

## **A Critical Discourse Analysis of Josep Borrell's Opening Speech Delivered at the European Union Ambassadors' Annual Conference 2022**

Ayodele Adebayo Allagbé, Franck Amoussou, Adrien Coovi Ahoutinou,  
Département d'Anglais, Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines (FLSH), Université André Salifou (UAS) de  
Zinder, République du Niger, <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5398-9178>, Laboratoire Lettres, Education et  
Communication (LaboLEC).  
Département d'Anglais, Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines (FLSH), Université André Salifou (UAS) de  
Zinder, République du Niger, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2298-9529>, Laboratoire Lettres, Education et  
Communication (LaboLEC).  
Département d'Anglais, Faculté des Lettres, Langues, Arts et Communication (FLLAC), Université d'Abomey-  
Calavi (UAC), République du Bénin,  
\*Corresponding Author: Ayodele Adebayo Allagbé

---

**Abstract:** This paper examines Josep Borrell's Opening speech delivered on October 10th, 2022, at the European Union Ambassadors' Annual Conference, Brussels. Drawing its theoretical insights from Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth, CDA), especially from Teun A. van Dijk's sociocognitive approach (1995a & b; 2000a; 2006a) and the mixed research methodology, it specifically analyses the discourse properties or structures (speech acts, syntax, lexicon, and rhetorical figures) this speaker deploys to persuade or discursively or/and cognitively manipulate his addressees with a view to getting them to take action. It also demonstrates how his language represents his (group) attitudes or ideologies. The findings reveal, for example, that the speaker employs three out of the five types of speech act (representatives, directives and expressives), the dominant type being representatives, indicating thus that the speaker mainly uses language to encode his view of the world as he understands it. The findings also exude that the speaker deploys seven types of word order (SV(A), SVO/C(A), ASV(A), ASVO/C(A), (A)OV, OV(S)/A and OSV), in varying proportions, in his speech, the dominant type being the conventional SVO/C(A) word order. The findings indicate as well that most of the sentence structures are active, and that the verbs therein are transitive. The main subject roles in all the sentences, as observed too, are played by the personal pronouns "he"; "I"; "you"; "they" and "we", the predominant pronoun being "we". In fact, the speaker polarises the aforementioned social actors: US vs. THEM. The analysis of lexical choices corroborates this. Finally, the findings unveil that the speaker deploys such rhetorical figures as repetition; anastrophe; rhetorical question; ellipsis; anaphora; appositive; simile; metaphor, etc., to emphasise his group's values and properties while de-emphasising those of out-group members. The study concludes that the analysis of discourse properties or structures provides an insight into how language is used for discursive or/and cognitive manipulation.

**Keywords:** Borrell's Opening speech; Discourse properties; group ideologies; social actors; US vs. THEM

---

### **I. Introduction**

One of the essential tenets of Critical Discourse Studies (henceforth, CDS) or Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth, CDA) is that discourse plays a fundamental role in the daily expression and reproduction of ideologies, and that ideologies influence all the various levels of discourse structure (van Dijk, 2000b). This tenet, put in another way, simply implies that there is no use of language that is devoid of ideological influence, and that ideologies often pervade all the levels of language (use), including phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic levels. However, the influence of ideologies goes beyond the aforementioned levels of language. In fact, according to proponents of CDA like van Dijk and Kintsch, for example, ideological influence is noticeable (and, in fact, traceable) at the linguistic, social and cognitive levels. For instance, if we take a political speech whose social function, as we all know, is to persuade people to act in a given way or take action, we will notice almost effortlessly that its production naturally requires the language user (or the speaker) to have a good command of linguistic, social and cognitive resources. This is to say, the speaker must know how to combine resources from the three levels to communicate intended meanings or produce (ideological and rhetorical) effects in his/her speech. Likewise, the reception of political discourse, just like that of any other type of discourse, requires the language user (or the audience) to know first how the speaker organises language to communicate intended meanings or produce effects and then respond effectively and accordingly to those effects.

Recent linguistic studies on political discourse have actually examined how politicians deploy language in their speech to communicate intended meanings or produce (ideological and rhetorical) effects or/and how the audience responds to those effects. For instance, Kusumawati, (2011) analyses how President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) uses language to build self-image in his selected international speeches. Using insights from critical linguistics, this scholar describes the grammar (word choice, sentence arrangement and figures of speech) of the speeches. The findings reveal that the speaker employs lexical items, sentence structures and figures of speech, in varying proportions, to encode his intention and positive self-image. Derakhshani, Qaiwar, Kazemian and Mohammadian (2021) also investigate President Donald Trump's First Speech delivered to the UN on September 19th, 2017. Drawing their theoretical underpinnings from Fairclough's brand of CDA and Rhetoric, the researchers examine how the president employs language to express intended meanings and persuade his audience. The findings show that the speaker deploys both rhetorical devices (parallelism and anaphora; three-part listing and amplification; antithesis and expletive and rhetorical questions) and CDA strategies (modal verbs, passivisation, nominalisation and unification strategy [we-groups]) in his speech. His intentional deployment of the aforementioned features, the scholars observe, is what helps him reach his intended goals.

Unlike the foregoing, Ramanathan, Paramasivam and Hoon (2020) study the tweets of two political premiers: Former Prime Minister of Malaysia, Najib Tun Razak and Prime Minister Narendra Modi. Anchored on pragmatics and Wodak's theoretical framework of discursive strategies, the paper explores the speech acts and discursive strategies the politicians use in their electoral campaigns. The findings exude that both politicians employ two major speech acts: commissives and directives. They further indicate that the speech acts encode the discursive strategies of predication and perspectivation. With this, the analysts note, the political leaders have been able to establish power through mutual consent. In the same token, Amoussou and Allagbé (2023)'s paper investigates President Muhammadu Buhari's national address on the Covid-19 pandemic. Using the Speech Act Theory, the study identifies and categorises the speech acts the president deploys in his speech. The findings show that President Buhari employs the five types of speech act, in varying proportions, the dominant type being representatives. The speaker, the analysis observes, uses representatives to encode his perception of the pandemic, and project his intentions about the measures taken or envisioned to curb it. In another very insightful paper, Allagbé and Amoussou (2023) analyse a political speech delivered by Mr. Nourénou Atchadé, the first vice president of the opposition party called "Les Démocrates" on February 12th, 2023, at the induction ceremony of the 9th legislative assembly held at the National Assembly, in Benin Republic. Drawing its theoretical insights from pragmatic literary stylistics, the study specifically examines how the speaker uses language to encode his intended meaning(s) and distinctive style in his speech. The findings indicate that the speaker uses four out of the five types of speech act (representatives, directives, commissives and expressives), the most dominant type being representatives. They also show that the speaker deploys a considerable number of presuppositions and conversational implicatures in his speech. In addition, they reveal that he employs such rhetorical strategies as hyperbole, imagery, litotes, metaphor, simile, allusion, rhetorical question, anastrophe, repetition/anaphora/epistrophe, apposition and phonological schemes (alliteration and assonance), the dominant type being hyperbole. These linguistic features, the scholars conclude, jointly interact to represent the speaker's intended meanings and distinctive style. Other very interesting linguistic studies, that deserve to be mentioned here but are not due to space limitations, are Kameswari and Mamidi, (2018); Anyanwu, (2023); Amoussou, Allagbé and Zounhin Toboula (2024); Allagbé (2024a and b), etc.

In line with the foregoing, this paper aims to examine Josep Borrell's Opening speech delivered at the European Union (henceforth, EU) Ambassadors' Annual Conference 2022. But it differs from the foregoing in that it applies Teun A. van Dijk's sociocognitive approach to a new political discourse. The study specifically analyses the discourse properties or structures (speech acts, syntax, lexicon, and rhetorical figures) this speaker deploys in his speech to persuade or discursively or/and cognitively manipulate his addressees with a view to getting them to take action. It also demonstrates how his language represents his (group) attitudes or ideologies.

## **II. Theoretical Framework**

As stated above, this paper draws its theoretical insights from CDA. According to van Dijk (1995c, p. 17), "Critical Discourse Analysis" (CDA) has become the general label for a special approach to the study of text and talk, emerging from critical linguistics, critical semiotics and in general from a socio-politically conscious and oppositional way of investigating language, discourse and communication." Elsewhere, this scholar holds that "Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (van Dijk, 2001, p. 352). Without dispelling the foregoing, Wodak (2001, p. 2) submits that "The term CDA is used nowadays to refer more specifically to the critical linguistic approach of scholars who find the larger discursive unit of text to be the basic unit of communication. This research specifically considers

institutional, political, gender and media discourses (in the broadest sense) which testify to more or less overt relations of struggle and conflict.”

It can be inferred from above that CDA is simply a critical approach to the study of text and talk geared to unpacking or demystifying the ideological power relations enacted therein. In fact, it is a method of Discourse Analysis or Studies with no single method, perspective or position. In other words, CDA is a multi-perspectival and multidisciplinary approach to the study of text and talk that aims “to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 132). Underlying CDA, as Wodak (2001, pp. 5-6) rightly points out, are the following assumptions:

- language is a social phenomenon;
- not only individuals, but also institutions and social groupings have specific meanings and values, that are expressed in language in systematic ways;
- texts are the relevant units of language in communication;
- readers/hearers are not passive recipients in their relationship to texts...

In point of fact, there are three major varieties of CDA, namely: Fairclough's socio-cultural approach, Wodak's discourse historical approach and van Dijk's sociocognitive approach (Datondji and Amoussou, 2019, p. 70). This paper chooses to apply van Dijk's sociocognitive approach. Of course, there are two reasons for choosing this approach. First, van Dijk's sociocognitive approach is a multidisciplinary theory of ideology “located in the conceptual and disciplinary triangle that relates *cognition*, *society* and *discourse*” (van Dijk, 2000a, p. 5). Undergirding this approach are two major theoretical presuppositions: 1. discourse and society are related and these relations are necessarily indirect and mediated by shared mental representations of social actors as group members and 2. the very knowledge of language and discourse is a paramount example of the shared social cognitions of groups and their members (van Dijk, 2006a, p. 138). Perhaps, there is a need to clarify what we mean by ideologies here before we continue. van Dijk (2000a, p. 8) defines ideologies as “the basis of the social representations shared by members of a group. This means that ideologies allow people, as group members, to organize the multitude of social beliefs about what is the case, good or bad, right or wrong, for them, and to act accordingly.” Elsewhere, he observes that “ideologies are localized between societal structures and the structures of the minds of social members. They allow social actors to translate their social properties (identity, goal, position, etc.) into the knowledge and beliefs that make up the concrete models of their everyday life experiences, that is, the mental representations of their actions and discourse. Indirectly (viz., through attitudes and knowledge), therefore, ideologies control how people plan and understand their social practices, and hence also the structures of text and talk” (van Dijk, 1995b, p. 21). The second reason for choosing van Dijk's sociocognitive approach is that it offers a principled and systematic multidisciplinary framework for ideological discourse analysis (see van Dijk, 1995 a & b and 2006a, for instance). According to van Dijk (2000a, pp. 69-70), ideologies may be represented as group schemata with an underlying structure measurable by means of the following categories:

- Membership: Who are we? Where are we from? What do we look like?
- Who belongs to us? Who can become a member of our group?
- Activities: What do we do? What is expected of us? Why are we here?
- Goals: Why do we do this? What do we want to realise?
- Values/norms: What are our main values? How do we evaluate ourselves and others? What should (not) be done?
- Position and group-relations: What is our social position? Who are our enemies, our opponents? Who are like us, and who are different?
- Resources: What are the essential social resources that our group has or needs to have?

Having sketched the theoretical framework of this study, let us now outline the methodology it intends to apply.

### **III. Methodology**

This paper examines Josep Borrell's Opening speech delivered on October 10th, 2022, at the European Union Ambassadors' Annual Conference, Brussels. It draws its theoretical insights from CDA, mainly from van Dijk's sociocognitive approach. It combines these theoretical insights with the mixed research methodology. With this, it specifically analyses the discourse properties or structures (speech acts, syntax, lexicon, and rhetorical figures) this speaker deploys to persuade or discursively or/and cognitively manipulate his addressees with a view to getting them to take action. It also demonstrates how his language represents his (group) attitudes or ideologies. To reach this goal, the speech acts and the syntactic sentence structures in the speech are first identified and quantified, and the findings thereof discussed qualitatively. However, the lexical choices and rhetorical figures deployed therein are only identified and discussed qualitatively.

Josep Borrell's Opening speech was downloaded on July 10th, 2023 from the official European website (<https://www.eeas.europa.eu>). The speech was actually selected for this study because it is generically and textually well-structured. More importantly, it represents current global issues, one of which is the ongoing war in Ukraine, and this representation, it is assumed, is ideologically oriented. Though the speech does not have an overall topic, it highly topicalises the repositioning of the European Union and the commissioning of all EU ambassadors to take action in this sense, in an apparently crisis-filled, conflictual and multi-polar world. The current study seeks to answer the two research questions below:

1. What discourse properties or structures (speech act, syntax, lexicon and rhetorical figures) does Josep Borrell deploy in his speech to persuade or discursively or/and cognitively manipulate his addressees?
2. What ideologies do these discourse properties or structures encode?

Due to space limitations, the entire analysed speech is not given here. Only samples from the corpus are provided where necessary for illustration.

## IV. Analysis of the Speech and Discussion of the Findings

The analysis of Borrell's Opening speech begins with the identification of speech acts.

### 4.1. Speech Acts

The speech acts identified in the speech are presented in the table below.

Speech acts	Utterances	Frequency/ percentage
<b>Representatives (Rep)</b>	3; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30; 31; 32; 33; 36; 37; 40; 42; 43; 44; 45; 47; 48; 49; 50; 51; 52; 53; 54; 55; 57; 58; 59; 60; 61; 62; 67; 68; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 76; 77; 78; 80; 82; 83; 84; 85; 86; 87; 88; 89; 90; 91; 92; 93; 94; 97; 98; 99; 100; 101; 102; 103; 104; 105; 106; 107; 109; 110; 111; 112; 113; 114; 116; 117; 118; 119; 121; 124; 125; 127; 128; 129; 131; 132; 133; 134; 135; 136; 137; 138; 139; 140; 141; 142; 143; 144; 145; 146; 147; 148; 149; 150; 151; 153; 154; 155; 156; 157; 161; 162; 163; 164; 165; 166; 167; 168; 169; 170; 171; 172; 173; 174; 175; 178; 179; 180; 181; 183; 188; 189; 190; 191; 192; 193; 194; 195; 196; 197; 201; 202; 203; 204; 206; 207; 211; 212; 213; 214; 215; 226; 231; 232; 233; 235; 236; 237; 239; 240; 241; 242; 243; 245; 247; 248; 251; 253; 254; 255; 259; 260; 261; 265; 266; 272; 274; 275; 276; 277; 278; 279; 280; 281; 283; 284; 286; 287; 288; 290; 295; 297; 298; 300; 301; 302; 303; 304; 305; 306; 307; 309; 310; 311; 314; 315; 318; 319.	<b>226 (70.63%)</b>
<b>Directives (Dir)</b>	10; 25; 34; 35; 38; 39; 41; 46; 56; 63; 64; 65; 66; 69; 79; 81; 95; 96; 108; 115; 120; 122; 123; 126; 130; 152; 158; 159; 160; 176; 177; 182; 184; 185; 186; 187; 198; 199; 200; 205; 208; 209; 210; 216; 217; 218; 219; 220; 221; 222; 223; 224; 225; 227; 228; 229; 230; 234; 238; 244; 246; 249; 250; 252; 256; 257; 258; 262; 263; 264; 268; 269; 270; 271; 273; 282; 285; 289; 291; 292; 293; 294; 296; 299; 308; 312; 313; 316; 317.	<b>89 (27.81%)</b>
<b>Commissives (Com)</b>	-	<b>00 (00%)</b>
<b>Expressives (Exp)</b>	1; 2; 4; 267; 320.	<b>05 (01.56%)</b>
<b>Declarations (Dec)</b>	-	<b>00 (00%)</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>320 (100%)</b>

**Table 1:** Distribution of speech acts in the speech.

As it clearly appears in the table above, the speaker employs three out of the five types of speech act: representatives, directives and expressives. In other words, he does not deploy commissives and declarations in his speech. A close look at the table further indicates that the speaker employs a total number of 320 utterances in his speech. Out of this figure, representatives come first with a rate of **226 (i.e. 70.63%)** utterances. They are



followed by directives with a figure of **89 (i.e. 27.81%)** utterances. Expressives rank third with a number of **05 (i.e. 01.56%)** utterances. The highest rate of representative speech acts exudes that the speaker uses language to inform and describe or represent (global) issues in his speech. For example, he uses Utterances (6; 7; 8; 9; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21) to inform his addressees (European Union Ambassadors) about what he expects them to do or what they are expected to do at the meeting:

6. You will have an entire week and you will be hearing from many people – from our President [of the European] Commission [Ursula von der Leyen], [President of the European] Council [Charles Michel], Commissioners, think tankers, journalists **(Rep)**. 7. You will discuss about how the European Union should position [itself] in this competitive and fractured world **(Rep)**. 8. I am the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign and Security Policy **(Rep)**. 9. I am in charge of building a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the [European] External Action Service – and in particular you – are supposed to support me on doing that **(Rep)**... 11. The new frontiers of diplomacy – it is a big range of issues **(Rep)**. 12. You will talk about how to revitalise multilateralism at this time of power politics **(Rep)**. 13. You will talk about European security, in light of the war in Ukraine, but not only – there are other security crises, which are looming **(Rep)**. 14. We will talk about [the] energy and climate crisis and what the European Union should do **(Rep)**. 15. Both things go together **(Rep)**. 16. We are facing one of the biggest energy crises since the first oil shock in the seventies **(Rep)**. 17. At that time, I was a student at the French Institute of Petroleum in Paris **(Rep)**. 18. It was 1972, and I was told that there was only oil for 20 years **(Rep)**. 19. Well, we are in 2022 and we still have a lot of oil, but at a very high price **(Rep)**. 20. So, energy and climate – both things together, are going to be a big challenge **(Rep)**. 21. We will talk about disinformation, foreign interference in our political processes, the digital revolution, the Global Gateway, gender and diversity **(Rep)**.

As can be clearly inferred from the foregoing, Josep Borrell expects his addressees to discuss the EU's position in the current world, support him in accomplishing his mission, talk about how to revitalise multilateralism, European security, the energy and climate crisis, disinformation, etc. among other issues.

The speaker further deploys Utterances (47; 48; 49; 50; 51; 52; 53; 54; 55; 57; 58; 59; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 67; 68) to represent Europe's dependence on Russia and China for energy (or gas) and commercial exchanges respectively. As it appears, this constitutes a major concern for the EU. In the same vein, the speaker employs Utterances (73; 74; 75; 76; 77; 78; 80; 82; 83; 84; 85; 86; 87; 88; 89; 90; 91; 92; 93; 94; 97; 98; 99; 100; 116; 117; 118; 119) to describe what is happening inside European countries (a radical shift is ongoing therein) and make claims about what is (and isn't) a surprise for them, Europeans. For instance, the war in Ukraine has come as a surprise to them. Likewise, they have not foreseen Putin's capacity to escalate the level of mass mobilisation and open nuclear threats. Again, they have not foreseen what is happening in the Sahel. Similarly, the degree to which Russia is becoming a major factor in African countries is a surprise to them. But the US-China competition is not a surprise to them at all.

In addition, the speaker uses directives for three purposes: to command or instruct, query and make suggestions. In fact, he deploys sixteen (**16 [i.e. 17.98%]**) directives (34; 35; 63; 64; 65; 66; 81; 126; 159; 160; 238; 249; 250; 252; 268 and 269) to query his addressees, twenty (**20 [i.e. 22.47%]**) directives (115; 120; 130; 152; 158; 177; 205; 222; 223; 227; 228; 229; 230; 246; 256; 292; 293; 294; 296; 317) to command or instruct them and fifty-three (**53 [i.e. 59.55%]**) directives (10; 25; 38; 39; 41; 46; 56; 69; 79; 95; 96; 108; 122; 123; 176; 182; 184; 185; 186; 187; 198; 199; 200; 208; 209; 210; 216; 217; 218; 219; 220; 221; 224; 225; 234; 244; 257; 258; 262; 263; 264; 270; 271; 273; 282; 285; 289; 291; 299; 308; 312; 313; 316) to make suggestions to them. As it appears, directives of suggestion surprisingly predominate over other sub-types. This shows politeness. It also indicates solidarity and shared responsibility. Note that while the speaker's use of commands indicates unequal power relations, his deployment of queries is meant for emphasis and persuasion. The subsequent examples illustrate these aspects:

#### ◆ **Commands**

115. Do not limit it to Ukraine **(Dir)**.

120. So, do not look only at the Ukrainian crisis **(Dir)**.

130. So, take care with the issues that appears – a crisis and then a following crisis erases the previous one, it looks like it is being solved but it is not solved. [It] is still there **(Dir)**.

152. Look at Turkey, India, Brazil, South Africa, Mexico, Indonesia **(Dir)**.

158. Look at Mexico's President [Andrés Manuel López Obrador]'s recent speech **(Dir)**

#### ◆ **Suggestions**

10. And in doing that, we have to deal with the new 'frontiers of diplomacy' - which is the title of this meeting **(Dir)**.

25. I want to structure my address today along two things **(Dir)**.

38. We should not try to deny it (**Dir**).

39. We should not try to resist it (**Dir**).

41. We have to accept it and to adapt [to] it, prioritising flexibility and resilience (**Dir**).

➡ **Queries**

34. How are we facing the world? (**Dir**)

35. What world is this? (**Dir**)

63. While the cooperation with the Biden Administration is excellent, and the transatlantic relationship has never been as good as it is today – [including] our cooperation with the United States and my friend Tony [Anthony] Blinken [US Secretary of State]: we are in a fantastic relationship and cooperating a lot; who knows what will happen two years from now, or even in November? (**Dir**)

64. What would have happened if, instead of [Joe] Biden, it would have been [Donald] Trump or someone like him in the White House? (**Dir**)

65. What would have been the answer of the United States to the war in Ukraine? (**Dir**)

Again, the analysis unveils that the speaker deploys five (05) expressives (1; 2; 4; 267 and 320) in his speech:

1. Good morning (**Exp**).

2. Welcome, welcome to all of you (**Exp**).

4. But in any case, [I am] very happy to be here and to be able to discuss in person (**Exp**).

267. We are happy that we are importing a lot of Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) from the United States – at a high price, by the way - and substituting Russian gas by American and Norwegian gas, or Azerbaijani gas – well, from Azerbaijan it's a small quantity (**Exp**).

320. Thank you (**Exp**).

As it is obvious above, the speaker uses the first expressive speech act to greet his addressees and the second one to welcome them to the meeting. But he uses the third one to express his being pleased to be able to discuss with them in person. Likewise, he uses the fourth expressive to encode their being happy to import a lot of Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) from the United States and the last one to express his gratitude to them. The next section is concerned with the structural organisation of the different speech acts or utterances in the speech.

**4.2. Syntax**

Under this section, we examine (the various types of) word order, active and passive sentence structures the speaker deploys in his speech. We also analyse the sentence structures to unravel the social actors responsible for the actions enacted therein. The various types of word order found in the speech are presented in the table below. Note that **S** stands for subject, **V** for verb, **A** for adjunct, **O** for object and **C** for complement.

Word orders	Utterances	Frequency/ percentage
<b>SV(A)</b>	15; 18; 19; 43; 63; 64; 80; 83; 87; 90; 99; 104; 106; 108; 113; 119; 126; 128; 129; 136; 137; 142; 143; 148; 178; 184; 188; 190; 194; 198; 199; 212; 216; 217; 219; 221; 227; 239; 245; 248; 259; 262; 268; 276; 287; 310; 311; 313; 314; 317.	<b>49</b> <b>(15.31%)</b>
<b>SVO/C(A)</b>	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 14; 16; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30; 31; 32; 34; 35; 36; 37; 38; 39; 40; 41; 42; 45; 46; 48; 49; 51; 53; 54; 57; 58; 59; 60; 61; 62; 65; 66; 67; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 74; 75; 76; 77; 78; 79; 81; 82; 84; 85; 86; 89; 92; 93; 94; 95; 96; 97; 98; 101; 102; 103; 105; 107; 109; 110; 111; 112; 114; 115; 116; 117; 120; 121; 122; 123; 125; 130; 131; 132; 133; 134; 138; 139; 140; 144; 146; 147; 149; 150; 151; 152; 153; 154; 155; 156; 157; 158; 159; 160; 161; 162; 163; 164; 165; 166; 167; 168; 169; 172; 173; 174; 175; 176; 177; 179; 180; 181; 182; 183; 185; 186; 187; 189; 191; 192; 196; 200; 201; 202; 203; 204; 205; 206; 208; 209; 215; 218; 220; 222; 223; 224; 225; 226; 229; 230; 232; 233; 235; 236; 237; 238; 242; 244; 246; 247; 249; 250; 251; 252; 254; 255; 256; 257; 260; 261; 264; 265; 267; 269; 270; 271; 272; 273; 274; 275; 277; 278; 279; 280; 281; 282; 283; 284; 285; 286; 288; 289; 290; 291; 292; 294; 295; 296; 297; 298; 299; 300; 301; 302; 303; 304; 306; 308; 309; 312; 315; 316; 318; 319; 320.	<b>230</b> <b>(71.87%)</b>
<b>ASV(A)</b>	207; 214; 228; 243.	<b>04</b> <b>(01.25%)</b>

<b>ASVO/C(A)</b>	17; 44; 47; 56; 73; 88; 91; 118; 124; 127; 141; 145; 170; 193; 195; 211; 213; 234; 240; 241; 258; 263; 266; 293; 305; 307.	<b>26</b> <b>(08.13%)</b>
<b>(A)OV</b>	197.	<b>01</b> <b>(00.31%)</b>
<b>OV(S)/A</b>	50; 52; 55; 100; 135; 171; 210; 253.	<b>08</b> <b>(02.50%)</b>
<b>OSV</b>	33; 231.	<b>02</b> <b>(00.63%)</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>320</b> <b>(100%)</b>

**Table 2:** Distribution of word orders in the speech.

Table 2 exudes that the speaker employs seven types of word order **SV(A)**, **SVO/C(A)**, **ASV(A)**, **ASVO/C(A)**, **(A)OV**, **OV(S)/A** and **OSV**, in varying proportions, in his speech. Significantly, the most dominant type, as observed, is the conventional **SVO/C(A)** word order with a figure of **230 (i.e. 71.87%)** instances. This implies that a great number of the sentences in the speech comprise at least two arguments: subject and object. It also suggests that these sentences are active, and that the verbs therein are transitive. On the contrary, the speaker's deployment of the **SV(A)** word order indicates that the sentence structures contain only one argument- subject, and that the verbs therein are intransitive, though they are active too. In addition, the presence of the remaining types of word order in the speech shows that the speaker places another constituent (an adjunct or an object) other than the subject in Thematic position. While the speaker's use of adjuncts (17; 44; 47; 56; 73; 88; 91; 118; 124; 127; 141; 145; 170; 193; 195; 197; 207; 211; 213; 214; 228; 234; 240; 241; 243; 258; 263; 266; 293; 305 and 307) in Thematic position suggests the foregrounding of Circumstantial Information in the speech (Eggs 2004, p. 339), his deployment of objects (33; 50; 52; 55; 100; 135; 171; 210; 231 and 253) in Thematic position indicates passivisation or the backgrounding or de-emphasising of the social actors responsible for the actions encoded therein. In fact, there are eleven passive sentences in the speech. While two of the passive structures obviously contain a subject or an agent (100 and 210), the rest are apparently subject-less or agentless (50; 52; 55; 135; 171; 207; 224; 225 and 253). This is indicative of the fact that the speaker presupposes that the addressees can easily infer the unsaid but implied subject or agent. It also denotes that the speaker is more or less sure that the audience is likely to rely on their mental models to deduce the implicature encoded in those agentless sentences. For instance, in the locution "50. Our prosperity has been based on cheap energy coming from Russia (**Rep**)", it is obvious the agent responsible for such a representative speech act is undeniably "by us", the EU or Europeans.

A perfunctory glance at the syntactic structures of the sentences further reveals that the speaker selects a multitude of elements as subjects in his speech. However, the main subject roles are played by the personal pronouns "he"; "I"; "you"; "they" and "we", the predominant pronoun being "we", suggesting thus the speaker's (group) perspectives or ideologies. The table below displays the various subject roles identified in the sentences:

<b>Subject roles</b>	<b>Utterances</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
<b>I</b>	1; 2; 3; 4; 8; 9; 17; 23; 25; (26); (27); (32); 46; 47; 48; 54; 75; 86; 87; 93; 103; 104; 123; 138; 182; 184; 185; 186; 189; 208; 209; 210; 211; 213; 218; 219; 220; 224; 225; 226; 236; 258; 277; (278); 281; 289; 291; 299; 319; (320).	<b>50</b>
<b>You</b>	6; 7; 12; 13; 70; 71; 96; 112; (115); (120); (130); (152); (158); 161; (177); 178; (205); 216; 217; (222); (223); (227); (228); (229); (230); 245; (246); 249; (250); 251; (256); 270; 282; 285; (292); (294); (296); 305; (317); 318.	<b>40</b>
<b>Nothing</b>	5; 214; 215.	<b>04</b>
<b>It</b>	11; 18; 22; 24; 36; 40; 45; 52; 74; (90); 91; (97); 99; 100; 102; (114); 117; 127; 128; 149; 192; 206; 247; 300; 301; 302.	<b>25</b>
<b>We</b>	10; 14; 16; 19; 21; 33; 34; 38; 39; 41; 50; 55 [Our prosperity]; 56; 62; 63; 69; 77; 78; 79; 84; 85; 89; 92; 116; 119; 122; 139; 151; 170; 176; 180; 187; 188; 190; 193; 194; 195; 198; 199; 200; 201; 202; 203; 204; 221; 231; 232; 233; 234; 235; 237; 238; 240; 241; 244; 248; 255; 257; 259; 262; 263; 264; 267; 272; 276; 284; 288; 290; 297; 303; 308; 309; 310; 312 [Our fight]; 314 [our model]; 315; 316.	<b>83</b>
<b>This</b>	30; 31; 35; 49; 72; 105; 110; 121; 134; 137; 156; 169; 183; 196; 197; 265; 273; 283.	<b>17</b>

The speed and scope of change	37.	<b>01</b>
Uncertainty	42.	<b>01</b>
Both things	15; 20 [energy and climate]; 313 [political freedom and economic prosperity or social cohesion].	<b>03</b>
The 'what' questions	28.	<b>01</b>
The 'how' questions	29.	<b>01</b>
Events that one could imagine that they will never happen, they	43.	<b>01</b>
the black swan	44.	<b>01</b>
Russian gas	51.	<b>01</b>
the access to the big China market	53; 60.	<b>02</b>
The best energy	57.	<b>01</b>
That	58; 94; 98; 140.	<b>04</b>
(Many, many) People	59; 298; 306; 307.	<b>04</b>
The adjustment	61.	<b>01</b>
What	64; 65; 66; 113; 268.	<b>01</b>
These	67.	<b>01</b>
the answer for me	68.	<b>01</b>
There	73; 131; (132); 133; 141; 144; 146; 164; 181.	<b>09</b>
The radical right	76.	<b>01</b>
Some things	80.	<b>01</b>
Ukraine	82.	<b>01</b>
The war in Ukraine	83; 239; 243.	<b>03</b>
they	88 [Russians]; 145 [authoritarian governments]; 153; 154 [Turkey, India, Brazil, South Africa, Mexico, Indonesia].	<b>04</b>
Every European citizen	95.	<b>01</b>
The third issue	101.	<b>01</b>
The prices	106.	<b>01</b>
the reaction of the Central Banks	107.	<b>01</b>
Everybody	108; 109; 124.	<b>03</b>
The (rest of the) world	111; 135; 150; 311.	<b>04</b>
the degree to which Russia	118.	<b>01</b>
Afghanistan	125; 126.	<b>02</b>
The same problems	129.	<b>01</b>
The two big powers	136.	<b>01</b>
authoritarianism	142.	<b>01</b>
Not just China, not just Russia	143.	<b>01</b>
this competition	147.	<b>01</b>
The fight between democracies and authoritarians	148.	<b>01</b>
these people [Turkey, India, Brazil, South Africa, Mexico, Indonesia]	155; 157.	<b>02</b>
Who	159.	<b>01</b>
he [our Mexico delegate]	160.	<b>01</b>
The second characteristic	162.	<b>01</b>
Everything	163.	<b>01</b>
The third characteristic of this world	165.	<b>01</b>
Putin	166; 167 [He]; 168.	<b>03</b>



These people [the Global South]	171; 172 [they]; 173; 174; 175.	<b>05</b>
The DRC	179.	<b>01</b>
Commission, College, the communitarianisation of policies	191.	<b>01</b>
some identities	207.	<b>01</b>
Your reports	212.	<b>01</b>
Quickly for European standards	242.	<b>01</b>
This amount of money	252; 253 [it]; 254.	<b>03</b>
Foreign policy	261.	<b>01</b>
President [of France, Emmanuel] Macron	266.	<b>01</b>
Why	269.	<b>01</b>
The last word	274.	<b>01</b>
Communication	275.	<b>01</b>
My blog	279; 280 [it]; 293.	<b>03</b>
The Russians and the Chinese	286; 287 [they].	<b>02</b>
The first problem	295.	<b>01</b>
the Chinese	304.	<b>01</b>

**Table 3:** Distribution of subject roles in the speech.

#### 4.3. Lexicon

In the previous sections (4.1. and 4.2.), we diligently analysed the various types of speech act, word order and active and passive structures the speaker employs in his speech. But we did not mention the ideological implications of these linguistic features. We are going to do just that here. To begin with, we assume that the speaker's ideologies underlying the aforementioned linguistic features are structured following the discursive strategy of US-THEM polarisation. The subsequent discussion will prove this assumption convincingly. The speaker begins, as observed, his speech by first greeting and welcoming his addressees to the meeting. Then he informs them about what he expects them to do or about what they are expected to do throughout the meeting period. Of course, the information the speaker provides his addressees includes some clues about his identity and social position and those of EU leaders and other potential speakers at the meeting. The speaker's expectations, as observed too, are nothing else but those of his institution; i.e. the European Union. This is to say, the speaker's mental models are ideologically shaped by the institutional roles he takes on in context, and this naturally transpires in his use of language. From the foregoing, it can be deduced that the speaker describes himself, his group members and their allies or friends in positive terms. This denotes positive self-presentation in van Dijk's terms (2006a).

In point of fact, the speaker encodes his (group) ideologies, *inter alia*, by means of personal pronouns. Ali, Christopher and Nordin's study (2017), one of the numerous recent studies in CDA, has revealed that pronouns, especially personal pronouns do represent socio-political ideologies in discourse. The personal pronouns the speaker deploys to express ideologies in his speech are "he"; "I"; "you", "they" and "we". For instance, when he describes or introduces himself or intends to observe some distance or display power, he uses the personal pronoun "I" and its variants "me" and "my": "3. **I** see some of you that **I** know personally, others **I** still do not know (**Rep**). 4. But in any case, [**I** am] very happy to be here and to be able to discuss in person (**Exp**)... 8. **I** am the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign and Security Policy (**Rep**). 9. **I** am in charge of building a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the [European] External Action Service – and in particular you - are supposed to support **me** on doing that (**Rep**)... 279. **My** blog is not "**my**" blog (**Rep**). 280. It is not **my** intellectual amusement, it's **my** "consigna" [guidance] (**Rep**). On the contrary, when he presents his (social) group (the European Union or Europeans) or identifies with his audience and persuades them to act in a desired way, he employs the personal pronoun "we" and its variant "our". This denotes unification strategy (Derakhshani, Qaiwar, Kazemian and Mohammadian, 2021): "308. **We** have to explain what are the links between political freedom and a better life (**Dir**). 309. **We**, Europeans, **we** have this extraordinary chance (**Rep**). 310. **We** live in the world in this part of the world where political freedom, economic prosperity and social cohesion are the best, the best combination of all of that (**Rep**). 311. But the rest of the world is not like this (**Rep**). 312. **Our** fight is to try to explain that democracy, freedom, political freedom is not something that can be exchanged by economic

prosperity or social cohesion (**Dir**). 313. Both things have to go together (**Dir**). 314. Otherwise, **our** model will perish, will not be able to survive in this world (**Rep**)."

Likewise, when the speaker presents their allies or supporters, he employs the personal pronoun "you" and its variant "your": "70. **You** - the United States - take care of our security (**Rep**)... 212. **Your** reports come sometimes too late (**Rep**).". Again, he surprisingly uses the same pronoun to name the Others: "71. **You** - China and Russia – provided the basis of our prosperity (**Rep**).". Moreover, the speaker uses the personal pronoun "they" and its variant "their" to refer to a multitude of out-group social actors: Russians [88]; Russians and Chinese [287]; authoritarian governments [145]; Turkey, India, Brazil, South Africa, Mexico, Indonesia [153 and 154] and the Global South [172; 173; 174; 175]: "88. And certainly, two days later, at five o'clock in the morning, **they** started bombing Kyiv (**Rep**).; 287. **They** are industrialising, **they** have [troll] farms systematically repeating, reaching everybody in the world - once and again, once and again (**Rep**).; 145. Sometimes, **they** are still wearing the democracy suit, but **they** are no longer democracies (**Rep**).; 153. **They** are middle powers (**Rep**). 154. **They** are swing states – **they** vote on one side or the other according to **their** interests, not only **their** theoretical values (**Rep**).; 172. More [importantly], **they** feel that the global system does not deliver, and **they** are not receiving **their** part (**Rep**). 173. **They** are not receiving enough recognition (**Rep**). 174. **They** do not have the role **they** should have according to **their** population and **their** economic weight (**Rep**). 175. And when facing these multiple crises – these multipolar crises - financial, food and energy crises – it is clear that **they** are not there following us because **they** blame us, rightly or not (**Rep**).". In addition, the speaker deploys the personal pronoun "He" to refer to two distinct social actors: "our Mexico delegate" (160) and "Putin" (167): "160. Is **he** here? (**Dir**)...167. **He** knows that nobody wants communism again (**Rep**).".

As it appears in the preceding analysis, the speaker's Other-presentation denotes negative lexicalisation in that he ascribes negative properties to the aforementioned out-group members or simply de-emphasises their positive properties. This clearly bears out his (group) attitudes or ideologies (van Dijk, 1995; 2006a). It also indicates what van Dijk (2006b, p. 361) rightly terms "discursive manipulation" or cognitive manipulation (Amoussou and Aguessy, 2020). In fact, the speaker's (group) ideologies are foregrounded even more when he overtly spells out the aims of the meeting to his audience. Notice the speaker's recursive use of the modal verb "will". It encodes certainty and commitment. Notice also his recursive use of the modal verb "should". It expresses necessity or obligation: "7. You **will** discuss about how the European Union **should** position [itself] in this competitive and fractured world (**Rep**)... 12. You **will** talk about how to revitalise multilateralism at this time of power politics (**Rep**). 13. You **will** talk about European security, in light of the war in Ukraine, but not only – there are other security crises, which are looming (**Rep**). 14. We **will** talk about [the] energy and climate crisis and what the European Union **should** do (**Rep**). 15. Both things go together (**Rep**)... 21. We **will** talk about disinformation, foreign interference in our political processes, the digital revolution, the Global Gateway, gender and diversity (**Rep**). "

In the same token, in the subsequent passage, the speaker encodes his (group) ideologies. In this text, he first represents Europe's dependence on Russia for energy (or gas) and China for commercial exchanges. As his representation clearly exudes, both Russian gas and Chinese market are no more accessible to Europeans. The reason for this is not explicitly mentioned (in the quoted passage). But we can imply (from the whole speech) that it is due to the ongoing war in Ukraine. Next, the speaker expresses some worries about Europe's dependence on the US for its security. We notice here that the speaker, in a bid to enhance the positive image of his (social) group, deliberately mitigates, by means of solid arguments, the impact of their inaccessibility to Russian gas and Chinese market. He further suggests ideologically that Europeans shoulder more responsibilities themselves. Consider his use of "Maybe I am wrong" (47) and "I think" mentioned three times (48; 49 and 54). They are hedges or cautious notes (Yule, 1996, p. 38), and are ideologically used by the speaker to express uncertainty, probability or caution. Consider also his use of a paraphrase associated with an authority, Olivier Schmitt (49); this is meant to express a fact in the speech. Finally, consider his use of the agentless passives (52 and 55) and the three successive queries (64; 65 and 66). All these linguistic features jointly interact to encode the speaker's ideologies:

47. **Maybe I am wrong**, but I want to discuss with you about it [what is happening to us] (**Rep**). 48. **I think** that we Europeans are facing a situation in which we suffer the consequences of a process that has been lasting for years in which we have decoupled the sources of our prosperity from the sources of our security (**Rep**). 49. This is a sentence to provide the headline, and I am taking that from Olivier Schmitt, who has been developing this thesis – **I think** - quite well (**Rep**). 50. Our prosperity has been based on cheap energy coming from Russia (**Rep**). 51. Russian gas – cheap and supposedly affordable, secure, and stable (**Rep**). 52. It has been proved not [to be] the case (**Rep**). 53. And the access to the big China market, for exports and imports, for technological transfers, for investments, for having cheap goods (**Rep**). 54. **I think** that the Chinese workers with their low salaries have done much better and much more to contain inflation than all the Central Banks together (**Rep**). 55. So, our prosperity was based on China and Russia – energy and market (**Rep**)... 57. The best energy is the one that you

produce at home (**Rep**). 58. That will produce a strong restructuring of our economy – that is for sure (**Rep**). 59. People are not aware of that but the fact that Russia and China are no longer the ones that [they] were for our economic development will require a strong restructuring of our economy (**Rep**). 60. The access to China is becoming more and more difficult (**Rep**). 61. The adjustment will be tough, and this will create political problems (**Rep**). 62. On the other hand, we delegated our security to the United States (**Rep**). 63. While the cooperation with the Biden Administration is excellent, and the transatlantic relationship has never been as good as it is today – [including] our cooperation with the United States and my friend Tony [Anthony] Blinken [US Secretary of State]: we are in a fantastic relationship and cooperating a lot; who knows what will happen two years from now, or even in November? (**Rep**) 64. What would have happened if, instead of [Joe] Biden, it would have been [Donald] Trump or someone like him in the White House? (**Rep**) 65. What would have been the answer of the United States to the war in Ukraine? (**Rep**) 66. What would have been our answer in a different situation? (**Rep**) 67. These are some questions that we have to ask ourselves (**Rep**). 68. And the answer for me is clear: we need to shoulder more responsibilities ourselves (**Rep**).

Another instance wherein the speaker represents his perception of or opinions about the world is noticed in the text below. In this text, the speaker acknowledges that many crises exist around the world, and that these crises move the world. He also admits that US-China competition exists, and that this competition will restructure the world. In fact, the speaker believes that the US-China competition will coexist with a broader “democracies vs. authoritarians”, a big divide. This depiction presupposes ideologies of social conflict and power politics. Indeed, the US-China competition, as the speaker perceives it, is nothing else but a conflict between two opposing ideological currents: capitalism and socialism or communism. While the speaker concedes that there is a fight between the aforementioned world powers, he intentionally refrains from drawing a neat categorisation here. This denotes (ideological) vagueness. Consider his recursive use of the expletive “There is/are” (131; 133; 141; 144 and 146); the epithet “big” (mentioned five times in [136] and “once” in [137]); the expression “That is not true” (139 and 140) and the modal adjuncts “Yes” in (141) and “Not” (mentioned twice in [143]) in the text. These linguistic features, as it appears, are deployed for emphatic purposes:

131. **There are** many crises around the world, which are the trends that move this world (**Rep**). 132. First, a messy multipolarity (**Rep**). 133. **There is** the US-China competition (**Rep**). 134. This is the most important “structuring force” (**Rep**). 135. The world is being structured around this competition - like it or not (**Rep**). 136. The two **big** powers – **big, big, big, very big** – are competing and this competition will restructure the world (**Rep**). 137. And this will coexist with a broader “democracies vs. authoritarians”, a big divide (**Rep**). 138. I would not insist a lot on it because on our side, there are a lot of authoritarian regimes (**Rep**). 139. We cannot say “we are the democracies”, and the ones which follow us are also democracies - **that is not true** (**Rep**). 140. **That is not true** (**Rep**). 141. **Yes**, there is a fight between the democratic systems and the authoritarian systems (**Rep**). 142. But authoritarianism is, unhappily, developing a lot (**Rep**). 143. Not just China, not just Russia (**Rep**). 144. **There is** an authoritarian trend (**Rep**). 145. Sometimes, they are still wearing the democracy suit, but they are no longer democracies (**Rep**). 146. **There are** some who are not democracies at all – they do not even take the pity to look like democracies (**Rep**). 147. So, this competition is a structuring force (**Rep**). 148. The fight between democracies and authoritarians is there (**Rep**).

#### *4.4. Rhetorical Figures*

To express his (group) attitudes or ideologies in his speech, the speaker further deploys such rhetorical figures as repetition; anastrophe; rhetorical question; ellipsis; anaphora; appositive; simile; metaphor; expletive; alliteration, assonance and rhyme; connotation; hyperbole; tautology; synonymy and antonymy; gradation and syllogism.

##### *Repetition*

Significantly, the speaker employs two types of repetition in his speech: lexical and structural. He repeats the following lexical choices more than one time in his speech: “he”; “I”; “you”; “they”; “we”; “European”; “Union”; “Commission”; “Russia”; “Russians”; “Putin”; “China”; “Chinese”; “Ukraine”; “United States”; “gas”; “energy”; “market”; “democracy”; “authoritarian”; “economy”; “security”; “relationship”; “cooperation”; “world”; crisis, etc. (see Table 3 above). He also repeats six of the seven structural features identified in the speech more than once: **SV(A)**, **SVO/C(A)**, **ASV(A)**, **ASVO/C(A)**, **OV(S)/A** and **OSV** (see Table 2 above). As stated earlier, the speaker's use of the aforementioned structural features has an ideological implication. For instance, his deployment of adjuncts or objects in Thematic position or subject-less or agent-less passive structures exudes his deliberate effort to foreground the Circumstantial Information in the sentences or background the actors responsible for the actions enacted therein.

### *Anastrophe*

As it appears in the structural features above, the speaker intentionally inverts the syntactic order of words to create rhetorical effects in his speech. Consider how he does so in the following:

33. **The world** we are facing – as I said, I am not a specialist on almost any of the issues, but I have a broad political understanding (**Rep**).

35. **What world** is this? (**Dir**)

197. **For cultural, historical and economic reasons**, this is no longer accepted (**Rep**).

205. Remember this sentence: “it is the identity, **stupid**” (**Dir**).

231. **Whatever** we do, there are taboo-breaking decisions (**Rep**).

### *Rhetorical Question*

In the anastrophic expressions above, we notice that one of them (35) is a rhetorical question. In fact, the speaker employs a total number of sixteen rhetorical questions (34; 35; 63; 64; 65; 66; 81; 126; 159; 160; 238; 249; 250; 252; 268 and 269) in his speech. He uses these rhetorical questions to persuade his audience or to influence them cognitively. In addition to the cited examples, let us give other examples of rhetorical question found in the speech:

63. While the cooperation with the Biden Administration is excellent, and the transatlantic relationship has never been as good as it is today – [including] our cooperation with the United States and my friend Tony [Anthony] Blinken [US Secretary of State]: we are in a fantastic relationship and cooperating a lot; who knows what will happen two years from now, or even in November? (**Dir**)

64. What would have happened if, instead of [Joe] Biden, it would have been [Donald] Trump or someone like him in the White House? (**Dir**)

65. What would have been the answer of the United States to the war in Ukraine? (**Dir**)

### *Ellipsis*

Again, we notice that some clause or sentence constituents are ellipsed in the speech. Consider the examples below. In the first example, only the agent is omitted. Likewise, in the second example, only the auxiliary verb is omitted. But in the third example, the subject, the main verb and the object are ellipsed.

55. Our prosperity was based on China and Russia—energy and market (**Rep**).

111. The world (**is**) following the Fed [the Federal Reserve], .... (**Rep**).

278. (**I spend a lot of time**) Talking [during] the doorstep, the post-meeting step, my blog (**Rep**).

### *Anaphora*

In addition to the above-mentioned rhetorical figures, the speaker recursively draws on anaphora to represent unequal power relations, on the one hand, and group ideologies, on the other. Consider how he does so in the following examples:

7. **You will** discuss about how the European Union should position [itself] in this competitive and fractured world (**Rep**)... 12. **You will talk about** how to revitalise multilateralism at this time of power politics (**Rep**). 13. **You will talk about** European security, in light of the war in Ukraine, but not only – there are other security crises, which are looming (**Rep**).

14. **We will talk about** [the] energy and climate crisis and what the European Union should do (**Rep**)... 21. **We will talk about** disinformation, foreign interference in our political processes, the digital revolution, the Global Gateway, gender and diversity (**Rep**).

### *Appositive*

Moreover, the speaker deploys three appositives to define and restate his group attitudes or ideologies. Notice how he does so in the examples below:

70. You - **the United States** - take care of our security (**Rep**).

71. You - **China and Russia** – provided the basis of our prosperity (**Rep**).

309. We, **Europeans**, we have this extraordinary chance (**Rep**).

### *Simile*

Like in the above, the speaker uses the only similitive expression in his speech to emphasise the positive property of his social group or political system.

311. But the rest of the world is not like this (*Europe where political freedom, economic prosperity and social cohesion are the best, the best combination of all of that*) (**Rep**).

### *Metaphor*

Furthermore, the speaker employs the two metaphorical expressions below to enforce his group values and empower his representatives in other parts of the world respectively.

315. We are too much Kantians and not enough Hobbesians, as the philosopher says (**Rep**).

318. You are my eyes, my ears around the world (**Rep**).

### *Expletive*

Again, the speaker deploys expletives for emphasis in his speech. In the third example, the speaker's use of the modal adjunct "Yes" further emphasises his opinion:

131. **There are** many crises around the world, which are the trends that move this world (**Rep**).

133. **There is** the US-China competition (**Rep**).

141. **Yes, there is** a fight between the democratic systems and the authoritarian systems (**Rep**).

### *Alliteration, Assonance and Rhyme*

The speaker also employs such phonological schemes as alliteration and assonance to produce musical or sound effects in his speech. Consider the two examples below culled from the speech. In the first sentence for example, the speaker repeats the phonemes /w/ and /e/. These repeated phonemes form both alliterative and assonantal patterns here. Again, in the first sentence, the final syllables of the first two words rhyme. In the second sentence too, the speaker repeats the phonemes /m/ and /i/. These repeated phonemes, like those in the first sentence, form both alliterative and assonantal patterns in the speech.

2. **Welcome, welcome** to all of you (**Exp**).

132. First, a **messy multipolarity** (**Rep**).

### *Connotation*

In fact, the speaker's use of the word 'messy' in the sentence below unfailingly connotes "lacking neatness or precision." From this, we can infer that he prefers the contrary of what he means; i.e. a unipolar world.

132. First, a **messy** multipolarity (**Rep**).

### *Hyperbole*

The speaker relies too on intentional overstatement to lay emphasis on his utterances or ideas. For instance, the phrases "fractured world" and "radical uncertainty" are deliberately employed in the examples below to encode in that order meanings of a catastrophe and a worrisome situation wherein there is absence of hope.

7. You will discuss about how the European Union should position [itself] in this competitive and **fractured world** (**Rep**).

36. Well, it is a world of **radical uncertainty** (**Rep**).

### *Tautology*

In a directive speech act (69), the speaker willingly draws on a redundant use of some words for emphatic reasons.

69. We have to take a bigger part of our responsibility in **securing security** (**Dir**).  
In fact, in asking his addressees to 'secure security', the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Security and Policy is inviting his in-group members to take the question of security seriously during their discussions.

### *Synonymy and Antonymy*

Again, it can be noted in the text under study the use of words or phrases realising lexical relations of synonymy and antonymy. These linguistic resources contribute to increasing the lexical density of the speech, as can be observed beneath:

44. At this pace, the **black swan** will be the majority (**Rep**). 45. It will not be **white swans** [...] (**Rep**).

63. While the **cooperation** with the Biden Administration is **excellent**, [...] we are in a **fantastic relationship** and cooperating a lot; who knows what will happen two years from now, or even in November? (**Dir**)

73. Inside our countries, there is a radical shift, and the radical right is increasing in our democracies, democratically – it is the **choice** of the people, it is not an **imposition** from any power (**Rep**).

As it appears, while Utterance (63) subsumes two instances of synonymy: *cooperation/relationship* and *excellent/fantastic*, Utterances (44 and 73) only display opposites which are respectively *black swan versus white swans* and *choice versus imposition*.



### *Gradation*

The speaker further makes recourse to gradation to draw the audience's attention to the serious character of his ideas/thoughts or/and create musical effects in his speech.

136. The two **big** powers – **big, big, big, very big** – are competing and this competition will restructure the world (**Rep**).

198. We have **to listen more (Dir)**. 199. We have **to be much more on "listening mode"** to the other side – the other side is the rest of the world (**Dir**). 200. We need **to have more empathy (Dir)**.

227. Behave as you would behave if you were an Embassy: **send a telegram, a cable, a mail** – quickly (**Dir**).

### *Syllogism*

Finally, the speaker draws on logical thinking or deductive reasoning to create his text. Indeed, we infer this from the generic structure of the speech. The generic structure gives what follows:

1. Greeting and welcoming of the participants;
2. Expression of satisfaction to meet the participants in person;
3. Self-introduction and introduction of EU leaders and other potential speakers at the meeting;
4. Announcement or recalling of the topics of the meeting (a. Revitalising multilateralism at this time of power politics; b. European security in light of the war in Ukraine and other security crises in the world; c. Energy and climate crisis and the role of the European Union and d. Disinformation, foreign interference in European political processes, the digital revolution, the Global Gateway, gender and diversity);
5. Plan of the speech ('what' and 'how' questions);
6. 'What' questions (Issue 1: The world is a world of radical uncertainty; Illustrations (e.g. The speed and scope of change is exceptional. Events, that one could imagine will happen, are happening.) and Conclusion (to be inferred by the audience); Issue 2: Europeans have decoupled the sources of their prosperity from the sources of their security; Illustrations (Europe depends on Russian gas and Chinese market. It also depends on the US for its security) and Conclusion (to be inferred by the audience); Issue 3: The US-China competition; Illustrations (e.g. This was not a surprise but the escalation of tension in Taiwan was not in the agenda; the competition between the two world powers is a structuring force and three characteristics of a competitive world) and Conclusion (to be inferred by the audience), etc.
7. 'How' questions (Argument 1: Europeans should think more politically and be more proactive and reactive; Illustrations (e.g. They should bridge the gap between national policies and Community policies; i.e. they should avoid working in silos. They should avoid thinking too much internal and exporting their model. They have to listen more to the other side (i.e. the rest of the world and have more empathy. They should think faster and take more risks, etc.) and Conclusion (to be inferred by the audience);
8. Closing words (expression of gratitude).

## **V. Conclusion**

This paper has examined Josep Borrell's Opening speech delivered on October 10th, 2022, at the European Union Ambassadors' Annual Conference, Brussels. It has drawn its theoretical insights from CDA, especially from Teun A. van Dijk's sociocognitive approach (1995a & b; 2000a; 2006a) and the mixed research methodology. With this, it has specifically analysed the discourse properties or structures (speech acts, syntax, lexicon, and rhetorical figures) this speaker deploys to persuade or discursively or/and cognitively manipulate his addressees with a view to getting them to take action. It has also demonstrated how his language represents his (group) attitudes or ideologies. The analysis has yielded some salient findings.

The findings reveal, for example, that the speaker employs three out of the five types of speech act (representatives, directives and expressives), the dominant type being representatives. This indicates thus that the speaker mainly uses language to encode his view of the world as he understands it (Black, 2006). This finding actually corroborates Amoussou and Allagbé's (2023), Allagbé and Amoussou's (2023), Anyanwu's (2023) and Amoussou, Allagbé and Zounhin Toboula's discovery. The discovery is that President Muhammadu Buhari, Mr. Nourénou Atchadé and President Bola Ahmed Tinubu, all politicians, respectively employ representatives predominantly in their speeches to represent their points of view or perceptions of social reality and intentions. Again, the findings exude that the speaker deploys seven types of word order (SV(A), SVO/C(A), ASV(A), ASVO/C(A), (A)OV, OV(S)/A and OSV), in varying proportions, in his speech, the dominant type being the conventional SVO/C(A) word order. This suggests that a great number of the sentences in the speech comprise at least two arguments: subject and object. It implies too that these sentences are active, and that the verbs therein are transitive. Unlike SVO/C(A), the speaker's deployment of the SV(A) word order unveils that the sentence structures count only one argument- subject, and that the verbs therein are intransitive, though they are active too.

Moreover, the speaker's deployment of the remaining types of word order in the speech exudes that he places another constituent (an adjunct or an object) other than the subject in Thematic position. While the speaker's use of adjuncts (17; 44; 47; 56; 73; 88; 91; 118; 124; 127; 141; 145; 170; 193; 195; 197; 207; 211; 213; 214; 228; 234; 240; 241; 243; 258; 263; 266; 293; 305 and 307) in Thematic position denotes the foregrounding of Circumstantial Information in the speech (Eggins 2004, p. 339), his use of objects (33; 50; 52; 55; 100; 135; 171; 210; 231 and 253) in Thematic position suggests passivisation or the backgrounding or de-emphasising of the social actors responsible for the actions encoded therein. In fact, there are eleven passive sentences in the speech. While two of the passive structures obviously contain a subject or an agent (100 and 210), the rest are apparently subject-less or agentless (50; 52; 55; 135; 171; 207; 224; 225 and 253). The main subject roles in all the sentences, as observed too, are played by the personal pronouns "he"; "I"; "you"; "they" and "we", the predominant pronoun being "we". This indicates unification strategy (Derakhshani, Qaiwar, Kazemian and Mohammadian, 2021). In point of fact, the speaker polarises the aforementioned social actors: US vs. THEM. The analysis of lexical choices repeatedly confirms this. It reveals that while the speaker represents himself, his social group, friends and allies in positive terms, he represents the Others (Russia; China; Russians; Chinese; Putin; the Global South, etc.) in terms that encode negative lexicalisation or Other-presentation.

Lastly, the findings unveil that the speaker deploys such rhetorical figures as repetition; anastrophe; rhetorical question; ellipsis; anaphora; appositive; simile; metaphor; expletive; alliteration, assonance and rhyme; connotation; hyperbole; tautology; synonymy and antonymy; gradation and syllogism to further emphasise his group's values and properties while de-emphasising those of out-group members. The foregoing findings truly confirm Kusumawati's (2011), Ali, Christopher and Nordin's (2017), Allagbé and Amoussou's (2023) and Kameswari and Mamidi's (2018) discoveries with regard respectively to the use of word choice, sentence arrangement and figures of speech to enact public image, the deployment of pronouns, especially personal pronouns to encode sociopolitical ideologies in discourse and the employment of mood choices to express group relations. The paper concludes that the analysis of discourse properties or structures provides an insight into how language is used for discursive or/and cognitive manipulation.

## References

- [1]. Ali, M. K., Christopher, A. A., and Nordin, M. Z. F. B. (2017). Pronouns and Ideology in Newspaper Discourse. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature (IJALEL)*, 6(3): 168-179. DOI: 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.3p.168. ISSN: 2200-3592 (print), ISSN: 2200-3452 (Online).
- [2]. Allagbé, A. A. (2024b). Linguistic Features and Discursive Strategies in Liberia's President Dr. George Manneh Weah's Closing Presidential Campaign Speech. *European Journal of Science, Innovation and Technology (EJSIT)*, 4(5), 261-281. ISSN 2786-4936. [www.ejsit-journal.com](http://www.ejsit-journal.com).
- [3]. Allagbé, A. A. (2024a). Discourse Structures and Ideologies in Nigeria's President Bola Ahmed Tinubu's Inaugural Speech. *Journal of the English Scholars' Association of Nigeria (JESAN)*, 26(3), 100-115. ISSN: 0029-0009.
- [4]. Allagbé, A. A. and Amoussou, F. (2023). A Pragmatic Literary Stylistic Analysis of a Political Speech Delivered by a Member of the Opposition Party at the Induction Ceremony of the 9th Legislative Assembly, Benin Republic. In Prof. Dr. Mustafa MUTLUER and Assist. Prof. Dr. Aytekin ERDOĞAN (Eds.). *Full Texts Book EGE 2nd International Congress on Social Sciences & Humanities, June 12-13, 2023 Ege University, Izmir, Türkiye*, pp. 201-215. ISBN: 978-625-367-169-3.
- [5]. Amoussou, F. and Aguessy, N. J. A. (2020). Decoding Manipulative Strategies and Ideological Features in Trump's Speech on the Coronavirus Pandemic: A Critical Political Discourse Analysis. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 8(4): 14-24.
- [6]. Amoussou, F. and Allagbé, A. A. (2023). Political Discourse on Health Crisis: A Pragmatic Analysis of President Muhammadu Buhari's Speech on COVID-19. In Prof. Osman ERKMEN & Gulnaz GAFUROVA (Eds.). *9th International Zeugma Conference on Scientific Research, February 19-21, 2023 Gaziantep, Türkiye*, pp. 750- 759. ISBN: 978-625-6404-76-2.
- [7]. Amoussou, F. and Allagbé, A. A. (2018). Principles, Theories and Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, (6)1: 11-18. ISSN 2347-3126 (Print) & ISSN 2347-3134 (Online).

- <http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0601002>.
- [8]. Amoussou, F., Allagbé, A. A. and Zounhin Toboula, C. M. (2024). A Pragma-Stylistic Analysis of Nigeria's President Bola Ahmed Tinubu's Inaugural Speech. *International Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences (IJEPS)*, 2(1): 27-48. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59890/ijeeps.v2i1.1211>.
- [9]. Anyanwu, E. (2023). Speech Act Theory and Political Speech: An Analysis of President Bola Ahmed Tinubu's Inaugural Speech. *Nigerian Journal of Arts and Humanities (NJAHA)*, 3(1): 78-88. ISSN: 2814-3760, E-ISSN: 2955-0343.
- [10]. Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic Stylistics*. First Edition. Great Britain: Edinburgh University Press.
- [11]. Datondji, A. C. and Amoussou, F. (2019). Discourse- Historical Approach to Critical Discourse Studies: Theoretical and Conceptual Analysis, Basic Characteristics and Analytical Tools. *Revue Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée, de Littérature et d'Éducation (RILALE)*, 2(1): 70-80. ISSN 1840 – 9318.
- [12]. Derakhshani, M., Qaiwar, S. N., Kazemian, B. and Mohammadian, S. (2021). Critical Discourse Analysis and Rhetorical Tropes in Donald Trump's First Speech to the UN. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11(10): 1224-1236. ISSN: 1799-2591. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpts.1110.10>.
- [13]. Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Second Edition. New York/London: Continuum international Publishing Group.
- [14]. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. First Edition. London: Longman.
- [15]. Kameswari, L. and Mamidi, R. (2018). Political Discourse Analysis: A Case of 2014 Andhra Pradesh State Assembly Election of Interpersonal Speech Choices. In *32nd Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation, Hong Kong, 1-3 December 2018*, pp. 239-246.
- [16]. Kusumawati, A. J. (2011). A Discourse Analysis of SBY's International Speech Text: A Study on Critical Linguistics. *Journal of English and Education*, 5(1):1-28.
- [17]. Ramanathan, R., Paramasivam, S. and Hoon, T. B. (2020). Discursive Strategies and Speech Acts in Political Discourse of NAjib and Modi. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 8(3): 34-44. P-ISSN: 2320-2653, E-ISSN: 2582-1334. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v8i3.3168>.
- [18]. van Dijk, T. A. (2006a). Ideology and Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2): 115-140.
- [19]. van Dijk, T. A. (2006b). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse and Society*, 17(3): 359–383. DOI: 10.1177/0957926506060250.
- [20]. van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin & H. Hamilton (Eds.). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352-371). Oxford: Blackwell.
- [21]. van Dijk, T. A. (2000a). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Second Edition. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- [22]. van Dijk, T. A. (2000b). *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Retrieved from <http://www.discursos.org> on July 13th 2023.
- [23]. van Dijk, T. A. (1995c). Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Japanese Discourse (JD)*, 1(1): 17-27.
- [24]. van Dijk, T. A. (1995b). Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In C. Schaffer & A. Wenden (Eds.). *Language and Pace* (pp. 17-33). Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.
- [25]. van Dijk, T. A. (1995a). Ideological Discourse Analysis. In Eija Ventola and Anna Solin. *Special Issue Interdisciplinary Approaches to Discourse Analysis* (pp. 135-161).
- [26]. van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Discourse and Society*, SAGE (London. Newbury Park and New Delhi), 4(2): 249-283.
- [27]. van Dijk, T. A. and Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- [28]. Wodak, R. (2001). What Critical Discourse Analysis is about- a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical*

*Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage.

[29]. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. First Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.