

‘Clear’ vs. ‘woolly’ language use in political speeches: the case of the controversial Dutch politician Geert Wilders

Author: Maarten Van Leeuwen

Affiliation: Leiden University, The Netherlands

Address: Department of Dutch Language and Culture
P.N. van Eyckhof 1, k. 106b
P.O. Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

Telephone: 0031-71-527 20 24

Email: m.van.leeuwen@hum.leidenuniv.nl

1 Introduction

In the Dutch political landscape, Geert Wilders has been one of the politicians who has attracted the most attention in recent years. Wilders is a controversial politician. He is the leader of the right wing populist Party for Freedom (PVV), and the main point at his political agenda is to stop what he calls ‘the Islamification of the Netherlands’. Internationally he is most known for his anti-Islam movie *Fitna*, which deals with this subject as well. Wilders is very successful with his anti-Islamic standpoints. In June 2009, his party was the big winner in the European Union elections, and opinion polls indicate that the Party for Freedom would probably become the largest political party if national elections were held now .

Wilders is not only well-known for *what* he says. He also draws attention with *how* he puts his message into words. On the one hand he is criticized for using words like ‘bonkers’, ‘insane’ or ‘completely nuts’ to characterize his opponents in parliamentary debates. On the other hand, he is able to formulate his standpoints very clearly, as is for instance indicated by the fact that he won a ‘plain language award’ in 2007, or by the recent judgment of the Dutch political scientist André Krouwel who stated that ‘Wilders scores low on argumentation’, but speaks ‘in very clear phrases’¹.

Which stylistic means underlie such an impressionistic judgment? *What* makes Wilders’ language use so ‘clear’? In this paper I will go into this question, by analyzing a representative Wilders speech which attracted quite some attention in the Netherlands. By doing so, I will illustrate the method I am using to analyze style in speeches. In particular, I will argue that ‘style’ is more than for instance foregrounded rhetorical figures and tropes, or conspicuous use of words: it is also a matter of *grammatical* text features, that are undeservedly neglected in most stylistic analyses.

The structure of my paper is as follows: first I sketch briefly the context of the Wilders speech and my method; then I will mention some striking stylistic features that contribute to the clarity of Wilders' language use, and finally I will go more deeply into a *grammatical* phenomenon to illustrate that such a feature can sort out subtle rhetorical effects which are worth analyzing.

2 Context and Method

In September 2007, Geert Wilders delivered a speech in the Dutch Lower Chamber during a debate on 'Islamic activism'. In his speech, Wilders incited a ban on the Koran, and argued that what he calls 'the Islamification of the Netherlands' has to be stopped. The speech caused quite some commotion, especially because Wilders called the then Minister of Integration, Ella Vogelaar, 'insane'. The speech is still representative for the way in which Wilders presents himself in addresses: with radical standpoints, breaking through political etiquettes, and in wordings which can impressionistically be described as 'clear'.

This impressionistic judgment about Wilders' language use functions as the starting point for my analysis. I make use of the method by Leech & Short (2007[1981]) to analyze which linguistic means underlie this impression. Two important aspects in this method are 1) the use of a checklist in which possible relevant linguistic means for stylistic analysis are mentioned, and 2) the choice of a point of comparison, to facilitate the stylistic analysis.

The original checklist by Leech & Short is included in the appendix. With my colleague Suzanne Fagel I am working on a Dutch version of this checklist. It functions as a heuristic tool that facilitates finding relevant linguistic means which contribute to the 'clarity' of Wilders' language use. In this paper, I will only point at *a few* factors.

As for the point of comparison, I have chosen Minister Vogelaar's speech about integration in the same debate on Islamic Activism. I have chosen *her* speech to compare Wilders with, because judgments about her style were quite the opposite from Wilders: Vogelaar was strongly criticized in the media for her 'unclear', 'veiled' or 'woolly' language use.

3 Several striking differences

A comparison of the two speeches² shows immediately some obvious differences. One of those differences is Wilders' use of concrete nouns and verbs which have a strong connotation, often accompanied by adjectives and adverbs which denote an endpoint on a semantic scale. These leave nothing to the imagination:

- (1) The Koran is a *highly dangerous* book; a book which is *completely against* our legal order and our democratic institutions. In this light, it is *absolutely necessary* to ban the Koran for the defense and reinforcement of our civilization and our constitutional state. (...)

The majority of Dutch citizens have become *fully aware* of the danger, and regard Islam as a threat to our culture. (...) Many Dutch citizens are *fed up to the back teeth* and *yearn* for action. However, their representatives in The Hague are doing *precisely nothing*. They are held back by fear, political correctness or simply electoral motives.³

Vogelaar instead, speaks more in indefinite concepts. Words with strong connotations are lacking, and when she makes use of quantifying adverbs, they do not denote a semantic endpoint, but function as mitigating modifiers. A representative example:

- (2) *Some habits and traditions* get *nearly* noiselessly accepted in *society*, but we also see that *less pleasant* and *sometimes even negative ways of changes* cause friction and tension in *society*.⁴

In addition, we find in Vogelaar's speech (and not in Wilders' address) quite some 'officialese', in particular noun style combined with 'empty verbs', where verb style could have been used as well:

- (3) It [the policy] is about the *encouragement* of the emancipation of women, the *strengthening* of the empowerment of these communities against radicalization and *making* violence related to honour a subject of discussion.⁵

Another difference between both speakers is the use of classical rhetorical figures of speech: Wilders makes use of all kinds of parallelisms and figures of repetition, which give his speech a clear structure; Vogelaar hardly uses them (Van Leeuwen 2009b). Furthermore, different from Vogelaar, Wilders makes use of clear imagery to present his ideas: he systematically speaks about 'the Islamification' in terms of war.

- (4) Madam speaker, approximately 1400 years ago *war was declared on us* by an ideology of hate and violence (...).

- (5) (...) the Islamic *incursion* must be *stopped*. Islam is *the Trojan Horse* in Europe.
- (6) She [minister Vogelaar] *is betraying* Dutch culture (...).
- (7) Islam aims *to dominate, subject, kill* and *wage war*.⁶

The war metaphor contributes to the clarity of Wilders' message: it enables him to create clear distinctions between good and evil, between aggressor (Islam), victims (millions of Dutch people), cowards (the Dutch government) and defenders of freedom (Wilders and his Party for Freedom). In addition, the suggested war situation can function as a justification for Wilders' radical viewpoints: in times of peace, his standpoints would be far less self-evident (cf. Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Lammerts & Verhagen 1994).

4 Grammatical phenomena

The brief overview of stylistic differences between Wilders and Vogelaar was meant to show what kind of stylistic means attention is paid to primarily in stylistic analyses of speeches: linguistic means that in the checklist by Leech and Short can be categorized under A (word use) and C (figures of speech). Attention is also often paid to category D (context and cohesion), for instance by answering a question like 'how does a speaker make strategically use of inclusive and exclusive *we*? (e.g. Cheng 2006 – and many others), but in general, barely any attention is paid to category B in the checklist: *grammatical* categories of analysis (cf. Van Leeuwen 2009a). In the rest of my paper, I will argue that it is important to take this category of analysis into account as well, complementary to the other categories mentioned. Grammatical choices can sort out subtle rhetorical effects which are worth analyzing. I will demonstrate this by the speeches of Wilders and Vogelaar.

4.1 Sentence length and sentence complexity

It can be expected on the basis of the impressionistic judgments about Wilders' en Vogelaar's style, that Wilders on average has not only shorter sentences, but also sentences that are less complex than Vogelaar. This indeed appears to be the case:

	Wilders	Vogelaar
Total of Sentences	84	89
Sentence length M(sd)	15,2 (12,4)	19,8 (10,8)

Figure 1: average sentence length in Wilders' and Vogelaar's speech on Islamic Activism

Wilders' average sentence length is 15,2 versus 19,8 for Vogelaar – a difference which is significant ($t = -2.62$, $df = 171$, $p = .01$).

When we look at the complexity of sentences, it is striking that more than 58% of Wilders' sentences do not contain subordinate clauses, versus 31% in the case of Vogelaar's speech:

Sentence type	Wilders	Vogelaar
Only main clause(s)	58,4% (52/84)	31% (26/89)

Figure 2: main clauses in Wilders' and Vogelaar's speech on Islamic Activism

This difference in sentence structure is also reflected in the amount of finite subordinated clauses that both speakers use: 43 vs. 87 (in 84 and 89 sentences respectively). When we differentiate between different *types* of finite subordinated clauses, we get the following, more detailed overview:

Type of finite subordinate clause	Wilders	Vogelaar
Adverbial clauses	8	13
Non-restrictive relatives	11	9
Restrictive relatives	12	21
Complementation	12	44
Total	43	87

Figure 3: finite subordinated clauses in Wilders' and Vogelaar's speech on Islamic Activism

As can be seen, the main difference in the use of finite subordinate clauses can be found in the complementation category, which is used 12 times by Wilders, and 44 times by Vogelaar. For that reason, I will examine the phenomenon of complementation in more detail, to illustrate how such a difference in grammar can realize subtle rhetorical effects. First I will go into the phenomenon of complementation; after that I will discuss the use of complementation in Wilders' en Vogelaar's speech, and its rhetorical effects.

4.3 Complementation constructions

Verhagen (2005) argues that complementation constructions consist of a 'matrix-' and 'complement-' clause, in which the complement-clause gives a description of reality, while the matrix-clause rather gives a description of the speaker's stance towards that description of reality – as is illustrated by the following example (Verhagen 2005: 96):

‘MATRIX-CLAUSE’	‘COMPLEMENT-CLAUSE’
(8) A. The director of GenTech expects that	clones of mammalian embryos will become possible in the near future.
B. Others believe that	it may take somewhat longer
C. but nobody doubts that	the cloning of a full-grown sheep or horse will be a reality within ten years.
D. The question is whether or whether	society is mentally and morally ready for this we will once again be hopelessly overtaken by the technical developments.

In each sentence, the matrix clause expresses the speaker’s stance towards a description of reality, which can be found in the complement clause. The expression of stance in the matrix clause can be *explicitly* related to the person whose stance is represented: in sentence A) this is the director’s viewpoint, and in B) and C) the standpoint of *others* and *nobody*. In D) however, an *impersonal* complementation construction can be observed: the matrix clause denotes a cognitive stance which is not explicitly related to somebody. In such a case, the context gives a decisive answer whose stance is adopted (Verhagen 2005: 131-137): in this case, the ‘matrix-clause’ expresses the viewpoint of the writer.

Verhagen argues that making use of a complementation construction can sort out certain rhetorical effects, as can be illustrated with another example (Verhagen 2005: 105-107):

- (9) Will we be in time for the football match?
- a) It was scheduled for 4 p.m.
 - b) I think it was scheduled for 4 p.m.
 - c) Michael said that it was scheduled for 4 p.m.

The argumentative *orientation* of each answer is the same: each of the three responses steers the addressee to draw the same conclusion (probably ‘yes, we will be in time’). However, the argumentative *strength* of each answer is different: the A-sentence presents the relevant information directly, ‘as a matter of fact’. In the B-sentence, this information is explicitly related to the point of view that the speaker has of the situation. As a result, the possibility is activated that there is a difference between that point of view and reality. In other words, by explicitly presenting

his perspective on the issue, the speaker evokes the idea that also *other* perspectives are possible. As a consequence, the B-utterance leaves more room for negotiation and discussion than the A-sentence: the argumentative strength is less. The argumentative strength of utterance C is even weaker than the B-sentence, because here the possibility exists that the speaker of the utterance (*I*) and Michael have a different standpoint about the question whether they will be in time.

4.4 Wilders' en Vogelaar's use of complementation constructions

Back now to the difference in complementation in the speeches by Wilders and Vogelaar. A detailed analysis gives the following results:

Type of complementation	Vogelaar
1 st person singular	14
1 st person plural	10
Impersonal (stance speaker)	18
Total	42

Figure 4: Complementation constructions used by Vogelaar, expressing her perspective

Vogelaar uses a complementation construction with a first person in the matrix clause 24 times: 14 times with *I*, and 10 times with inclusive *we*:

- (10) *I believe that* my role as minister of integration is to raise these matters within the communities in which they occur.
- (11) *More and more often, we see that* Muslims are being equated with extremists and enemies of democracy.⁷

In addition, Vogelaar uses an 'impersonal' complementation construction 19 times, of which 18 times the context clearly indicates that the matrix clause expresses *Vogelaar's* stance towards the topics that she mentions⁸:

- (12) *It is a fact that* the acceptance of this religion is complicated through (...).
- (13) *For the authorities, this means that* religion as such is a collateral factor which has to be taken into account in our policy (...).⁹

In other words, in 84 sentences Vogelaar uses a complementation construction 42 times in which she expresses her stance towards the situation. In Wilders' speech, this is strikingly different:

Type of complementation	Wilders	Vogelaar
1 st person singular	0	14
1 st person plural	1	10
Impersonal (stance speaker)	0	18
Total	1	42

Figure 5: Complementation constructions used by Wilders expressing his perspective, compared to Vogelaar

In Wilders' speech, only once a personal complementation construction with a first person in the matrix clause is found (and he never uses impersonal complementation constructions at all):

(14) Madam Speaker, *let us ensure that* the third Islamic invasion, which is currently in full spate, will be stopped (...).¹⁰

What is the rhetorical effect of these differences? It is striking that Vogelaar often describes her standpoints as her *perspective* on integration, while Wilders presents his ideas primarily as *facts*. As a result, Vogelaar leaves room for discussion and negotiation, whereas Wilders leaves minimal room for that: the *lacking* of complementation constructions in Wilders' language use contributes to the certainty with which he presents his ideas.

4.5 Third person complementation constructions

In figure 3 it can be seen that Wilders uses a complementation construction 12 times in his speech. So far, I discussed only one of them; what about the other 11 cases?

It turns out that these complementation constructions have a *third person* in the matrix clause (a type which can be found only once in Vogelaar's address). For instance:

(15) *Minister Donner believes that* Sharia law should be capable of being introduced in the Netherlands (...).

(16) *Minister Vogelaar babbles that* the future Netherlands can be a country with a Judeo-Christian-Islamic tradition, *and that* she aims to help Islam to take root in Dutch society.¹¹

In other words: Wilders not only uses little complementation compared to Vogelaar; it is also striking that *when* he uses it, he uses it almost exclusively to present the standpoints of *other people*. Those standpoints are presented as *perspectives* on integration, which enables Wilders to distance himself

from those standpoints by presenting his own ideas. Wilders own ideas are presented without complementation constructions, that is, directly, 'as a matter of fact'.

The factuality and certainty by which Wilders presents his own ideas contributes to the clarity of his message. By presenting 'facts', it looks as if Wilders is very objective. At the same time however, he is also extremely subjective (cf. Langacker 1991), as can be seen in for instance his use of evaluative verbs, nouns and adverbs, and his presentation of what he calls the 'Islamification' in terms of war (cf. section 3 above). The interplay of 'objectivity' and 'subjectivity' and its rhetorical consequences for representing someone's standpoint is an interesting point for further research.

5 Summary

In this paper, I have given a practical illustration of the method I am using to analyze style in speeches. I have pointed at several factors which contribute to the 'clarity' of Wilders' language use, by making a comparison with the 'woolly' language use of former minister of integration Ella Vogelaar – using the checklist by Leech & Short (2007[1981]) as my main heuristic tool.

The 'clarity' by which Wilders presents his ideas is due to a combination of stylistic means, like concreteness in word use, metaphor use, parallelisms & figures of repetition, lack of 'officialese', etc. I have especially argued that also *the lack of complementation constructions* is one of the contributing factors to Wilders' plain language. With that, I hope to have shown that it can be fruitful in stylistic research to focus on grammatical categories of analysis as well, complementary to more traditional categories like word use, metaphor or other figures of speech. Grammatical choices can sort out subtle rhetorical effects that are worth analyzing.

Bibliography

- Cheng, M. (2006) 'Constructing a new political spectacle: tactics of Chen Shui-Bian's 2000 and 2004 inaugural speeches', *Discourse and Society* 17 (5) 583-608.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980) *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago [etc.]: University of Chicago Press.
- Lammerts, A. and A. Verhagen (1994) 'De oorlog in de krant', *Perspectieven in taalbeheersingsonderzoek*, 375-384. Dordrecht.
- Langacker, R. (1991) *Concept, Image, and Symbol, The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Leech, G. N. and M. H. Short (2007[1981]) *Style in Fiction, A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*, 2nd edition. London [etc.]: Longman.

- Van Leeuwen, M. (2009a) 'Rhetorical Style of Political Speeches: A Linguistic Approach', *Proceedings of the 2nd Rhetoric in Society Conference*, January 21-23 2009, Leiden University.
- Van Leeuwen, M. (2009b) 'Het hoofdzinnenbeleid van Wilders, Over de stijl van Geert Wilders en Ella Vogelaar', *Tekstblad* 15, 2, 6-11.
- Verhagen, A. (2005) *Constructions of Intersubjectivity, Discourse, Syntax and Cognition*. Oxford: University Press.

Notes

1. See <http://www.kennislink.nl/publicaties/helderheid-overtuigingskracht-en-humor> (a Dutch website). Last accessed on October 22, 2009.
2. The examples I present in this paper are translated from Dutch. I translated these in the case of Vogelaar's speech; for the Wilders' speech, I made use of his own translation.
3. Dutch original: 'De Koran is levensgevaarlijk en volledig in strijd met onze rechtsorde en democratische rechtsstaat. Het zal de rechtsstaat, de vrijheid van godsdienst en onze Westerse beschaving alleen maar versterken als wij de Koran verbieden. Ter verdediging en versterking van onze rechtsstaat en beschaving is het dan ook bittere noodzaak de Koran te verbieden.'
 (...) 'De meerderheid van de Nederlanders is namelijk doordrongen van het feit dat de islam een gevaar is.
 (...) veel Nederlanders zijn het spuugzat en hunkeren naar actie. Maar de Haagse politiek doet helemaal niets, tegengehouden door angst, politieke correctheid of simpelweg electorale motieven.'
4. Dutch original: 'Sommige gebruiken en tradities worden vrijwel geruisloos in de samenleving aanvaard, maar wij zien ook dat minder prettige en soms zelfs negatieve kanten van veranderingen wrijving en spanningen in de samenleving veroorzaken.'
5. Dutch original: 'Het gaat om het bevorderen van de emancipatie van vrouwen, het versterken van de weerbaarheid van die gemeenschappen tegen radicalisering en het bespreekbaar maken van eerge relateerd geweld.'
6. Dutch originals:
 - (4) 'Ongeveer 1400 jaar geleden is ons de oorlog verklaard door een ideologie van haat en geweld (...).'
 - (5) '(...) Die toenemende islamisering moet worden gestopt. De Islam is het paard van Troje in Europa.'
 - (6) 'Zij toont (...) aan dat zij de Nederlandse cultuur verraadt'.
 - (7) 'De islam wil overheersen, onderwerpen, doden en oorlog voeren.'
7. Dutch originals:
 - (10) 'Ik denk dat mijn rol als minister voor integratie is om dit soort zaken aan de orde te stellen binnen de gemeenschappen waarin zij voorkomen.'
 - (11) 'Steeds vaker zien wij dat moslims vereenzelvigd worden met extremisten en vijanden van de democratie.'

8. The only exception is an imperative, in which the matrix clause has a second person as its implied subject: 'Punish the offender, but make it also possible that his cousin or brother can be gay freely.' ('Straf de dader, maar maak vooral ook mogelijk dat zijn neef of broer vrij homofiel kan zijn.').
9. Dutch originals:
 - (12) 'Het is een gegeven dat de acceptatie van deze religie wordt bemoeilijkt doordat de islam een aantal sterke uitingsvormen heeft in het publieke domein.'
 - (13) 'Voor de overheid betekent dit dat religie als zodanig een omgevingsfactor is, waarmee wij in ons beleid rekening moeten houden, maar waarmee wij ons niet inhoudelijk moeten inlaten.'
10. Dutch original: 'Laten wij ervoor zorgen dat de derde islamitische invasie die nu volop gaande is, tot stilstand wordt gebracht.'
11. Dutch originals:
 - (15) 'Minister Donner zei eerder dat hij de invoering van een sharia in Nederland zich kon voorstellen, als de meerderheid dat maar zou willen.'
 - (16) 'Minister Vogelaar kwekt dat Nederland in de toekomst een joods-christelijk-islamitische traditie zal kennen, en dat zij de islam wil helpen te wortelen in de Nederlandse samenleving.'

Appendix: A checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories (Leech & Short: *Style in Fiction* (2007[1981]))

A: Lexical categories

1. GENERAL. Is the vocabulary simple or complex? Formal or colloquial? Descriptive or evaluative? General or specific? How far does the writer make use of the emotive and other associations of words, as opposed to their referential meaning? Does the text contain idiomatic phrases or notable collocations, and if so, with what kind of dialect or register are these idioms or collocations associated? Is there any use of rare or specialized vocabulary? Are any particular morphological categories noteworthy (e.g. compound words, words with particular suffixes)? To what semantic fields do words belong?
2. NOUNS. Are the nouns abstract or concrete? What kinds of abstract nouns occur (e.g. nouns referring to events, perceptions, processes, moral qualities, social qualities)? What use is made of proper names? Collective nouns?
3. ADJECTIVES. Are the adjectives frequent? To what kinds of attribute do adjectives refer? Physical? Psychological? Visual? Auditory? Colour? Referential? Emotive? Evaluative? etc. Are adjectives restrictive or non-restrictive? Gradable or non-gradable? Attributive or predicative?
4. VERBS. Do the verbs carry an important part of the meaning? Are they stative (referring to states) or dynamic (referring to actions, events, etc.)? Do they 'refer' to movements, physical acts, speech acts, psychological states or activities, perceptions, etc.? Are they transitive, intransitive, linking (intensive), etc.? Are they factive or non-factive?
5. ADVERBS. Are adverbs frequent? What semantic functions do they perform (manner, place, direction, time, degree, etc.)? Is there any significant use of sentence adverbs (conjuncts such as *so*, *therefore*, *however*; disjuncts such as *certainly*, *obviously*, *frankly*)?

B: Grammatical categories

1. SENTENCE TYPES. Does the author use only statements (declarative sentences), or do questions, commands, exclamations or minor sentence types (such as sentences with no verb) also occur in the text? If these other types appear, what is their function?
2. SENTENCE COMPLEXITY. Do sentences on the whole have a simple or complex structure? What is the average sentence length (in number of words)? What is the ratio of dependent to independent clauses? Does complexity vary strikingly from one sentence to another? Is complexity mainly due to (i) coordination, (ii) subordination, or (iii) parataxis (juxtaposition of clauses or other equivalent structures)? In what parts of a sentence does complexity tend to occur? For instance, is there any notable occurrence of anticipatory structure (e.g. of complex subjects preceding the verbs, of dependent clauses preceding the subject of a main clause)?
3. CLAUSE TYPES. What types of dependent clause are favoured: relative clauses, adverbial clauses, different types of nominal clauses (*that*-clauses, *wh*-clauses, etc.)? Are reduced or non-finite clauses commonly used and, if so, of what type are they (infinitive clauses, *-ing*-clauses, *-ed* clauses, verbless clauses)?
4. CLAUSE STRUCTURE. Is there anything significant about clause elements (e.g. frequency of objects, complements, adverbials; of transitive or intransitive verb constructions)? Are there any unusual orderings (initial adverbials, fronting of object of complement, etc.)? Do special kinds of clause construction occur (such as those with preparatory *it* or *there*)?
5. NOUN PHRASES. Are they relatively simple or complex? Where does the complexity lie (in premodification by adjectives, nouns, etc., or in postmodification by prepositional phrases, relative clauses, etc.)? Note occurrence of listings (e.g. sequences of adjectives), coordination or apposition.
6. VERB PHRASES. Are there any significant departures from the use of the simple past tense? For example, notice occurrences and functions of the present tense; of the progressive aspect (e.g. *was lying*); of the perfective aspect (e.g. *has/had appeared*); of modal auxiliaries (e.g. *can, must, would*, etc.) Look out for phrasal verbs and how they are used.
7. OTHER PHRASE TYPES. Is there anything to be said about other phrase types: prepositional phrases, adverb phrases, adjective phrases?
8. WORD CLASSES. Having already considered major or lexical word classes, we may here consider minor word classes ('function words'): prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns, determiners, auxiliaries, interjections. Are particular words of these types used for particular effect (e.g. the definite or indefinite article; first person pronouns *I, we*, etc.; demonstratives such as *this* and *that*; negative words such as *not, nothing, no*)?
9. GENERAL. Note here whether any general types of grammatical construction are used to special effect; e.g. comparative or superlative constructions; coordinative or listing constructions; parenthetical constructions; appended or interpolated structures such as occur in casual speech. Do lists and coordinations (e.g. lists of nouns) tend to occur with two, three or more than three members? Do the coordinations, unlike the standard construction with one conjunction (*sun, moon and stars*), tend to omit conjunctions (*sun, moon, stars*) or have more than one conjunction (*sun and moon and stars*)?

C: Figures of speech, etc.

Here we consider the incidence of features which are foregrounded by virtue of departing in some way from general norms of communication by means of the language code; for example, exploitation code. For identifying such features, the traditional figures of speech (schemes and tropes) are often useful categories.

1. GRAMMATICAL AND LEXICAL. Are there any cases of formal and structural repetition (anaphora, parallelism, etc.) or of mirror-image patterns (chiasmus)? Is the rhetorical effect of these one of antithesis, reinforcement, climax, anticlimax, etc.?

2. PHONOLOGICAL SCHEMES. Are there any phonological patterns of rhyme, alliteration, assonance, etc.? Are there any salient rhythmical patterns? Do vowel and consonant sounds pattern or cluster in particular ways? How do these phonological features interact with meaning?
3. TROPES. Are there any obvious violations of, or departures from, the linguistic code? For example, are there any neologisms (such as *Americanly*)? Deviant lexical collocations (such as *portentous infants*)? Semantic, syntactic, phonological, or graphological deviations? Such deviations (although they can occur in everyday speech and writing) will often be the clue to special interpretations associated with traditional poetic figures of speech such as metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, paradox and irony. If such tropes occur, what kind of special interpretation is involved (e.g. metaphors can be classified as personifying animising, concretising, synaesthetic, etc.)? Because of its close connection with metaphor, simile may also be considered here. Does the text contain any similes, or similar constructions (e.g. 'as if' constructions)? What dissimilar semantic fields are related through simile?

D: Context and cohesion

- Cohesion: ways in which one part of a text is linked to another (the internal organisation of the text).
 - Context: the external relations of a text or a part of a text, seeing it as a discourse presupposing a social relation between its participants (author and reader; character and character, etc.), and a sharing by participants of knowledge and assumptions.
1. COHESION. Does the text contain logical or other links between sentences (e.g. coordinating conjunctions, or linking adverbials)? Or does it tend to rely on implicit connections of meaning? What sort of use is made of cross-reference by pronouns (*she, it, they*, etc.)? By substitute forms (*do, so*, etc.), or ellipsis? Alternatively, is any use made of elegant variation – the avoidance of repetition by the substitution of a descriptive phrase (as, for example, 'the old lawyer' or 'her uncle' may substitute for the repetition of an earlier 'Mr Jones')? Are meaning connections reinforced by repetition of words and phrases, or by repeatedly using words from the same semantic field?
 2. CONTEXT. Does the writer address the reader directly, or through the words or thoughts of some fictional character? What linguistic clues (e.g. first person pronouns *I, me, my, mine*) are there of the addresser-addressee subject? If a character's words or thoughts are represented, is this done by direct quotation (direct speech), or by some other method (e.g. indirect speech)? Are there significant changes of style according to who is supposedly speaking or thinking the words on the page?