

## **Critical Discourse Analysis in the Libyan President Al Ghaddafi's Last Speech on 22\ 02\ 2011 during the Libyan Uprising.**

Lutfi Mohammed Alhemmaid Alwash <sup>1</sup>, Mohd Azidan Abdul Jabar <sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Alif Redzuan Abdullah, PhD <sup>2</sup>, Vahid NimehchiSalem PhD <sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> PhD student under the discourse studies, Department of Foreign Languages. At Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

<sup>2</sup> Department of Foreign Languages. A Professor in Discourse Studies, Arabic Language and Applied Linguistics at Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. azid@upm.edu.my. muhammadalif@upm.edu.my

<sup>3</sup> An associate professor at the Department of English at the Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. vahid@upm.edu.my

\* Corresponding author: gs55582@student.upm.edu.my

### **Abstract**

This study is expected to shed light on the further clarification of figurative language use and complement the research of social practices effects of discourse. It is expected to provide more information about the vocabulary and structural sets from the perspective of lexical and grammatical signals in the language of leaders. All that shall a coherent theoretical framework for CDA and metaphor. Most of Al Ghaddafi speeches were in

Manuscript Received Date: 08/08/21

Manuscript Acceptance Date:  
10/09/21

Manuscript Published Date:  
24/09/21

©The Author(s) (2021). Published by USIM Press on behalf of the Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact [usimpress@usim.edu.my](mailto:usimpress@usim.edu.my)

DOI: 10.33102/uij.vol33no2.263



Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia  
[uijournal.usim.edu.my](http://uijournal.usim.edu.my)

vernacular language not in classical Arabic language because of his origins. Under the scope of CDA by applying the Fairclough 3D model. The objective of the study was to identify and analyze the overuse of figurative language in Al Ghaddafi speech that produced opposite results, from gaining support to gaining failure of his rule, this shall be by categorizing the themes in their social and cultural contexts, with a focus on the metaphor's lexicon used in his last speech. CDA is an approach to language analysis that is concerned with issues of language, power and ideology. The figurative language is a useful tool in conveying messages to the audience when used in the specific purpose of speech in a balance but if used heavily it will give the opposite of what was hoped for, and this can be very clear evidence for all when we read what had happened and the results gained by Al Ghaddafi from his speech in the next few days after this horrible and terrifying speech.

**Keywords:** *Al-Ghaddafi, figurative language, arabic lexicon, vernacular language, CDA, metaphor*

## 1. Introduction

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) explores the role of discourse structures in constituting social inequality. Metaphorical structure, however, has received relatively little attention in explicit CDA. The paper aims to readdress this by developing Bedouin area and the majority of his audience were ordinary people who were not educated in classical Arabic. Therefore, this study will be focusing on metaphor and the semantic phenomena that were employed in the speech of the Former Libyan President Al Ghaddafi in his last speech using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).

What the over-use of figurative language may add to speech intentions? and what it added to the speech-language of Al Ghaddafi's discourse in his final speech? In this study, Al Ghaddafi discourse is analyzed from a linguistic point of view. It is an exercise on how language is used tactfully to arrive at the intended goals of the speaker. The study seeks to analyze an authentic Vernacular Arabic-language text using the CDA approach as presented in Norman Fairclough's 1992 publication *Discourse and Social Change*. The analysis will examine the structure, the substance as well as language of Al Ghaddafi's speech. Several levels will be observed: semantic macrostructures (topics), local meanings and lexical style in order to explain to what extent the speaker's ideologies are reflected in their linguistic choices.

### 1.1- Statement of the Problem

Ludwig (1951) An Austrian professor of philosophy, founder of logical positivist philosophy, student of the philosopher Russell, and the philosopher most interested in the philosophy of language, language is the paved road to knowledge as a means of forming meaning in discourse, and philosophical problems are necessarily due to problems in language, so he believes that "everything happens within language "He likened language to a game, as it consists of a set of rules that the player must understand well in order to be

able to use them.". Divide language into two levels, one for use, the other for understanding, and the task of the philosopher to differentiate between them. He was famous for the phrase "the word does not carry the meaning; we charge it." And the phrase "intelligence is never artificial." His well-known book "Philosophical Investigations", which was published after his death, was chosen as the most important book of the twentieth century, and this selection was made by American universities in 1999. He wrote a very good book called "In Certainty". One of the most famous of his rule What you cannot say clearly should be tolerated.

As a revolutionary leader of the Jamahiriya, Al Ghaddafi, ruled the country for over four decades until the dramatic end of his regime in 2011. Throughout the period, he acted as if he had no real power within the formal structures of the government; however, in reality, he had consolidated all the power in himself, by creating different security and intelligence organizations that were directly accountable to him. In regards to the place in which Al Ghaddafi delivered his speech; he chooses a popular landmark in Libya called The House of Resistance. This was Al Ghaddafi's presidential palace, and was bombed by the United States Air Forces in 1986. Thus, Al Ghaddafi's choice of this landmark was mainly to send a message of resistance and defiance. In retrospect, it is undoubtedly clear that Al Ghaddafi's choices were intentionally taken to emphasize his defiance and resistance, hatred for western aggression, and utter love and respect for Libya and Libyan tribes. Al Ghaddafi's exaggerated body language and fiery attitude was an effective communication tool that reflected his views, his state of mind and the current circumstances he was enduring. He was slamming the stage repeatedly, leaping forward at each time he raised his voice to emphasize a point, and most importantly, using his fist, waving it up in the air or slamming it hard on the podium. In addition, there were other apparent body gestures such as finger-pointing, which is considered very rude and a sign of threatening in the Arab region. Al Ghaddafi's started pointing his finger when he sounded fiery as well as when he was demanding that Libyans go out on the streets to clean Libya.

Many studies conducted (Chorine, 2008; Gelvin, 2009) on Arab Spring leaders are on media coverage and politics, it would be interesting to carry out further research in areas beyond the newspapers (Abeed, 2017) such as CDA on Al-Gaddafi speeches. (Gulam, 2010; Berween, 2003; Yahaya, 2020; Alduhaim, 2019; Almajali 2015) All of those mentioned here had done different studies about AL Ghaddafi regime, politics or character but none in metaphor or figurative metaphor found in Al Ghaddafi last speech under the scope of CDA.

Here an attempt is made to study the language of discourses for him. This study shall be the first of its kind in studying the effects of using the metaphor of AL Ghaddafi's last speech on the 22nd of February only at seven days of the revolution sparked on Libya against him and his regime. All that shall be under the scope of CDA by applying the Fairclough 3D model.

## **1.2- Significance of the Study**

The study will contribute to the work of uncovering the figurative language inside Al-Gaddafi speech under the scope of CDA studies in general and narrowing the effect of the

language on addressees by bringing awareness that language plays a crucial role in policies. This analysis will also add to the body of knowledge by analyzing the Ghaddafi speeches that contain indicators of the power of language in discourse studies and the contemporary notion of figurative metaphors which relates to identifying the lexical in AL Ghaddafi speech indicating metaphors.

This study is expected to shed light on the further clarification of figurative language use and complement the research of social practices effects of discourse. It is expected to provide more information about the vocabulary and structural sets from the perspective of lexical and grammatical signals in the language of leaders.

### **1.3- Research objectives**

The objective of the study was to identify and analyze the over-use of figurative language in Al Ghaddafi speech that produced opposite results, from gaining support to gaining failure of his rule, this shall be by categorizing the themes in their social and cultural contexts, with a focus on the metaphor's lexicon used in his last speech.

## **2-Methodology**

### **2.1- Theoretical Framework**

CDA is based on Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (Fairclough, 1992, Fairclough, 1999) and the Critical Linguistics approach which stemmed from the work led by Roger Fowler at the University of East Anglia in the 1970's. Both Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics and Critical Linguistics rejected two widespread notions in linguistics at that time: the treatment of language systems as autonomous and independent of the use of language, and the separation of meaning from style or expression (Fairclough, 1992).

CDA is an approach to language analysis that is concerned with issues of language, power and ideology. CDA is neither a homogenous model nor a school or a paradigm, but mostly a shared perspective on doing linguistics, semiotic or discourse analysis (van Dijk, 1993). Being an interdisciplinary approach to discourse, it does not consider language as independent from social studies; rather, it focuses on language as a form of social practice (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). The aim of CDA is to perceive language use as social practice. Language users do not function in isolation; rather they function in a set of cultural, social and psychological frameworks. CDA explores not only the connections between textual structures but also the links between textual structures and their function in interaction with society.

Therefore, it could be assumed that the one element of CDA which differentiates it from other forms of DA exists in its attribute of "critical". "Critical" implies showing connections and causes which are hidden (Fairclough, 1992). It is important to expose the

hidden things since these are not evident for the individuals involved; hence, they cannot be fought against.

## **2.2- Fairclough Three Dimensions Modal.**

According to Fairclough, one of the prominent theoreticians who contributed many articles and books that establish CDA as a field of research, there are three levels of discourse: firstly, social conditions of production and interpretation, i.e. the social factors that led or contributed to the origination of a text and, at the same time, would affect the interpretation of the text; Secondly, the process of production and interpretation, i.e. in what way the text was produced and how this affects interpretation; thirdly, the text which is the product of the first two stages. The analysis of a specific discourse requires analysis in each of these three dimensions and their interrelations. It is hypothesized that significant connections exist between features of texts, ways in which texts are put together and interpreted and the nature of the social practice. In other words, when we interpret a text, we should analyze and understand the social and discourse practices to reach a full understanding of the analyzed text. CDA is essential in analyzing political texts. When we conduct CDA, it is important to understand the social and historical factors around the text production (van Dijk, 1995). This paves the way for a better understanding of the analyzed text.

In accordance with these three levels of discourse, Fairclough presents three stages of CDA:

- Description which is the stage concerned with the formal properties of the text.
- Interpretation which is the stage concerned with the relationship between text and interaction- with seeing the text as a process of production and as a resource in the process of interpretation.
- Explanation which is the stage concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context- with the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation and their social effect.

Though Fairclough supported the ideas of Critical Linguistics, he felt that they did not go far enough. He believed that Critical Linguistics focused exclusively on the text as a product and excluded how these texts are produced or how they may be interpreted. Fairclough believes that it is equally essential for us to understand the processes of text production and interpretation.

We must also understand the social context in which all these processes occur: "CDA gives attention to the dynamic interplay between text production, the text itself, and text interpretation or consumption" (Fairclough, 1992, p. 5). Fairclough calls this multidimensional approach his 'social theory of discourse'. He called for greater critical analysis of all forms of discourse.

This can be represented diagrammatically as follows:



(Reproduced from Fairclough, 1992, p. 73)

Fairclough describes this framework as “an attempt to bring together three analytical traditions, each of which is indispensable for discourse analysis”. These analytical traditions are:

- The tradition of close textual and linguistic analysis within linguistics
- The macro-sociological tradition of analyzing social practice in relation to social structures.
- The interpretive or micro sociological tradition of seeing social practice as something which people actively produce and make sense of on the basis of shared commonsense procedures (adapted from Fairclough, 1992, p. 72).

Since the three dimensions of this framework considerably overlap in reality, Fairclough (1992) anticipates a number of problems. One problem is the designation of analytical topics as one or the other. This would be largely imprecise. Another problem is the overwhelming number of textual features that are worthy of inclusion in any critical discourse analysis.

### 2.3- What is figurative language?

Figurative language serves as an excellent communication tool and is something we encounter daily that helps us convey complex descriptions or emotions quickly and effectively. Also referred to as "figures of speech," figurative language can be utilized to persuade, engage and connect with an audience and amplify your intended message. Implementing figurative language takes some careful thought and close observations to successfully convey your intended meaning. Figurative language is the use of descriptive words, phrases and sentences to convey a message that means something without directly saying it. Its creative wording is used to build imagery to deepen the audience's understanding and help provide power to words by using different emotional, visual and sensory connections.

### 2.4- How is figurative language used?

Figurative language is used in both literature and poetry to create layers of meaning accessible to the reader through the senses, symbolism, and sound systems. Figurative language makes the reader more in-depth on the topic of the work, without the author having to explicitly place the characteristic of the reader. It is a way for the reader to enter words with their minds and emotions, rather than just understanding a story or poem. The metaphorical language encourages the reader to make connections with the characters, the plot, and the deeper message of the work that creates the most memorable experience for the reader. There are several types of figurative language, but the most common are: 1- simile 2- A false similarity 3- embodiment 4- Symbolism 5- hyperbole 6- Photographer 7- Sophistry - contradictory speech 8- The paradox 9- Voice Simulation 10- Mono quote. Additionally, allusions and paradoxes are also common types of figurative language.

Metaphor is an idiomatical language and a rhetoric. The language that lifts a thing and its transformation from one place to another, such as saying: I borrowed something from so-and-so, that is, I transferred it from his hand to mine, as for idiomatically, it is one of the sciences of rhetoric related to the science of rhetoric, one of the branches of rhetoric science, which was defined by many writers and rhetoricians. Statements regarding what is related to it are summarized in that it is the use of a word or meaning other than what it was placed in or it came to him because there is a similarity between the two words.

## 2.5- What Is a Metaphor?

A metaphor (from the Greek “metaphorá”) is a figure of speech that directly compares one thing to another for rhetorical effect. While the most common metaphors use the structure “X is Y,” the term “metaphor” itself is broad and can sometimes be used to include other literary terms, like similes. There are countless ways of looking at metaphors, thinking about them, and using them. There are countless ways of looking at metaphors, thinking about them, and using them. But in deference to the metaphorical blackbirds of Wallace Stevens (“The blackbird whirled in the autumn winds. /It was a small part of the pantomime”), here are a few of them.

There are a few different types of metaphor, each serving a different purpose. A standard metaphor is one that compares two unlike things using the basic construction X is Y. Shakespeare’s line “All the world’s a stage” is a standard metaphor. Implied. An implied metaphor is a type of metaphor that compares two things that are not alike without actually mentioning one of those things. For example, “A woman barked a warning at her child.” Here, the implied metaphor compares a woman to a dog, without actually mentioning the dog. Visual. A visual metaphor compares one thing to a visual image that suggests an association. Visual metaphors are commonly used in advertising—for example, a car manufacturer picturing their latest sports car alongside an image of a panther. The metaphor is used to suggest the car is as slick, fast, and cool as the wild animal. Extended. An extended metaphor is a version of a metaphor that extends over the course of multiple lines, paragraphs, or stanzas of prose or poetry. Extended metaphors build upon simple metaphors with figurative language and more varied, descriptive comparisons.

## 2.6- Metaphor and political speeches

Metaphors have an impact on cognitive perception while at the same time even native speakers do not always realize the presence of metaphor in a speech or text. The sum of these two valuable features results in its power to influence people's opinions or thoughts and alter their vision of the world. Since politics are closely connected with ideology, metaphors share a great deal in influencing people's political convictions (Lesz, 2011: 21). In metaphor, the associations made between the focus and the frame can be very direct and easy, but they can also be very intricate and powerful in affecting people's attitudes. In organizing our perception of a certain issue, the metaphor suggests a point of view on this issue and thus creates a context for dealing with it (Burkholder & Henry, 2009: 100). In this way, metaphor is able to affect the policy convictions of individuals, but also of complete nations (Burkholder & Henry, 2009: 111). It would not be an exaggeration to say that in the future hall of shame that Al Ghaddafi name would surely make the top ten list of dreaded dictators that sojourned this earth. Names like Benito Mussolini of Italy, Saddam Hussein of Iraq, Emperor Hiro Hito of Japan, Adolph Hitler of Germany, Joseph Stalin of USSR, Idi Amin of Uganda, Sani Abacha of Nigeria, etc. would also make the top ten list. And finally, we should not see the reign of Ghaddafi as beneficial to mankind.

Thousands of political vocabularies and phrases can be found in lexicons, one of the phrases that continues to excite the audience is *Algerdan* "Rats". the killing of Al Ghaddafi Libya was linked with the phrase. When the widely publicized uprising in Libya against the tyrannical government of the late Gaddafi was at its apogee, Al Ghaddafi, in his unflappable mannerism, for the umpteenth time called the people that took their protests to the streets and squares. He once issued a command that his loyalists should kill the Rats (the protesters) without fear or kindness, screaming that the Rats should be killed. It is the height of arrogance for a leader to command his loyalists to kill those protesting against his tyrannical government.

Given the unbridled obsession for Rats which *Algerdan* "Rats" exhibited during the uprising that eventually consumed him and put an end to his tyrannical government. In reference to the dictionary found out that the phrase *Algerdan* "Rats" simply means undignified competition for success in one's career, social status. Further reference to the dictionary revealed that in a figurative sense it means a person who deserts a cause. (This emanates from the belief that rats desert a ship that will sink or be wrecked).

If there is anything that Al Ghaddafi would remember for, is the addition of a new idiom contribution he made towards the development of the world's political jargon. Naturally, Rat is a rodent. According to the dictionary, a rodent is an animal, e.g. a rat, rabbit, squirrel or beaver, which gnaws things with its strong teeth specially adapted for this purpose. Rat is destructive by nature. If rats invade a farm, the crops in that farm are bound to be completely destroyed in a few hours by the rats. Figuratively put, are politicians all over the world not destroying the sustaining resources of their respective countries? As rats would do to the farms, many countries in the world have been impoverished by politicians so much that one would not be wrong to unequivocally say that politicians are rats.

In this study, the methodological framework was based upon CDA as conceived by one of its most outstanding theoreticians Fairclough (1992, 1995, 2001, and 2003). The researcher



drew upon the multidimensional model of analyzing discourse developed by Fairclough (1992). Fairclough explains that discourse can be seen as I) a language text, i.e. spoken or written, ii) discourse practices (text production and text consumption), iii) socio-cultural practices. Fairclough (1999) develops the following method of discourse analysis which includes: a) linguistic description of the language text, b) interpretation of the relationship between discursive processes and the text, and c) explanation of the relationship between the discursive processes and social processes.

The present study is a linguistic study of Al Ghaddafi's last speech delivered on February 22, 2011, to reveal how the language is utilized as a part of defending himself of any responsibilities of what had happened to draw the audiences' attention and persuaded them to support his policies. This speech lasted about 75 minutes. A descriptive-analytic method of research based on the critical discourse analysis model presented by Fairclough (1989, 1995, 2001 & 2010) framework (2004) were utilized throughout the current study to find out the answers to the research questions. It is worth mentioning that Al Ghaddafi final speech is a good sample of methodological instruments pertaining and including most of his language use and figurative metaphors.

Procedures for analyzing the data were as follows: first, the speech in its original Arabic version as well as its translated English version was downloaded from the internet. Second, the speech was analyzed in light of Fairclough's model. There was an attempt to link linguistic practices with socio-cultural practices. Both macro and microanalysis were conducted. The political speech under investigation was then analyzed in terms of semantic macro-structures (topics) and local semantics (local meanings). While the first level portrayed the main topics that resided in the speech, the second level tackled the major critical linguistic aspects of the speech: intertextuality of text, religious expressions, figures of speech (metaphor, simile, personification and dysphemism), repetition, synonymy and collocation.

**2.6.1- Social and discursive practices:** The analysis of a discursive event as social practice refers to several levels of social organization, i.e., "the context of situation, the institutional context and the wider social context" (Fairclough, 1992, p. 134). Interdiscursivity is a key concept in analyzing a text because it emphasizes a historical view of texts as transforming the past, e.g. prior texts, into the present. Therefore, it is important to give a historical background about the situation in Libya during this important event. Encouraged by the protests that overthrew the president of Tunisia and Egypt, Libyans launched huge anti-government demonstrations on the 17<sup>th</sup> of February 2011.

**2.6.2- Linguistic practices:** A two-level analysis of the speech under investigation in this study was conducted in a cohesive manner: macro analysis in terms of topics and micro analysis in terms of the prominent linguistic features of the speech-language. The structure is examined element as well as the language discourse. This section presents the major findings of the study.

### **3- Findings and discussion**

To study the figurative language of a personality like Al Ghaddafi, who is known for his vernacular Libyan Arabic and his strange and unexpected expressions in most of his speeches, could be difficult. The difficulty here is in interpreting the figurative language of his words in the vernacular Libyan language, which is difficult to understand even for Arabic speakers. It poses a strong challenge for any researcher, especially after he was eliminated and many of his documents were absent or burned after the Libyan revolution on February 17<sup>th</sup> 2011. The study will focus only on the figurative language found in his last speech broadcasted from Tripoli on the Libyan tv on 22\2\2011, before his escape to Sert his home city where he was caught and killed by the Libyan revolutionaries on 20\10\2011.

### 3.1- Figurative Language & Metaphors found in the last speech

- **Pronoun (I):** During their speeches, both presidents employed the singular pronoun, plural pronoun and third person in their speech to emphasize a particular message he wishes to convey. Comstock and Scharrer (2005:37) state, using the third person aims to create an impact on the audience by reflecting the speaker's ego defensiveness, demonstrating greatness as well as glory in one's name and history. For instance, during the speech, Al Ghaddafi used **the third person about 18** times to exhibit his pride in being Al Ghaddafi, his status and importance and to praise himself. Consider the following example:

**“However, today when you say Libya, they say “oh yeah, Libya, Al Ghaddafi, Libya the revolution”.**

*Ama alyawm inddama takool Libya, yakolo lak: aha Libya! AL Ghaddafi! Libya althawra.*

أما اليوم عندما تقول ليبيا، يقولو لك: آه ليبيا! القذافي! ليبيا الثورة.

It is the way Al Ghaddafi demonstrated that he was the creator of the Libyan country and that he was the one who introduced Libya to the world. By doing so, Al Ghaddafi wanted to gain the people's gratitude for all his good deeds, which would eventually lead to his support.

Al Ghaddafi used the pronoun **(I) about 105 times** during his speech, to reflect on his success and to revolve the speech around him, as seen in the following example:

**“I am higher than the positions that presidents and poms take, I am a fighter, struggler,**

**warrior, and revolutionist, from the tent, from the desert”.**

*Ana arfa'o men almanasib allati yatakaladha alroasa wa al obahat, ana mokatil, mojahid, monadhil, tha'ir men al Khaimah men al badia.*

أنا أرفع من المناصب التي يتقلدها الرؤساء والأبهات، أنا مقاتل، مجاهد، مناضل، ثائر، من الخيمة، من البادية

In this example, the 'I' was followed by several active participles, which are usually used as an adjective or a descriptive term in Arabic. The English equivalent of it would usually be a noun ending in /-er/ or /-or/, for example, fighter (Ryding, 2005: 103). Al Ghaddafi described himself using his favorite active participles that have always been associated with his name:

**fighter, struggler, warrior, revolutionary, from the desert.**

*Mokatel, mogahid, monadhil tha'ir men al khiemah.*

مقاتل، مجاهد، مناضل ثائر، من الخيمة

To Al Ghaddafi, using the pronoun we could have meant to share his revolutionary attitude with the Libyan people to remind them of Libya's history and how they supported him against the corrupt regime. This can be seen in the following example as it clearly illustrates how he highlighted his role as the Libyan rescuer, to which he saved Libya before and he is willing to do everything he can to save it again from the rebels. By repeating his achievements, he was trying to gain sympathy and support from the people who supported him earlier and those who knew his role in developing Libya. In essence, he was cleverly reaching out to both older and uneducated people, deceiving them into believing that this uprising was merely an act of corrupted young men.

**We have challenged the great nuclear countries in the world, and we won and they bowed their heads here.**

*Nahno kawamna gabaroot amreka, gabaroot britania, aldawal alnawawia, helf alatlassi kawamna gabarooth, lan nastaslim, wa kona nahno samedoon hona.*

نحن قاومنا جبروت أمريكا، جبروت بريطانيا، الدول النووية، حلف الأطلسي قاومنا جبروته، لم نستسلم، وكنا

نحن صامدون هنا

It is the way Al Ghaddafi demonstrated that he was the creator of the Libyan country; and that he was the one who introduced Libya to the world. By doing so, Al Ghaddafi wanted to gain the people's gratitude for all his good deeds, which would eventually lead to his support. Through this speech, a number of important messages were sent to Libyans whether they are revolutionaries or supporters, to the Arabs and to the whole world, here in this paper the speech in regard to language and metaphor is outlined as follows:

### **3.2- Collocations, irony, metaphors, personification and threat, pressure.**

He started his speech by saluting the youth with the "morning of the revolution", asking them to rebel and follow him, as he is the "the revolution leader" and they are the "people of revolution" just like their ancestors, as shown in Figure 4. Moreover, in his attempts to associate the world's knowledge of Libya with the great revolution, he sought the support

of the big tribes that originally helped him during the first revolution in Libya back in 1969. He further described himself as a pure revolution leader and not a country president, reminding Libyans of the revolutionary history and his achievements that liberated Libya from the dictator kingdom regime. Al Ghaddafi wanted to gain the support of both important tribes - nationalists who were against foreign intervention, and uneducated people who approved of his revolution and his modest attitude.

The speech was full of language tools that serve his intentions and fancy dreams of being the creator of modern Libya. His words were full of irony, collocations, metaphors and personification, the following are examples he used of collocations that he used to talk to his supporters:

**youth of Al-Fateh, youth of nationalism, youth of Fatimid, youth of defiance, generation of defiance and generation of anger.**

*Shababalfateh, Shabab al kawmia, Shabab alfatemia, Shabab altahaddi, geel altahaddi wa geel al ghadab.*

شباب الفاتح، شباب القومية، شباب الفاطمية، شباب التحدي، جيل التحدي وجيل الغضب

The language here was used to encourage those who still believe in him to catch their attention of what he is going to say for them to act quickly against the revolutionaries. He used collocations in sentences as when he described the Arab TV channels like Al Jazeera, Al Arabia and other channels that covering the uprising wave in Libya with chained phrases in long sentences, like:

**devices of double service, villainy, mediaeval and Arab cowardice.**

*aghezat alamalla wa alnadala wa alragaiya wa algabana alarabia.*

اجهزة العمالة، النذالة، الرجعية والجبانة العربية

### 3.3- Arrogance, power calming, bribe, beg and intimidating

From the first minutes, Al Ghaddafi tried to show that he still rules the country, throughout the speech his voice was loud he used lots of moves and gestures to show the power for all, supporters or revolutionaries, locally or internationally.

**He described Libya as AL qibla for Africa and for the world (as Al qibla is Mecca for Muslims)**

*Libya qiblat afrecia wa al alem,*

ليبيا قبلة افريقيا والعالم.

Any Muslim will reject such figurative as it touches a very holy Sharia for them.

He said that those channels want to convey a message saying inside it that Libyans do not want freedom and dignity besides the rule of being the leader of Africa and Asia and the rest of the world.

**“Look at Libya, it doesn't want glory, it doesn't want honor, it doesn't want liberation. Rather, it wants the dervish, it wants the beard, it wants the lice-infested (to describe Islamists among revolutionaries), it wants colonialism, it wants the setback, and it wants to be down”.**

*Ondhro ila Libya fa heia la toread almagd la toread alezza la toread al tahreer, bal toread aldarwasha toread allehia toread al amaiem toread al emgamleen, toread al isteamar toread al entikassa toread al hadheadh.*

انظروا الي ليبيا فهي لا تريد المجد لا تريد العزة لا تريد التحرير بل تريد الدروشة تريد اللحية تريد العمامم تريد (في اشارته للإسلاميين الموجودين من بين الثوار) تريد الاستعمار تريد الانتكاسة وتريد الحظيظ المقملين

Although repetition might reflect the speaker's intention of strongly emphasizing a point, and to have people fixated on it, it can also be a sign of the speaker's competence to impose a particular idea over the addresses. The substantive speech Al Ghaddafi made was highly criticized by many political analysts due to AL Ghaddafi's repetition of his favorite primary themes, such as foreign conspiracies, the Islamist uprising and revolution. Using a repetitive pattern to emphasize important ideas that they wish the public to understand, for instance, Al Ghaddafi's threats of hunting the protesters or condemning them. To understand how repetition has had an enormous impact on the way people perceived the speech, consider the following example:

**Span by span, house by house, room by room, alley by alley, person by person**

*Shiber, bait, dar, zangha*

شبر، بيت، دار، زنقه، فرد

AL Ghaddafi used the word **revolution** “*thawra*” ثورة for about 33 times throughout the speech. He was creating linguistic neologism in Arabic by substituting the word revolution as a root to many other words. AL Ghaddafi's usage of these vocabularies in a certain repetitive manner and a particular order aimed to threaten the protesters and hunt them everywhere. He started by stating that he would start his search in each span in Libya, and then gradually enhanced the search to include each house, and each room in the house, each alley in Libya and finally each person. This was AL Ghaddafi's attempt to threaten the protesters that they will be captured. In addition, AL Ghaddafi's usage of the same word in a repetitive pattern intended to enforce his threats and his obligation to perform it. It is evidently clear that the repetition, in this case, aimed to emphasize AL Ghaddafi's threats as well as to make it stick in Libyans' minds.

Throughout the speech, Al Gaddafi was harping on the same topics, but had sudden pauses several times to ask, “*من أنتم؟*” *Who are you?*” *Man antom?* which is interesting in a way since it might reflect his utter shock of the current events. Al Gaddafi used this phrase

whenever he was questioning the people who were destroying Libya, or demonstrating against him. Moreover, he had used this phrase to emphasize his surprise as well as outrage at this anonymous group of people who were destroying Libya.

**Is that it, you people of Benghazi? Who are you?**

*Hadi akhretha ya ahel Benghazi! man antom*

هذه آخرتها يا أهل بنغازي! من أنتم؟

**You may regret this in a day when remorse will be useless. Whoever lives in a glasshouse should not stone people, who are you?**

*Qad tandamoon yawm la yanfa'o alnadam, aladi baitaho min zogag la yargimo alkas bilhagar. man antom?*

قد تندمون يوم لا ينفع الندم، الذي بيته من الزجاج لا يرمج الناس بالحجارة. من أنتم؟

Regardless of the fact that he blamed several parties for the uprising, such as foreign western countries, Islamist groups, and traitorous Arab media, his constant asking of the same question was meant to demonstrate his doubts of who those people were as well as of the reason behind their actions. This perhaps was another way of having Libyans rethink the revolution and whether it was indeed a foreign intervention that would eventually ruin Libya.

#### 4- Discussion

Looking in the theme of the speech-language used by Al Ghaddafi or the time, was not successful for the stage or the position of his rule. Whereas, he used lots of I's more than words that can be counted as a low frequency in his speech which can collect more supporters around, him rather than around the other part (revolutionaries) **"I am higher than the positions that presidents and pumps take, I am a fighter, struggler, warrior, and revolutionist, from the tent, from the desert"**. He used metaphors of threatening more than a metaphor of gathering people. He talks to Libyans from above saying to them **"who are you?"** after forty-two years of rule, he admitted that he does not know them. A country of seven million residents linked in his speech to him, **"However, today when you say Libya, they say "oh yeah, Libya, Al Ghaddafi, Libya the revolution"**, as if no one on earth knows Libya or Libyans, and this can be one of the killing metaphors that he used which increased the curve against him internationally or locally. Besides many other disgusting figurative metaphors such as: the dervish, the beard, turbans, lice-infested (to describe Islamists) and used rats or mice to describe the revolutionaries.

This speech failed to gain support domestically or internationally because of its language as Al Ghaddafi used too many language tools lots of personification, lots of irony, lots of metaphor, he used words that his people do not need. Language of threatening was used massively but at the wrong time. Language of figurative metaphor distorted the intended meaning of the speech rather than bring supporters for him.

Therefore, figurative language can be useful to explain intentions or to put colors on the speech as adding salt to food, but too much salt will ruin the meal and this is exactly what happened for Al Ghaddafi's last speech, he destroyed every good thing he may did during his rule because of using a language which considered rush and impolite by most of his audience and led to his loss.

In the next table are examples of self-arrogance words besides the figurative language found in the speech categorized as types of metaphor and pronouns:

Category	Word example	Why?
Figurative Metaphor	Rats, drugged youths, bearded	Rats repeated 12 times, just to say that, these revolutionaries are weak and have no power and you can kill them. Youths repeated 15 here are under unconscious effects but when they will wake up, they will regret this. Bearded 7 times, to accuse them of Al Qaeda & ISIS.
Irony	Rats, bearded, lice-infested	Just to make fun of them and to show them as of disabilities and are not able to be against him in ruling Libya
Personification	facing a solid rock, a hard rock	To show that he is still in power and still capable of ruling
Simile	Rats, mice, cats	Lowering of the revolutionaries by making them a small number and they have no place like him as they live in dark and in streets only not in light as me now.
Repetition	- it wants the dervish, it wants the beard, it wants the lice-infested -Span by span, house by house, room by room, alley by alley, person by person	Emphasize and assertion on his intentions for arresting and finishing this revolution
Idiom	Who his house from glass do not throw stones	Threatening the countries who were supporting revolutionaries against him like Qatar, Emirates, Turkey and other foreign countries.
Grammar (I)	I or words describing self like: fighter, struggler, warrior. etc.	105 times, used pronoun (I) is an effective tool to praise oneself, and demonstrate his achievements as a leader.
Grammar 3rd person	Libya, Al Ghaddafi, Libya the revolution".	about 18 times to exhibit his pride in being Al Ghaddafi, his status and importance and to praise himself.

Grammar (We)	We have challenged the great nuclear countries in the world, and we won and they bowed their heads here	Using the pronoun, (we) could have meant to share his revolutionary attitude with the Libyan people to remind them of Libya's history and how they supported him against the corrupt regime.
--------------	---	--

## 5- Conclusion

As for CDA, Fairclough's model emphasized the power of language since it sheds light on the way linguists or speakers can use different linguistic features to their advantage to shape the public's opinions. Al Ghaddafi's threats of hunting the protesters or condemning them repetitive appeal to all the people. So, on his ideology of the conspiracy theory pointed out many times in the speech or protecting the country from any intervention. One can argue that the speech was particularly for misuse of language tools were employed to change the public's attitude towards the uprising, not just by language but by other modes too.

What the over-use of figurative language may add to speech intentions? and what it added to the speech-language of Al Ghaddafi's discourse in his final speech? A figurative language is a useful tool in conveying messages to the audience when used in the specific purpose of speech in a balance but if used heavily it will give the opposite of what was hoped for, and this can be very clear evidence for all when we read what had happened and the results gained by Al Ghaddafi from his speech in the next few days after this horrible and terrifying speech. This speech was the straw that broke the camel's back for Al Ghaddafi and for his long rule over the state of Libya, which he concluded with a terrifying pictorial language full of threat and intimidation, which turned against him with the evil that he wanted for his people, who admitted that he did not know them.

Upon this study, it is recommended to have deeper studies in metaphor around the figurative language in all the globe languages wither the language is stander, classical or vernacular, to give note that figurative language can be harmful to conveying messages when used a lot, but it can ease conveying messages when used properly in the right place and in the correct time. Finally, metaphor is a painting tool that should be used to give more colors to the picture to catch the attention of the hearer to look into the words paint just to gain love, but not to paint words with threatening and horrifying blood. here the reaction will be opposite to what the conveyer wants of using the figurative language in his speech or in his writing.

## 6- References

Abdelhamed, A. (2011). *Lmādhā Fshlt Khṭb Mbārķ Al-thlāthh qbl Al-tnhī?* [Why Did Mubarak's Three Speeches Fail Before He Stepped Down?]. Available at: <https://www.masress.com/elakhbar/30962>, [Accessed 22 January 2019].



Alduhaim, A. (2011). *A Comparative Analysis of Near Synonyms in Different Translations of Quran* (MA). United Kingdom: University of Salford Manchester.

Abdul-Latif, E. (2012). *Hrbw blāghī-a: Mnāwārāt Khtāb al-slt-a fī sāht al-thwrā-a* [Rhetorical Battles: Maneuvers of Presidential Speeches in the Revolutionary Arena] *Journal of Comparative Poetics*, 32, 283-311.

Abeed, Manal (2017) *News Representation in Times of Conflict: A Corpus Based Critical Stylistic Analysis of the Libyan Revolution*. Doctoral thesis, University of Huddersfield.

Adimi, Ahmed. (2011) "Analyzing Hosni Mubarak's Speech: Paternity, Selfishness and Deception." Dr. Ahmed Adimi Blog, <http://adimiahmed.overblog.com/article-68720736.html>. 5 January 2020.

Al-Majali, W. (2015) "Discourse Analysis of the Political Speeches of the Ousted Arab Presidents During the Arab Spring Revolution Using Halliday and Hasan's Framework of Cohesion." *Journal of Education and Practice* 6.14: 96-108.

Al-Sowaidi, et al. (2017) "Doing Politics in the Recent Arab Uprisings: Towards a Political Discourse Analysis of the Arab Spring Slogans." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 52 :621-45.

Anagondahalli, D. (2013) "Prior Reputation and the Transition from Image Repair to Image Makeover: The Case of Hosni Mubarak." *Public Relations Review* 39: 241-44.

Al-Saleh, A. (2015). *Voices of the Arab spring: Personal stories from the Arab revolutions*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Chorine, E. D. (2012). *Exit the Colonel: The hidden history of the Libyan revolution*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research*. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 121-138). London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough N., Mulderrig J., & Wodak R. (2011). *Critical discourse analysis*. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 357-378). London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical discourse analysis: An overview*. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse and Interaction* (pp. 67-97). London: Sage.

Gulam, Khaled. (2019). *Mechanisms for Analyzing Media Discourse in Libyan Newspapers - an Analytical Study on Al-Sabah and Libya Al-Ekhbaria Newspapers*. Misurata University. Libya.

Lahlali, E. M. (2011). *Contemporary Arab Broadcast Media*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lahlali, E. M. (2012). Repetition and Ideology in Nasrallah's Political Speeches. *Arab Media & Society* (Issue 15.), 1-13.

Lahlali, M. (2011b). The Arab Spring and the Discourse of Desperation: Shifting from an Authoritarian Discourse into a "Democratic" One. *Journal of Arab Media and Society*, 13.