



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Rhetorical Effects of Grammar

Leeuwen, M. van

Citation

Leeuwen, M. van. (2012). Rhetorical Effects of Grammar. *Critical Approaches To Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*, 5(2), 88-101. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/18672>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/18672>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



MAARTEN VAN LEEUWEN

Leiden University

m.van.leeuwen@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Abstract

In the analysis of political discourse, relatively sparse attention is paid to grammatical phenomena. As far as grammatical phenomena are analyzed, the focus is generally on linguistic means that can be used to hide agency, like nominalization and passivization, or on transitivity analysis. In this article I argue that it can be fruitful in the analysis of political discourse to focus on other grammatical phenomena as well. I argue that also other grammatical phenomena can sort out subtle rhetorical effects that are worth analyzing – complementary to more ‘traditionally’ analyzed linguistic categories. I will highlight the grammatical phenomenon of ‘complementation’ and illustrate its rhetorical potential. A detailed stylistic analysis of a speech held by the Dutch controversial politician Geert Wilders serves as an example.

Key words: grammar and CDA, stylistic analysis, cognitive linguistics, political speeches, Geert Wilders

1. Introduction

Within the tradition of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), substantial attention has been paid to style, i.e. a focus not on what (political) actors say, but on how they say it. Analyses have focused on a wide variety of linguistic means. However, striking is the relative sparse attention devoted to *grammatical* phenomena: although grammatical categories are mentioned as an interesting area for stylistic analysis (see among others Fowler and Kress (1979), Fairclough (1992)), in practice, the primary focus has traditionally been on other linguistic means (e.g. significant word choice, pronoun use, metaphor and other classical rhetorical figures of speech, etc.). As far as grammatical phenomena are analyzed, the focus is generally on linguistic means that can be used to hide agency, like nominalization and passivization (cf. Dirven et al. 2007: 1230). Another well known category is transitivity analysis (Halliday and Matthiesen 2004; Simpson 1993; Jeffries 2010).

In this paper, I will argue that it can be fruitful in the analysis of (political) discourse to focus on other grammatical phenomena as well. I will argue that other grammatical phenomena can also create subtle rhetorical effects that are worth analyzing – complementary to more ‘traditionally’ analyzed linguistic

categories. More specifically, I will highlight the grammatical phenomenon that is called ‘complementation’.¹ I will argue that the way politicians make use of complementation can have subtle rhetorical effects. A detailed stylistic analysis of a speech held by the Dutch controversial politician Geert Wilders will serve as an example.

The structure of this article is as follows. In the next section, I will elaborate briefly on Geert Wilders and the speech that will be the focus of analysis. In Section 3 the method used will be described. For reasons that will be discussed, I will compare the speech by Wilders with a speech of the former Minister of Integration, Ella Vogelaar. A detailed stylistic analysis will be presented in Section 4: I will point at several stylistic phenomena, at all ‘layers’ of the speech. However, most attention will be paid to grammatical phenomena, especially the phenomenon that is called ‘complementation’, to illustrate that such a phenomenon can create subtle rhetorical effects. In the discussion (Section 5) I will reflect on the analysis presented.

2. Geert Wilders and His Contribution to the Debate on ‘Islamic Activism’ (2007)

In the Dutch political landscape, Geert Wilders has attracted much attention in recent years. Wilders is a controversial politician. He is the leader of the right wing Party for Freedom (PVV), and the main point on his political agenda is to stop, what he calls, ‘the Islamification of the Netherlands’. Internationally he is mostly known for his anti-Islam movie ‘Fitna’, which focuses on the assumed threat and barbarity of Islam. Wilders is very successful with his anti-Islamic standpoints. Since the last national elections, held in June 2010, the Party for Freedom has become the third political party in the Netherlands.

Wilders is not only well-known for what he says. He also attracts 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 judgment of the Dutch political scientist André Krouwel who stated that ‘Wilders scores low on argumentation’, but speaks ‘in very clear phrases’.²

One of Wilders’ most discussed speeches was the one he held in Dutch parliament during a debate on Islamic activism in 2007. In this 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 representative for the way in which Wilders presents himself in addresses: with radical standpoints, breaking with political etiquette, and in populist wordings which can intuitively be described as ‘clear’. This intuitive judgment about Wilders’ language use will function as a starting point for the stylistic analysis of his speech, for reasons that will be discussed in the next section.

3. Method

Geert Wilders' contribution to the debate on 'Islamic activism' has been analyzed by making use of the method proposed by Leech and Short (2007). In this method, the use of a checklist forms the basis for stylistic analysis. Although Leech and Short focus on the analysis of literary texts, their method is in principle applicable to non-literary texts as well (Leech and Short 2007: 62). The checklist itself involves possible relevant linguistic means for stylistic analysis. It consists of four categories: A. Lexical categories; B. Grammatical categories; C. Figures of speech; D. Context and cohesion. Each of the four categories lists numerous linguistic phenomena that can be relevant to the stylistic analysis of a particular text. As such, the checklist can be used as a heuristic tool to find linguistic means 'bottom up'. Because one cannot tell in advance which factors are relevant and which are not, the checklist can be helpful in finding these means, without excluding phenomena beforehand.³

Leech and Short make use of a point of comparison to facilitate the analysis: by contrasting the style of a text with a very different one, it is easier to find relevant linguistic means in the text the analyzer is primarily looking at (Leech and Short 2007: 41-44). For that reason, Geert Wilders' speech has been analyzed in comparison to another speech in the same debate. That other speech is the contribution by the then Minister of Integration, Ella Vogelaar, who presented her ideas on integration as well during the debate – but in a very different way. Judgments about her language use were quite the opposite from Wilders' 'clear' contribution: Vogelaar was strongly criticized in the media for her 'unclear', 'veiled' or 'woolly' language use.⁴

The contrasting intuitive judgments in the media about the language use of both speakers present a good starting point for the stylistic analysis. Which linguistic means can underpin these intuitive judgments about both speakers? In other words: which stylistic characteristics can contribute to these intuitive judgments about Wilders' and Vogelaar's speeches?

This question forms the basis for the stylistic analysis in the next section, in which the use of a checklist will be put to the test. In Section 4, various linguistic means from all four categories of the Leech and Short's checklist will be discussed. These linguistic means were selected during an analysis of every subsection of the checklist, i.e., they turned out to be the most salient ones to identify which factors contribute to the impression of 'clarity' and 'woolliness' in the two speeches. I will focus successively on linguistic means from categories A (lexicon), C (figures of speech) and D (context and cohesion): categories that are frequently analyzed in political discourse. Category B (grammar) is less often used in analysis, and will be discussed in Section 4.4. More specifically, I will focus on the grammatical phenomenon of 'complementation', to show that it can add to the inventory of linguistic tools relevant for CDA. In the Conclusion (Section 5), I will reflect on the analysis presented.

4. Stylistic Analysis of Wilders' and Vogelaar's Speeches

In the stylistic analysis presented below, abbreviations between brackets (e.g. A1, C3) refer to subcategories in the Leech and Short's (2007) checklist. Abbreviations used in the quantified data must be read as follows: W = Wilders; V= Vogelaar; w = number of words. The examples are translated from Dutch by the author.

4.1 Lexical Categories

A major stylistic difference between Geert Wilders and Ella Vogelaar is their different use of adverbs and adjectives of quantity, intensity and time (A3+A5). In Vogelaar's speech, these adjuncts significantly more often have a mitigating function than in Wilders' contribution (V: 26/1666 w; W: 9/1352 w; $G2(1) = 5.45, p < .05$)⁵:

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.

When the adverbs are placed on scales (quantity: *everything-much-little-nothing*; intensity: *extremely-very-somewhat-to a small extent*; time: *always-sometimes-never*), it is striking that in Wilders' speech most of these adverbs denote an endpoint on the semantic scale. Whereas Vogelaar quite frequently uses mitigating modifiers, Wilders leaves nothing to the imagination:

The Koran is [...] 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 defence and reinforcement of our civilization and our constitutional state. [...]

In Wilders' speech, the adjuncts of quantity, intensity and time seem to be part of the larger stylistic phenomenon called 'promotional language' (Pander Maat 2007): a phenomenon that contains all linguistic means that can be used to enforce someone's standpoints (Schellens 2006: 17). Promotional language can be found in adjectives and adverbs, but also in other linguistic phenomena, such as substantives, verbs and figurative language. In this paper, promotional language as such will not be analyzed in detail: that would require a study in itself (cf. Pander Maat 2007; Schellens 2006). However, it is striking that Wilders uses this 'promotional language technique' frequently:

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.

Secondly, the speeches differ in the use of 'abstract nouns' (A2; see Table 1): nouns denoting events, situations, processes, psychological or social phenomena, e.g., words like *polarization, equality, issues, communities, religion, change of mentality, feelings, emancipation, etc.*

Abstract nouns	Wilders	Vogelaar
Tokens	126	228
Types	80	134

Table 1: Abstract nouns in the speeches by Wilders and Vogelaar.

The differences in the use of abstract nouns are significant for both tokens (V: 228/1666 w; W: 126/1352 w; $G2(1) = 12.36$, $p < .001$) and types ($G2(1) = 4.83$, $p < .05$). The higher level of abstractness of Vogelaar's speech can partly be explained by the content of her contribution: she speaks about integration-in-general, while Wilders focuses more concretely on the integration of one specific group in Dutch society: Muslims (see also Section 5).

A final relevant lexical aspect is the use of definite and indefinite articles (A1). Vogelaar often refers to groups of people or to concepts in a generic, indefinite way ('when you talk to *people*, you get to know each other' / 'Of course, *faith* and *religion* are part of *integration issues*'). Wilders instead, prefers to use the definite article '*de* Islam' (lit. '*the* Islam'), '*the* Dutch people', '*the* politicians in The Hague', etc.: clear-cut entities and concepts that are presented as unities. By doing so, Wilders abstracts from the diversity within groups or concepts that can be found in reality; the simplifications contribute to the 'clarity' of his message (Van Leeuwen 2009).

4.2 Figures of Speech

Unlike Vogelaar, Wilders makes use of consistent imagery to present his ideas. He systematically speaks about 'the Islamification' in terms of war (C3):

Madam speaker, approximately 1400 years ago **war was declared on us** by an ideology of hate and violence [...].

[...] the Islamic **incursion** must be stopped. Islam is **the Trojan Horse in Europe**.

She [minister Vogelaar] is **betraying** Dutch culture [...].

Islam aims to **dominate, subject, kill** and **wage war**.

The war metaphor contributes to the simplification of Wilders' message, and with that to the 'clarity' of his speech: the war metaphor 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 views would be far less self-evident (cf. Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lammerts and Verhagen 1994).

The impression of 'clarity' of Wilders' speech is further supported by frequent use of parallelism (C1): sentences or parts of sentences with similar grammatical structures. For instance, Wilders ends his speech as follows:

Minister [Balkenende], on behalf of a great many Dutch citizens: stop the Islamification of the Netherlands! Mr Balkenende, a historic task rests on your

shoulders. Be courageous. Do what many Dutch citizens are screaming out for. Do what the country needs. Stop all immigration from Muslim countries, ban the building of new mosques, close all Islamic schools, ban burkhas and the Koran. Expel all criminal Muslims from the country, including those Moroccan street terrorists that drive people mad. Accept your responsibility! Stop Islamification! Enough is enough, Mr Balkenende. Enough is enough.

Vogelaar does not use rhetorical figures that have a structuring function: sentences which are composed in a parallel way are much less frequent in her speech.

4.3 Cohesion

Referring expressions (D1) are another important feature that adds to the impression of ‘clarity’ and ‘wooliness’ of the two speeches. For a ‘clear’ text it is important that referring expressions are not ambiguous or difficult to resolve (cf. Burger and de Jong 2009; Sanders and Spooren 2007). In Dutch, demonstratives (*this, that, those*) and pronominal adverbs (*therefore, therein, hereto*) are two frequently used types of referring expressions. Wilders and Vogelaar differ significantly in their use (V: 62/1666 w; W: 32/1352 w; $G_2(1) = 4,50$; $p < .05$) (cf. Table 2).

	Wilders	Vogelaar
Demonstratives	23	49
Pronominal adverbs	9	13
Total	32	62

Table 2: Demonstratives and pronominal adverbs in the speeches by Wilders and Vogelaar.

However, the way in which both speakers use these referring expressions is more important than their absolute frequency. In Vogelaar’s speech, the referring expressions contribute to the ‘wooliness’ of her speech. In 18 cases (29 %) it is not quite clear what the speaker is referring to. The numbered/italicized examples in the next fragment are representative of this aspect of her speech:

It [the policy] is about stimulating women’s liberation, about strengthening those communities’ defences against radicalization and about making honour related violence debatable. In these communities themselves it has to become clear what is acceptable, and what isn’t. [1] Taboos around **these kinds of subjects** have to be broken within these communities. In the integration policy we start from the preservation of achievements in our society, like equality of men and women regardless of their sexual inclination or religion. It has taken our society long enough to come to broad acceptance of [2] **these equalities**. I will promote and defend [3] **these** forcefully. But I also say that [4] **this** means that we need realism and patience.

‘These kinds of subjects’ [1] and ‘these equalities’ [2] are difficult to process because it is not immediately clear what they refer to precisely. ‘These’ [3] is relatively difficult because it does not refer to ‘these qualities’ in the preceding sentence, but further back, to ‘equality of men (...)’. A similar thing holds for ‘this’ [4]: it does not refer to the same concepts as ‘these’ in the preceding sentence, but to the fact that it has taken society long enough to come to a broad acceptance.

Regarding referring expressions, Wilders’ contribution is much ‘clearer’ than Vogelaar’s speech: the referents of his demonstratives and pronominal adverbs are easy find in all cases.

Apart from conquest, Madam Speaker, Islam is also bent on installing a totally different form of law and order, namely Sharia law. **This** makes Islam, apart from a religion for hundreds of millions of Muslims also, and in particular, a political ideology.

4.4 Grammatical Categories

While checking every subsection of the Leech and Short’s (2007) checklist, the linguistic elements discussed so far turned out to be the most salient aspects contributing to the impression of ‘clarity’ and ‘woolliness’. In this final subsection, the relatively infrequently analyzed category of grammatical phenomena (category B) will be elaborated on and applied. It will be shown that it is important for stylistic analysis to take this category into account as well.

Based on the intuitive judgments, it can be expected that the sentences in Wilders’ and Vogelaar’s speeches differ in length as well as complexity (B2). This intuition indeed turns out to be correct. Wilders’ average sentence length is 15,2 versus 19,8 for Vogelaar, a significant difference ($t(171) = -2.62$, $p < .01$) (see Table 3).

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

Table 3: Average sentence length in the speeches by Wilders and Vogelaar.

Regarding 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 (see Table 4).

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

Table 4: Main clauses in the speeches by Wilders and Vogelaar.

This difference in sentence structure is also reflected in the amount of finite subordinated clauses (B3) that both speakers use: 43 vs. 87. Specified in different types of finite subordinated clauses, the result is shown in Table 5.

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

Table 5: Finite subordinated clauses in the speeches by Wilders and Vogelaar.

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. These results made it interesting to also analyze complementation in more detail.

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).

‘MATRIX-CLAUSE’	‘COMPLEMENT-CLAUSE’
a. The director of GenTech expects that	clones of mammalian embryosit 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. (Verhagen 2005: 96)

In each sentence, the matrix clause invites the reader to adopt a stance towards a description of reality, which is given 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 anybody in particular. In such cases the context gives a decisive indication of whose stance is adopted (Verhagen 2005: 131-137): e.g., in sentence (d), the matrix-clause expresses the perspective of the writer.

Verhagen argues that making use of complementation constructions can cause certain rhetorical effects. He gives the following example (Verhagen 2005: 105-107):

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: in the same context (say, it is 2 p.m., and we are close to the stadium), each of the three responses guides the addressee to draw the same conclusion (probably 'yes, we will be in time'). However, the argumentative strength of each answer varies: sentence (a) presents the relevant information directly, 'as a matter of fact'. In sentence (b), this information is explicitly related to the subjective perspective of the speaker. As a result, the possibility is implied that there is a difference between the point of view taken and reality. In other words, by explicitly presenting his perspective on the issue, the speaker evokes the idea that other perspectives are also possible. As a consequence, the sentence (b) leaves more room for negotiation and discussion than does sentence (a): the argumentative strength is less. The argumentative strength of sentence (c) is even weaker than the (b), because here the possibility exists that the speaker of the utterance ('I') and Michael have a different point of view about the question whether they will be in time.⁶

How are complementation constructions used in the speeches by Wilders and Vogelaar? In Table 6, the complementation constructions are divided into different types (based on the grammatical subject in the matrix clause) and linked to whose perspective is adopted:

Who's perspective?	Type of complementation	Wilders	Vogelaar
Speaker's perspective	1st person singular	1	14
	1st person plural	0	10
	Impersonal	0	16
Other's perspective	2nd person singular	0	0
	2nd person plural	0	1
	3rd person singular	10	1
	3rd person plural	1	0
	Impersonal	0	2
Total		12	44

Table 6: Complementation constructions in the speeches by Wilders and Vogelaar from a formal and a functional perspective.

First of all, Table 6 shows that Vogelaar's speech contains 40 cases of complementation constructions in which the speaker's perspective is expressed in the matrix clause. A few examples:

I believe that my role as minister of integration is to raise these matters within the communities in which they occur.

More and more often, we see that Muslims are being equated with extremists and enemies of democracy.

It is a fact that the acceptance of this religion is complicated through [...]

For the authorities, this means that religion as such is a collateral factor which has to be taken into account in our policy [...].

In Wilders' speech, only one construction of this type can be observed:

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

Typical for Wilders' speech is the *lack* of complementation:

Madam Speaker, the Islamic incursion must be stopped. Islam is the Trojan Horse in Europe. If we do not stop Islamification now, Eurabia and Netherabia will just be a matter of time.

Very many Dutch citizens, Madam Speaker, experience the presence of Islam around them. They have had enough of burkas, headscarves, the ritual slaughter

of animals, so-called honour revenge, blaring minarets, (...) and the enormous overrepresentation of Muslims in the area of crime, including Moroccan street terrorists.

Madam Speaker, the Koran is a book that incites to violence. The distribution of such texts is unlawful according to Article 132 of our Penal Code. In addition, the Koran incites to hatred and calls for murder and mayhem. The distribution of such texts is made punishable by Article 137(e).

What is the rhetorical effect of this difference in the use of complementation constructions? It is striking that Vogelaar frequently describes her viewpoints 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 lack of complementation constructions in Wilders' language use contributes to the certainty with which he presents his ideas.

This is further supported by another striking difference shown in Table 6, that Wilders *does* use complementation constructions more than once, but only to present the ideas of other people:

Minister Donner believes that Sharia law should be capable of being introduced in the Netherlands [...].

In other words, Wilders presents the ideas of others as perspectives whereas his own ideas are presented as facts. This factuality and certainty by which Wilders presents his own ideas contributes to the 'clarity' of his message: he leaves minimal room for alternative views.

By presenting opinions as 'facts', Wilders comes across as being very objective. However, his message is extremely subjective, as can be seen in, for instance, his use of promotional language (cf. Section 4.1) and his presentation of what he calls the 'Islamification' in terms of war (cf. Section 4.2).

5. Conclusion

This paper presents a detailed stylistic analysis of the speeches by the Dutch politicians: Geert Wilders and Ella Vogelaar in the debate on 'Islamic activism' in the Dutch Lower Chamber (2007). A checklist (Leech and Short 2007) was used to find linguistic means that could contribute to intuitive judgments about the speeches of both politicians ('clear' vs. 'woolly' language). The aim of the analysis was to illustrate the importance of grammatical phenomena for the analysis of political discourse. More specifically, I hope to have shown that the grammatical phenomenon of 'complementation' can add to the inventory of linguistic tools relevant to CDA. A fine-grained analysis of the use of complementation constructions shows that Ella Vogelaar presented her ideas about integration as a perspective on issues, which leaves room for other views. Wilders, instead, presented his standpoints primarily as facts, with minimal room for negotiation or discussion (see section 4).

In the analysis of complementation constructions, I did not make a distinction between different types of verbs in the matrix clause, i.e. I have not distinguished between, for example, *I think that...* *I am sure that...* or *It is a*

fact that... This is not to ignore differences in certainty between such expressions, but in the present analysis such differences are of minor importance. The analysis focuses on rhetorical effects of the complementation constructions *as such*, i.e. the presence (in Vogelaar's speech) vs. absence (in Wilders' speech) of complementation constructions, and rhetorical consequences of this difference (cf. endnote 6).

It is also important to stress that the discussed stylistic means are not directly linked to intuitive notions like 'clear' or 'woolly' language use, but only *indirectly* (cf. Van Leeuwen, forthcoming). Speakers who make use of for instance complementation constructions, mitigating modifiers or indefinite articles (see Section 4.1) are not automatically 'woolly' speakers: they put more *nuance* into their message than speakers who present their ideas without for instance complementation, or make use of adverbs that primarily denote an endpoint on a semantic scale (see Section 4.1). How such a difference in nuance is *interpreted* is highly dependent on the context: in the context of speeches held in parliament, it can be perceived by the public as being 'clear' or 'woolly' – which was at least the case with the language use of Wilders and Vogelaar.

In this paper, barely any attention has been paid to factors that can *explain* the stylistic differences between Wilders and Vogelaar. Several factors can be mentioned. First of all the content of the speeches: Vogelaar's message was more abstract and nuanced. She spoke about integration-in-general, while Wilders focused on the integration of Muslim people. Secondly, the political role was different: in general (Wilders is a member of the opposition, while Vogelaar was part of the government) and during this specific debate (Vogelaar had to defend herself, while Wilders was attacking her). Other factors could be preparation (Wilders had written his speech beforehand; Vogelaar did not (cf. Vogelaar and Bosma 2009), and gender (see for instance Oversteegen and Missioura 2009). Although such differences can indeed partly explain the differences mentioned, they do not alter the fact that the described differences between both speakers *exist*, and that both speakers construed their ideas about integration stylistically in a very different way. As such, the stylistic analysis presented in this article was meant to show that 'style' is always a combination of linguistic means – means that can be found at all layers of a text, including grammar.

Notes

- ¹ The phenomenon of 'complementation' is just one grammatical means that deserves more attention in the analysis of (political) discourse. For instance, it has convincingly been argued that the cognitive linguistic notion of 'force dynamics' can be a useful tool for CDA practitioners (see Hart (2011); cf. also Oakley (2009: 207-218). Another grammatical phenomenon that has been underexposed is the phenomenon of 'aspect': Fausey and Matlock (2011) argue that the use of imperfective aspect instead of perfective aspect can have important consequences in construing a (political) message.
- ² See <http://www.kennislink.nl/web/show?id=275381> (accessed on May 25, 2011).
- ³ See Van Leeuwen (forthcoming) for a more elaborate discussion about the method used.

- 4 See for instance Heerma van Voss (2008) who states that Vogelaar was designated a communication strategist who occupied himself with ‘minister Vogelaar and her notorious woolly language use’.
- 5 The frequencies in both speeches have been calculated by using a log likelihood calculator <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html> (accessed on September 8, 2010). A loglikelihood test enables a comparison between frequencies in corpora, even if the investigated phenomena are relatively rare (Vis et al. 2009: 415). For the computation of differences in sentence length (see Section 3.4), a student’s t-test was used.
- 6 There are contexts conceivable in which utterance B has less argumentative strength than utterance C, e.g. in a context in which Michael is an expert on the topic that is under discussion. However, in such a context it still holds that both the C- and B-utterances have less argumentative strength than the A- sentence, i.e. the answer *with* a complementation construction has less argumentative strength than an answer *without* such a construction. It is this difference that occupies centre stage in the analysis of both speeches.

References

- Burger, P. and de Jong, J. (2009). *Handboek Stijl, Adviezen voor aantrekkelijk schrijven*. Groningen/Houten: Noordhoff Uitgevers.
- Dirven, R., Polzenhagen, F. and Wolf, H. G. (2007). Cognitive Linguistics, Ideology, and Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Geeraerts and H. Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 1222-1241.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge [etc.]: Polity Press.
- Fausey, C. M. and Matlock, T. (2011). Can Grammar Win Elections?. *Political Psychology* 32(4), pp. 563-574
- Fowler, R. and Kress, G. (1979). Critical Linguistics. In R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress and T. Trew (eds.), *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. pp. 185-213.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Arnold.
- Hart, C. (2011). Force-interactive patterns in immigration discourse: A Cognitive Linguistic approach to CDA. *Discourse & Society* 22(3): 269-286.
- Heerma van Voss, S. (2008). Nu gaf Vogelaar wél antwoord; Minister krijgt forse kritiek van kamer om wijkenaanpak’. *Nrc.next* (Dutch Newspaper), April 24.
- Jeffries, L. (2010). *Critical Stylistics, The Power of English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, Macmillan.
- Lakoff, G. And Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lammerts, A. and Verhagen, A. (1994). De oorlog in de krant. In A. Maes, P. van Hauwermeiren and L. van Waes (eds.), *Perspectieven in Taalbeheersingsonderzoek*. Dordrecht: ICG Publications. pp. 375-384.
- Leech, G. N. and Short, M.H. (2007). *Style in Fiction, A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. 2nd ed. London: Longman.
- Oakley, Todd (2009). *From Attention to Meaning. Explorations in Semiotics, Linguistics, and Rhetoric*. European Semiotics 8. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Oversteegen, E. and Missioura, O. (2009). Taal en gender in de advocatuur. Een stilistische analyse van pleidooien van vrouwelijke en mannelijke advocaten. *Neerlandstiek.nl*, <http://www.neerlandstiek.nl/09.05/> [accessed December 2, 2011]

- Pander Maat, H. (2007). How Promotional Language in Press Releases Is Dealt With by Journalists: Genre Mixing of Genre Conflict? *Journal of Business Communication* 44, pp. 59-95.
- Sanders, T. and Spooren, W. (2007). Discourse and Text Structure. In D. Geeraerts and H. Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 916-941.
- Schellens, P. J. (2006). *Bij vlagen loepzuiver, Over argumentatie en stijl in betogende teksten*. Oration Radboud University. Nijmegen.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.
- Van Leeuwen, M. (2009). Het hoofdzinnenbeleid van Wilders, Over de stijl van Geert Wilders en Ella Vogelaar. *Tekstblad* 15(2): 6-11.
- Van Leeuwen, M. (forthcoming). Systematic stylistic analysis: The use of a checklist. In B. Kaal, E. Maks and A. van Elfrinkhof (eds.), *From Text to Political Positions, State-of-the-art approaches to mapping/estimating party positions*. Selected papers from the workshop From Text to Political Positions (T2PP), Free University Amsterdam, 9-10 April 2010.
- Verhagen, A. (2005). *Constructions of Intersubjectivity, Discourse, Syntax and Cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vis, K., Sanders, J. and Spooren, W. (2009). Subjectiviteit door de jaren heen: conversationalisatie in journalistieke teksten. In W. Spooren, M. Onrust and J. Sanders (eds.), *Studies in taalbeheersing* 3. Assen: Van Gorcum. pp. 405-418.
- Vogelaar, E. and Bosma, O. (2009). *Twintig maanden knettergek, Dagboek van een ministerschap*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Balans.