

**An Analytical Study of Selected Speeches of three Egyptian leaders:**

**Saad Zaghoul, Mohamed Nageeb and Hosny Mubarak**

A Research in Linguistics

Submitted to the Department of English Language and Literature

Faculty of Women for Arts Science and Education

Ain Shams University

By

**Shadia Aly Hasab El-Nabi**

Under the Supervision of

**Dr. Ali Ezzat**

Professor of Linguistics

Faculty of Education

Ain Shams University

And

**Dr. Neveen Mohamed Allam**

Lecturer of Linguistics

Faculty of Women for Arts Sciences and Education

Ain Shams University

**ملخص**

اللغة هي وسيلة قوية تشكل السياسة. كلاهما يتفاعل ويعتمد على بعضهما البعض. ومن هنا ، فإن البحث الحالي يفحص الاستخدام اللغوي للخطابات السياسية للقادة المصريين الثلاثة خلال

الثورات المصرية الثلاث: خطاب سعد زغلول خلال ثورة ١٩١٩ ، خطاب محمد نجيب خلال ثورة ١٩٥٢ ، وخطاب مبارك خلال ثورة ٢٠١١ لتوضيح هيمنتهم على عقول شعوبهم. تطبق هذه الدراسة الأدوات التحليلية فى اطار تحليل الخطاب النقدي (CDA) والنحو النظامي الوظيفي (SFG).

بعد مقارنة الخطابات الثلاثة ، يصبح الفرق واضحا. تكشف النتائج أنه من ناحية ، يتم الإعلان عن الخطابين الأولين لسعد زغلول ومحمد نجيب من أجل حرية الشعب ، اذ قاما باستخدام بعض الاستراتيجيات لإقناع العامة بأفكارهم ، وهذا يظهر بوضوح فى اختياراتهم اللغوية والنحوية. من ناحية أخرى ، تظهر النتائج أن الخطاب الثالث لمبارك اظهر أنه يفرض إيديولوجياته اذ يستخدم استراتيجيات استطرادية فى محاولة للسيطرة على أفراد شعبه والتأثير على آرائهم ومعرفتهم.

فى الخطابين الأولين شجع الناس قادتهم ، بينما فى حالة مبارك أصروا على تنحيه.

الكلمات المفتاحية : ثلاثة قادة مصريين ، تحليل الخطاب النقدي ، النحو النظامي الوظيفي

## Abstract

Language is a powerful means which shapes politics. Both of them interact and depend upon one another. Hence, the present research examines the linguistic usage of the political speeches of the three Egyptian leaders during the three Egyptian revolutions, to clarify their domination of their people's mind. It applies the analytical tools of Wodak's Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) within Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). After comparing the three speeches, the differences become clear. The results reveal that, on the one hand, the first two speeches of Saad Zaghloul and Mohamed Nageeb are declared for the sake of the people's freedom. They utilize certain discursive strategies to convince the public of their ideas, and this appears vividly in their lexical and grammatical choices. On the other hand, the results show that the third speech of Mubarak is declared to impose his ideologies. He uses manipulative discursive strategies in an attempt to control and dominate his people and influence their opinion and knowledge. In the first two speeches the people encourage their leaders, while, in the case of Mubarak, they insist on his stepping down.

*Keywords:* Three Egyptian Leaders, Critical Discourse Analysis, Systemic Functional Grammar

## **1. Introduction:**

Language is a powerful means which shapes politics. Both of them interact and depend upon one another. Hence, the present research examines the linguistic usage of the political speeches of three Egyptian leaders during the three Egyptian revolutions, to clarify their domination of their people's mind. It applies the analytical tools of Wodak's **Discourse Historical Approach** (DHA) under the fabric of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). These leaders utilize certain discursive strategies to convince the public of their ideas, and this appears vividly in their lexical and grammatical choices. After comparing the three speeches, the difference between the strategies of those politicians becomes clear.

## 2. Objectives of the study:

This paper analyzes selected speeches of three Egyptian leaders during the three Egyptian revolutions: the speech of Saad Zaghloul during the revolution of 1919, the speech of Mohamed Nageeb during the revolution of 1952, and Mubarak's speech during the 25<sup>th</sup> of January 2011. The objectives of this paper are:

1. To apply DHA as a theory to test the political speeches of the three leaders in an attempt to clarify the **intentions** of the three leaders, as represented through their words.
2. To uncover the **DHA strategies** used by the three leaders to convince the public of certain goals.
3. To reveal imposed **ideologies** of the three politicians to dominate people, and to clarify how these ideologies are manifested lexically and grammatically.
4. To clarify the difference in the **Egyptians' response** to their leaders' speeches during the revolutions throughout the chosen periods.

### 3. Research Assumptions:

This thesis is an attempt to test the validity of the following hypotheses:

1. On the one hand, Saad Zaghloul and Mohamed Nageeb can convince the public by their unique speeches in critical times to abide by their rules. They are able to impose their ideologies upon the public and liberate their country from the British occupation, and to overthrow the monarchy of King Farouk. On the other hand, Mubarak is very manipulative in his lexical choices, which lead to his inability to convince the public to let him stay for 6 more months.
2. The characters and the images of Saad Zaghloul and Mohamed Nageeb, as patriotic modest characters, appear vividly through their use of particular lexical structures, while the image of Mubarak is that of an arrogant dominating president who has to be obeyed without any negotiation. This is apparent throughout his speech.

### 4. Research Questions:

1. How can **DHA** successfully offer comprehensive and accurate analysis of political texts?
2. How can **manipulative discursive usage** of language powerfully affect people's opinions and beliefs?
3. How do political discourses, of different political leaders, **change** through time? How are these differences manifested **lexically and grammatically**?
4. To what extent do Saad Zaghloul and Nageeb succeed to **convince the public** of their decisions through their language?

5. To what extent does Mubarak **fail to dominate** and manipulate the public by his speech?

### **5. Data Sources:**

The data analyzed in this thesis are three selected speeches by the three Egyptian leaders during the three Egyptian revolutions. The first one is Saad Zaghloul's speech during the Egyptian revolution of 1919. The second speech is by Mohamed Nageeb during the Egyptian revolution of 1952, and the third speech is of Mubarak during the revolution of 2011.

### **6. Critical Discourse Analysis:**

van Dijk is one of the leading figures and pioneers of study and research in the domain of CDA. According to van Dijk (1988), CDA studies and analyzes written texts and spoken words to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance and inequality. It is concerned with showing how these sources are initiated, maintained, reproduced and transformed within specific social, economic, political and historical contexts (p. 24).

CDA studies discourse and its functions in society and the ways society are represented in text and talk. van Dijk (1995) states that CDA "presupposes detailed theories of the structures and strategies of text and talk, and especially explicit theories about the role and functions of such properties in social contexts and cognitive processing". Moreover, "CDA has its own aims, research programs, theoretical frameworks and methods" (p.24).

It is worth pointing out that Critical Discourse Analysis focuses on how social relations, identity, knowledge, and power are formed through

written and oral texts in every aspect of our daily lives. Schiffrin & Hamilton (2001) define CDA as "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" (p. 352).

Additionally, van Dijk (2000) advocates that critical discourse analysis adopts the view that every choice of meaning is motivated by ideology "much of our discourse, especially when we speak as members of groups, expresses ideologically based opinions" (p. 9), and it directs the attention to meaning in culture. Thus, from this perspective, there is no meaning outside power.

Usually, any political speech is associated with the manipulator's political goal, which is clear in his choice of words. Critical Discourse analysis's main aim, as van Dijk (2006) assumes, is to uncover the analyst's implicit meanings in his speech and to reveal what the speaker really wants his audiences to know and to believe, and this happens using the rhetorical analytical instruments. This means that **manipulation** is characterized as "an illegitimate social practice because it violates general social rules or norms". All forms of interaction or communications that are only in the interests of one party and against the best interests of the other party are defined as illegitimate (p. 363).

van Dijk (1998) further explains the notion of '**ideology**' as a special kind of social beliefs shared by members of a social group. He clarifies the concepts of ideologies as:

ideologies are not merely sets of beliefs, but socially shared beliefs of groups. These beliefs are acquired, used and changed in social situations, and on the basis of the social

interests of groups and social relations between groups in complex social structures (p. 135).

According to van Dijk (2000), discourse is considered as a crucial component for ideologies to be reproduced or invented. He states that "much of our discourse, especially when we speak as members of groups, expresses ideologically based opinions". Ideology is not necessarily negative, but there is negative or positive ideology depending on the values of the person who evaluates such a group (p. 9).

In short, CDA is a very rich field that embraces various interdisciplinary approaches towards the social analysis of discourse. These approaches co-operate to focus on the linguistic features of the discourse, to reveal hidden ideologies and the unequal power relations. It must be noted that although there are different approaches to CDA, many of them recognize Systemic Functional Linguistics as a tool for analysis. Both CDA and SFG have been used in a complementary relationship.

### **7. Systemic Functional Grammar:**

Systemic functional grammar is completely different from traditional grammar. Traditional grammar discusses the standard language form, it relates words to classes such as nouns, verbs adjectives, and prepositions. On the other hand, functional grammar, as Eggins (2004) argues, is concerned with understanding the different choices that the speaker makes to express different meanings. She states that "SFL does not only ask functional questions about how people are using language, but it also interprets the linguistic system itself from a functional semantic perspective" (p. 11).

Although CDA provides the linguists with the critical and ideological dimension of the analysis of texts, Systemic Functional



Grammar (SFG) provides an insight into the social nature and function of a particular linguistic system. Eggins (2004) clarifies that the distinctive aspect of systemic linguistics is that the “text seeks to develop both a theory about language as social process and an analytical methodology which permits the detailed and systematic description of language pattern” (p. 21).

Martin (1992) states that SFG by Halliday is concerned with understanding the different choices that the speaker makes to express different meanings. It is concerned with the relationship between language and social context, by reference to **field** (the topic), **tenor** (the social relationship between participants) and **mode** (the channel that carries out the communication). He explains that “projecting experiential meaning onto context [gives] field, interpersonal meaning [gives] tenor and textual meaning [gives] mode”. In addition, the interpretation of social context then includes two communicative planes: **genre** (context of culture), and **register** (context of situation) (pp. 494-5).

SFG, according to Thompson (2014), divides meanings in language into three types; these broad functions are referred to as metafunctions “the labels for each of the metafunctions are reasonably transparent”. He adds that “the first (using language to talk about the world) is the experiential, the second (using language to interact with other people) is the interpersonal, and the third (organizing language to fit in its context) is the textual” (p. 30).

### **8. Discourse Historical Approach:**

Reisigl (2017) characterizes DHA as an interdisciplinary approach which has strong roots in linguistics. It does not consider discourse analysis a method of language analysis, but a multidimensional project that integrates methods, theory, methodology and research practice.

Sometimes SFL turns to be a helpful linguistic toolbox. DHA does not just look at the historical dimension of discourses, but it is concerned with different areas of discourse studies as: discourse and discrimination, language barriers in various social institutions, discourse and politics, discourse and identity, discourse and history, discourse in the media and discourse and ecology (p.48).

Accordingly, Reisigl and Wodak (2009) explain that linguists explore how discourses, genres and texts change in relation to sociopolitical change through focusing on the intertextual and the interdiscursive relationships between them. *Intertextuality* means that texts are linked to other texts both in the past and in the present. They add that such connections "are established in different ways: through explicit reference to a topic or main actor, through references to the same events, by allusions or evocations, by the transfer of main arguments from one text to the other" (p.90).

Engstrom (2013) argues that "discourses never exist in isolation but are intertwined in complex networks, known as *interdiscursivity*" (p.10). Reisigl and Wodak (2009) explain that discourses are linked to each other in various ways. Discourses are open and hybrid. A topic of a discourse is linked and can refer to a topic of other discourse; new sub-topics can be created at any time. They add that "A discourse about a specific topic can find its starting point within one field of action and proceed through another one. Discourses then 'spread' to different fields and relate to or overlap with other discourses" (p.90).

Moreover, Wodak (2001) employs the **principle of triangulation**, which is considered as a methodical way to be followed by any analyst to minimize the risk of being biased. It combines different interdisciplinary approaches and it endeavors to work multimethodically and

interdisciplinarily on the basis of background information. It helps in the analysis of the interrelationship between discursive and other social practices and structures (p. 64). Reisigl and Wodak (2009) further illustrate that in order to analyze or explain the complexity of any discourse, the analyst considers different and accessible sources of data from different analytical perspectives. They assert their point of view by stating that the principle of triangulation "implies taking a whole range of empirical observations, theories and methods as well as background information into account" (p. 89).

### **8.1. The DHA in eight steps:**

Reisigl & Wodak (2009) illustrate the methodology of the DHA in eight steps as follows:

#### **8.1.1. Step (1): Activation and consultation of preceding theoretical knowledge:**

In this step, Reisigl & Wodak (2009) present the research question about the discourse under analysis. The importance of this step is to clarify the topic of the discourse, what does it mean and its relationship with modern societies. At this point, the researcher is able to formulate a more general discourse related research question where assumptions related to this question arise and the discourse will comprise different and may be, contradicting interpretations. Reisigl & Wodak add that being "viewed from a historical perspective, we assume that the discourse (or some facets of the discourse) will have changed over time, depending on a range of factors to be identified in our analyses" (p. 98).

#### **8.1.2. Step (2): Systematic collection of data and context information:**

Reisigl & Wodak (2009) assert that for the analysis of specific discourse, there is a range of empirical data that could be collected

through observation, audio visual recording, interview or researches in archives. They provide a specific criterion for the collection of these data which must be followed:

(a)- "specific political unit"

They provide examples for political units such as region, nation state, international union or language communities.

(b)- "specific periods of time relating to important discursive events"

These periods of time are connected with the issue in question.

(c)- "specific social and especially political and scientific actors"

Those actors are collective, individual or organizations. They give examples for environmentalists, different party-political affiliation, car companies or climatologists.

(d)- "specific discourses"

Specific discourses concerned with specific topics.

(e)- "specific fields of political action"

These political fields include the management of international relations, the formation of public attitudes and will, the fields of political control and political advertising.

(f)- "specific semiotic media and genres"

Such as expert reports, election programs, press articles, TV discussion and interviews and popular scientific texts (p. 98).

### **8.1.3. Step (3): Selection and preparation of data for specific analyses:**

Reisigl & Wodak (2009) assume that the data for the discourse under analysis are downsized according to specific criteria. These criteria are: frequency, redundancy, representativity, (proto) typicality, intertextual or interdiscursive scope/ influence, salience and uniqueness (p.99).

#### **8.1.4. Step (4): Specification of the research question and formulation of assumption:**

Reisigl & Wodak (2009) clarify in this step the research question in some detail. They assume that "the research question has to consider opposing political accusations of abuse and manipulation, and alternative appeals for action", and thus the analysis of controversial positions. Critical discourse analysts thus describe these contradictory positions and their persuasive character on the basis of the principle of rational argumentation and the underlying manipulative strategies. The analysis of the media coverage is also very important where "The DHA pays special attention to such diachronic comparisons" (p.99). Accordingly, Lawton (2016) adds that in this step a literature review is conducted and data are examined. These data are analyzed to identify discourse topics and themes. Then, Specific research questions emerge from the preliminary analysis (p. 117).

#### **8.1.5. Step (5): Qualitative pilot analysis:**

Lawton (2016) argues that this step allows testing and applying certain categories of analysis which are chosen according to their relation to the data (p. 117). Reisigl & Wodak (2009) add that the analyst focuses on three aspects according to the three dimensions of the DHA besides the five strategies. First, the analyst identifies the main discourse topics off the text, then he focuses on the main strategies to be found in the

discourse under analysis. Finally, he focuses on the principle claims, as well as on the topoi and fallacies employed to justify these claims (pp. 100-102).

#### **8.1.6. Step (6): Detailed Case Study:**

Lawton (2016) states that this step contains a range of texts which are selected for more detailed analysis (p.117).Reisigl & Wodak (2009) argue that the data are primarily qualitative, but in part also quantitative. It contains a detailed study on the macro- , meso- , and micro-levels of linguistic analysis and on the level of context. This step "interprets the different results within the social, historical and political context of the discourse under consideration" (p. 118).

#### **8.1.7. Step (7): Formulation of critique:**

This step, according to Lawton (2016), is an interpretation of the results after conducting the analysis. There is an emphasis on three dimensions of critique "text/discourse-immanent critique, socio-diagnostic critique; and future-related or prospective critique" (p.117). Reisigl & Wodak (2009) argue that the critique is based on principles such as criteria of rational argumentation, human rights and democratic norms. Moreover, it "points to intended biases in representations (especially media coverage) and to contradictory and manipulative relationships between discourses and power structures" (p. 119).

#### **8.1.8. Step (8): Application of the detailed analytical results:**

Reisigl & Wodak (2009) assume that the results might be applied or proposed for application. The application of the analytical results

stems from the critique. They add that the application should not only consist of the scholarly publication of the results, but it "should also be made accessible to the 'general public' (e.g. by recommendations newspaper commentaries, training seminars, further education courses, radio transmission and political advising". Such knowledge requires recontextualization of theory, methods and empirical results into other communicative practices (p. 119).

To conclude, the previous 8 stage Programme is realized in a big interdisciplinary project. Resigil and Wodak (2009) declare that it is important to be aware of the overall research design, then a researcher makes explicit choices when devising his own project. In this case, one can conduct only a few studies, and therefore restrict the range of data collected (p.96).

## **8.2. The Discursive Strategies:**

Reisigl & Wodak (2009) outline a selection of discursive strategies for the DHA. They state that 'strategy' generally means a systematic way of using language, an accurate and intentional plan of practice adopted to achieve a social, political and linguistic aim (p. 95). They are represented as follows:

### **8.2.1. The nomination/Referential Strategy:**

The referential or **nomination strategy** is that by which one represents social actors, and this is done in many ways. Wodak (2009) gives example with the in-groups and out-groups where membership categorization devices include tropic reference by metaphors and metonymy as well as synecdoche in the form of a part stand for the whole or a whole stand for the part. (p. 320). Reisigl & Wodak (2009) add several membership categorization devices such as deictics and

anthroponyms, verbs and nouns used to denote processes and actions (p.95).

### **8.2.2. The predication Strategy:**

The **predicational strategy** is the strategy where social actors as individuals, group members or groups as a whole are linguistically characterized. Wodak (2009) states that such a strategy cannot be separated from the nomination strategies. After identifying the social actors as individuals or group members, they are linguistically provided with predications (p.320). Wodak (2001) explains the predicational strategy of social actors through the question "What traits, characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to them?". She adds that the devices are stereotypical, evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits, implicit and explicit predicates (p. 72).

### **8.2.3. The argumentation Strategy:**

Wodak (2001) assumes that there are **argumentation strategies** and 'a fund of **topoi**' through which positive and negative attributions are justified. She further points out that these topoi are used to justify political inclusion or exclusion, discrimination or preferential treatment. She asks the question "by means of what arguments and argumentation schemes do specific persons or social groups try to justify and legitimize the exclusion, discrimination, suppression and exploitation of others?" (p. 73). Reisigl and Wodak (2009) explain that the justification and questioning of claims of truth and normative rightness occur through topoi (formal or more content related) or fallacies (p.95).

### **8.2.4. The perspectivization Strategy:**



The **perspectivization, framing or discourse representation**, as Reisigl and Wodak (2009) assume, is positioning the speakers or writer's point of view and expressing involvement or distance. This happens through deictics, direct, indirect or free indirect speech, quotation mark, discourse markers and metaphors (p. 95). In a similar fashion, Wodak (2001) describes this strategy with the question "From what perspective or point of view are these labels, attributions and arguments expressed?" (p. 73).

### 8.2.5. The intensifying Strategy:

Reisigl and Wodak (2009) clarify that the **intensifying and mitigation** strategies help to modify (intensify or mitigate) the illocutionary force, hence the epistemic or deontic status of utterances. This happens through diminutives, augmentatives, modal particles, tag questions, subjunctive, hesitations, vague expressions, hyperboles, litotes, indirect speech acts and verbs of saying, feeling and thinking (p.95). However, Wodak (2001) clarifies the idea of this strategy through the question: "Are the respective utterances articulated overtly? Are they intensified or are they mitigated?" (p. 73).

Therefore, it is of great importance to clarify that DHA is helpful in terms of identifying strategies based around language usage. Baker et al. (2008) emphasize the idea that DHA's strength is not in locating and analyzing referential strategies only, but "it builds on a network of referential, predicational and argumentative strategies along with analysis of metaphors, presuppositions, mitigation, and hyperboles, etc. in deconstructing a text, all of which require a close analysis of context" (p.295). These strategies are applied to various levels of discourse

analysis. They present the theoretical aspects of the DHA. They are divided according to their linguistic fields: Semantic, lexical, syntactic and rhetorical analysis.

### **9. Previous Studies utilizing the Discourse Historical Approach:**

Many researches have been conducted on different political speeches by using the methods of CDA and SFG to reach better understanding of political discourse. Some of these researches utilize the DHA as the framework to examine Political speeches linguistically, such as Sean Meades's paper (2015) entitled "Multi-modal Discourse Historical Approach to Analyzing Negative Political Advertising". He uses DHA to examine the linguistic and other auditory-visual resources in three ads launched in Canada by the governing conservative party in (2013). They interact in the argumentation process to give a political message against the eldest son of former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau to convey his deficient leadership skills. The ads draw on multiple argumentation strategies (topos of definition, topos of authority and topos of threat). In the conclusion it becomes clear that while many of the inferences are explicit, much of the topoi are constructed through predications that are evoked through the integration of visual and non-linguistic auditory resources.

In the same way, Hamza's thesis (2012) "A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Representation of Donald Trump in the Guardian" analyzes critically the construction of the media negative-other representation of Donald Trump and his golf complex project in Scotland by the Guardian e-news. The framework applied in the research is the DHA. The data of the research consists of 29 e-articles. Hamza provides numerous examples of References, Predication, Argumentation, Perspectivation and Intensification in these e-articles. She concludes that

the Guardian's reporting on Trump's negative personality and all these strategies used for negative other identity fail to reach the desired results. This happens due to the lack of the Guardian's power.

#### **10. Method of Research and Procedures:**

The texts are collected and translated, the first two speeches are the researcher's translation and the third speech is the CNN translation. Next, this work analyzes three speeches of the three leaders by applying the **Discourse Historical Approach** of Wodak which integrates historical background of these discourses. Afterwards, the researcher applies the DHA discursive strategies, which are applied to various levels of discourse analysis. They are divided into two parts, according to their linguistic fields (Part 1 Syntactic and Semantic Analysis, and Part 2 Argumentative and Rhetorical analysis). This paper employs the **Antconc** software which helps to achieve the purpose of the current research. It is a corpus tool which facilitates the counting of the repetition of some words. It provides the frequency of the presence of separate words and accordingly helps in the analysis.

#### **11. Application:**

##### **Part 1: Syntactic and Semantic Analysis:**

This part investigates the syntactic and the semantic aspects of the DHA as applied to the data. Syntax, as van Dijk (1998) declares, plays a fundamental role in expressing positive meaning about us and negative meaning about them. He declares that "the study of sentence forms, syntax, has drawn attention from (critical) linguists interested in ideological analysis from the start" (p.202). Reisigl and Wodak (2009) specify some syntactic devices for the discursive strategies such as:

deictic pronouns, quotation marks, tag Question, direct and indirect speech, relative clauses, adjectives and prepositional phrases (p. 95).

As for Semantics, it is the part of linguistics that studies meaning, and the source of this meaning that leads to successful understanding. Reisigl and Wodak (2009) identify some semantic devices for the discursive strategies. The current research studies the discursive construction of social actors, the discursive construction of objects/ phenomena/ events and the discursive construction of processes and actions (p. 95).

## **Part 2: Argumentative and Rhetorical Analysis:**

The second part of the analysis investigates the argumentative and the rhetorical aspects of the DHA. van Dijk (1998) assumes that "rhetorical structures play such an important role in ideological manipulation" (p.208). They are used for the preferred group and they change how recipients understand and evaluate the events. Rhetorical structures are studied as a means to emphasize or de-emphasize meanings. In the rhetorical analysis, the research focuses on some devices such as metaphors and hyperboles.

As for the argumentative aspect, it focuses on the idea of topoi. van Dijk (2000) explains that Topoi are the topics that have become standardized and publicized. They are used as 'ready made' in argumentation (p. 53). Wodak (2001) adds that topoi play an important role in positive self and negative other-presentation which requires justification and legitimation strategies. She presents topoi of advantage/ usefulness, topoi of danger and threat, topoi of responsibility, topoi of Law and right, topoi of history and topoi of justice (pp. 75-80).

### **11.1. Syntactic Analysis**

### 11.1.1. Deictic pronouns:

Deictics are used as a device for the perspectivization strategy. Deictic pronouns are the pronouns that refer to the speaker of the utterance. Bateson (2003) states that the Arabic language has twelve personal pronouns divided into three categories

- 1<sup>st</sup> person (singular /ʔana/ and plural /naħnu/)
- 2<sup>nd</sup> person (Masc. sing. /ʔanta/, fem. Sing. /ʔanti/, Masc. pl. /ʔantum/, fem. Pl. /ʔantunna/ and Dual /ʔantumaa/)
- 3<sup>rd</sup> person (Masc. sing. /huwa/, fem. Sing. /hiya/, Masc. pl. /hum/, fem. Pl. /hunna/ and Dual /huma/ (p. 40)

The following table clarifies the use of pronouns [I –we- they] in each leader's speech:

Zaghloul's speech			Nageeb's speech			Mubarak's speech		
Rank	Freq	word	Rank	Freq	word	Rank	Freq	word
26	4	<b>I</b>	15	3	<b>I</b>	5	51	<b>I</b>
5	12	<b>we</b>	19	3	<b>we</b>	14	21	<b>we</b>
			36	2	<b>they</b>	497	1	<b>they</b>

According to the AntConc software

### Analysis and Discussion:

**Saad Zaghloul** does not make an intensive use of the first person pronoun "I". He uses it only four times throughout his speech, and this clarifies that he, as a patriotic leader, does not use the authoritative tone. He sends a message to his people that he is a member of the delegation group. Saad Zaghloul uses the first person plural "we" twelve times to emphasize the idea of the unity between all the Egyptians. He sends a message to the Egyptians that they (the Egyptians, El Wafd, Saad Zaghloul and his group) are all one hand seeking only Egypt's interest and independence against the occupation.

*Examples:*

إنى أشكر حمد الباسل	I would like to thank Hamad Al-Basel
هيا الفرصة التى أنتهزها لأحدثكم	giving me the opportunity which I seized to inform you
فلا ينقصنا إلا أن يعترف مؤتمر السلام	All we need is to attain the Peace conference's declaration
وتشرفنا بتوكيل الأمة إيانا	We have been honored by the nation's authorization
فنحن أمام القانون الإنسانى أحرار	According to the Humanitarian law, we are free

Regarding **Mohamed Nageeb's speech**, he uses the first person pronoun "I" three times to clarify the idea that the army works hard to save Egypt. He wants to spread the spirit of security and stability between the Egyptians, and also between the foreigners. As for the first person plural "we", he uses it when he uses the authoritative tone. He tries to clarify that they, the free officers, are responsible for stability and are

precise in their plan. Being patriotic, he bears the responsibility at that critical time, and he sends a message to the Egyptians that they are capable of their role. He uses the third person pronoun "they" when he talks about the former army men, and announces that they will not face any harm, they will be released in the appropriate time and will not be dealt with in a harsh way. He assures them and their families that they are safe, but, at the same time, he "excludes" them from being part of the army.

*Examples:*

وإني أؤكد للشعب المصري	I assure the Egyptian people
وأنتهز هذه الفرصة فأطلب من الشعب	I seize this opportunity to ask the people
نثق في قدرتهم	we trust their capabilities
لن ينالهم ضرر	they will not face any harm

As for **Mubarak**, in his speech he makes an intensive use of the first person pronoun "I" to show strength and domination, being the president of Egypt who imposes rules and orders that should be followed. He tries to show authority and to emphasize his importance. He enforces his ideologies so that people could easily be affected by his ideas. He uses them frequently in an attempt to represent positive self-presentation showing his positive qualities. Mubarak talks about himself and his personal experiences showing himself as a patriotic leader who works for the sake of his country, and who is still working for the sake of Egypt and the right of its people till the end of his life.

As for the first person plural "we", it is used by the ex-president Mubarak 21 times to show closeness. He wants to emphasize the idea that he shares the Egyptians their feelings, their pain and their problems. It can also be used in an attempt to clarify We vs. Them, as if those who are in Tahrir square, and are demonstrating against him, are on one side, and all the other Egyptians, including himself and his regime, are on the other side. He tries to gain the people to his side to follow him and accept his decisions.

Mubarak, in his speech, uses the third person pronoun "they" when he mentions those who demonstrate against him, which gives the impression of the out-group participation. It is used to divide the people into two groups: those who demonstrate in Tahrir square referring to them as "they", and the rest of the people including himself as "we". Mubarak wants to send a message that if "they" do not stop their demonstrations "they" will be in danger. He wants to warn them, and also to alert the rest of the Egyptians that if they follow those demonstrators, they will be risking their security and their country's stability.

### *Examples*

:

أتوجه بحديثي اليوم لشباب مصر	I am directing my speech to the youth of Egypt
أتوجه إليكم جميعا بحديث من القلب	I'm addressing you today out of a true and an



	honest heart
أوضاع يصبح معها الشباب الذين دعوا إلى التغيير والإصلاح أول المتضررين منه	those youth who had called for change, <b>they</b> would really be endangered out of the movement
سنثبت نحن المصريين	<b>We</b> are going to prove that <b>we</b> , the Egyptians,
سنثبت أننا لسنا أتباعا لأحد	<b>we're</b> going to prove that <b>we</b> are not followers to anybody

### 11.1.2. Relative clauses:

Relative clauses are used as a tool to add extra information. They are used as a device for the predication strategy. Ryding (2005) states that in the Arabic language "relative pronouns relate an element in a subordinate relative clause (in Arabic, ?al-sila) to a noun or noun phrase in the main clause of a sentence". She adds that relative clauses in Arabic are either definite clauses introduced by a relative pronoun, or indefinite relative clauses which do not include a relative pronoun. She provides examples for definite relative pronouns: Singular masculine /?allathii/, Singular feminine /?allatii/ (p. 322).

**Saad Zaghoul** utilizes the relative clauses as follows:

هياً الفرصة التى أنتهزها

giving me the opportunity **which** I seized

تفاصيل هذه الأزمة التى تجتازها مصر فى الوقت الحاضر

the details of this crisis **which** Egypt is surpassing currently

لتحقيق رجاء اللورد سالسبورى، الذى قال فى ٣ ديسمبر ١٨٨٩

to achieve the goal of Lord Salisbury **who** announced on December 3, 1889

هذا الاحتلال الذى لم يكن له حق فى البقاء

the occupation, **which** had no right to remain

ومخالفة صريحة للمبادئ الجديدة، التى خرجت بها الإنسانية من هذه الحرب الهائلة

a clear violation of the new principles of humanity **which** occurred after this huge war.

### Analysis and Discussion:

Saad Zaghloul's main aim of his speech is to clarify to the people the current situation and to mention his plan for the coming step to attain his goals. He uses this device to help him in clarifying his ideas and explain vividly the current situation.

**Mohamed Nageeb** uses indefinite relative clause without a relative pronoun as follows:

-وتولى أمرنا فى داخل الجيش رجال نثق فى قدرتهم

army figures **whom** we trust

### Analysis and Discussion:

In his speech, Nageeb uses the relative clause in the predicative strategy to clarify which person is being talked about. He simplifies his ideas that the military purge results in the presence of trusted army figures known for their patriotism.

**Mubarak** makes use of definite and indefinite relative clauses as follows:

وسأحاسب الذين أجرموا فى حق شبابنا بأقصى ما تقرره أحكام القانون من عقوبات رادعة

I will follow those perpetrators **who** have afflicted those crimes with full sense of decisiveness

ذلك هو القسم الذي أقسمته أمام الله

This is the offer **that** I undertook before Allah almighty

الثقة في أن التغيير والتحول الذي بدأناه

Change and transfer **that** we have already started

الشباب الذين دعوا إلى التغيير والإصلاح أول المتضررين منها

those youth **who** had called for change, they would really be endangered out of the movement

وعلىنا أن نواصل الحوار الوطني الذي بدأناه بروح الفريق وليس الفرقاء

We have to continue the national dialogue **that** we have already started with the spirit of a team and away from any sense of animosity

### **Analysis and Discussion:**

In his speech, Mubarak makes use of relative clauses to simplify his ideas to his listeners and clarify who he is talking about. He presents self-positive image in all his relative clauses and gives a positive image also for his regime.

#### **11.1.3. Adjectives:**

Adjectives play a fundamental and essential role in political speeches. They are used as a device for predication strategy which helps to frame and raise certain feelings. Ryding (2005) states that to form an adjective in the Arabic language, there are rules to be followed for agreement, word order and inflection for the comparative and superlative. She states that Arabic adjectives are structured in two ways "through derivation from a lexical root by means of the root -and- pattern system or by means of attaching the nisba suffix -iyy (m) or -iyya (f) to create

an adjective from another word usually a noun", and there are also derivational adjectives (pp. 250-255).

In Saad Zaghloul's speech there are many adjectives as follows:

الوقت الحاضر	The <b>present</b> moment
أنسب فرصة	the most <b>appropriate</b> opportunity
السيادة التركية	the <b>Turkish</b> sovereignty
الاحتلال الفعلى	The <b>current</b> occupation
القانون الدولى	<b>the international</b> law
مخالفة صريحة	a <b>clear</b> violation
للمبادئ الجديدة	the <b>new</b> principles
القانون الإنسانى	the <b>Humanitarian</b> law
حكم أجنبى	<b>foreign</b> rule
الوزير الأول	the <b>prime</b> minister
وفضائلها الاجتماعية	its <b>social</b> virtues
أبناء المدنية الفرعونية والمدنية العربية	the sons of the <b>Pharaonic and Arabic</b> civilization
الدرك الأسفل	the <b>least</b> stair

### Analysis and Discussion:

The patriotic leader Saad Zaghloul describes his love to his country and his positive feelings through positive adjectives describing Egypt and the Egyptians. He uses nisba suffix -iyy (m) in some adjectives like (الفرعونية - العربية) when he describes the Egyptians. On the other hand, his hatred for the British protection and the Turkish occupation is

described through the negative adjectives as the **Turkish** sovereignty, the **current** occupation and a **clear** violation for the law.

**Mohamed Nageeb** makes use of adjectives as follows:

الشعب المصري	the <b>Egyptian</b> people
فترة عصيبة	<b>difficult</b> times
الوقت المناسب	The <b>appropriate</b> time.

### Analysis and Discussion:

Throughout his speech, Nageeb does not make use of many adjectives. His speech is short and precise without a need to raise feelings or to persuade the listeners, as the people believe him and accept his speech. He describes the situation by the word "difficult times" to raise his people's feeling of patriotism, and also to mention that the army works for the nation's interest.

As for **Mubarak**, he makes use of varied adjectives which present positive self-image and negative-other image, as follows:

لجيل مصري جديد	a <b>new</b> generation for Egypt
بالحوار المتحضر والواعي	a <b>national</b> dialogue, the <b>wise</b> dialogue
مطالب عادلة	your <b>fair</b> demands
نظام سياسي	<b>political</b> system
لانتخابات الرئاسية المقبلة	the <b>upcoming presidential</b> elections
متسع القاعدة	has <b>strong</b> bases
انتخابات حرة ونزيهة	<b>transparent</b> and <b>free</b> elections
لانتقال السلمي للسلطة	a <b>peaceful</b> transition of power

الأوقات العصيبة	this <b>critical</b> juncture
كافة القوى السياسية	<b>different political</b> parties
حوارا وطنيا بناء	a <b>national</b> dialogue
خريطة طريق واضحة	a roadmap that is quite <b>crystal clear</b>
أحداث مأساوية حزينة	<b>miserable</b> circumstances
التقرير الأول	a <b>preliminary</b> report
ضغوط أجنبية	<b>foreign</b> intervention

### Analysis and Discussion:

Mubarak makes use of many adjectives to express a definite meaning and to persuade his listeners. He uses them to simplify abstract and complex ideas by adding adjectives describing them. He uses positive adjectives as a means for adding positive frames for his government and his role, being the patriotic leader who tries hard to save his country and its people, and who works hard for its security.

#### 11.1.4. Prepositional phrases

In political speeches, prepositional phrases are used as a device for the predication strategy to colour and inform the sentences in a powerful way. Ryding (2005) declares that in Arabic, as in English, prepositions refer to a location or a direction. Its meaning can apply to concepts of space or time. She adds that Arabic prepositional expressions "fall into two groups the first group being a relatively small number (ten) of true prepositions and the other group being a more extensive collocation of locative expressions". She provides examples for prepositions as: 'at' /fi/, 'in' /bi/, 'to' /ʔilaa/, 'from' /min/, 'at' /fi/ for time (p. 366).

In his speech, **Saad Zaghloul** uses a lot of prepositional phrases as follows:

على أن هيا الفرصة	for giving me the opportunity
الذى شرفته البلاد بتوكيلها	was honored <b>by the country's</b> authorization
التي أنتهزها لأحدثكم	which I seized <b>to</b> inform
ليت فكرة الاستقلال جديدة فى مصر	the issue which is not new <b>in</b> Egypt
لا يجد فرصة أنسب من هذه لتحقيق رجاء	would not find a better chance <b>to</b> achieve the goal of
لم يكن له حق فى البقاء إلى حماية	had no right <b>to</b> remain <b>into</b> a British protection
أحرار من كل حكم أجنبى	we are free <b>from</b> any foreign rule.
لهذا الغرض السامى	<b>For</b> this reason
لنسعى فى الوصول إلى الاعتراف بهذا الاستقلال،	<b>to</b> achieve the Egyptians' objectives <b>to</b> reach independence.
وتشرفنا بتوكيل الأمة	We have been honored <b>by</b> the people's authorization
أمرت الحكومة الناس بالكف	the government ordered the people <b>to</b> stop it.
ومن خطاب الوزير الأول	the letter <b>from</b> the prime minister
غير أننا كنا مضطرين إلى هذا التوكيل	We were forced <b>for</b> this authorization
على هذا الاتهام	<b>for</b> such accusation

من جيل إلى جيل	<b>from</b> one generation <b>to</b> the other.
----------------	---

### Analysis and Discussion:

Saad Zaghloul's usage of prepositional phrases is for the purpose of modifying the nouns and the verbs. His usage also illustrates a logical temporal and spatial relationship between the object of the prepositional phrase and the components of the rest of the sentence, and thus his speech is precise and reaches his people easily.

**Mohamed Nageeb** uses prepositional phrases as follows:

من اللواء	<b>From</b> the Major General Staff Officer
في حرب فلسطين	<b>in</b> the Palestine war
في الوقت المناسب	<b>at</b> the appropriate time.
في ظل الدستور مجرداً من أية غاية	<b>under</b> the rule of the constitution
سيقابل بشدة	punished <b>in</b> a severe unprecedented way
وسيقوم الجيش بواجبه هذا متعاوناً مع البوليس	The army will take charge <b>in</b> cooperation with the police

### Analysis and Discussion:

Throughout his speech, Nageeb uses prepositional phrases to convey the meaning of his sentences in a powerful way. His usage modifies the nouns and the verbs. He tries to clarify his ideas to reach his listeners in a precise way.

In his speech, **Mubarak** uses many prepositional phrases as follows:



بميدان التحرير	<b>in</b> Tahrir Square
بحديث من القلب	<b>out</b> of a true and an honest heart
الأب لأبنائه	<b>from</b> a father to his sons
الألم من أجلهم مثلما تألمتم	I felt that I was <b>in</b> your boots
بكل الجدية والصدق	with a <b>full sense of</b> perseverance and honesty
فالأخطاء واردة في أي نظام سياسي	Mistakes can happen <b>in</b> any political system
في الاستماع لشباب بلادي	<b>in</b> listening to the youth of my country
في انتخابات حرة ونزيهة	<b>in</b> transparent and free elections
للخروج من الأزمة الراهنة	for coming <b>out</b> of this crisis
من خلال حوار مسؤول	<b>through</b> respectful dialogue
وبأقصى قدر من الصدق	<b>with</b> a sense of honesty
الخروج بالوطن من هذه الأوقات العصيبة	carrying the nation <b>out</b> of this critical juncture
ولقد أسفر هذا الحوار عن توافق مبدئي	this national dialogue can result <b>in</b> a near sense of consensus
يضع أقدامنا على بداية الطريق	put our feet <b>on</b> a way
للخروج من الأزمة	<b>out</b> of this crisis
إلى خريطة طريق	<b>into</b> a roadmap
على طريق الانتقال السلمي للسلطة	<b>on</b> the path of a peaceful transfer of power

### Analysis and Discussion:

Throughout his speech, Mubarak's usage of prepositional phrases modifies the nouns and the verbs. He tries to clarify the discursive characterization and qualification of social actors, objects and events that

he talks about, in an attempt to dominate his people's mind and persuade them of his ideas.

## 11.2. Semantic Analysis

### 11.2.1. Discursive construction of social actors

#### • Proper names:

Proper names are used as a device for the Nomination strategy. Ryding (2005) states that in the Arabic language, proper nouns include names of people and places. The sources of these names are Arabic, and sometimes they are non-Arabic (p. 96). Usually the intensive use of specific proper nouns during leaders' speeches is accomplished in an attempt to guide their audience towards what they wish them to feel or think about a certain topic. The three leaders use proper names in their speeches as shown in the following table:

Zaghloul's speech			Nageeb's speech			Mubarak's speech		
Rank	Freq	word	Rank	Freq	word	Rank	Freq	word
17	5	Egypt	5	4	Egypt	12	21	Egypt
66	2	El-Wafd	100	1	Nageeb	168	2	Mubarak
138	1	Hamad	107	1	Palestine	466	1	Sinai
185	1	Peace conference				491	1	Tahrir square
210	1	Salisbury						

According to the AntConc software

### Analysis and Discussion:

In Saad Zaghloul's speech, he does not make intensive use of proper nouns. He uses the proper name (Egypt) 4 times because his

objective is only his country's interest. He uses other proper names like Peace conference, Lord Salisbury, Hamad Al- Basel, and El-Wafd to clarify his ideas so that the people may understand what he is talking about.

Throughout his statement, **Mohamed Nageeb** mentions his ideas in a clear way. He uses the proper name (Egypt) 4 times because it is his main concern. He mentions his name (Mohamed Nageeb) only once to clarify that he is the sender of the message, because it has been announced by Anwar Sadat in his name. He sheds light on the war in Palestine and mentions the proper name (Palestine), while explaining the need for the revolution against this regime which is responsible for their failure in this war.

**Mubarak** uses the proper name (Egypt) 20 times to persuade his audience that his main aim is Egypt's concern, and that he is seeking its stability and security. He uses the proper name (Mubarak) only 2 times to stress the idea that he is not seeking his personal stance. He tries to manipulate his people and convince them that his goal, as a leader, is only Egypt and its people.

### 11.2.2. Discursive construction of objects/ phenomena/ events

#### •abstract (mental feeling):

Abstract/mental feeling is used as a device for the nomination strategy. Throughout his speech, **Zaghloul's** patriotic emotions appear vividly through his choice of words. His feelings appear in his words as in:

شرفته	Was <b>honored</b>
يتأجج فى قلوب المصريين الشوق	Egyptians' <b>hearts flew</b>

بارقة أمل	a glimmer of <b>hope</b>
احترام القوانين	<b>respect</b> for laws
لا نطلب من الحياة إلا الدرك الأسفل	it was difficult for us to be <b>satisfied</b> <b>with the least of life</b>

### Analysis and Discussion:

Saad Zaghoul feels that his people's authorization is an honor for him and his group. He describes many mental feelings like the Egyptians' heart which flew to achieve independence once they found any glimmer of hope, their respect for the law, and the path of truth and justice. Saad Zaghoul clarifies that they refuse to live and be satisfied with the least way of living.

**Mohamed Nageeb** uses abstract words that clarify his mental feeling as follows:

نثق في قدرتهم وفي خلقهم وفي وطنيتهم	we <b>trust</b> their capabilities, morals and patriotism
-------------------------------------	--

### Analysis and Discussion:

Being a patriotic leader, Mohamed Nageeb describes the armed figures to emphasize their capabilities and patriotism through mentioning the mental feeling of trust. He tries to encourage them and announce to the people that they are capable of holding the responsibility of securing their country.

As for **Mubarak**, his words clarify his mental feelings, as in the following examples:

تألمت	<b>Felt pain</b>
حرجا	<b>Embarrassment</b>

قدر من الصدق والشفافية	Sense of <b>honesty and transparency</b>
والثقة	Sense of <b>trust</b>
الخلاف	Sense of <b>differences</b>
هزت ضمير الوطن	<b>shook the conscience</b> of the nation
الاطمئنان والأمان	<b>security and stability</b>
وبوحدة وتماسك	sense of <b>unity and solidarity</b>

### Analysis and Discussion:

Throughout his speech, the emotional approach appears vividly. Mubarak tries, through his choice of words, to motivate his people's emotions by using hyperbolic expressions. He uses all the words that describe him and his regime positively and the expressions that describe the other negatively.

### •Political matters:

Political matters are used as a device for the nomination strategy. **Saad Zaghloul** mentions political matters in his speech, as follows:

حماية	<b>British protection</b>
باطل بطلانا أصليا أمام القانون الدولي	is null for the <b>international law</b>
ومخالفة صريحة للمبادئ الجديدة	a clear violation of the <b>new principles</b>
فلا ينقصنا إلا أن يعترف مؤتمر السلام بهذا الاستقلال	what we need is to attain the Peace conference's <b>declaration of Egypt's independence</b>
ألفت أنا وأصحابى الوفد المصرى	<b>I have comprised Wafd (delegation) party</b>

صودرت الحرية فى أشخاصنا وفى المصريين جميعا	Our <b>freedom</b> , and thus all the Egyptians', <b>were seized</b>
--	--

### Analysis and Discussion:

Saad Zaghloul attempts to clarify the situation to his people. He talks about the British protection which is null for the international law. He describes how they are prevented from travelling, and the government orders the people to stop their authorization. All these political issues motivate the Egyptians to start their revolution against the British occupation and the Turkish sovereignty.

**Mohamed Nageeb** mentions political matters such as:

هزيمتنا فى حرب فلسطين	our defeat in <b>the Palestine war</b>
قمنا بتطهير أنفسنا	employ our own <b>military purge</b>

### Analysis and Discussion:

Nageeb describes political matters like the defeat in the Palestine war where many Egyptians have lost their lives, and that king Farouk has been responsible for this. He mentions the exclusion of the army officers who work against Egypt, and have been arrested and replaced with trustworthy figures.

**Mubarak's** speech includes many political matters as:

مخاطر الإرهاب	<b>Terrorism</b>
لرفع حالة الطوارئ	abolishing <b>the emergency Law</b>
تعديلات تشريعية	<b>Legislative reforms</b>
التعديلات الدستورية	<b>Constitutional amendments</b>

### Analysis and Discussion:

In his speech, Mubarak mentions different political matters in an attempt to show his understanding for the current situation, and the

reasons behind the demonstrations and foreign interventions. He also tries to warn the people of the chaos and the terrorism that might erupt as a result of this revolution. He clarifies the reason and the importance of the emergency law. He tries to influence his people's opinions and thoughts that he seeks stability and security.

## **12. Conclusion:**

The present research has aimed to clarify the discourses employed by the three Egyptian leaders during the three Egyptian revolutions, Saad Zaghloul, Mohamed Nageeb and Hosny Mubarak. These leaders have used political speeches to communicate with the public in different periods in the time of crisis. Each of them has his different ideologies, and has had different impact. The analysis is conducted by using a new approach of critical discourse analysis, which is the Discourse Historical Approach, to clarify the discursive strategies used by these leaders.

After comparing the three speeches, the differences become clear. On the one hand, the first two speeches of Saad Zaghloul (1919) and Mohamed Nageeb (1952) are subjected to the linguistic tools of DHA to test how far the Egyptian people are affected by their leaders' endeavors to liberate their country from the British occupation and from King Farouk. In the case of Mubarak, on the other hand, his speech is analyzed by employing the same tools to show why people insisted on his stepping down, when he tried to control their minds in an attempt to stop their revolution by dominating their ideas, and this appears vividly through his language.

The three political speeches are delivered in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). They are well structured, being formal speeches in critical times. The results indicate that Saad Zaghloul and Mohamed Nageeb

avoid using the authoritative tone in their speeches. Their discourses are informative speeches intended mainly to clarify political issues for Egypt's interest. As for Mubarak's speech, he uses the authoritative tone throughout his speech. He tries to dominate his people's mind by mentioning several times that he is the President. Mubarak's goal is to convince the demonstrators in Tahrir Square to abide by his policy to let him rule during the last months of his term.

Concerning the people's response, there is a great difference between the Egyptians' response to the first two speeches of the patriotic leaders, Saad Zaghloul and Mohamed Nageeb, who are looking after their country's interest, and Mubarak, whose main concern is himself, and to serve out the last months of his terms. The first two leaders succeeded to win their people's support, while Mubarak failed. After listening to Saad Zaghloul's speech (1919), the people's support for Wafd party grew, and after Saad Zaghloul had been arrested, people gathered and started their revolution. After Mohamed Nageeb's speech (1952), the revolution broke out. King Farouk left the country, and it was the end of his monarchy. As For the 2011's speech, Mubarak received an opposite response. Mubarak did not submit to the will of the demonstrators to leave, and his people insisted on his stepping down. His speech failed to meet his people's need. Mubarak was confronted with masses of Egyptians demonstrating to overthrow him and his regime.

Finally, the researcher encourages discourse analysts to use Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) further, as a tool to be applied to social historical texts. Its discursive strategies are helpful tools for the researchers in their work with a view to conducting comprehensive studies of these texts.



### References

- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravini, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society*, 19(3), 273-306.

- Bateson, M. C. (2003). *Arabic Language Handbook*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University press.
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An Introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). New York NY/ London: Continuum.
- Engström, R. (2013). *The in-group and out-groups of the British National Party and the UK Independence Party: A corpus-based discourse-historical analysis* (unpublished doctoral dissertation).Lund University.
- Hamza, Z. (2012) *A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Representation of Donald Trump in the Guardian* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Malaya.
- Lawton, R. (2016). A Critical Integrated Approach to Language Policy as Discursive Action: Strengths, Challenges, and Opportunities. In Barakos, E. & Unger, J. W (eds.) *Discursive Approaches to Language Policy* (pp. 105-127). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. Philadelphia / Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.
- Meades, S. (2015).Proceedings from annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association: *Multi-Modal discourse historical approach to analyzing negative political advertising*. York University.
- Reisigl, M., &Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse historical approach (DHA). In Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 87-120). London, UK: Sage.
- Reisigl, M. (2017). The discourse historical approach. In Flowerdew, J. & Richardson, J. E, (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp. 44-59). London, UK: Routledge.
- Ryding, K. C., (2005). *A reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. New York: Cambridge university press.
- Schiffrin, D. Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. E. (2001). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Malden, USA/ Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed).New York, USA: Routledge.

- van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as Discourse*. Hillside, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese discourse*, 1(1), 17-27.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*. London, UK: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and discourse: A Multidisciplinary introduction* [pdf document]. English version of an internet course for the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldBooks/Teun%20A%20van%20Dijk%20%20Ideology%20and%20Discourse.pdf>.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(2), 359-383.
- Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse historical approach. In Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. (pp. 63-95). London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2009). The semiotics of racism: A critical discourse-historical analysis. In Renkema, J. (ed.) *Discourse, of course: An overview of research in discourse studies* (pp. 311-326). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.