


**A Stylistic Analysis of the Language of
Resistance in Alaa Al Aswany's Articles
Ahead of 2011 and 2013 Egyptian
Revolutions**

Dr. Ingy Farouk Emara
Faculty of Al Alsun & Mass Communication
Misr International University

Abstract

This paper adopts a stylistic analysis of the articles written by Alaa Al Aswany before the two Egyptian revolutions of 2011 and 2013 in order to show how the writer's use of certain themes and linguistic devices delivers his resistance ideologies. The chosen ten articles, five published before the 2011 revolution and five published before the 2013 revolution, are analyzed using Halliday's systemic functional grammar approach which sees language or discourse as having three metafunctions: an ideational function, a relational function and a textual function (Halliday, 1978). These three functions are traced in Al Aswany's articles to show how the writer reflects his social identity, maintains social relations with the readers, and conveys certain ideologies through the language choices he makes. The paper compares between the articles written before the 2011 revolution and those written before the 2013 revolution in terms of the discourse features the writer uses to convey certain social and political ideologies relevant to each period of time. The results of the stylistic analysis carried out in this paper reveal that the linguistic devices and figurative language used imply the writer's own resistance of the two political regimes and arouse the reader's feelings of resentment and resistance against those regimes, with more direct calls for resistance made in the articles written before the second revolution. The analysis also describes the writer's political and social ideologies as well as his presentation of power relations shifting from the hands of authoritative regimes to the hands of the people. On the whole, this paper provides an example of how newspaper discourse may reveal underlying ideologies and power relations with the aim of triggering

Dr. Ingy Farouk  Art Magazine - Issue 40
attitudes of resistance against oppressive practices of political regimes.

Key Words

Functional stylistic analysis - resistance language - social and political ideologies

1. Introduction


Egypt experienced remarkable political, social and ideological changes in the second decade of the twenty-first century, having witnessed two revolutions that ousted two Egyptian presidents in the period from January, 2011 till June, 2013. The first revolution that started on January 25th, 2011, and is often referred to as one of the Arab Spring revolutions, was induced by the relentless efforts of political activists and enlightened writers whose impact was intensified by the prevalence of their ideas through online social networks. One of the well-known Egyptian writers that have intensively used the language of resistance in their writings is Alaa Al Aswany, who is also considered by many as one of the prominent faces of both revolutions.

Alaa Al Aswany is an Egyptian writer and novelist, and one of Egypt's leading liberal voices. Descending from an aristocratic family, he was educated in a French school, obtained a Bachelor's degree in dental and oral medicine from Cairo University, and later pursued a Master's degree in dentistry at the University of Illinois in Chicago. His social and educational background has had its impact on his writing style and the topics he chooses to write about. His novel *The Yacoubian Building*, which presented the Egyptian society satirically, has been widely read in Egypt and elsewhere. Al

Aswany has written weekly articles in several Egyptian and international newspapers.

It is believed that Al Aswany's work played a vital role in triggering revolutionary feelings among the Egyptian people (Kaminski, 2011). The Egyptian revolution of 2011 started on the 25th of January and ended with the resignation of President Hosni Mubarak on the 11th of February. The revolution was a reaction against legal and political issues including police brutality, state of emergency laws, lack of free elections and large-scale corruption. After the revolution against Mubarak and a period of rule by the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces, the Muslim Brotherhood organization took power with the election of the Islamist President Mohamed Morsi in June 2012. However, Morsi's government encountered fierce opposition from various sectors of the Egyptian society, and mass protests broke out against his rule in what was known as the 30th of June Revolution in 2013. This second revolution resulted in the overthrow of Morsi on the 4th of July, 2013. Both uprisings of 2011 and 2013 are referred to as revolutions since each of them conforms to the definition of a *revolution* as a movement that results in a fundamental change in power or political organization (Merriam-Webster's online dictionary).

The present paper aims at carrying out a stylistic analysis of five articles written by Al Aswany shortly before the ousting of Ex-President Hosny Mubarak in 2011, and five other articles he wrote before the ousting of Ex-President Mohamed Morsi in 2013, in order to highlight how the language of resistance was employed in these articles within the framework of Halliday's

Dr. Ingy Farouk  Art Magazine - Issue 40
meta-functional approach. In so doing, the following questions are addressed:

- 1) Which linguistic devices has the writer used to signify his resistance to the political regime in each period?
- 2) What are the ideational, relational and textual functions of the language patterns used in Al Aswany's articles to indicate resistance?
- 3) What are the stylistic differences between the articles written before the first revolution and those written before the second one?

The answers to the above questions are explored with the target of finding out how newspaper articles may trigger attitudes of resistance against oppressive practices of political regimes.

2. Literature Review

Stylistic analysis is concerned with the study of the style of a writer. Crystal (1989) describes *style* as the selection of a set of linguistic features to convey a certain meaning. Originally, stylistics used to be applied to literary texts, but nowadays, its scope has been extended to encompass any type of written or spoken text (Simpson, 2004). Since stylistic analysis is concerned with the identification of the patterns of language used in a certain text, and the analysis of the style of a writer/ speaker to show the effect he/ she wants to communicate to the reader/ speaker, it has often been associated with discourse analysis (Short, 1990). In some contexts, stylistic analysis has become embedded within a framework of critical discourse analysis since the investigation of ideology and social power, which is the main concern of critical discourse analysis, features as part of stylistic analysis

with its emphasis on both the linguistic features of the text and its reception by the readers (Carter, 2010).

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) aims at investigating how social power abuse, political dominance and inequality are resisted by text in the social and political contexts (van Dijk, 2001). It has a socio-political purpose in attempting to highlight the role of discourse in the reproduction of social inequality, and its success can be measured by how far it contributes to change (van Dijk, 1993). The role of discourse in describing social life implies that meaning is not embedded in the perceived reality but is rather shaped by linguistic representation (Fairclough, 1992; Halliday, 1990; van Dijk, 2002). What distinguishes critical discourse analysis from other types of discourse analysis is its attribute of 'critical' which serves to expose hidden connections and provide resources for the disadvantaged through change (Fairclough, 1992). Both critical discourse analysis and stylistic analysis have the potential to reveal the political and social ideologies presented in a text; yet, stylistic analysis tends to pay more attention to how the style and figurative language patterns used by a writer convey certain intentions and ideologies (Simpson, 2004).

Linguistic analysis of political texts, such as the newspaper articles selected for analysis in this paper, reveals the writer's intentions and ideologies that may not be stated explicitly. Bayram (2010) believes that a linguistic analysis of political discourse can be effective when it highlights how linguistic behavior reflects political behavior and attitudes. This can be done on two levels: the linguistic micro-level that looks into

the use of specific words and syntactic structures to fulfill a certain strategic function, and the macro-level which studies the communicative situation and function of a text and investigates the linguistic structures that have been chosen to fulfill this function. Thus, language use belongs to the micro-level while the presentation of political and social issues such as power, dominance and social inequality belongs to the macro-level of analysis.

Previous studies have shown that media in general and newspaper articles in particular have the potential of using discourse that shapes public opinion through the framing of news events and through analysis (Rose 2014). Framing is the conscious attempt to reshape accounts of events in order to legitimize certain perspectives and actions (Williamson, Skocpol and Coggin 2011). In a study carried out by Nelson, Clawson and Oxley (1997), readers were found to be more open to a Ku Klux Klan rally when the news story discussing it framed the rally as a free speech issue. Another study showed that readers showed racial attitudes against minorities in general when they were exposed to crime news stories involving minorities (Valentino, 1999). This shows that media can be powerful enough to change the readers' attitudes and shape their ideologies. A notion clearly associated with ideology is power (van Dijk, 2001). Power, in this sense, refers to the ability to shape actions through discourse, a goal which print media strives to achieve through written discourse.

Critical discourse analysis is not regarded as politically neutral but rather as a critical approach targeting social change

and taking the side of oppressed social groups (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). It also contributes to the construction of social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and meaning (Fairclough, 1995). The same view would apply to stylistic analysis so long as it investigates how a writer's style reveals certain identities, constructs social relations and conveys particular ideologies. This view draws on Halliday's systemic functional grammar (SFG), which investigates how discourse is generated to convey the speaker's/ writer's intentions (Halliday, 1978). Functional stylistic analysis based on SFG has drawn the attention of many researchers (Halliday, 1994; Shen, 2002; Zhang, 2005). Central to SFG is the metafunctional approach where discourse is seen as having three metafunctions: ideational, interpersonal and textual (Halliday, 1978). The ideational metafunction expresses content or the speaker's/ writer's experience of the real world as well as the world of his own consciousness, the interpersonal establishes social relationships, and the textual provides links between language and the situation in which it is used (Halliday, 1978). The three metafunctions of language work simultaneously and can be analyzed in every utterance/ sentence. Fowler (1996) adds that the ideational metafunction consists of processes, participants and circumstances, the three of which are specified through choices in the transitivity system. The above three metafunctions can be traced in the articles analyzed in the present paper where the writer reflects his experiences and attitudes toward political processes, participants and circumstances, maintains social relations with the readers, and conveys certain resistance ideologies through the linguistic patterns he uses. The main linguistic patterns or

tools analyzed in the selected articles to reflect the writer's ideologies are personal pronouns, lexicalization, transitivity and figurative language.

Personal pronouns have often been analyzed to refer to individual stance and power relations in political discourse. Fairclough (1989) argues that personal pronouns have a relational value and help construct social power relationships. Wodak (2005) also believes that pronouns have the ability to reflect group identities and help conceptualize different parties as insiders or outsiders. In this sense, pronouns should not be considered as mere referential words but rather as tools expressing contexts of interaction and identity (Bramley, 2001). In political discourse, pronouns are not simply used as anaphoric references but are used to position oneself and others in relation to political interests and associations (Fairclough, 1989).

A second linguistic tool that has frequently been used to analyze a writer's political ideologies is that of lexicalization or lexical choices. Examining lexical choices reveals the ideological and political stances of a journalist and portrays power relations and cultural values underlying a certain text (Fairclough, 1995). Van Dijk (1995) believes that lexical analysis is a very important component in ideological discourse analysis. He maintains that the different attitudes, beliefs and opinions of language users lead to differences in their use of words to communicate certain ideologies. The popular example Dijk uses to highlight the importance of lexicalization is the pair of words "terrorist" versus "freedom fighter" where the

former carries a negative connotation, and the latter carries a positive one. Lexical analysis also lies at the heart of stylistic analysis since the style of a writer is mainly shaped by the lexical choices he/ she makes.

A third important tool used in stylistic analysis is that of transitivity, which is described by Halliday (1994) as one's perception of goings-on expressed through the semantic system of the language and the grammar of the clause. The semantic processes described by clauses are composed of the verbal process itself and the participants involved. Transitivity expresses what process and participant types there are in a text and how they are categorized. In describing any process in a text, writers have to make the choice of what to include or exclude what to foreground or background, and what process types and categories to use to represent events (Fairclough, 1995). The choice of process and the positioning of participants in a text determine the agent of news acts in terms of causality and responsibility. Transitivity analysis helps one to analyze the ideational function of a text by determining who is causing what to whom, which participants or agents are regarded as actively incriminated, and which ones are considered as the affected participants or worthy victims (Bazzi, 2009).

The use of figurative language and metaphors is a fourth linguistic tool examined in stylistic analysis to reflect the way a writer portrays persons or events (Simpson, 2004). The twentieth century has witnessed a change in the view of metaphor brought about by prominent Anglo-American philosophers and literary critics. Lackoff and Johnson (1980)

laid the foundation to the cognitive theory of metaphor maintaining that one's conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. According to cognitive theorists, a reader's conceptualization of abstract and unfamiliar areas of experience is greatly shaped by metaphor (Thornborrow, 1993; Semino, 2008). Political discourse currently focuses on the investigation of the ideological effects of metaphor (Chilton, 1996; Musolf, 2004), which has significant implications in stylistic analysis.

It is therefore clear that public knowledge about the world and the events taking place in it is largely shaped by media and the way media reports these events (van Dijk, 1991). News represented in media is created through a selective process by journalists and has the power to highlight which events and aspects of events are worth knowing about (Allan, 2004). Though previous studies have tackled how political and social relations are examined in critical discourse analysis (Valentino, 1999; Bramley, 2001; Wenden, 2005; Oyeleye and Hunjo, 2013; Rose, 2014), few have managed to examine how political, social and power relations presented through discourse can reflect a writer's ideology of resistance and trigger resistance feelings among readers themselves. Therefore, this paper aims to investigate how the discourse of the newspaper articles written by the Egyptian writer Alaa Al Aswany conveys certain ideologies that target social and political change in Egypt prior to the two revolutions of 2011 and 2013. The paper provides a stylistic analysis of the articles within the framework of Halliday's metafunctional approach and with emphasis on the writer's use of the linguistic tools of

personal pronouns, lexicalization, transitivity and metaphors to reflect resistance ideologies.

3. Methodology

Stylistic analysis, as well as discourse analysis, usually follows a qualitative methodology in which the analyst interprets meanings of a text in relation to the systems of power that shape it (Hoy, 1999). However, the use of quantitative analysis in the form of analyzing the frequency of occurrences of certain lexical items helps highlight specific ideologies underlying discourse. This paper analyzes the discourse of Al Aswany's articles both quantitatively and qualitatively while adopting a textual analysis approach, which involves characterizing the structure of the discourse and applying the content analysis method. This type of analysis tackles the themes the discourse is developed around and investigates the selection of relevant topics, the frequency of occurrence of each and the relationships between the different topics (Ruiz, 2009).

In this paper, the focus is on the themes or topics that highlight the notion of resistance in Al Aswany's articles, as well as the writer's use of certain lexical and linguistic devices to convey his resistance ideologies. The paper offers a stylistic analysis of the chosen articles in terms of Halliday's multifunctional approach (1978) in order to investigate how the use of certain linguistic devices reflects certain social and political ideologies. The linguistic devices examined in this paper are personal pronouns, lexicalization, transitivity and metaphors. The analysis of the articles also aims to investigate how social

power abuse, political dominance and inequality are resisted by text in the social and political contexts (van Dijk, 2001).

The paper adopts a quantitative-qualitative method of analysis in order to examine the implication of certain themes and linguistic devices pertaining to the language of resistance. It also compares the articles written before the 2011 revolution and those written before the 2013 revolution in terms of the linguistic patterns the writer uses to convey certain social and political ideologies relevant to each period of time. In so doing, the following questions are addressed:

- 1) Which linguistic devices has the writer used to signify his resistance to the political regime in each period?
- 2) What are the ideational, relational and textual functions of the language patterns used in Al Aswany's articles to indicate resistance?
- 3) What are the stylistic differences between the articles written before the first revolution and those written before the second one?

The answers to the above questions are explored with the target of finding out how newspaper articles may trigger attitudes of resistance against oppressive practices of political regimes.

The present paper analyzes ten articles written by Alaa Al Aswany, five published before the 2011 revolution and five published before the 2013 revolution. The articles were selected on the basis of their proximity in time to the two revolutions; each five articles appeared in a period of time stretching over five months prior to each revolution. The five selected articles Al Aswany wrote before the 2011 revolution

appeared in *Al Shorouk* newspaper, while the five articles written before the 2013 revolution appeared in *Al Masry Al Youm* newspaper. Contrary to state-run newspapers at the time, *Al Shorouk* and *Al Masry Al Youm* were two independent newspapers which frequently featured articles written by opposition writers against the political regime.

The ten articles studied are written in Arabic. The present study cites particular excerpts from the selected articles, followed by a translation of these excerpts, and provides a stylistic analysis of the resistance language used in each excerpt. The linguistic patterns analyzed are underlined in both the original excerpts and the translation provided. The articles written before the 2011 revolution were published in *Al Shorouk* newspaper, and are referred to as the first set of articles. These articles are titled: ملاحظات على مشروع جمال مبارك (Remarks on Gamal Mubarak's project), لماذا لا يذهب المصريون إلى الانتخابات (Why don't the Egyptians vote?), هل أصبح أساتذة الجامعة كلهم منافقين؟ (Have all university professors become hypocrites?), مصير إبراهيم عيسى (The destiny of Ibrahim Issa), and لهذا يتقدمون ولهذا نتخلف (This is why they progress and we deteriorate). Each of the articles in the first set has an average number of 1100 words. The articles written before the 2013 revolution were published in *Al Masry Al Youm* newspaper, and are referred to as the second set of articles. The articles are: لماذا يقتل مرسي المصريين؟ (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?), ماذا نصنع في الدم؟ (What shall we do about blood?), متى يرحل مرسي؟ (When will Morsi leave?), كيف نتحرر من الفاشية؟ (How do we set ourselves free from fascism?) and انفجروا.. أو موتوا (Explode.. or die!). Each of the articles in the latter set has an average number of 1430 words.

4. Results & Discussion

This section presents the results of the functional stylistic analysis of the discourse of the chosen articles in terms of the linguistic devices of personal pronouns, lexicalization, transitivity and metaphors, which aims at portraying how the writer's style and linguistic choices advocate resistance against oppressive regimes.

4.1 Personal pronouns

The personal pronouns studied in this section include the *first person singular and plural pronouns* (I, me, we, and us), and the *second person singular and plural pronouns* (singular you and plural you). Only subject and object pronouns are studied as these are the ones indicating the agents responsible for actions and the receivers affected by such actions. First and second person pronouns were chosen since these pronouns are influenced by factors such as proximity or distance and directness or indirectness between the writer and reader (Fowler, Hodge, Kress & Trew, 1979). For example, the use of the pronoun *we* may indicate intimacy and solidarity between the writer and the reader, whereas the generalized *you* can sometimes refer to anyone and may imply that the individual addressed is different from the writer (Fowler, Hodge, Kress & Trew, 1979).

In the present paper, first and second person pronouns are analyzed as one of the tools that reflect the writer's ideologies. However, the number of personal pronouns in the source language (i.e. Arabic) does not always equal the number of personal pronouns in the English translation. In many cases,

the Arabic pronouns are not explicitly mentioned, but they can be inferred from the form of the verb. For example, the presence of (أ) in the verb (أرى) meaning (I see) signifies the first person singular subject pronoun *I*, so in such a case the letter (أ), is counted as referring to the subject pronoun *I* and is underlined in the cited excerpts to mark the presence of that pronoun. The following table shows the number of first and second person pronouns present in each set of articles.

Table 1 Personal pronouns in both sets of articles

Pronoun	Number of occurrences before 2011 revolution	Number of occurrences before 2013 revolution
I (subject) أنا، ألف المتكلم، تاء المتكلم/ الفاعل	67	4
Me (object) ياء المتكلم/ المفعول	20	0
We (subject) نحن، نون ونا المتكلمين/ الفاعلين	14	40
Us (object) نا المتكلمين/ المفعولين	5	8
You (subject) أنت، أنتم، تاء الفاعل، تم الفاعلين	12 (singular only)	25 (singular and plural)
You (object) لك المخاطب، كم المخاطبين	5 (singular only)	10 (singular and plural)

The above table shows that the number of first person singular pronouns (I and me) was significantly higher in the articles published before the 2011 revolution. The first person pronoun is a term of self reference that signifies subjectivity and states the speaker's position (Bramley, 2001). It was used more often before the 2011 revolution to refer to the writer's

self-esteem, which also signified his alienation from his readers and the Egyptian society in general. He viewed himself as an intellect that had the privilege of living and studying in the United States as was evident from what he wrote in most of his articles. Among the examples of the use of first person singular pronouns in the first set of articles are:

- في الثمانينيات، تقدمت للحرساء على بحث دراسية لثولويات المنحده (مصير إبراهيم عيسى)

- In the eighties, I applied for a scholarship in USA (The destiny of Ibrahim Issa).

- في الدور السابع عشر من فندق كروان بلازا في وسط مدينة شيكاغو ... أرى شيكاغو التي عشت فيها وتعلمت واكتشفت عالما إنسانيا جديدا ومثيرا كتبت عنه في رواية تحمل اسمها منذ خمسة وعشرين عاما بالضبط، حصلت على درجة الماجستير في طب الأسنان من جامعة الينوى في شيكاغو... أشاد رئيس جامعة الينوى بما اعتبره إنجازا استثنائيا حققته في الأدب، وأكد أن الجامعة فخورة بي باعتباري أحد أبنائها... قلت كلمة قصيرة أكدت فيها أنني مدين لجامعة الينوى بما حققته من نجاح (لهذا يتقدمون ولهذا نتخلف).

- achievement I have made in the field of Arts, and declared that the university was proud of me as an alumni,...I gave a short speech in which I confirmed that I owed my success to Illinois University for the success I have achieved (This is why they progress and we deteriorate).

The use of the first person singular pronouns decreased in the articles before the 2013 revolution as the writer came to realize the potentials of the Egyptian citizens who managed to change history in the 2011 revolution. First person singular pronouns in these articles occurred in cases where the writer

talked about his experience with figures of the revolution as is clear in the following example.

- في العام الماضي، تلقيت دعوة لحضور الاحتفال بعيد الميلاد المجيد في كنيسة قصر الدوبارة... دخلت إلى القاعة فوجدت مجموعة من الشخصيات التي ارتبطت بالثورة... اقتربت مني سيدة منتشحة بالسواد وقالت لي: - أنا والدة أميرة، أصغر شهداء الإسكندرية... لم أجد ما أقوله لها (ماذا نصنع في الدم؟).

- Last year, I received an invitation to attend Christmas celebration at Dubara Palace Church... I entered the hall to find a group of people who took part in the revolution...A woman dressed in black approached me and told me, "I am the mother of Amira, the youngest martyr [revolution victim] in Alexandria."...I had no words to say (What shall we do about blood?).

Concerning the first person plural pronouns 'we' and 'us', there was a significant increase in their use in the articles before the 2013 revolution; i.e. they occurred in both subject and object positions 54 times compared to 19 times before the 2011 revolution. However, the more significant increase was in the number of subject pronouns (40 compared to 14), which refers to the readers as agents or active participants in actions and events. This implies that the writer perceived the readers (or Egyptians in general) before the second revolution as more active and more able to bring about change. As substitution of one word by another has semantic and ideological implications (van Dijk, 1998), the writer substituted the word 'Egyptians' by first person plural pronouns to imply closeness to and intimacy with the readers.

First person plural pronouns were used before the 2011 revolution to engage with the readers in hypothetical situations or to reflect a feeling of uncertainty about the future, which was also achieved through the use of conditional sentences. Examples include the following.

- هذا الفشل الذريع لوزير الكهرباء كان كفيلا بإقصائه عن منصبه فورا لو كنا في بلد ديمقراطي (ملاحظات على مشروع جمال مبارك).

- Such an abject failure of the Minister of Electricity would force him out of office immediately if we were in a democratic country (Remarks on Gamal Mubarak's project).

- لا يمكن أن يفهم الشعب إلا إذا احترمنا قدراته وتفكيره واستمعنا إلى آراء الناس واختياراتهم.... عندما تحدث في مصر انتخابات حقيقية سنشارك فيها جميعا أما الآن فلنتركهم يلعبون مسرحيتهم السخيفة المملة وحدهم (لماذا لا يذهب المصريون للانتخابات؟).

- We cannot understand the people unless we respect them and listen to their opinions...When we have real fair elections in Egypt, we will all participate, but now, let them perform their ridiculous boring play alone (Why don't the Egyptians vote?).

The writer in the above examples engaged himself with the readers, not in a way that shows he was equal to them, but rather in a way that shows that he, like everyone else, was skeptic about the possibility of having democracy and fair elections in Egypt. The writer also called for resistance against the election process, but he did so indirectly by involving

himself with the readers and stating that they would all participate in elections only when there were fair ones.

In the articles written before the 2013 revolution, first person plural pronouns were used to put the writer on equal footing with the readers. Here, the writer seemed no more skeptical about achieving democracy because he had seen the Egyptian citizens bring about radical political change with the 2011 revolution. The use of first person plural pronouns here both engages the writer with his readers and serves an imperative function by calling the readers to take action, which strengthens the writer's call for resistance. Examples include the following.

- بعد أن قتل مواطنيه يخرج علينا مرسى ليلقى بيانا عقيما ركيكا.... لقد أثبت مرسى أن الإسلام الحقيقي العظيم الذي نعتقه ونعتر به يختلف إلى حد التناقض مع الإسلام الذي يتبناه الإخوان المسلمون.

- After killing his own citizens, Morsi comes out to us with a shallow statement.... Morsi has proved that the real great Islam we believe in and revere is completely the opposite of the Islam adopted by the Muslim Brothers (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?).

- واجبنا أن نقاطع هذه الانتخابات.... فلنقاطع الانتخابات وننضم إلى العصيان المدني حتى تتحرر مصر من قبضة القتل (ماذا نصنع في الدم؟).

- We have to boycott these elections... Let us boycott these elections and join the civil disobedience until Egypt is free from the grip of [those] murderers (What shall we do about blood?).

Here, the writer's call for resistance is intensified through the use of obligation modal verbs with the first person plural pronouns *we* and *us* as in, "we have to boycott these elections," and "let us boycott these elections and join the civil disobedience", while in the articles before the 2011 revolution, resistance was implied more indirectly through the use of first conditional sentence structure as in "when we have real fair elections in our Egypt, we will all participate."

There was also a significant increase in the number of second person pronouns in the articles published before the 2013 revolution; i.e., there were 35 instances of the pronoun 'you' as both subject and object compared to 17 instances in the articles published before the 2011 revolution. In the articles before the 2011 revolution, only singular second person pronouns were used, while in those before the 2013 revolution, both singular and plural second person pronouns were used to arouse the readers' feelings of unity and sense of belonging to the same nation. The increase is also significant with the second person subject pronouns signifying more belief in the readers' potential to change.

The second person singular pronouns were used before the 2011 revolution in examples such as the following.

- في البلاد الديمقراطية قوانين صارمة تمنع استقادة صاحب السلطة من منصبه... فإذا كنت مثلا رئيسا للجنة التحكيم في مسابقة ووجدت ابنك أو زوجتك بين المتسابقين يجب عليك أن تتنحي فورا (هل أصبح أساتذة الجامعة كلهم منافقين؟).

- In democratic countries, there are strict rules preventing those in power from misusing their positions...., so if, for example, you were chairing the evaluation committee in a contest and found your son or wife among the contestants, you would have to resign immediately (Have all university professors become hypocrites?)

- إذا كنت موهوبا في مصر فعليك أن تختار بين ثلاثة طرق: إما أن تهاجر إلى بلاد ديمقراطية تحترم المواهب وتقدر الكفاءة فتعمل بجد وتتقدم كل يوم حتى تصبح مثل أحمد زويل ومحمد البرادعي ومجدي يعقوب وأمثالهم، وأما أن تسلم موهبتك لنظام الاستبداد وتقبل أن تكون خادما له... وإما أن تقرر الاحتفاظ بشرفك عندئذ سينتظرك مصير إبراهيم عيسى (مصير إبراهيم عيسى).

- If you were a talented citizen in Egypt, you would have to choose one of three options: to immigrate to democratic countries that respect talents and value proficiency, so you could work hard till you become as successful as Ahmed Zowail, Mohamed El Baradei, Magdy Yacoub and others, or to give your talent to a corrupt unfair regime and accept to be a servant for it, or finally, to hold on to your principles and dignity, in which case you would have the destiny of Ibrahim Issa [who was unfairly trialed due to his opposition to the political regime] (The destiny of Ibrahim Issa).

In the above examples, the writer placed the reader in hypothetical situations that reflected one's political impotence and inability to have one's rights as one would in any other democratic country.

In the articles before the 2013 revolution, however, Al Aswany addressed the reader using the singular second person pronoun as in the following excerpt.

- إذا وجدت نفسك في نزاع قضائي ماذا تفعل؟! .. بالطبع ستقوم بتوكيل محام ليترافع عنك أمام المحاكم، ثم إذا اكتشفت أن محاميك فاشل أو أنه بلا ضمير يسعى إلى التواطؤ مع خصومك ضدك.. ماذا تفعل؟! .. ستقوم بإلغاء التوكيل الذي منحه للمحامي وتبحث عن محام آخر أمين وكفاء (انفجروا.. أو موتوا).

- If you found yourself in a legal dispute, what would you do? You would definitely assign an attorney to defend you and give him a proxy to represent you in court, but if you found that your attorney was a failure or that he was plotting with your opponents against you, what would you do? You would withdraw the proxy you gave him and look for a more honest and *qualified* attorney (*Explode . or die!*).

Though the writer made use of a hypothetical situation here, he used it to draw an analogy between a corrupt president and a corrupt attorney. He no longer used hypothetical situations to refer to the reader's political impotence or options of a better life outside Egypt as he insinuated in the examples found in the articles before the 2011 revolution. Instead, he aroused in the reader the feeling of resentment by implying that the reader is capable of withdrawing trust from a president, which is as simple as withdrawing trust from an inefficient attorney.

The second person singular pronoun was also used in the articles published before the 2013 revolution to address the president himself, which was not found in the five articles published before the 2011 revolution. For example, Al Aswany addressed Morsi saying,

اقتل يا مرسي المصريين وأمعن في القتل، ولكن إعلم أن القتل لن يحميك من
مصيرك ولن يقضى على الثورة. رسالتك وصلت يا مرسي وبقدر قتلك
للمصريين فإن رد الثورة عليك سوف يصلك قريباً.. أقرب مما تتصور (لماذا
يقتل مرسي المصريين؟).

- Kill the Egyptians, Morsi, but you should know that killing them will not save you nor will it silence the revolution. Your message is made clear, Morsi, and the more you kill Egyptians, the sooner you will get a response from the revolutionaries, sooner than you can imagine (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?).

After the toppling of a previous president in a previous revolution, the writer now showed more boldness in addressing the president and criticizing him directly using the singular second person pronoun.

In one of the articles written before the 2013 revolution, Al Aswany directly called for resistance through the use of directive verbs and second person plural pronouns, addressing the readers as one united group, as in the following example.

- انزلوا إلى الشوارع يوم ٣٠ يونيو ولا تعودوا حتى تنقشع الغمة عن بلادنا.
إذا تقاعستم عن هذا الواجب لا يحق لكم بعد ذلك أن تتذمروا من الظلم
والهوان والقمع. إما أن تتمردوا على حكم الإخوان أو تقبلوا الذل الذي
سيفرضونه عليكم. انفجروا.. أو موتوا (انفجروا.. أو موتوا).

- Go out to the streets on the 30th of June and don't come back until our country is ridded of this adversity...If you fail in this duty, you will then have no right to complain about injustice, oppression and repression. Rebel against the Muslim Brothers' rule or suffer the humiliation they will impose on you. Explode.. or die (Explode.. or die!).

The use of the second person plural pronouns in the above examples served to arouse the readers' anger by appealing to their patriotic feelings and showing them that the only alternative to their rebellion against the president's rule was humiliation and loss of dignity. Plural pronouns were also used to unite all the readers (i.e. all Egyptians) together and urge them to react together against the injustice and oppression of the president and the political group he belonged to.

It is clear from the above examples of personal pronouns that pronouns are mainly used to show distance from or closeness to the readers. Through pronouns, writers both acknowledge and recognize the presence of their readers (Paltridge, 2012). The use of personal pronouns is also influenced by factors such as proximity or distance, directness and indirectness (Fowler, Hodge, Kress & Trew, 1979). Al Aswany showed more proximity and intimacy with the readers before the second revolution through the use of more first person plural pronouns ('we' and 'us') and less first person singular pronouns ('I' and 'me'). He also showed more respect for the readers, representing the Egyptians in general, and more belief in their potentials and ability to bring change through the use of more first and second subject person pronouns, which

implies that the Egyptians were now perceived as active rather than passive participants in events.

Al Aswany's use of pronouns as a linguistic device reflecting his resistance ideologies can also be analyzed in terms of Halliday's three metafunctions of language. On the ideational level, the writer used first person pronouns before the first revolution to reflect his preference for western democratic countries and his pro-American ideologies as a scholar who had benefited from education and life in the United States. The presentation of such ideologies portrayed a certain identity for him; that is the identity of an enlightened scholar who was more privileged than the average Egyptian citizen. However, this identity changed before the second revolution with a shift towards involvement with the readers and the Egyptian citizens at large through his increasing use of plural first person pronouns and the tuning down of his personal ego. This shift, in turn, has had its effect on the interpersonal level of analysis where the writer attempted to have closer relations with the readers after the success of the first revolution. Before the second revolution, the writer involved himself more with the readers through the use of plural first person pronouns and showed more belief in their capacity to rise against oppression. As for the textual level, the increase in the number of subject second person pronouns, both singular and plural, in the articles written before the second revolution reflects the writer's belief in the readers' capacity to achieve change as active participants in society, and in turn serve to arouse their feelings of self-confidence and willingness to resist oppression and achieve democracy.

4.2 Lexicalization

Lexicalization here refers to the writer's choice of certain lexical items to highlight specific events and contrasts. The lexical items studied in this section were chosen because they serve to convey particular opinions or ideologies related to resistance. The lexical terms in table 2 are those related to incompetence, corruption, protest and violence while the contrasts listed in table 3 show dissimilarities between two ideas or entities. The following table shows the number of occurrences of lexical items pertaining to violence and protests in the articles published before each revolution.

Table 2 Lexical items related to violence and protest

Lexical Item	Number of occurrences before 2011 revolution	Number of occurrences before 2013 revolution
Incompetence	20	33
Corruption	110	96
Protest	11	98
Violence	42	260

The events the present paper focuses on are those related to incompetence, corruption, protest and violence since they serve the function of arousing the reader's feelings of resentment and resistance against oppressive regimes.

In the articles written before the first revolution, incompetence was mentioned in terms of the regime's and ministers' failure to manage the country's political affairs as in the following example.

هذا الفشل الذريع لوزير الكهرباء كان كفيلا بإقصائه عن منصبه فورا لو كنا في بلد ديمقراطي، لكننا في مصر، حيث لا يعتبر الفشل سببا حاسما في إقالة الوزراء (مشروع جمال مبارك).

- Such failure of the Minister of Electricity would be enough to dismiss him from his post if we were in a democratic country, but in Egypt, failure is not a good reason to dismiss ministers (Gamal Mubarak's Project).

The above example, as well as other examples referring to incompetence in the articles written before the 2011 revolution, attributes incompetence and failure to the authorities rather than to the president himself. The writer tended to avoid blaming the president directly, but he implied his rejection of the president's policies through criticizing the authorities and those in power.

In the second set of articles published before the 2013 revolution, there were more references to incompetence, mainly representing the president's failure as in the example below.

لكن الرئيس مرسي انحدر إلى الفشل بسرعة لم يتوقعها أنصاره وخصومه على السواء (لماذا يقتل مرسي المصريين؟)

- But President Morsi has slid into failure faster than any of his supporters or opponents would expect (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?)

The above example shows that the writer tended to criticize the president personally in the second set of articles, and blamed him directly for the failure of his policies.

Corruption in the first set of articles was frequently stressed in terms of the infringement of laws and parliamentary elections to serve the regime's interests. Even when the writer

wanted to criticize the election of the president's son or granting the president's wife honorary academic degrees, he blamed that on the authorities rather than on the president himself as can be found in the following examples.

ماذا فعلت الأحزاب لمنع التعذيب والقمع والفساد (لماذا لا يذهب المصريون للانتخابات؟)

- What have the political parties done to stop torture, repression and corruption? (Why don't the Egyptians vote?)

من الآن فصاعدا لن يحاسب أحد رئيس جامعة القاهرة - أي ترمي التعليم وانتقاع البحث العلمي ونقص الإمكانيات وانتشار الفساد والدروس الخصوصية (هل أصبح أساتذة الجامعة كلهم منافقين؟).

- From now on, no one will question the president of Cairo University about the deterioration of education, the halt of scientific research, the lack of resources and the widespread of corruption and private lessons (Have all university professors become hypocrites?).

In the above examples, the agent or the person responsible for corruption is not clearly mentioned, yet the blame is again laid on the authorities (i.e. the political parties and the president of Cairo University) rather than the president himself.

Corruption was also referred to in the second set of articles, though it had a slightly fewer number of occurrences than the number it had in the articles before the first revolution. The articles written before the second revolution mentioned political corruption on part of the president and Muslim

Brothers organization in terms of cheating and appointing only those related to the Muslim Brothers.

[الإخوان المسلمون] يعطون أنفسهم الحق في الكذب والتضليل والغش.... ، كل شيء مباح لديهم مادام يحقق مصلحة الجماعة التي هي عندهم أهم من مصلحة الوطن... مرسى ينتمي إلى الإخوان الذين هم على أتم استعداد لأن يقتلوا المصريين ويخربوا الوطن من أجل الحفاظ على السلطة بأي طريقة وأي ثمن.

- [The Muslim Brothers] give themselves the right to lie, mislead and cheat... Everything is acceptable for them as long as it serves their interests, which is more important for them than the interests of their homeland. Morsi belongs to the Brothers who are completely ready to kill the Egyptians and destroy their homeland in order to stay in power by any means and at any cost (Explode.. or die!).

Corruption was referred to in the above example through words such as *lie*, *mislead* and *cheat* and through reference to the willingness of the president and his group to commit any crimes to stay in power. Again, criticism of the president is stated directly in the second set of articles where he is portrayed as a corrupt leader who is willing to destroy his country to remain in power and serve the interests of his group rather than the interests of his own country.

Protest was referred to in the articles written before the 2011 revolution in terms of condemnation of certain laws or calling for boycotting parliamentary elections, but there was no direct reference to carrying out a public disobedience or revolution. Examples of terms related to protest in the first set of articles include the following:

[أساتذة الجامعة] أصدروا بيانا شجاعا يدينون فيه استعمال الجامعة لأغراض سياسية.

- They [the university professors] issued a statement condemning using the university to achieve political goals (Have all university professors become hypocrites?).

مقاطعة الانتخابات المزورة القادمة هو الموقف الصحيح الذي اتخذته الشعب المصري وبالتالي فإن كل من يشترك فيها يكون خارجا على إرادة الأمة.

- Boycotting the coming invalid elections is the correct decision the Egyptian people have decided to make; therefore, anyone who participates in these elections will be acting against the will of the nation (Why don't the Egyptians vote?).

In the above two examples, the writer uses declarative statements to describe decisions that have already been made to signify protest. He does not use directive statements nor does he directly ask the readers to protest. He also uses words such as *condemning* and *boycotting* to refer to protest actions taken by Egyptians and praises them in a way to encourage the readers to take similar actions and resist the corruption of the political regime.

On the other hand, the articles written before the second revolution of 2013 have a significantly higher number of words related to protest, that is, 98 compared to 11 in the first set of articles. The articles written before the 2013 revolution refer more directly to the idea of resistance against the ruler and his ruling party. They directly call for public protests, civil

disobedience, sit-ins and revolutions. Examples from these articles include the following.

الثورة بددت الخوف إلى الأبد. المصريون مهما قتلهم مرسى لن يذعنوا ولن يخافوا.
(لماذا يقتل مرسى المصريين؟).

- The revolution has erased fear for good. No matter how many of them Morsi kills, the Egyptians shall not succumb nor shall they fear (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?).

إذا كنتم تحبون مصر وتريدون إنقاذها من براثن هذه العصابة الفاشية..... انزلوا إلى الشوارع يوم ٣٠ يونيو ولا تعودوا حتى تنقشع الغمة عن بلادنا. إذا تقاعستم عن هذا الواجب لا يحق لكم بعد ذلك أن تنذمروا من الظلم والهوان والقمع. إما أن تتمردوا على حكم الإخوان أو تقبلوا الذل الذي سيفرضونه عليكم. انفجروا.. أو موتوا.

- If you love Egypt and want to save it from that fascist gang, go out to the streets on the 30th of June and don't come back until our country is ridded of this adversity...If you fail in this duty, you will then have no right to complain about injustice, oppression and repression. Rebel against the Muslim Brothers' rule or suffer the humiliation they will impose on you. Explode.. or die (Explode.. or die!).

In the above examples written before the 2013 revolution, the writer used grammatical structures implying determination and certainty such as declarative statements like, 'The revolution has erased fear for good,' future tense as in 'the

Egyptians shall not succumb nor shall they fear,' and directive sentences such as, 'go out to the streets, rebel against the Muslim Brothers' rule and 'explode or die!' The writer used such structures to encourage the readers to participate in the public protests the writer was calling for, and to suggest that that such protests were the inevitable consequences of Morsi's inadequate rule. The writer's use of directive sentences asking the readers directly to 'rebel' and 'explode' strengthens the call for resistance against the president and the whole political regime.

As for terms related to violence, there were 42 instances of such terms in the articles published before the 2011 revolution compared to 260 in the articles published before the 2013 revolution. Violence in the first set of articles was referred to mainly in terms of the police brutality against university students and arresting opponents of the regime. This is clear in the following example.

جامعة الينوى، تتابع بدقة نشاط خريجها في كل أنحاء الدنيا فتكافئ من ينجح منهم،... أما جامعة الأزهر، فإن ضابط الأمن فيها يعتدي على طالبة بطريقة وحشية (لهذا يتقدمون ونحن نتخلف).

- The University of Illinois follows up its successful graduates to reward them while in Al-Azhar University, a security officer brutally assaults a student (This is why they progress and we deteriorate).

Such examples aimed at raising the reader's awareness of the corruption and incompetence of the current political regime in an attempt to arouse feelings of resentment towards it, which

in turn may lead to resistance against the whole regime. However, no direct call was made to protest against such violent acts.

The articles published before the 2013 revolution have a significantly higher number of words related to violence. Examples include,

فإذا بخيرت الشاطر يرسل بميليشياته المسلحة ليهاجموا المعتصمين
ويقبضوا عليهم ويعذبوهم ببشاعة... بعد أن قتل مواطنيه يخرج علينا
 مرسى ليلقى بيانا عقيما ركبكا.... ويرفع أصبعه في وجوهنا مهددا
 بالمزيد من القتل (لماذا يقتل مرسى المصريين؟).

- Khairat Al Shater (A powerful Muslim Brother figure) sends militias to attack the protesters, arrest them and brutally torture them.... After killing his citizens, Morsi comes out with a shallow statement... threatening to kill even more (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?).

The lexical terms used in the above examples link the president and the Muslim Brotherhood organization with images of bloodiness and brutality, which strengthens the readers' feelings of resentment and urges them to take action to save their own country and fellowmen. The writer here directly accused the president and his organization of crimes against the Egyptian people, the matter which was not likely to occur during the period preceding the first revolution of 2011.

Another lexical choice the writer made is the use of contrasts to highlight dissimilarity between certain ideas or entities. Opposition or contrasts serve an ideational function in stylistic analysis since they aim at emphasizing a certain



ideology through highlighting dissimilarities between two concepts or entities. Cruse (1986) maintains that oppositeness is the sense relation that is most readily understood by ordinary speakers. According to Lyons (1977), there appears to be a human tendency to describe experience in terms of dichotomous contrasts. Yet, it is worth noting that oppositeness or contrast is not only a relation between individual words but could also be between phrases, sentences and concepts (Davies, 2013). The following table shows the number of occurrences of contrasts in each set of articles.

Table 3 Lexical items showing contrast


Contrast	Number of occurrences before 2011 revolution	Number of occurrences before 2013 revolution
Democratic vs. undemocratic countries	8	1
Gaining rights vs. suffering oppression	4	5
Politically mature vs. politically immature citizens	3	0
Opponents vs. proponents	0	4
Making vs. breaking promises	1	5
Leader vs. follower	0	3
Winning vs. losing elections	0	3

Democratic countries were contrasted with non-democratic ones 8 times in the first set of articles and one time in the second. This shows the writer's bias towards democratic countries, especially the United States, before the first revolution. Having lived and received post-graduate education in the States, Al Aswany felt superior to most Egyptian citizens, which was reflected more than once in the first set of articles.

He also made frequent comparisons between Egypt as an underdeveloped non-democratic country and other developed countries. The following is an example of a comparison between opportunities of success in Egypt and in other democratic countries.

- إذا كنت موهوبا في مصر فعليك أن تختار بين ثلاثة طرق: إما أن تهاجر إلى بلاد ديمقراطية تحترم المواهب وتقدر الكفاءة فتعمل بجد وتتقدم كل يوم حتى تصبح مثل أحمد زويل ومحمد البرادعي ومجدي يعقوب وأمثالهم، وأما أن تسلم موهبتك لنظام الاستبداد وتقبل أن تكون خادما له... وإما أن تقرر الاحتفاظ بشرفك عندئذ سينتظرك مصير إبراهيم عيسى (مصير إبراهيم عيسى).

- If you were a talented citizen in Egypt, you would have to choose one of three options: to immigrate to democratic countries that value talents and dedication so you could work hard till you become as successful as prominent figures such as Ahmed Zowail, Mohamed El Baradei, Magdy Yacoub and others, or to give your talent to a corrupt unfair regime and accept serving it, or finally, to hold on to your principles, in which case you would have the destiny of Ibrahim Issa [a journalist who

Dr. Ingy Farouk  Art Magazine - Issue 40
was unfairly trialed due to his opposition to the political
regime] (The destiny of Ibrahim Issa).

This example implies that the writer did not believe in the power of the Egyptians to achieve change or democracy before the first revolution, but two years later, his articles reflected more respect for the Egyptian citizens who were finally able to achieve change and overthrow an oppressive regime. The articles before the second revolution were more concerned with internal affairs rather than comparisons with other countries.

Gaining rights and losing rights are contrasted almost equally in the two sets of articles, implying the writer's stress on the importance of gaining one's rights and standing against oppressive leaders in both cases. Politically mature and politically immature citizens are contrasted 3 times in the first set but are not mentioned in the second set, which again reflects the writer's belief in the power and maturity of the Egyptian citizens after they successfully carried out a revolution in 2011 to overthrow a thirty-year-long dictatorship. Proponents versus opponents are contrasted 4 times in the second set of articles but they were not mentioned in the first set, implying that the Egyptians became divided into two sects, proponents and opponents of the Muslim Brothers, in the period after the first revolution. Before the first revolution, the Muslim Brothers were constantly curbed by the authorities, so they never appeared in the public nor did they aim for any political gains. However, with a Muslim Brother president coming to power in 2012, the supporters of the Muslim Brothers gained more power, both socially and politically,

gaining more supporters to their side, which resulted in a division between people who seek a moderate non-fundamentalist ruler, and those who believe in the idea of a fundamentalist Caliphate led by a Muslim Brother president.

Making promises is contrasted with breaking promises 5 times in the second set of articles published before the 2013 revolution and once in the first set published before the 2011 revolution. Before the first revolution, breaking promises was associated with the regime's frequent infringement of fair parliamentary elections as in:

هل تعهد النظام بعدم التزوير وحتى إذا تعهد بذلك فهل وفى النظام مرة واحدة بتعهداته؟

- Has the regime promised not to commit electoral fraud? And even if it has promised that, has the regime ever kept its promises before? (Why don't the Egyptians vote?)

Before the second revolution, the writer made it clear that President Morsi, and his Muslim Brotherhood organization, frequently made promises that they never kept:

خاب أمل المصريين عندما بدأ الرئيس يتصل من وعوده واحدا تلو الآخر، لا يتسع المجال هنا لاستعراض وعود مرسى الزائفة فقد تعود على أن يعد ولا يفى بوعوده وهو لا يخجل إطلاقاً من أن يقول شيئاً ويعمل عكسه

- The Egyptians were disappointed....when the president started to go back on his promises one by one; Morsi's fake promises are too many to be documented here. He has got used to making promises that he never keeps, and never feels ashamed to say something and do the opposite. (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?).



The writer in the above example made reference to the president's frequent breaking of promises as a way to stir the feelings of the resistance in the readers and to urge them to take an action because no matter how many promises the president made, he would break them all. He implied that people should no longer believe the president nor should they expect him to change the country's conditions to the better. The contrast between the president as a leader and as a follower was mentioned 3 times only in the second set of articles. Al Aswany believed that President Morsi was simply a follower of the Muslim Brotherhood organization, and did not have the power or the courage to act without their permission, which also strengthened the urge for resistance and change as the readers realized that their president was not powerful enough to rule.

In terms of the metafunctional approach, the stylistic analysis of Al Aswany's articles reveals that on the ideational level, the writer used more lexical terms related to corruption before the 2011 revolution to signify resistance ideologies against the regime's political corruption, favoring of the president's family members and acts of electoral fraud. However, in the articles written before the 2013 revolution, there were significantly higher instances of terms related to protest and violence, which strengthened the call for resistance by portraying the president and his Muslim Brother allies as brutal and blood thirsty. On the interpersonal level, the writer's style used in the first set of articles created a distance between him and the readers on one hand and between the readers (i.e. the Egyptian people) and people of other democratic nations on

the other. This was evident through the comparisons he made between Egypt and other democratic countries, and between his experiences in Egypt and his experiences in the United States. However, in the second set of articles, the writer made no such comparisons; instead he compared between what the Egyptians expected before the 2013 revolution and the disappointment they felt afterwards, involving himself more with the readers. On the textual level, the writer paid more attention to lexical items related to corruption in the first set of articles, and used more declarative statements to refer to people's discontentment with the practices of the political regime. Yet, in the second set of articles, he made more use of terms related to violence and protest, and he used more directive statements to urge the readers to act against the violence and brutality of the regime.

4.3. Transitivity

Transitivity is part of the ideational function of language showing the writer's view of the world (Halliday, 1985). Transitivity answers the question of what action takes place (event), who acts (actor) and who is acted upon (recipient). In stylistic analysis, as well as critical discourse analysis, transitivity aims at investigating the cultural, ideological and political factors that influence the way a process is expressed in a particular text (Fairclough, 1992). This section describes the main participants involved in political events in the articles published before each revolution in order to highlight the persons and entities responsible for or affected by such events. The following table represents the frequency of reference to the


Dr. Ingy Farouk  Art Magazine - Issue 40
 president, regime, authorities, Muslim Brothers and Egyptians
 as both actors and recipients.

Table 4 Participants as actors and recipients

Participant	Role	Number of occurrences before 2011 revolution	Number of occurrences before 2013 revolution
President (by title only)	actor	4	4
	recipient	3	3
President (by name only i.e., 'Mubarak, Morsi')	actor	0	00
	recipient	0	16
President by title and name (i.e., President Mubarak, President Morsi)	actor	4	1
	recipient	1	0
Regime	actor	15	1
	recipient	24	1
Authorities	actor	8	0
	recipient	2	0
Muslim Brothers	actor	5	53
	recipient	2	84
Egyptians	actor	16	21
	recipient	14	61

The above table shows that before the 2011 revolution, the president was referred to by title only 7 times, 4 as actor and 3 as recipient of actions, and he was referred to by both title and name (i.e., President Mubarak) 5 times, 4 as actor and 1 as recipient, but he was never referred to by name only (i.e., Mubarak) in the five selected articles written before the 2011 revolution. In the articles written before the 2013 revolution, however, the president was referred to by title only 7 times, 4 as actor and 3 as recipient, and he was referred to by both title and name (i.e., President Morsi) only once. However, in these articles, the president as participant in actions was referred to by name only (i.e., Morsi) 11 times, 10 as actor and 1 as recipient.

The Egyptian president was always referred to by title before the 2011 revolution, as a journalist was expected then to address the president in an appropriate way. However, after the 2011 revolution, the political atmosphere in Egypt witnessed a great change. Al Aswany stated in one of the articles investigated in this study that the 2011 revolution has erased fear for good (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?), implying that anyone can now criticize the president freely. In the articles before the 2011 revolution, the president was never referred to by the name only without the title. In the articles before the 2013 revolution, the president as participant was referred to by the name, without a title, 11 times, 55 as actor and 16 times as recipient, and was given the title 'president' only once. Though President Mubarak was never referred to by name only in the first set of articles, he was always referred to

by name only in the second set, which supports the view that the writer was likely to criticize presidents more openly after the 2011 revolution. By using names rather than titles, the writer aimed to reduce the gap between the president and himself, and was therefore able to confront him directly. This, in turn, implies to the readers that the president is a normal person that can be opposed and brought down if he fails to meet the necessary standards. It also implies the success of the first revolution in creating an atmosphere of freedom where people no longer fear the president or other political authorities.

In terms of transitivity, the president was seldom held responsible for or directly affected by actions before the first revolution. The writer avoided making direct reference to the president and preferred to refer more to the regime and authorities as agents. Even when the president was mentioned, he was referred to as actor in terms of his responsibility as president and as recipient in terms of his supporters' abuse of power in his name. The following examples show how Mubarak was referred to, first as actor and second as recipient.

ولما سأل الرئيس مبارك وزير الكهرباء عن السر في انقطاع التيار، ألقى بلومه على المصريين، لأنهم يسرفون في استعمال أجهزة التكييف

- When President Mubarak asked the Minister of Electricity about the reason behind the power cut, the latter blamed the Egyptians for misusing air conditioners (Remarks on Gamal Mubarak's Project).

روعه وهددوه بالحبس لأنه جرؤ على السؤال عن صحة الرئيس مبارك.

- They [the authorities] terrified him [Ibrahim Issa] and threatened to jail him because he dared to ask about President Mubarak's health (The destiny of Ibrahim Issa).

The above examples show that the corruption and injustice taking place before the 2011 revolution were attributed to the authorities and those in power, rather than to the president himself. The president was not directly referred to as the 'actor' responsible for oppressive practices.

However, in the articles written before the second revolution, the president was frequently held responsible for actions, most of which were related to violence and repression of Egyptians. He was to blame for the violence and practices igniting protest among Egyptians, which added to the reader's feeling of resentment towards the president's rule and strengthened the urge for resistance. In the same articles, the president was also referred to as recipient of actions in cases where the writer wanted to show that he was incompetent and easily manipulated by others, especially the United States and the Brotherhood organization that he belonged to. The following examples show how Morsi was referred to, first as actor and second as recipient of actions.

- بعد أن قتل مواطنيه يخرج علينا ميسي ليلقى بيانا عقيما ركيكا.... مههدا بالمزيد من القتل.

- Actor: After killing his citizens, Morsi comes out with a shallow statement... threatening to kill even more (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?).

- لكن الولايات المتحدة، فيما يبدو، ستظل تدعم مرسى حتى لو قتل المصريين جميعاً.

- Recipient: But it seems that the United States will keep backing Morsi even if he kills all Egyptians (When will Morsi leave?).

The word 'regime' was used 39 times (15 as actor and 24 as recipient) to refer to President Mubarak before the 2011 revolution, but was only used twice (once as actor and once as recipient) to refer to President Morsi before the 2013 revolution. Again this implies the writer refrained from directly criticizing the president in the first period, and tended to refer to him as a 'regime'. However, the fact that the writer very rarely used the word 'regime' with the second president not only shows that he now showed more freedom to criticize the president directly, but also implies that the writer did not acknowledge Morsi as a representative of a proper political regime. Al Aswany made several references in the second set of articles to Morsi's incompetence and his complete obedience to the Muslim Brothers organization, which makes him unlikely to represent a socially and politically acceptable regime.

The authorities were mentioned 10 times, 8 times as actor and 2 as recipient, in the first set of articles written before the 2011 revolution, whereas they were not referred to in the articles written before the second revolution. Instead of referring to authorities, the writer made frequent references to the Muslim Brothers. Muslim Brothers were mentioned 53 times as actor and 84 times as recipient in the second set of

articles, while they were only mentioned 5 times as actor and twice as recipient in the first set of articles written before the 2011 revolution. This implies that the writer viewed the Muslim Brothers as the only authority affecting the political life in Egypt during the reign of Morsi. It also shows that before the first revolution, the writer did not find the Muslim Brother's presence in Egypt of any important significance. The following are examples of reference to the Muslim Brothers as agents and actors responsible for violence before the 2013 revolution.

-الإسلام عند شباب الإخوان يتمثل في المرشد، سيؤيدونه بحماس لو قتل الشعب كله (ماذا نضع في الدم؟).

- The young (Muslim) Brothers will always support their leader (guide) even if he kills the whole population (What shall we do about blood?).

- لقد تفوق الإخوان المسلمون على إسرائيل في القتل لكن الفرق أن إسرائيل تقتل من تعتبرهم أعداء إرهابيين بينما مرسي يقتل مواطنين مصريين حثيرون منهم انتخبوه للرئاسة (لماذا يقتل مرسي المصريين؟).

- The Muslim Brothers have outperformed Israel in killing people, but the difference is that Israel kills what it considers terrorist enemies, but Morsi kills many Egyptian citizens, many of whom have elected him president (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?).

The above examples draw a detestable and bloody image for the Muslim Brothers, portraying them as the ultimate enemy of the Egyptian people, and the cause of all violence and destruction, which strengthens the readers' desire for political change and resistance of the regime.

There was also frequent reference to the Muslim Brothers as recipients of actions where the writer wanted to stress their incompetence and portray them as followers rather than leaders as is clear in the example below.

- الولايات المتحدة تدعم الإخوان لأن وجودهم في مصلحتها ومصالح إسرائيل.

- The United States is backing the Brothers because their presence serves American and Israeli interests (When will Morsi leave?).

As for Egyptians as participants, there was a significant increase in reference to them as both actors and recipients in the articles written before the second revolution. Reference to the Egyptians, and Egypt as representative of Egyptian people, occurred 30 times, 16 as actor and 14 as recipient, in the articles written before the first revolution, whereas they were mentioned 82 times, 21 as actor and 61 as recipient, in the articles written before the second revolution. In the first set of articles, the Egyptians were mostly referred to as passive people suffering from an unfair and corrupt regime. Examples include,

إن مشروع جمال مبارك يحمل في جوهره معنى واحدا: توريث مصر كأنها مزرعة أو عقار، هذا المعنى، بالإضافة إلى ما يحمله من إهانة بالغة للشعب المصري، يسير في عكس اتجاه المستقبل، ويقضى على كل أمل للمصريين في العدل والحرية

- Gamal Mubarak's project has one essential implication: that Egypt can be inherited as if it were a farm or a property. Besides the insult this implication represents to the Egyptian people, it seems to be going against the future and kills every hope of justice and freedom the Egyptians may have (Gamal Mubarak's Project).

There was one hopeful example, however, that showed Egypt as having the potential to change for the better, though there was no direct reference made to changing the president or the political system:

وأن تيار التغيير في مصر سينتصر بإذن الله لأنه يدافع عن الحق والعدل، بينما يدافع أتباع النظام عن الظلم والقمع والشر. مصر قد نهضت ولن يستطيع أحد، مهما يكن، أن يعطلها عن المستقبل.

- Change will prevail one day in Egypt, God willing, because it supports rights and justice, whereas the regime's followers support oppression, repression and evil. Egypt has risen and no one will ever be able to hold her back from the future (The destiny of Ibrahim Issa).

The portrayal of Egypt as a passive recipient of action, and as a farm that could be passed on as inheritance, reflects the writer's attitude towards the political situation before the first revolution and implies that he felt pessimistic about the overall situation. It also shows that he called for change and resistance implicitly by raising people's awareness of the humiliating future they could face.

The second set of articles written before the second revolution describes the Egyptians as more active participants or agents who are capable of changing any undesirable conditions in their country. Examples from these articles include,

- إن المصريين قاموا بثورة قدموا خلالها آلاف الشهداء وعشرات الألوف من المصابين، ولا يمكن بعد كل ذلك أن يقبلوا استبدال ديكتاتور بأخر... الثورة بددت الخوف إلى الأبد. المصريون مهما قتلهم مرسى لن يذعنوا ولن يخافوا.

- The Egyptians have ignited a revolution in which they sacrificed thousands of martyrs and left tens of thousands wounded, and there is no way they can accept the replacement of a dictator by another... The revolution has erased fear for good. No matter how many of them Morsi kills, the Egyptians shall not succumb nor shall they fear (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?)

The articles written before the second revolution also show a significant increase in reference to the Egyptians as recipients of actions, especially actions related to violence and repression. This is intended to alert the readers and arouse their feelings of resentment towards a regime that would go as far as killing the Egyptians to silence them. Examples of reference to the Egyptians as recipients include the following:

مرسى يقتل المصريين على أمل إدخالهم في حظيرة الإخوان التي عاش
عمره فيها لكن الثورة بددت الخوف إلى الأبد.

- Morsi is killing the Egyptians hoping to lead them into the Muslim Brotherhood barn where he had spent his entire life, but the revolution has erased fear for good (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?)

In terms of the functional analysis of transitivity, the ideational metafunction of the selected texts represents the writer's ideologies about the chief participants on the political scene in Egypt before and after the 2011 revolution. The writer avoided directly criticizing the president and attributed most actions related to political corruption to the regime and authorities before the 2011 revolution, while he laid the blame mainly on the president and his political group for the violence

and oppressive practices taking place before the 2013 revolution. Transitivity, in this way, serves the purpose of foregrounding an ideological enemy as agent in an active process of violence (Bazzi, 2009), the matter which adds to the readers' feelings of resentment and resistance to the president and the whole political group he belongs to. In terms of the interpersonal metafunction, the writer implied in the first set of articles that the relationship between the Egyptians and the ruler was one of subjugation, where the Egyptians were likely to suffer the humility and oppression of the president and his supporters. However, the writer's portrayal of the relationship between the ruler and the people in the second set of articles showed more confidence in the Egyptians' potentials and ability to resist the oppressive practices of the ruler and his group. This was made clear in the writer's choice of linguistic patterns, which is also related to the textual metafunction of the articles' discourse. The writer always referred to the president before the first revolution by the title *President*, and did not make direct reference to him as the one responsible for the corruption taking place in Egypt during his rule. However, in the articles written before the second revolution, the writer chose to address the president by name without any titles to imply that the president was now on equal level with both the writer and the reader. The president was also shown to be responsible for most of the violence and oppressive practices taking place at the time, which all added to increasing the feeling of resistance among the readers, and urged them to take action against the president and his group.



4.4. Metaphors

Figurative language in Al Aswany's articles is examined in terms of the metaphors used, which aims at influencing the reader's view through the analogies the writer makes between existing realities and repelling images that serve the purpose of arousing the reader's feelings of resentment and resistance. Analogies or comparisons play an important role in shaping the reader's mental perception of ideas by fostering the development and acquisition of relational concepts (Gentner, 2003). The metaphors discussed in this section are those that occurred two or more times in either of the two sets of articles. The following table shows the number of occurrences of these metaphors in the articles written before the 2011 revolution and those written before the 2013 revolution.

Table 5 Metaphors

Metaphor	Number of occurrences before 2011 revolution	Number of occurrences before 2013 revolution
Acting	6	2
farm	6	3
Tools of destruction	0	5
Tools of corruption	4	0
Staircase	0	4
Hands stained with blood	0	3
Darkness of future	2	1

The tables above shows that the metaphors related to acting, i.e. comparing political practices to theatrical acting, were used 6 times in the first set of articles and 2 times in the second. In

the first set of articles, the practices of the president and authorities were compared to theatrical performances that are meant to fool people. The comparison here aims to urge people to resist and reject the regime's attempts to deceive them. Following is an example of using the theatrical or acting metaphor.

- عندما تحدث في مصر انتخابات حقيقية سنشارك فيها جميعا أما الآن فلنتركهم يلعبون مسرحيتهم السخيفة المملة وحدهم (لماذا لا يذهب المصريون للانتخابات؟).

- When we have real elections in our country, we will all participate, but now, let them perform their ridiculous boring play alone (Why don't the Egyptians vote?)

Here, the writer uses the theatre metaphor to arouse the readers' resentment of the practices of the political regime, comparing the regime's manipulation of elections to the performance of a ridiculous play and setting a contrast between the reality that the readers seek in having 'real elections' and the illusion the political regime is creating. This helps in triggering the feeling of resistance against the political regime and its deceptive means of keeping in power through faulty elections.

The metaphor of acting was used twice in the second set of articles to compare the exposure of the president's true nature to the understanding of a scene that has been unraveled as is shown in the following example.

- المشهد في مصر الآن واضح. مصر تحكمها جماعة فاشية وصلت إلى السلطة بالانتخابات، لكنها قررت أن تستعمل الديمقراطية كأنها سلم خشبي

تصعد عليه إلى الحكم، ثم تركله بعيدا حتى لا يصعد عليه سواها (لماذا يقتل
مرسي المصريين؟).

- The scene is now clear. Egypt is being ruled by a fascist group that has obtained power through elections, but has decided to use democracy as a wooden ladder to rise to presidency then kick it away so that no one else can climb it (Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?)

Here, the writer attempted to show the readers that the president, and the Muslim Brothers organization that he belonged to, were not worthy of the power they possess, and that the people should be aware of their true nature that started to be uncovered after they reached power. The word 'scene' in the above example not only alludes to theatrical performances representing unreal fake situations, but also implies that the political situation is now clear, just like a scene that is being unraveled, allowing the audience to understand the message behind the theatrical performance. This creates a feeling of resistance against the political regime as the readers feel that they are now being illuminated and informed of the deceptive nature of their leaders.

Metaphors comparing Egypt to a farm were used 6 times in the first set of articles and 3 times in the second. It is worth noting that in the first articles, the Egyptian people in general were compared to domestic animals through using the imagery of a farm to show their subordination to the political regime. This serves the idea of arousing people's awareness of the danger of subordination to the ruler and his regime as is shown in the following example.

A Stylistic Analysis of the Language

إن مشروع جمال مبارك يحمل في جوهره معنى واحداً: توريث مصر كأنها مزرعة أو عقار، هذا المعنى، بالإضافة إلى ما يحمله من إهانة بالغة للشعب المصري، يسير في عكس اتجاه المستقبل، ويقضى على كل أمل للمصريين في العدل والحرية (مشروع جمال مبارك).

- Gamal Mubarak's project has one essential implication: that Egypt can be inherited as if it were a farm or a property. Besides the insult this implication represents to the Egyptian people, it seems to be going against the future and kills every hope of justice and freedom the Egyptians may have (Gamal Mubarak's Project).

The above example implies that the president's political regime regards Egypt as a 'property' that can be inherited and the Egyptians as submissive followers who can easily be manipulated. This imagery serves to stir the readers' anger so they can stand up to their oppressors and refuse such a humiliating situation.

In the second set of articles, the writer used the metaphor of the farm to warn the readers against the possibility of the new regime curbing them once more after they have set themselves free. He also uses the farm imagery to imply that Morsi's government perceived the Egyptian citizens as subordinate beings, and to refer to the brutal killing of the protesters.

- مرسى يقتل المصريين على أمل إدخالهم في حظيرة الإخوان التي عاش عمره فيها لكن الثورة بددت الخوف إلى الأبد (لماذا يقتل مرسى المصريين؟).

- Morsi is killing the Egyptians hoping to lead them into the Muslim Brotherhood barn where he had spent his

Dr. Ingy Farouk  Art Magazine - Issue 40
entire life, but the revolution has erased fear for good
(Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians?)

In the first set of articles, the writer used the imagery of the farm to arouse the readers' feelings of resentment, yet he left it for them to decide whether they would accept such humiliation or rise against it. However, in the second set of articles, he used the farm imagery to imply that though the political regime wanted the people to be as obedient and subordinate as domestic animals, the Egyptians would not allow that. The writer now laid more emphasis on the power of the Egyptians who had erased all fear with the revolution they carried out in 2011: "the revolution has erased fear for good."

Other imagery used includes tools of destruction and corruption, staircases, hands stained with blood and darkness. The president and authorities were directly compared to tools of destruction 5 times in the second set only, which implies the Muslim Brothers' violence as a fundamental extremist group and serves to arouse the reader's repulsion for their rule. The president and authorities were alluded to as tools of corruption 4 times in the first set only, which implies that the main reason for rejecting their rule was the corruption of President Mubarak and his ruling party. Here, the writer made several references to corrupt politicians and businessmen to arouse the reader's resentment against the whole regime.

The staircase metaphor occurred 4 times in the second set of articles only, mainly to refer to the Muslim Brothers using presidency to rise to power and achieve their ambitions. The

metaphor of hands stained with blood was used 3 times in the second set of articles only to refer to the president's responsibility for the crimes committed against the Egyptian citizens, and to stress the idea that the Muslim Brothers are a fundamentalist, extremist and violent group. The future of the country was compared to darkness 2 times in the first set and one time in the second, which implies more hope in the future of Egypt after the success of the first revolution.

Metaphors, as shown above, provide a way of perceiving and interpreting the world, which makes it an important tool of discourse analysis (Guo, 2013). Metaphors also help shape the understanding of one's physical, social and inner world through mapping conceptual structures from a relatively familiar experiential source domain onto a more abstract target domain (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). In Al Aswany's articles, the metaphors used before the 2011 revolution served to arouse the readers' resentment to the regime through focusing on humiliating images like comparing the political scene to a theatrical farce and comparing the Egyptians to helpless animals. On the other hand, the metaphors used before the 2013 revolution focused more on bloody and violent images, which aimed to arouse the readers' contempt towards the president and his group and to urge them to seek political reform. In terms of the metafunctional approach, the analysis of the ideational metafunction of the articles shows that the writer's ideologies in the first set of articles represented the political regime as corrupt and manipulative and the Egyptian people as submissive. In the second set of articles, however, the metaphors used stressed the brutality of the regime and the



inevitability of an uprising on part of the Egyptians. On the interpersonal level, the articles written before the second revolution created more distance between the readers and the violent oppressive political regime by portraying repulsive images of the regime's practices against the people. The analysis of the textual metafunction of the articles shows that the lexical choices and metaphors used in the first set of articles were related to corruption and fake performances, while those used in the second set of articles were related to violence, destruction and deception, the matter which intensified the call for resistance.

The analysis of the linguistic devices used in this paper aims at describing the writer's presentation of resistance ideologies through discourse. Like critical discourse analysis, stylistic analysis achieves its aims by clarifying aspects of ideology that may be hidden by the use of words. It investigates meaning through deconstruction or breaking discourse down into parts by analyzing the grammar and word choice in a way that reveals the underlying ideological associations and implications (Bloor & Bloor, 2007). The first question the present study attempts to address is 'which linguistic devices reflect the writer's ideologies?' The writer makes his ideologies clear through the use of personal pronouns, lexicalization, transitivity and metaphor as mentioned above. The detailed analysis of these linguistic devices addresses the second question, which is, what are the ideational, relational and textual functions of the language patterns used in Al Aswany articles to indicate resistance? The analysis shows how Al Aswany revealed the incompetence of each political regime,

A Stylistic Analysis of the Language

stressing political and social corruption in the articles written before the first revolution and violence and destruction in the ones written before the second revolution. He also showed more involvement with the readers and portrayed himself as being on equal footing with them in their call for resistance in the second set of articles, in contrast to his self-portrayal as a superior enlightened scientist and writer in the articles written before the first revolution.

The stylistic analysis of the discourse of Al Aswany's articles also addresses the third question posed by this paper: that is, what are the stylistic differences between the articles written before the 2011 revolution and those written before the 2013 revolution? The analysis reveals that the writer's style before the 2011 revolution showed more indirect allusions to revolution against the political regime and made indirect calls for resistance through the use of comparisons between the undemocratic atmosphere in Egypt and the democracy experienced in countries such as the United States, and through portraying the Egyptians as submissive beings who are manipulated by those in power. However, in the articles written before the 2013 revolution, the writer made more direct calls for resistance, and urged the readers to revolt against their oppressive leaders through the use of directive statements, and through stirring the readers' repulsion against the destructive and violent practices of the political regime. The shift in the writer's style in the second set of articles also shows a shift of his ideology in relation to power. Before the 2011 Revolution, he saw more power in other democratic nations, especially the United States which he frequently described as a democratic

civilized country that Egypt should look up to. After 2011, he saw more power in the Egyptians themselves, and his articles focused more on Egypt's internal affairs.

Conclusion

The above stylistic analysis of Al Aswany's articles before the two Egyptian revolutions of 2011 and 2013 shows how a writer's use of certain lexical and linguistic devices may trigger attitudes of resistance against oppressive practices of political regimes. The linguistic devices and figurative language used imply the writer's own resistance of the two political regimes and arouse the reader's feelings of resentment and resistance against them. The above analysis of the articles also reveals the writer's political and social ideologies reflecting his resentment of the passivity of the Egyptian citizens before the first revolution and his appreciation of their potentials after their success in achieving political change with the overthrow of the president in 2011. In terms of Halliday's metafunctional approach, the ideational analysis of Al Aswany's articles shows a shift in the writer's ideologies and experiences of the world in the second set of articles as he showed more belief in the Egyptians' ability to rise against oppression and attain political and social reform after the success of the 2011 revolution. The interpersonal analysis of the articles shows more involvement with the readers in the articles written before the second revolution where the writer portrayed himself as being on equal footing with the readers rather than being superior to them as was shown before the first revolution through his repetitive references to his achievements abroad. The textual analysis shows that the linguistic devices and

A Stylistic Analysis of the Language

imagery used served the purpose of arousing resistance in both sets of articles, with more inclination toward direct calls for revolution against the destructive and violent practices of the political regime in the articles written before the second revolution. The stylistic analysis presented in this paper also displays power ideologies underlying the writer's discourse, which emphasizes the shift of power from authoritative political regimes to the hands of the people. In an attempt to describe the power of discourse to achieve social and political change, stylistic analysis thus proves to be an effective means of portraying social identities and advocating political ideologies of resistance.

References

Allan, S. (2004) *News Culture*. New York: Open University Press.

Al Aswany, A. (2010, August 24). Remarks on Gamal Mubarak's project. *Al Shorouk*. Retrieved from

<http://www.shorouknews.com>

Al Aswany, A. (2010, August 31). Why don't the Egyptians vote? *Al Shorouk*. Retrieved from

<http://www.shorouknews.com>

Al Aswany, A. (2010, September 21). Have all university professors become hypocrites? *Al Shorouk*.

Retrieved from <http://www.shorouknews.com>

Al Aswany, A. (2010, October 12). The destiny of Ibrahim Issa. *Al Shorouk*. Retrieved from

<http://www.shorouknews.com>

Al Aswany, A. (2010, October 19). This is why they progress and we deteriorate. *Al Shorouk*. Retrieved from

<http://www.shorouknews.com>

Al Aswany, A. (2013, January 28). Why does Morsi kill the Egyptians? *Al Masry Al Youm*. Retrieved from

<http://www.almasryalyoum.com>

Al Aswany, A. (2013, February 2). What shall we do about blood? *Al Masry Al Youm*. Retrieved from

<http://www.almasryalyoum.com>

Al Aswany, A. (2013, March 11). When will Morsi leave? *Al Masry Al Youm*. Retrieved from

<http://www.almasryalyoum.com>

Al Aswany, A. (2013, June 3). How do we get rid of fascism? *Al Masry Al Youm*. Retrieved from

<http://www.almasryalyoum.com>

Al Aswany, A. (2013, June 24). Explode.. or die. *Al Masry Al Youm*. Retrieved from

<http://www.almasryalyoum.com>

Bayram, F. (2010). "Ideology and political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of Erdogan's political speech. *ARECLS*, 7, 23-40.

Bazzi, S. (2009). *Arab News and Conflict: A multidisciplinary study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins & Co.

http://research.ncl.ac.uk/ARECLS/volume7/bayram_vol7.pdf

Bello, U. (2013). If I could make it, you too can make it! Personal pronouns in political discourse : A CDA of President Jonathan's presidential declaration speech.

International Journal of English Linguistics, 3 (6), 84-96.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v3n6p84>

Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. (2007). *The practice of critical discourse analysis: An introduction*.

London: Hodder Arnold.

Bramley, N. R. (2001). *Pronouns of politics: The use of pronouns in the construction of 'Self' and 'Other' in political interviews*. (Doctoral thesis,

Australian National University, Australia). Retrieved from

<https://digitalcollections.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/46225/5/01front.pdf>

Carter, R., 2010. Methodologies for stylistic analysis: Practices and pedagogies. In D. McIntyre and B. Busse, eds.

Language and style. London: Palgrave, 55-68.

Chilton, P. (1996). *Security metaphors: Cold War discourse from containment to Common House*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Cruse, D. Alan. (1986). *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1989). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, M. (2013). *Oppositions and Ideology in News Discourse*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. London: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis: An overview, in T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G. & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London, Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1996). *Linguistic criticism*. 2nd edition. London: Oxford University Press.
- Guo, S. (2013). Metaphor Studies from the Perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis: A Case Study of Business Acquisition. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3 (3), 475-481. Retrieved from <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/tpls/article/view/tpls0303475481>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.

- Halliday, M. A. K. (1990). New Ways of Meaning: A Challenge to Applied Linguistics. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6, 7-36.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. 2nd edition. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hoy, D. C. (1999). Critical Resistance: Foucault and Bourdieu: Perspectives on embodiment.
The intersections of nature and culture, 3-21.
- Jorgensen, P. & Philips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.
- Kaminski, M. (2011). The face of Egypt's uprising. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from
<http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748703385404576258603352822070>
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Musolf, A. (2004). *Metaphor and Political Discourse, Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Nelson, T., Clawson, R. and Oxley, Z.M. (1997). Media framing of a civil liberties conflict and its effect on tolerance. *The American political science review*, 9, 567-583.
- Oyeleye, A.L. & Hunjo, H.J. (2013). A critical discourse review of resistance consciousness in the language and ideology of social change project in Wole

Soyinka's political discourse. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 3, 82-97.

Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v3n2p82>.

Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis*. London: Bloombury.

Revolution. (2016). In *Merriam Webster Online Dictionary*.

Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com>

Rose, J. (2014). *The new racism in the media: A discourse analysis of newspaper commentary*

on race, presidential politics, and welfare reform. (

Master's thesis, Georgia State University): Retrieved

from http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/sociology_theses/51

Ruiz, J. (2009). Sociological discourse analysis: methods and logic. *Qualitative Social*

Research, 10(2), Art. 26. Retrieved from [http://nbn-](http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0902263)

[resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0902263](http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0902263)

Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Shen, D. (2002). Reconsideration on functional stylistics.

Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 34(3), 188-193.

Short, M. (1990). Discourse analysis in stylistics and literature instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*,

11, 181-195.

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A resource book for students*.

London: Routledge.

Thornborrow, J. (1993). Metaphor of Security: A comparison of representation in the defence discourse in

post Cold War France and Britain. *Discourse and Society*, 4 (1), 99-119.

- Valentino, N. (1999). Crime news and the priming of racial attitudes during evaluations of the President. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 63(3), 293-320.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1991) *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 249-283. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1995. Discourse Semantics and Ideology. *Discourse and Society*, 6 (2), 243-289.
- Van Dijk, T. A. & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: An interdisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis, in D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin and H. Hamilton (eds), *Handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Political discourse and political cognition. In P. Chilton, & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as talk and text* (pp. 203-238). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, B.V.
- Wenden, A.L. (2005). The politics of representations: A critical discourse analysis of an Aljazeera special report. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 10 (2), 89-112.
- Williamson, V., Skocpol, T. & Coggin, J. (2011). The tea party and the remaking of

Dr. Ingy Farouk  Art Magazine - Issue 40
republican conservatism. *Perspectives on Politics*, 9, 5-
43.

Wodak, R. (2005). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse
Analysis Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*.
Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

Zhang, D. L. (2005). *Function and style of language*. Beijing:
Higher Education Press.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27