



TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

Vol. 7, 2020

**A new decade
for social changes**

www.techniumscience.com

ISSN 2668-7798



9 772668 779000

Rhetorical Devices in Political Speeches: Nigel Farage's Speeches at the European Parliament

Ahmed Sokarno Abdel-Hafiz Hussein

Aswan University, Egypt

sokarno2001@hotmail.com

Abstract. Nigel Farage's speeches and rhetoric have been instrumental and effective in the British voters' decision to withdraw from the European Union. This paper aims to study rhetorical devices in the speeches of Nigel Farage at the European Parliament: list constructions, contrastive pairs etc. Having identified and classified the rhetorical devices, I proceed to perform a frequency analysis with the purpose of determining the number of times each device occurs. Thus the research questions are: (a) what rhetorical devices permeate the speeches? and (b) what is their frequency of occurrence? In order to achieve these objectives, I have studied twenty speeches Farage delivered at the European Parliament during the period from 2010 to 2017. I examine rhetorical devices that were previously treated as nonessential in Farage's speeches (cf. Hädicke 2012) and I present arguments against the claim that the three-part list is the most common strategy in political speeches

Keywords. rhetorical devices, list constructions, contrastive pairs, metaphors

1. Introduction

Politicians employ rhetorical devices in order to deliver persuasive speeches (cf. Jefferson 1990). As Crines and Heppell (2016, para. 14) point out, politicians use several rhetorical devices or techniques: "irony, humor, metaphors, analogies, anecdotes, quotations, rebuttals, hyperbole, utilitas (i.e. identifying shared objectives with the audience) or antithesis-based rhetorical techniques involving reasoning via opposites." It has often been claimed that rhetorical devices such as three-part lists and contrastive pairs are the most effective strategies that prominent politicians depend on (cf. Atkinson 1983, 1984a, 1984b as cited in Lin 2011; Uvehammer 2005). Such three-part lists and contrasts are claimed (Atkinson 1984a, pp. 33-34 cited in Bull & Noordhuizen 2000, p. 275) to be "consistently effective in "inviting" audience applause to political speeches." As David (2014, p. 167) argues, three-part structures and lists are "memorable and resonant in many kinds of text".

Drawing on some randomly selected speeches (20 speeches) delivered by Nigel Farage at the European Parliament (EP) in the period between 2010-2017, I will examine all the rhetorical devices that permeate the speeches: two-part list, three-part list, four-part list, five-part-list, contrastive pairs, simile, metaphor, tag question, verbal repetition, rhetorical questions, and Sarcasm. Furthermore, an attempt is made to perform a frequency analysis of the rhetorical devices used in the twenty speeches, that is, the number of times each device occurs is counted.

Relying on such an analysis, I will argue that two-part units are as common, if not more common, than three-part units.

2. Overview

Political speeches are instrumental in impacting not only the opinions of MPs at parliaments but also those of the public. As Lin (2011, p. 474) argues, politicians are often aware of the value of using rhetorical devices in evoking applause to elicit agreement from their audience. As such, applause can be interpreted as a highly noticeable expression of group identity or solidarity with the speaker and the party the speaker represents.

Nigel Farage, the President of UKIP (United Kingdom Independent Party) has been a member of the European Parliament (EP) since 1999. He represents South East England in the EP. As stated in Politico,

Farage is one of the two most effective speakers in the chamber. He used Parliament more effectively than any other to push his domestic agenda, engineering the EU referendum in Britain in June, which will be his greatest success or failure. As co-chief of EFDD party group, he is a leading enabler of European populism Euro skepticism. <http://www.politico.eu/list/the-40-meps-who-actually-matter-european-parliament-mep/nigel-farage/> accessed April 29, 2017

Although Farage has been addressing the members of EP, he actually aimed to influence the opinion of the British people. He himself has confessed that he joined the EP in order to inform the British people of everything that was going on at the EP:

We came here because we felt the British Public were not being told what was happening in Europe and how much it was costing. We've used our position here to try to get that information back to the British Public. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bJHETdxwv8Y>

He has played a pivotal role in affecting the direction of the Brexit vote; more than thirty million people participated in the referendum. The result of the referendum was shocking and unexpected: more than half of the British people voted to leave the EU.

3. The purpose of study

The study aims to pinpoint the rhetorical devices that facilitate the job of politicians. Such devices, which leave a longstanding impact on the audience, include list construction, contrastive pairs, rhetorical questions, tag questions, similes, metaphors, and sarcasm. Thus it is an attempt to pinpoint which of these rhetorical devices are more common in confronting an unfriendly group in a political context. Thus the questions that we need to address here pertain to the effectiveness of Farage's speeches: is it appropriate to claim (cf. Atkinson 1983, 1984a, 1984b cited in Bull & Noordhuizen 2000, p. 275 and Lin 2011; Uvehammer 2005) that three-part lists and contrastive pairs are "the most effective strategies that prominent politicians depend on"? How did he manipulate his oratorical skills in confronting a group of former experienced politicians in the European parliament? What rhetorical devices did he employ in his speeches? Which devices are most prevalent in the speeches?

4. The Significance of the study

The study is essential in drawing the attention of politicians and nonpoliticians to the devices that turn a speech into a successful tool for attaining or achieving objectives: persuading the addressee to adopt the very viewpoint of the speaker.

5. Previous Studies

Nigel Farage's conference and EP speeches and TV interviews have attracted the attention of linguists, discourse analysts and rhetoricians. Pareschi and Albertini (2016, Para. 1) have conducted a qualitative analysis of the five keynote speeches delivered by Nigel Farage at the party conferences in 2011-2015. The categories they use aim to figure out "the representations of the "elite" and the "people", which presuppositions and explicit arguments mark the five speeches, arguably best suited to represent the wider discourse of UKIP.". This study does not pay attention to political rhetorical devices such as two-par lists, three-part lists or contrastive pairs.

However, there is an article that tackles the political rhetoric of Nigel Farage in relation to his conference speeches (2010-2014). Using rhetorical political analysis, Crines and Heppell (2016) attempted to determine how Farage's conference speeches are constructed and delivered and to identify the rhetorical techniques he employed in these speeches: rhetorical questions, antithesis, utilitas (i.e. identifying shared objectives within the audience), hypophora (i.e. a series of questions to attract attention), and anaphora (i.e. a series of short complete sentences). The difference between Crine and Heppell's study and this one is that Farage's conferences speeches were written and directed at a specific class of audience: the working class, whereas his EP speeches were mostly oral, spontaneous and directed not only at the EP members, but also at all TV audience at home. Crine and Haappell's work does not provide a frequency analysis of the rhetorical techniques employed by Farage; this study involves statistical information pertaining to the most frequent rhetorical devices.

Moreover, Hädicke (2012) has used Nigel Farage's interviews and speeches in EP (2010-2012) to conduct a qualitative and quantitative analysis. The categories studied are: repetition of key words, metaphors, colloquialisms and offences, usage of pronouns and patterns of identification and solidarity. She has concluded that usage of pronouns is the most common strategy, which recurs 1601 times. This is followed by colloquialisms and offences (304 times) and metaphors (103 times). It is quite clear that this study has ignored a lot of rhetorical devices that permeate the speeches of Nigel Farage in EP (e.g. list constructions and contrastive pairs).

These ignored devices are considered appealing and effective. In the words of Uvehammer (2005, p. 20), politicians do not hesitate "to use the most appealing and effective words in order to catch the attention of the listeners." According to Atkinson (e.g., 1983, 1984a, 1984b cited in Lin 2011, p. 474), there are two rhetorical devices which are widely employed to invite audience applause in political speeches: three-part lists and contrasts. Beard (2000) agrees with Atkinson when he claims that the techniques that politicians use in order to persuade their audience include tripartite structures, contrastive pairs and metaphors. Beard (2000, pp. 38-39) goes on to argue that "[t]he three-part list is attractive to the speaker and listener because it is embedded in certain cultures as giving a sense of unity and completeness.". Likewise, Jefferson (1990, p. 63) claims that "many of these lists occur as three-part units". BBC magazine has conducted an interview with some prominent political speech writers with the purpose of identifying the effective devices in a speech, devices that can have persuasive power. Two of the devices they agreed upon are: the three-part lists and direct use of contrasts. According to this magazine, President Obama "used 29 of them in his roughly 10-minute victory speech" <http://lifehacker.com/5315116/use-contrasts-and-three-part-lists-for-better-persuasion>.

The tripartite structure or list of three (cf. Canepari 2011, p. 223) in political speeches “can be simple repetition of words or repetition of prepositions” (Beard 2000, p. 7). Similarly, Uvehammer (2005, p. 20) argues that this device is characterized as the repetition of prepositions, words or names three times. The repetition may also involve “different words, with similar meanings as in Mandela’s first speech in 1990: “Friends, comrades, and fellow South Africans.” (Beard 2000, p. 7).

Uvehammer (2005) has explored the linguistic strategies or devices that were used in the first US Presidential debate between Kerry and Bush in 2004. These strategies include political rhetoric, politeness and propaganda. He has identified three rhetorical devices: lists of three, contrastive pairs and metaphors. Alo (2012) has studied the persuasive strategies used by African leaders belonging to five regions. Examining a selected set of their speeches, Alo argues that these leaders employed many strategies such as the use of the pronouns “we”, “us” “our” as a strategy of collectivization and the use of such modal auxiliaries as “must” and “should” for obligation and necessity.

This study is going to examine all rhetorical or techniques Farage has employed in the EP twenty speeches.

6. Data Collection and Methodology

Nigel Farage has been speaking at the EP since his election in 1999. His speeches, which were directly addressed to the EP members and were broadcast on TV, were all oral speeches that evolved around the importance of Brexit, that is, Britain’s withdrawal from the European Union. I have collected twenty speeches delivered by Nigel Farage at the EP during the period 2010-2017: three of these speeches were delivered in 2010, two in 2011, six in 2012, one in 2013, one in 2014, two in 2015, one in 2016 and four in 2017. All these speeches, which can be obtained from the internet, have been randomly selected, their scripts being available at the sites they are located in. Note that some of these speeches were delivered before Brexit referendum, but other speeches were given after the results became known.

These speeches are examined in such a way that all rhetorical devices are identified and classified: list construction (e.g. two-part and three-part or four-part lists etc.), contrastive pairs, verbal repetition, simile, metaphor, rhetorical questions, tag questions, and sarcasm. Then the recurrence of each type in the speeches is counted. This can help us determine which type is most common.

7. Rhetorical Devices in Nigel Farage’s Speeches

Rhetorical devices permeate Farage’s speeches at the EP. It contains different types of list-construction: two-part, three-part, four-part and five-part lists. Moreover, it has contrastive pairs, simile, metaphor, irony as well as sarcasm. The speeches also include such devices as verbal repetition, rhetorical questions, and tag questions.

7.1 Two-part list

The two-part list can express itself as repetition with a difference. The list or unit appears twice. The elements that make up the two-part list must belong to the same category: noun phrase, verb phrase, adjective phrase etc. Thus the following excerpt from Farage’s speeches presents a two-part list:

The reason **you’re so upset, you’re so angry** has been perfectly clear, from all the angry exchanges this morning. (*28 June 2016*)

Here the repeated noun complement clauses, **you're so upset, you're angry**; they differ as to the last element: **upset/angry**.

In the following extract the two-part list is a noun phrase which is joined with another noun phrase; the disjunctive conjunction "or" is used.

Well, one vision we *didn't* lack is, we understood that the countries of Europe are different; and if you try and force together **different people or different economies** without first seeking the consent of those people, it is unlikely to work. And the plan has failed. (08 July 2015)

The following extract shows that the elements of the two-part list can be noun phrases that contain a post-modifier prepositional phrase:

And **these years of austerity, these years of high unemployment and increasing poverty**: None of it's worked! In fact your debt/GDP ratio has gone from 100 percent at the start of the crisis to 180 percent right now. (8 July 2015)

Note that there is no conjunction that joins the two parts: **these years of austerity, these years of high unemployment**. Also note that the second part has an extra word (i.e. "high").

The following extract shows that the elements (i.e. two clauses) of a two-part list can be joined by a coordinating conjunction such as 'and':

I am cynical and sceptical, as are much of the European public, about who has used those weapons until **we get the full report and we get the intelligence right**.

(11 September, 2013)

The following extract contains a two-part list. The two parts are clauses that differ as to one word: **Afghanistan / Iraq**. The two parts are joined by the conjunction "**and**"; also note that the auxiliary "**did**" replaces the verb in the two parts.

I understand that and I agree with that - but rushing to war **as we did in Afghanistan, as we did in Iraq**, was a mistake and Mr. Cameron tried to bounce us into war and thank goodness the House of Commons has given us pause for thought. Surely, that must be a good thing. (11 September, 2013)

7.2 Three-part list or tripartite

As Canepari (2011, p. 223) shows, the three-part list or the list of three is "one of the most common means of eliciting approval". This device is based on a repetition with a difference. Also the three parts are expected to be of the same category: lexical or phrasal:

Because **what the little people did, what the ordinary people did – what the people who'd been oppressed over the last few years who'd seen their living standards go down did** – was they rejected the multinationals, they rejected the merchant banks, they rejected big politics and they said actually, **we want our country back, we want our fishing waters back, we want our borders back**. (28 June 2016)

This extract is interesting because three-part lists permeate it: there are three different three part lists. The first list involves the repetition of the sentential subject (what the little X did), but there is a difference between the first two in the attributive adjective ("**little**" / "**ordinary**"); the third one has a relative clause modifying the subordinate subject. The second three-part list repeats the complement clause (they rejected X) with a difference only in the complement clause object (e.g. "**multinationals**" / "**merchant banks**" / "**big politics**"). The third three-part list is the repetition of a sentence (we want X) with the object being different in each case (e.g. "**our country back**" / "**our fishing waters back**" / "**our borders back**").

The following extract contains both a two-part list and a three-part list:

What happened last Thursday was a remarkable result – it was a seismic result. Not just for British politics, for European politics, but perhaps **even for global politics** too. (28 June 2016)

The first is a two-part unit where the repeated part is a sentence. The difference between the two parts is that the sentential subject of the first part is replaced by the pronoun **it** in the second; they have different adjectives ("**remarkable**"/ "**seismic**").

The extract also has a three-part list; a prepositional phrase appears three times: "**for British politics**", "**for European politics**", but perhaps even "**for global politics**".

7.3 Four-part list

This is a unit that contains four parts. All parts share some elements and differ as to one element. All parts belong to the same category, as is the case in two- and three-part lists. Thus in the following extract, the four-part list contains four adjectives and there is no conjunction "**and**": And it's developing as a Union of intolerance. Anybody that stands up here and dares to give a political view that is different to the received wisdom is written off as **mad, insane, violent, fascist**- we've heard it for years from these people. (28 September 2011)

The following extract contains two four-part lists: the first list contains four adjectives, but this is different from the previous four-part list in that the conjunction "**and**" appears before the last adjective:

It's a pretty obscene definition of democracy to decry those of us that believe in national democracy and European cooperation. You call us '**populist**', '**extremist**', '**xenophobic**' and '**nationalistic**'. Surely Mr. Barroso the point about democracy is **you engage in debate, you listen to what the other person has to say, you put it to the public and you accept the result.** (12 September 2012)

Note this extract also contains another four-part list where the subject '**you+VP**' is repeated four times with the conjunction "**and**" appearing before the last part.

7.4 Five-part list

A five-part list, like three- or four-part lists, has five parts that have the same category and the different elements have the same function in each part:

Because, just look at the confusion. **We've got** you as the President of the Commission. **We've got** a President of the European Parliament. **We've got** my old friend Herman Van Rompuy, who is the permanent president of the European Council. **We've got** the Poles - they're now presidents temporarily [Poland holds six-month EU Council presidency] of the European Council. **We've got** presidents all round this room, goodness me, even I am a president. (28 September 2011)

In this extract, each part is a sentence (a subject + VP (V+ noun clause functioning as object)): We've got+NP. This pattern emphasizes the point the speaker is making: that there are many presidents in the European parliament. The last part conveys this meaning: "**We've got presidents all round this room...**"

7.5 Contrastive pairs

Contrastive pairs or antithesis is a rhetorical device involving two parts that stand in stark contrast. It is "a contrast or opposition in the meanings of contiguous phrases or clauses that

manifest parallelism—that is, a similar word-order and structure—in their syntax.” (Abrams 1999, p. 11) According to Beard (2000), this device is used in order to elicit approval.

Contrastive pairs can be used with repetition to achieve persuasive effect. The following extract contains both contrastive pairs and a three-part list:

I represent a group that is against military action in Syria. **We're against it not because we're pacifists. We're against it not because we don't care about the awful things going on there. We're against it because we think there's some pretty poor thinking going on.** (11 September, 2013)

Here the three-part list involves a complex sentence containing a negated clause of reason in the first two, but the third part contrasts with the first two parts in that it has no negation words: (**We're against it not because X/We're against it becauseX**)

The following extract contains contrastive pairs:

This idea that somehow **the rebels are the good guys** and **Assad are the bad guys** (contrastive pairs) really is over-simplifying situation where of course we know that Al-Qaida have significant representation amongst those rebel groups. (11 September, 2013)

In this extract, the two parts of the contrastive pairs stand in opposition: each part has a different subject ("**the rebels**"/ "**Assad**") and each part has a different adjective in the complement ("**good**"/ "**bad**"). The objective here is to highlight the difference between the rebels and Assad. Note that the conjunction "**and**" joins the contrastive parts.

7.6 Simile

Abrams (1999, p. 97) defines simile as “a comparison between two distinctly different things is explicitly indicated by the word “like” or “as””. The simile is an effective device because it draws similarity between dissimilar things.

Each of the following extracts contain a simile. In most cases, the comparison is indicated by the word “like”. Thus in the following extract EP members are describes as a pack of hyenas that are ready to devour their prey, Papandreou.

But you guys have played a role, because when Mr Papandreou got up and used the word 'referendum' - or Mr Rehn, you described it as 'a breach of confidence', and your friends here got together **like a pack of hyenas**, rounded on Papandreou, had him removed and replaced by a puppet Government. What an absolutely disgusting spectacle that was. (16 November 2011)

In the following extract, the events in European Union is likened to a novel by Agatha Christie, whose novels are based on mystery: in most cases, someone is mysteriously murdered and the reader keeps wondering who the murderer is:

It's getting **like an Agatha Christie novel**, where we're trying to work out who is the next person that's going to be bumped off. The difference is, we know who the villains are. You should all be held accountable for what you've done. You should all be fired. (16 November 2011)

In the following extract, the tenor is the way the Romanians treat the Roma minority; they do not treat them as human beings. In order to indicate the atrocity, the speaker uses the word "pigs" as a vehicle of comparison:

Sir, I will say this to you: I have never described the Romanians as living like pigs. What I said was: the Romanians treat their Roma minority **like pigs**, alright, so let's get that absolutely clear. Your country discriminate against a large group of people in a way we have not seen in Europe since the 1930s, alright? **(11 September, 2013)**

The following extract involves a simile that has produced humor: the EP members laughed. The speaker here compares the old politicians in EP with old or useless horses that are taken to a knacker's yard, where they are killed.

I don't know about some bright new fresh start for Europe, it looks a bit more **like the knacker's yard** for failed domestic politicians. **(16 December 2014)**

The previous simile produced laughter. However, not all similes have a humorous effect. The following extract has a simile that EP members protested against: the speaker directly referred to them as a group of people who are involved in criminal activities and are protecting each other and do not care about the interests of other people:

*All I can say is thank goodness we are leaving. You are behaving **like the mafia**, you think we're a hostage. **(5 April 2017)***

In all the other instance of simile, the word "like" is used. The following extract, however, includes a simile in which the word "as" is used.

Well, it's not all bad news, because in Britain the opinion polls are clear that a clear majority of Brits now want to leave this Union, leaving David Cameron **as piggy-in-the-middle**, trying to pretend to be a Eurosceptic when he comes over here, going back home and claiming victories - but he's stuck. And I predict one thing: Big political change is coming in Britain because he's losing the support of millions of his own voters. **(23 October, 2012)**

Note that here, the target of the simile is a single individual, David Cameron, who is compared to a child who is participating in a children's game. Cameron stands helpless in the middle between two other children who are throwing a ball to each other over his head.

7.7 Metaphor

There are different definitions of metaphor. Crystal (2008, p. 98) defines it as "as a process of understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another. A typical metaphor is a mapping between a better-known, more concrete conceptual domain (the 'source domain') and the conceptual domain which it helps to organize (the 'target domain')." Abrams (1999, p. 97) shows that "in a metaphor, a word or expression that in literal usage denotes one kind of thing is applied to a distinctly different kind of thing, without asserting a comparison." Dikins (2005, p. 228) has given a similar traditional definition when he states that the metaphor is "...a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is used in a non-basic sense, this non-basic sense suggesting a likeness or analogy (whether real or not) with another more basic sense of the same word or phrase". Similarly, Ali (2010, p. 42) has defined it as "the figure of speech in which a comparison is made between two seemingly unrelated subjects". Leech (1969, p. 151) points out that metaphor "is associated with a particular rule of transference, which we may simply call the 'Metaphoric Rule', and which we may formulate: F= 'like L'. That is, the figurative meaning F is derived from the literal meaning L in having the sense 'like L', or perhaps 'it is as if L'."

As Peck and Coyle (1984) state, “[t]he obvious attraction of metaphor is that it makes an idea more vivid: it can prove difficult to grasp the thread of an abstract thought, but when the idea is described in concrete terms it comes to life.” (p.140). Hädicke (2012, p. 32) concurs that “presenting political issues in an immensely vivid and lively language not only captures the audiences’ attention, but also curbs their imagination and helps depicting these often highly abstract and complex processes.”

The following extract contains a metaphor from the domain of traffic; Mrs. Merkel, the German Chancellor, is compared with a car driver that has to interrupt his journey and return to a past location. The metaphor is used to indicate that the German leader is about to take a different position concerning her policy on immigration.

I simply cannot believe you are blind to the fact that even Mrs. Merkel **has now made a u-turn** and wants to send people back. **(15 February 2017)**

In the following extract, there is an implicit metaphor for the tenor is not present, but we understand it to be the EU. This new institution is described as the new Berlin Wall that divided Germany into two parts: East and West. It stands as a symbol of ideological and physical barrier. Thus EU is described as a barrier that is dividing Europe into two parts: North and South.

"Indeed, I feel that the Continent is now divided from North to South. There is a **new Berlin Wall**, and it's called the Euro. **(8 July 2015)**

The following extract involves a metaphor which deals with Russia as if were a bear that was quiet and peaceful before it was deliberately annoyed by EU leaders:

We poked the Russian bear with a stick. (11 March 2015)

This extract contains a metaphor from the domain of vehicles: here the speaker compares the bailout process that EU is using to address the economic problems facing the Mediterranean countries such as Greece to a vehicle that is going to break down:

This new European Stability Mechanism, your new **bailout vehicle is doomed** before it starts **(3 July 2012)**

7.8 Tag Question

Crystal (2008, p. 476) defines tag questions as

A structure that usually consists of an AUXILIARY VERB plus pronouns, attached to the end of a STATEMENT in order to convey a NEGATIVE or POSITIVE orientation... In all cases, the INTONATION in which the tag is uttered determines its FUNCTION—the contrast between ‘asking’ and ‘telling’, illustrated by English she’s late, isn’t she? (‘I’m asking you if she is late) v. she’s late, isn’t she! (‘I am asking you to agree me she is late!)

Tag questions are also defined “as interrogative fragments added to a statement to elicit agreement or disagreement, require a negative answer to deny an accusation” (Hogg & Jackson 2010, p. 818).

The following extracts contain tag questions. The tag question consists of an auxiliary that is followed by a pronoun. It should be noted that two of them have a positive orientation and two

have a negative orientation. In fact, none of them is a real question that requires an answer. All of these tag questions seek agreement with the speaker:

you're not laughing now, **are you?** (28 June 2016)

you are rather noisy about it, **aren't you?** (16 November 2011)

A new start for Europe, I mean you couldn't invent it, **could you?**
(16 December 2014)

*And of course Mr Tusk, who is not with us today, I suspect he's still crying, he looked pretty tearful, **didn't he?*** (5 April 2017)

thus in the first tag question the speaker is certain that the EP members cannot be laughing because Great Britain has decided to leave EU.

7.8 Free Verbal Repetition

Verbal repetition is often confused with parallelism. Parallelism involves partial repetition as we have seen in list-constructions (e.g. two-part list), whereas verbal repetition is the exact copying of some previous part of a text (whether word, phrase, or even sentence), since, of course, if there were merely a partial repetition, this would amount to a parallelism. Traditional rhetoric distinguishes two categories of free repetition: immediate repetition, or EPIZEUXIS (e.g. 'Come away, come away, death') and that of intermittent repetition, or PLOCI" (Leech 1969, p. 77).

Repetition permeates political speeches. Forraiová (2011, p. 61) has investigated the occurrence of repetition in five political speeches of Barack Obama. She has identified 312 occurrences of repetition in these speeches. Repetition is said to have many functions. It can function "didactically, playfully, emotionally, expressively, ritualistically; repetition can be used for emphasis or iteration, clarification, confirmation; it can incorporate foreign words into a language, in couplets, serving as a resource for enriching the language." (Johnstone et al. 1994, cited in Forraiová 2011, p. 18). As Forraiová (2011, p. 7) puts it, repetition "may produce emphasis or cohesion by patterns of sound. It may impact the audience and emphasize or awaken speaker's points". Forraiová goes on to claim that of all these functions, the cohesive function is the most common function of repetition, constituting 32% of all identified repetitions. Leech (1969, p. 79) states that repetition "presents a simple emotion with force. It may further suggest a suppressed intensity of feeling—an imprisoned feeling, as it were, for which there is no outlet but a repeated hammering at the confining walls of language." Hädicke (2012) has studied repetition of key words in Farage's speeches. She argues that it "serves the purpose of bolstering his political arguments" (p. 29)

Note that exact verbal repetitions in the speeches studied here do not have a cohesive function. Rather, they emphasize meaning or confirm the expressed viewpoint. Thus the exact verbal repetition in the following extract is the comparative adjective "tougher". The repetition is reflective of the hardship that is exacerbating:

they made life **tougher** and **tougher**. (Feb 9, 2010)

In the following extract, the speaker is describing EP members as dangerous; he repeats the adverb of degree "very" to emphasize how dangerous these people are:

You are very, very dangerous people, indeed. (24 November 2010)

The following extract involves the repetition of the auxiliary and the lexical verb, “**must obey**” in order to place great emphasis on how influential Mr. Barroso is in the EU:

And I think Mr. Barroso, today, the British people hearing you, calling for the EU to become a global power making it absolutely clear that member states **must obey, must obey** what you tell them whether they are in the relatively wealthy north or the poorer south. **(12 September 2012)**

7.9 Rhetorical Question

Leech (1969, p. 184) defines this device as “a question which is abnormal in that it expects no answer”. Gray (1984, p. 174) agrees with Leech when he defines a rhetorical question as “[a] question asked not for the sake of enquiry, but for emphasis: the writer or speaker expects his audience to be totally convinced about the appropriate reply.” A rhetorical question is also described as “a sentence in the grammatical form of a question which is not asked in order to request information or to invite a reply, but to achieve a greater expressive force than a direct assertion.” (Abrams 1999, p. 271). All of the following extracts involve rhetorical questions:

people will look back at you, and they will say 'how did this unelected man get all of this power?' **(28 September 2011)**

And how did Europe's political class sitting in this room decide that the community method [federal] should replace national democracy? **(28 September 2011)**

Who do you think you are kidding, Mr Juncker? **(11 March 2015)**

And are we really happy that somebody who will be in charge of our overseas security policy was an activist a few years ago in an outfit like CND? **(25 November 2017)**

Note that the rhetorical question in the first extract does not require an answer; the people asking this question would express their astonishment at an unelected man (“**Mr. Junker**”) enjoying tremendous powers. Thus the rhetorical question reflects the speaker’s condescending attitude towards the President of EU. The second rhetorical question is directed at the whole parliament members to whom he refers as “**Europe’s political class**”. Although the rhetorical question implies a negative assertion (Europe’s political class should decide that the community method should replace democracy), it is more expressive and effective than a negative assertion. The third rhetorical question looks as if it is given to Mr. Junker, but in fact it is not. Evidence that it is not a real question is that the speaker does not wait to hear the answer. He goes on with stopping the flow of speech. The rhetorical question, although it is similar to a negative statement, it is more powerful and more persuasive. The same thing can be said about the third rhetorical question, which is more expressive than a negative assertion (we are not happy that....)

7.10 Sarcasm and irony

These two concepts are often subject to confusion. Although sarcasm is a type of irony, the two concepts are quite distinct from each other. Leech (1969, p. 172) states that sarcasm “consists in saying the opposite of what is intended: saying something nice with the intention that your hearer should understand something nasty.” Sarcasm is also shown to be “far more useful to restrict it only to the crude and taunting praise for dispraise.” (Abram 1999, p. 136). Furthermore, sarcasm is characterized as “[a]n extreme form of IRONY, intended to hurt. A bitter or wounding remark.” (Gray 1984, p. 182). As for irony, it is defined as

a statement in which the meaning that the speaker implies differs sharply from the meaning that ostensibly expressed. The ironic statement usually involves the expressive expression of one attitude or evaluation, but with indications in the overall speech-situation that the speaker intends a very different, and often opposite, attitude or evaluation.” (Abrams 1999, p. 135)

Thus irony is situation-driven and can be unintentional and innocent, whereas sarcasm involves intentionality and tendency to hurt or mock somebody.

All the following extracts involve sarcasm:

As a policy to impose poverty on Greece and the Mediterranean, you’ve done very well. (28 June 2016)

I should thank you; you should perhaps be the pin up boy of the Eurosceptic movement. (24 November 2010)

So I guess she’s perfect for this European Union. (25 November 2017)

Note that the first extract contains a sarcasm: the speaker knows that imposing poverty on any country is not something good; it is abominable and disgusting, yet he says that they have done very well. Obviously, the speaker is mocking EP members for allowing this to happen. Similarly, in the second extract, the speaker is mocking Mr. Junker by thanking him for his policies that have ignited a storm of protests from Eurosceptic groups. The third extract involves a cruel mockery of Lady Ashton whom he considers incompetent and corrupt. I would draw your attention to the last extract involving a rhetorical questions: it is directed against Lady Ashton. All these excerpts show that Farage has used verbal attack “to topple Brussel’s “unelected puppets” and degenerate them” (Hädicke 2012, p. 35).

8. Discussion and Analysis

Having examined the various rhetorical devices that the twenty speeches of Farage contain, we can go on to determine which device(s) have more occurrences. The quantitative analysis should verify or refute the claim (cf. Atkinson 1983, 1984a, 1984b cited in Atkinson 1984a, pp. 33-34 cited in Bull & Noordhuizen 2000, p. 275 and Lin 2011, Uvehammer 2005) that three-part lists and contrastive pairs are predicted to permeate successful political speeches, because these devices are the most effective strategies that prominent politicians depend on.

Table (1) shows the number of times each device occurs in the twenty speeches under investigation. It is shown that the two-part list is the most common device:

Table (1) Rhetorical Devices

Rhetorical dev		%		
2-part list	58	37.66		
3-part list	28	18.18		
Con pairs	16	10.39		
Simile	10	6.49		
Tag Q	9	5.84		
Verb Rep	8	5.19		
4-part list	6	3.90		
Metaphor	6	3.90		
Rhet Q	6	3.90		
Sarcasm	6	3.90		
5part-list	1	0.65		
Irony	-	-		
Total	154	100		

2= two 3= three 4=four 5= five Con = contrastive Q = Question Rep = Repetition Rhet = Rhetorical

it recurs 58 times (37.66%). The three-part list comes second, recurring 28 times (18.18%). Contrastive pairs occupy the third place; they recur 16 times (10.39%). Contrastive pairs are followed by simile (10 times) with (6.49%), simile (9 times) with a frequency of (5.84%) and verbal repetition (8 times or 5.19%). The other devices are less frequent: metaphor, rhetorical question and four-part units or lists (each recurring 6 times), sarcasm (6 times), and five-part units, which is the least frequent devices (each recurring only once). Note that these results argue against Jefferson (1990)'s claim: "many of these lists occur as three-part units" (p.63) The two-part unit in these speeches is twice as many as three-part unit. Thus the analysis of Nigel Farage's speeches shows that the claim (cf. Atkinson 1983, 1984a, 1984b cited in Atkinson 1984a:33-34 as cited in Bull & Noordhuizen 2000, p. 275 and Lin 2011; David 2014; Jefferson 1990; Uvehammer 2005). three-part lists is the most effective device is not always true: the number of two-part lists is shown to be twice that of three-part units.

Note that irony is not attested in the speeches under study. This is because irony, unlike sarcasm, does not manifest itself in political speeches. Political speeches are based on intentional use of words and expressions and politicians do not hesitate to defend their ideologies and ridicule or mock their opponents as fiercely and mercilessly as possible. In such a situation, sarcasm is much more appropriate than any other devices.

Conclusion

The investigation of the twenty speeches by Farage has shown that different rhetorical devices were used in order to persuade not only the EP members, but also the British people who were about to decide whether to stay or leave EU. The speeches are shown to contain all types of list-constructions: two-part list, third-part list etc. They also involve contrastive pairs, simile, tag questions, metaphors, rhetorical questions, and sarcasm. The frequency analysis has indicated that two-part list is the most frequent device, occurring 58 times. Surprisingly, it is more common than third-part list: there are twice as many instances of two-part list as three-part list, which argues against the claim that three-part units are more common and more effective. Furthermore, simile, which occurs 10 times, is more frequent than metaphor (6 times). It has also been noted that sarcasm rather than irony is more prevalent in political speeches; this is because sarcasm serves the need of politicians who intend to diminish or attack their opponents.

Obviously, it is sarcasm rather than irony, which does not occur in the speeches, that is specially effective in such a hostile environment as EP: Farage had confront a group of European politicians.

References

- [1] Abrams, M. (1999). *A glossary of literary terms*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle
- [2] Ali, A. (2010). "Translation of Metaphor: Notions and Pedagogical implications". In *Beyond Denotation in Arabic-English Translation*. In S. Faiq & A. Clark (eds), 42- 59. London: Sayyab Sayyab Books.
- [3] Alo, Moses A. (2012). A rhetorical analysis of selected political speeches of prominent African leaders. *British Journal of Social Science* 10 (1), 87-100.
- [4] Beard, A. (2000). *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.
- [5] Bull, P. & Noorhuizen, M. (2000). The mistiming of applause in political speeches. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 19 (3), 275-294.
- [6] Canepari, M. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis and translation studies*. Milano: Edu Catt.
- [7] Crines, A. & Heppell, T. (2016). Rhetorical style and issue emphasis within the conference speeches of UKIP's Nigel Farage 2010-2014, *British Politics*, UK Palgrave Macmillan. Doi: 10.1057/pb.2016.2, 22 Feb.
- [9] Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- [10] David, M. (2014). Language, power and manipulation: The use of rhetoric in maintaining political influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching* 5 (1), 164-170.
- [11] Dickins, J. (2005). Two models for metaphor translation. *Target* 17 (2), 227-273.
- [12] Forraiová, M. (2011). *The Use and Function of Repetition in Political Speeches*. University of Pardubice Master thesis
- [13] Gray, M. (1984). *A dictionary of literary terms*. Beirut: York press.
- [14] Hädicke, N. 2012. *Populists are actually democrats: A content analysis of Interviews and speeches given by Nigel Farage against the backdrop of populism and Euroscepticism*. Master of Arts in European Studies Master Thesis Lund Universitet MAPES.
<http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOid=3516817&fileOid=3516838>
- [15] Hogg, M. & Jackson, R. (2010). *Encyclopedia of Identity*. Sage Publications.
- [16] Jefferson, J. (1990). List-construction as a task and a resource. In G. Psathas, (ed.),
- [17] *Interaction Competence*, (pp. 63-92). Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.
- [18] Leech, G. (1969). *A linguistic guide to English poetry*. London: Longman
- [19] Lin, C. (2011). *The Study of political language: A brief overview of recent*
- [20] *Research*. Chia-nan Annual Bulletin 37, 471-485.
- [21] Pareschi, A. and Albertini, A. 2016. *Immigration, elites and the European Union: How UKIP frames its populist discourse*, 24-28 April 2016 Joint Sessions of Workshops, Pisa
<https://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/a0b341ab-03aa-4295-867b-a26d397fe411.pdf>
- [24] Peck, J. & Coyle, M. (1984). *Literary terms and criticism*. London: Macmillan Education.
- [23] Schoor, C. (2015). Political Metaphor, a matter of purposeful style. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 5 (1), 82-101.

- [24] Uvehammer, Marianne. (2005). The impact of linguistic strategies in political debate: A linguistic discourse Analysis of the first Bush and Kerry Presidential Debate 2004. Institutionen for individ och samhahalle hv.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:216059