ... will create jobs, opportunity, and hope for future Gaza

In example 19, the occupied land of Gaza is to be handed over not to Palestinians but to an International Stabilisation Force (ISF) who agrees with '*the transitional authority*' of Palestinians. The downgrading of the Palestinians' status and constructing them as only 'transitional' authority of their own land is one recurrent ideology that has prevailed in this text. Example 20 presents 'investment' as pre modifier of the noun 'proposals' and head noun in the second mention of this example. In both cases, the meaning of financial interest is presupposed by placing 'investment' as part of a noun phrase that describes the text producer's intention to construct Gaza as an investing opportunity.

The analysis presented in section 6 has explained the potential of the role played by the noun choice, its modification and the use of nominalisation in the construction of the patterns of agency and power. The analysis has also highlighted the importance of the structural context in supporting the interpretation of the implied ideological meanings. Overlap between naming, transitivity and prioritising was in operation to support determining the specific ideological meanings intended by numerous naming and describing instances. After outlining the detailed analysis of the naming practices that construct the world of events and the participants involved in Trump's 20-points Gaza

peace plan, section 6 below outlines a number of major concluding points commenting on some analytical issues and suggests recommendations for future research.

7. Conclusion

The major aim of this research is to present a naming and describing analysis following the critical stylistic approach to explore patterns of agency and power presented in Trump's 20-points Gaza peace plan. To do so, the paper raises two research questions. The first attempted to discover the range of naming and describing practices that construct patterns of agency and power. Examining the text proves that the three naming and describing linguistic structures were used regularly and have participated in the construction of agency and power in the text. Analysis shows that the choice of noun has constructed the Palestinian as less powerful by avoiding referring to them as a country which results in less power and agency status. On the other hand, the noun 'Israel' was frequently used to ascertain the legitimate and powerful status of the referent. In either case bias in naming these two participants entails the text producer's intention to give more legitimacy to the latter and decrease the state rights of the former.

The second question intended to examine the value of the centrality of the concept of 'textual meaning' and its role in providing a more rigorous and objective analysis. Throughout the analysis, different examples revealed that textual meaning was essential to present an interpretation that can account for the ideological meaning intended by the use of naming practice depending on the textual surroundings of the noun and relating this to the connotations different naming choices entail. For example, the nominalised choice of 'governance' proves to be one essential textual choice that underlies the text producer's ideology to present a taken for granted portrayal of who is to rule Gaza after the activation of the plan announcement and at the same time drawing away attention on the identity of those who shall rule Gaza.

The different instances of naming and describing practices analysed in this study have also shown the importance of conducting an analysis that enable interpreting ideological meanings whether or not we agree with them simply because they are planted in the choices used in the text. For example, the choice of the nouns ' Hamas' and 'Israel' and their placement in the sentence structure revealed an intended ideological meaning that legitimise power and agency for Israel and downgrade the same meanings when the participant is the Palestinians.

The discussions and analysis carried out in this study demonstrates the power of the critical stylistic approach in carrying out an analysis that adheres to the principles of rigor and objectivity. This is done by examining the interpretation of the naming choices following their semantic and syntactic textual factors that uncover ideologies whether or not the analyst agrees with them. Future research on the same text is recommended to uncover other the ideological meaning embedded in the choice of

verbs and the way structural foregrounding and backgrounding are employed ideologically and how this portrays the world of events and that participants involved in Trump's 20-point Gaza peace plan.

References:

- Ahmed, I., & Malik, U. T. (2024). Language and Power: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Political Speeches in Multicultural Societies. In *Proceeding of the International Conference on Language, Literature, and Culture Studies* (Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 42-47).
- Alaghbary, G. S. (2013). Review of the book *Critical Stylistics: The Power of English*, by L. Jeffries. *International Journal of Language Studies*. (Vol. 7, pp. 3).
- Alemi, M., Tajeddin, Z., & Rajabi Kondlaji, A. (2018). A discourse-historical analysis of two Iranian presidents' speeches at the UN General Assembly. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 6(1), 1-17.
- Al-Rikaby, A. B. M. (2025) Exclusion/Inclusion of Self & The Other Via Moral Disengagement in U.S. Presidential Rhetoric on Palestine (2025). *Mustansiriyah Journal of Arts* 49 (110), 345- 360
- Barkho, L. (2011). The discursive and social paradigm of Al-Jazeera English in comparison and parallel with the BBC. *Communication Studies*, 62(1), 23-40.
- Breeze, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and its critics. *Pragmatics*. Quarterly publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA). 21, 4.493-525.
- Hassan, W., Rehman, A., Zafar, A., Akbar, F., & Masood, S. (2019, September). An Application of Fairclough's Three Dimensional CDA Approach to Fraser Anning's Speech in Australian Senate. In *Linguistic Forum-A Journal of Linguistics* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 32-35).
- Hammersley, M. (1997). On the Foundations of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Language & Communication*. 17, 3.237-248.
- Handayani, D., Heriyanto, Soemantri Y. S (2018). Fairclough's Three Dimension Framework Used on Trump's Political Speech: A Critical Discourse Analysis A Case Study of Historic Speech related to Jerusalem. In *Proceedings of the 1st Annual International Conference on Language and Literature* (Vol. 18, p. 19).
- Hassan, S. H. (2024). The Israel-Gaza Conflict in the British Press A Corpus-based Critical Stylistic Analysis. *Thi Qar Arts Journal*, 8(47).
- Jaafar, B. A. (2025). A Sociocognitive Study of Queen Elizabeth's II Speeches on her Daughters-in-Law (Doctoral dissertation, College of Education for Humanities Department of English. A Thesis Submitted to the Council of the College of Education for Humanities, University of Kerbala).
- Jeffries, L. (2007). *Textual construction of the female body: A critical discourse approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Jeffries, L. (2010a). *Critical Stylistics: The power of English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jeffries, L., & McIntyre, D. (2010). *Stylistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jeffries, L. (2014). *Critical Stylistics*. In M. Burke (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics*. London: Routledge
- Jeffries, L. (2016). *Critical Stylistics* In V. Sotirova (Ed.), *The Bloomsbury Companion To Stylistics* (pp. 157-176) London: Bloomsbury
- Jeffries, Lesley. (2022). *The language of contemporary poetry: A framework for poetic analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Katea, H. H. (2018). *Understanding Discursive Persuasion in American and Iraqi Call to Arms Discourse: Discursive Strategies as Instruments of Persuasive Politics*. Bangor University (United Kingdom).
- Khuzaee, S. (2019). (PhD). *A Multimodal Textual Analysis of Non-literary Texts: A Critical Stylistic Approach*. University of Huddersfield: Huddersfield
- Li, T., & Zhang, Y. (2019). Language and power: A critical discourse analysis of the political speech. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 5(4), 259-262.
- Masroor, F., Shaikh, S., Marwa, S., & Afzaal, S. (2020). Persuasion and Mind Control in Leadership Discourse: A Socio-Cognitive Approach towards Selected Political Speeches. *Journal of Communication and Cultural Trends*, Fall.
- Nagi, N. (2019). The 'Then' and the 'Now' in Brexit Discourse: A Discourse-Historical Approach Case Study. *فيلولوجى: سلسلة الدراسات الأدبية واللغوية*, 36(72), 79-106.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2013). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. Routledge.
- Forchtner, B., Krzyżanowski, M., & Wodak, R. (2013). Mediatization, right-wing populism and political campaigning: The case of the Austrian Freedom Party. In *Media talk and political elections in Europe and America* (pp. 205-228). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Lamb, G. (2000) 'Reflections on Demilitarization: A Southern African Perspective', *International Peacekeeping* 7=3p.120.
- Othman, A. R. (2023). *Implicit Ideologies in Selected Political Speeches: A Socio-cognitive Approach* (Doctoral dissertation, Koya University).
- Othman, A. R., & Salih, S. M. (2024). The Manifestation of Discursive Devices in Male and Female Politician Speeches: A Socio-Cognitive Study. *Mitanni Journal of Humanitarian Sciences*, 5(1), 18-31.

- Rashid, B. N. M. A (2023) Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Political Speech on Online Education1. *Journal of Development in Social Sciences and Humanities*; Vol, 15, 68-78.
- Reisigl, M. (2008) 11. Rhetoric of Political Speeches. *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*, 243-70.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 87–121). London, UK: Sage.
- Reisigl, M. (2013). Critical discourse analysis. *The Oxford handbook of sociolinguistics*, 67-90
- Shadeed, Y., Ayesh, A., & Itmeizeh, M. (2019). Critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's speech on recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. *Academic Research International*, 10(4), 11-28.
- Simonyan, A. (2016). Cognitive Analysis of Political speeches. *Foreign Languages in Higher Education*, 20(3 (21)), 11-16.
- Stubbs, M. (1997). Whorf's children: Critical comments on critical discourse analysis (CDA). *British studies in applied linguistics*. 12, 100-116.
- Tincheva, N. (2012). Political speeches and text structure. In *Selected papers from the 1st ARSA Conference* (pp. 1295-3000).
- Ulrike, T. (2013). *Crime through a corpus: The linguistic construction of offenders, victims and crimes in the German and UK press*. (PhD thesis). University of Huddersfield: Huddersfield
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. *Belgian journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359-383.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. London: Sage
- Yeo, J. Y., Ting, S. H., Jerome, C., & Leong, H. J. (2025). A Retrospective View of Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). *Gading Journal for the Social Sciences* (e-ISSN 2600-7568), 28(1), 22-37.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: a critical view. *Language and Literature*. 4,3.157-172.
- Weiss, E. H. (2005). *The Elements of International English Style*. New York: Armonk.
- Wodak, R. (1989). *Language, power and ideology: Benjamins*

About the author:

Shatha Khuzae is a senior lecturer of Linguistics, College of Education for Woman/ University of Al Qadisiya /Qadisiya/ Iraq. She holds a PhD in Linguistics from the University of Huddersfield, UK. University/Iraq. Her research interests include multimodality, multimodal stylistics, critical stylistics, textual stylistics, textual analysis, visual grammar, social semiotics, and critical discourse analysis.

sthatha.salih@qu.edu.iq