Style and Ideology in Jonathan's *No Enemies to Fight: Goodluck Jonathan on the Marble*

Emmanuel Jolaolu Adegbenro

Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State,Nigeria

E-mail: adegbenro.emmanuel@oouagoiwoye.edu.ng

Abstract

This paper investigated style and ideology in *No Enemies to Fight – Goodluck Jonathan on the Marble*, a compendium of quotable quotes from the former Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches. Prominent linguistic features that project the writer's ideologies were identified, and then analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively, employing the theoretical framework of Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics. Findings showed that Jonathan deployed simple syntactic structures, inclusive person deixes and lexical reiterations to advance personal and political ideologies founded on honesty, humility, fairness, forgiveness, friendship, openness, prudence and respect for the rule of law. These held beliefs earned him the desired public acceptance and support. The research has not only unraveled Jonathan's ideologies; it has also thrown light on the deployment of stylistics for espousing ideological positions in political texts.

Introduction

Language has power not only to communicate but to construe opinions and conscript intentions. This assertion supports the view of Omojuyigbe (2015, p. 165) that "people use language to communicate ideas, beliefs and emotion with other people". Following from this view, speeches of politicians can be used to reflect their ideological positions on several issues. The selling point of any political leader is usually the speeches they deliver in the course of their interactions with the people. Speeches are means of reaching out to their audience not only to disseminate vital information on policies, developments and programmes but also to subtly present their views, opinions and beliefs to the listeners, in order to gain popularity as well as public acceptance.

Therefore, for a political speech to be forceful or produce the desired result, it must be delivered in well-crafted, manipulative and persuasive language. Language is not only crucial but critical to a successful speech delivery. The success of a political discourse will be determined by how effectively a politician utilizes the channel opened up by language. Opeibi (2009) says that no matter how good a candidate's manifesto is, no matter how superior political thoughts and ideologies of a political party may be, these can be expressed and further translated into social actions for social change and social continuity through the facilities provided by language. There is hardly anything that can be achieved in politics without language, especially when it has to do with convincing people, persuading, promising, enlightening and informing them. Language is the conduit to people's hearts. No wonder Akinkuolere (2011) submits that the support that citizens have for politicians will be determined by what they say and how they say it for success to be achieved in candidacy, programmes or politics.

However, from speeches delivered by politicians, there are some expressions which can be said to carry weight of profundity and can be referenced at any auspicious time in attribution to the speaker and the particular occasion that calls for the speech. These profound statements can be referred to as quotations or quotable quotes. Quotations are excerpts from long texts and are usually brief and concise. They represent the essential points or main thrust of the entire written or spoken document. Quotations are also used to reinforce ideas and to amplify the writer's or speaker's thoughts, beliefs, and claims. They are nuggets of information which appear

as memorable phrasing. *No Enemies to Fight: Goodluck Jonathan on the Marble* is an unusual text devoted to compiling notable quotations from the numerous speeches of Goodluck Ebele Jonathan when he was President of Nigeria. Although the title in itself reveals the fact of a leader in conflict with certain individuals or groups, but the compendium represents Goodluck Jonathan's remarkable statements and generally summarises the motivation for his political ideologies.

A number of studies have examined political speeches adapting different linguistic approaches such as pragmatics (Ayeomoni 2012), discourse analysis (Chilton and Schaffner 1997), semantic-pragmatics (Maiyanga 1990), rhetorical stylistics (Oha 1994), critical discourse analysis (Teittinen 2000) and stylistics (Olaniyan 2015). This present article tries to establish the ideological positions of an ex-political leader - Goodluck Jonathan - using a selection of quotations from his speeches through the resources offered by stylistics. Doing this, we aim to find out how a leader's political ideologies can be consistently and subtly exposed through salient statements made in his addresses. Jonathan's (2013) *No Enemies to Fight: Goodluck Jonathan on the Marble,* therefore, constitutes the source of the primary data for the study that is about to be carried out in this paper as it essentially examines style and ideology in selected quotable quotes from the speeches of a past Nigerian President who emerged and survived through the pulsating steam of controversial circumstances, and how those ideologies helped him in gaining public acceptance.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical frameworks for this study are the notions of language realisation/stratification, instantiation, register and context of situation and of culture, which are aspects of Halliday's (1985) Systemic Functional Linguistics. By realisation, Halliday asserts that a text both realises and is realised by the context of situation in which context of situation is modelled as a tripartite structure of field, tenor and mode. These are the elements of semiotic structure of context embedded in the meta-functional organisation of language. And by instantiation, Halliday agrees that a linguistic system is open and dynamic rather than circular and self-regulating (Halliday 2002). He argues further that language is ideologically saturated, that is, "ideological interpretant built into language" (Halliday2003a, p. 135). The

concept of instantiation views language as "agentive in the construction of reality, and by extension, is always ideological" (Halliday 2003c, p. 237). An ideology forms through repeated manifestations of a pattern of meaning(s). That is, ideologies take shape by being instantiated through the relationship of instance to system and system to instance. By this, register becomes the environments for the manifestation of ideology (Hasan 2005a).

According to Lukin (2017), the concepts of context and register are crucial to showing the affordances of particular register to the dissemination of specific ideologies. And since the text is an instance of a particular register, it is, therefore, an ideal host for ideological interpretations. In addition, the context of situation will provide the means to relate text to the context of culture, where the explanation for the function and origin of ideology lays (Lukin 2017).There is a relationship between ideology and register. Ideologies traverse registerial lines because ideological clusters of meaning can be found across various registers. However, Foucault's (1972, p. 38) "discursive formation" provides the feature of ideology as a "regularity" (i.e. an order, correlation, position and functions, transformations) between 'object types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices'. Language cannot be recognised in isolation. This is saying that language will not be recognised as language if it occurs in isolation; it should always be in relation to a particular scenario, participants, actions and events from which what is said derives their meaning. This is what Halliday (1979) refers to as the situation. Berry (1975, p. 24) corroborates this when he points out that "Systemic Linguistics is interested in relating the internal organisation of language, the various kinds of patterning which language exhibits to function of language and to the social situation of language". In order to unravel the ideological positions of Goodluck Jonathan in the compendium of his quotations, three stylistic features will be analysed, which include syntactic structure, personal deixes and reiteration of lexical items.

Literature Review

There are two main components in the title of this paper; style and ideology, which need distinct elucidations. It is therefore pertinent to elucidate the two terminologies one after the other before an attempt is made to explain them as a concept. To start with, stylistics comes from the word style, which can

be seen as the peculiar way of doing things by an individual. It can be someone's peculiar way of talking, walking or writing. Considering writing for example, style is the total sum of the writer's language habits or choices which marks him or her out as a distinct person. Lucas (1955, p. 9) supports this assertion when he says that style is 'the effective use of language... whether to make statements or to rouse emotions. It involves first of all the power to put fact with clarity and brevity'. Three things are germane in that definition. One is that style involves the use of language. The second is that language is deployed for certain effect, which include; to make statements or to rouse emotions. The third is that style should be clear and brief. However, this definition is somewhat narrow and sectional in that it fails to account for the one who uses the style and in what circumstance. Therefore, Leech and Short (1981, p. 11) define style as "the way in which language is used in a given context, by a given person, for a given purpose, and so on". In other words, style is by no means restricted to the style of a particular author, but can be characteristic of a situation, a character, a particular text, a particular linguistic expression that is investigated over time and so on (Norgaard, Busse and Montoro 2010, p. 155).

A popular approach to style considers it as choice. This deals with the variations and the options that are available to an author. For instance, Traugott and Pratt (1980, p. 29) assert that style can be said to concern the characteristic choices in a given text. To them, this view will enable us to distinguish between 'style' and 'language' in that language can be said to be the sum total of the structures available to the speaker, while style can be regarded as the characteristic choices made from the totality. Within the writer's choice, there is a reflection of his ego and the social condition of his environment.

In determining the appropriate choice of linguistic elements, two important choice planes are available to the writer: the paradigmatic and syntagmatic. The paradigmatic (vertical) axis gives a variety of choices between one item and others, thus enabling the writer to choose the most appropriate. The syntagmatic (horizontal) axis, however, considers expressions that regularly collocate in terms of appropriateness of usage. In his own view, Holman (1980, p. 432) says style is:

The arrangement of words in a manner which at one's best expresses the individuality of the author and the idea and the intent in the author's mind. The best style for any given purpose is that which most clearly approximates a perfect adaptation of one's language to one's ideas. Style is a combination of two elements: the idea to be expressed and the individuality of the author.

Having considered what style is, it now suffices to examine what is meant by stylistics. Stylistics is the study of style in a text. In other words, it is a linguistic discipline that concerns itself with how language is deployed by writers to convey meanings. That means when we analyze or describe the linguistic features of a text written by a writer in relation to the meaning the writer is trying to pass across, we are doing stylistics. No wonder Olajide (2003) observed that stylistics is concerned with identifying, describing and explaining whatever is striking and recurrent in the written or spoken text. This definition is supported by Verdonk (2002: 4) when he describes stylistics as "the analysis of distinctive expression in language and the description of its purpose and effects". However, what is striking or prominent may not be a deliberate attempt of the writer, it may be a coincidence. This idea is supported by Osundare (2008) who says that style is hardly ever an accident. It is both a configuration and a consequence of interrelated factors – historical, cultural, social, and ideological. This is why even when the writer is constant, the how varies in different ways to modify or change it.

Ideology, on the other hand, can be viewed as a set of beliefs that inform and guide decisions. It can also be viewed in terms of the ideas or ideals, especially one which constitutes the basis of economic or political theory and policy. Collins Dictionary online defines it as a set of beliefs, especially the political beliefs on which people, parties, or countries base their actions. Also, Wikipedia online describes ideology as a set of beliefs or philosophies attributed to a person or group of persons, especially as held for reasons that are not purely epistemic, in which practical elements are as prominent as theoretical ones. James and Steger (2010) suggest that "ideologies are patterned clusters of normatively imbued ideas and concepts,

including particular representations of power relations. These conceptual maps help people navigate the complexity of their political universe and carry claims to social truth". From the different definitions cited above, one can glean that ideology is a set of values or opinions held by a person or a group of persons through which their actions are influenced and guided. Minar (1961) while describing ideology observes that it can be a collection of ideas which have normative content. He observes further that ideology plays a vital role of persuasion in human-social interactions. Eagleton (1991) also offers some of the acceptable definitions of ideology. One of the definitions is that ideology is the process of production of meanings, signs and values in social life. Another one is that it is a body of ideas characteristic of a particular person, social group or class. He says further that ideology concerns the indispensable medium in which individuals live out their relations to a social structure. Different types of ideologies have been identified, ranging from political, social, epistemological and ethical ideologies. The one which is germane to this study is political ideology.

Political ideology is a concept fraught with problems, having been dubbed the 'the most elusive …in the whole of social science' (McLellan, 1986, p. 1). It can however be viewed as a set of related beliefs about political theory and policy held by an individual, group of individuals or a particular social class. According to Nnoli (2003, p. 177), "Destutt de Tracy (1754 - 1836) used it to describe a new scientific discipline that systematically studies ideas, emotions and sensations – the science of ideas". Ideology of an individual can be positive or negative. This is what Nnoli (2003, pp. 178 - 179) presents on two contradictory realities, the good and the bad. The former depicts "a system of thought that animates social or political action" while the latter represents "a misleading, illusory or one-sided criticism or condemnation". The questions to be answered in this study are: what are the identified ideologies of Goodluck Jonathan as subtly revealed in the compendium of quotations from his speeches? What stylistic devices has he deployed to portray the identified ideologies? How have the identified ideologies contributed to his political acceptability?

Methodology
The text, *No Enemies to Fight – Goodluck Jonathan on the Marble,* which is a compendium of quotable quotes from the speeches delivered by the former Nigerian President, is the source of data for this study. After thoroughly

reading through the text, prominent linguistic elements deployed in the compendium were identified, together with copious expressions which illustrate the styles. The linguistic elements were analyzed quantitatively by means of statistical counting and become the basis of the qualitative consideration for the writer's political and personal ideologies. The theoretical framework of language realisation/stratification, instantiation, register and context of situation and of culture as specific aspects of Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics was followed in underpinning the study.

Data Analysis

The analysis done in this paper covers only three aspects vis-à-vis syntactic structure, personal deictic elements, and lexical reiterations, which are believed, will assist in exposing the tangible aspects of Goodluck Jonathan's ideologies.

Syntactic Structure

In exploring the syntactic structure of the text, the structural architectures according to their types that have been used to portray Goodluck Jonathan's ideological stance of in *No Enemies to Fight* are hereby presented on a frequency table. An attempt is also made to explain the ideological implications of the distribution.

Table 1: The distribution of structural sentence types and percentages

Sentence Type	Frequency	%
Simple	209	61.29
Compound	39	11.44
Multiple	10	2.93
Complex	72	21.11
Compound Complex	11	3.23
Total	**341**	**100**

In that table 1, the total number of sentences in the sampled text is 341. Out of this number, the simple sentences are 209, which take 61.29%, compound sentences are 39, which take 11.44%. Multiple sentences are 10,

taking 2.03%, complex 72, taking 21.11% and compound-complex 11, taking 3.23%. There is no doubt that this is a disproportionate distribution, in which Goodluck Jonathan makes use of more simple structures in the text than any other sentence types. The ideological impression which this creates is to stylishly project a positive image of himself and his political initiatives. A close look at some instances of the use of simple sentence structures in the text has revealed Goodluck Jonathan's personal political ideologies, some of which are; accessibility, fairness, loyalty, honesty, sincerity, accountability or prudence, forgiveness and friendship.

First of all, the preponderant use of simple sentences in Goodluck Jonathan's *No Enemies to Fight* is aimed at presenting himself as a President who is not only simple but accessible. By choosing to deliberately address the people in simple structures, he tends to make himself easily understood by every section of the society, including those without a high level of education. Majority of these simple sentences have as few as four words and a maximum of sixteen words. For example:

> *Our votes must count!*
> *One man, one vote!*
> *One woman, one vote!*
> *One youth, one vote!*

The above four simple sentences are deployed to stylishly communicate, in simple terms, the personal political views of Jonathan Goodluck. Each of the four short sentences, containing four words each, is used to project his idea of what should be the ideal in a democratic election; a vote to every legible electorate. The sentences are emphatic, and are rendered in form of a political slogan with instructive messages. Apart from the first sentence which canvasses for the participatory disposition of the people during elections, the other three successive paralleled syntactic structures stress, through repetitive elements, the inclusion of every franchised electorate in performing their civic duty. With these pervading simple structures, Jonathan subtly condemned election malpractices through multiple voting. He also presents himself not only as someone honest or sincere but who is also opposed to fraudulence practices in any election. All these attempts are to present a positive personality of himself in an easy-to-

remember simple structure and also to gain acceptance and support of the people.

> *Government will not interfere with the will of*
> *the people.Elections must be free and fair.*
> *I will not influence the electoral process.*

The above two extracts from the text further establish the political viewpoint of the former Nigeria president as someone who believes in fairness. The first is made up of two short sentences, while the second is made up of one sentence. It is clear that Goodluck Jonathan deployed some of the simple structures found in the text to reiterate his commitment to electoral justice through a commissive act. It is a way of deliberately presenting a positive aspect of his character to the people so that they can see him as a sincere person whom they can trust and rely upon. That is why he is making a promise never to tamper with people's decision in election but to ensure a free and fair electioneering process, as implied in the above quotations..

Furthermore, through simple, recoverable short sentences, Goodluck Jonathan advances a principle of loyalty and openness in his dealings with people. This becomes clear from some sampled simple sentences in the text. Example:

> *I am loyal to Nigeria's economy. I don't have accounts or*
> *property abroad. All my children live and school in Nigeria.*

The above three sentences were credited to a statement he made while receiving a delegation of the Labour Party in Abuja on April 28, 2011. The statements were made to reinforce his opinion on what he considered as good governance. He is indirectly trying to convince the people to share his political principles which are based on loyalty, sincerity, fairness, honesty and trust, openness and credibility.

> *Nobody's political ambition is worth the blood of any Nigerian.*

The above quotation was a statement from the acceptance speech Goodluck Jonathan delivered on April 18, 2011 after winning the Presidential election. He deliberately made the above statement to communicate one of his very strong political views, and that is politics without desperation. He is trying to caution supporters' excesses in displaying mindless and wanton hooliganism, thuggery, destruction and killings after the election. He is trying to portray himself as a peace loving politician who is ready to lay his mandate on the altar of sacrifice as long as that would ensure peace in the country. This political ideology, subtly propagated, eventually becomes his selling point for a general acceptance and endearment.

I have no enemies to fight.

The above is also one of the simple sentence quotations identified in the text. This simple construction is also used to project Goodluck Jonathan as someone who easily forgives and holds no grudge against anyone. He is by this statement extenuating a political principle based on politics without resentments. He further seeks reconciliation and friendship with all political enemies and also seeks an alignment and cooperation with all oppositions in order to move the nation forward.

Person Deixes
An inventory of all personal deixes in the compendium of Jonathan's quotations have been taken and displayed on a table for analysis.

Table 2: The distribution of person deixes and percentages

Person Deixes	Frequency	%
Exclusive	**107**	**26.9**
I	84	21.2
Me	9	2.3
My	13	3.3
Myself	1	0.2
Inclusive	**290**	**73.1**
We	117	29.5
Us	23	5.8
Our	147	37.0
Ourselves	3	0.7

Total	397	100

The table above shows that there are only eight personal deictic elements used by Goodluck Jonathan in his *No Enemies to Fight*, which have been categorized as exclusive and inclusive. The exclusive deictic elements and their distributions in percentages are as follows: 'I' 21.2%; 'me' 2.3%; 'my' 3.3% and 'myself' 0.2%, while the inclusive deictic elements and their distributions also in percentages are 'we' 29.5%, 'us' 5,8%, 'our' 37.0% and 'ourselves' 0.7%. It is, therefore, obvious that Goodluck Jonathan deployed more of the inclusive deictic elements (73.1%) than exclusive deictic elements (26.9%). This has ideological implications in interpreting his power positioning in relation to the people. With the use of personal plural pronoun 'our' taking the highest percentage of 37.0%, followed by 'we' 29.5%, it becomes indisputable that Jonathan positions himself closer to the people rather than distancing himself. What that means is that he believes in an ideology of inclusive participation in the business of governance. This can be illustrated with some examples from the text.

> *Our first responsibility as citizens is to use the ballot.*
> *Our vision is of a greater Nigeria, built on shared prosperity …*
> *We have come to the point where we must now agree that elections*
> *in our country must not continue to be a breeding ground for …*

In the above excerpted expressions, 'our' and 'we' are used inclusively to call for a joint participation in the running of the affairs of the country. 'We' and 'our' in those expressions refer to Goodluck Jonathan as the President and the entire citizens. This is a way of condemning division among the people, and encouraging unity and collective participation. He is indirectly saying 'I alone cannot do it, let us do it together'. The few instances where Jonathan used the exclusive 'I' and its variants are in situations of absolute necessity as the man at the centre stage and as the leader of the Nigerian government who must take personal responsibilities. Some examples from the text can justify this assertion:

> *I will defend the right of all citizens to freely express their …*
> *I will continue to fight, for your future, because I am one of you …*

*Anything **I** say, **I** will do, **I** will do it except it becomes inexplicable.*

In most instances where 'I' is used, it is used not to demonstrate ego or boasting or self-sufficiency, but rather to make personal commitments to the people through promises. Jonathan's use of the exclusive person deictic elements is not to draw away the people from the deictic field but rather to draw them towards the deictic centre. This further helps to establish an ideology of personal commitment or self-responsibility in government which is clearly demonstrated by the use of 'I' and its exclusive variants.

Lexical Reiterations

Goodluck Jonathan deliberately deploys some lexical items to consistently reiterate some of his ideologies. These reiterations are used to emphasize his themes and dominant topicality in the text. Some of the policies which are subtly focused through reiteration of lexical items are friendship, honesty, prudence, humility, peace, welfarism, self-reliance, supremacy of rule of law and forgiveness. Many lexical items indicating those topical issues run through the quotations of Jonathan in his *No Enemies to Fight*.

*Patriotism, **accountability** and **transparency** must underpin all our work.*
*I believe that only in **honest service** can those who we have freely*
elected to serve find perfect peace.
*We are public servants and we must give **proper account** of our stewardship*
to the people at all times.

A critical look at the foregrounded expressions will draw the attention of the readers to Jonathan's principle of honesty, trustworthiness, accountability and prudence. In the first excerpt, the words 'accountability' and 'transparency' are family words reiterating or suggesting honesty and sincerity. Then in the second quotation, the expression 'honest service' can be said to reinforce the meaning of 'proper account' mentioned in the third excerption. All of these are to emphasize his ideological beliefs of openness and accountability in his government.

I have come to launch a campaign of ideas, not one of calumny.
*I have come to preach **love**, not **hate**. I have come to break you away*

*from divisive tendencies of the past which have slowed our drive to true nationhood. I have no **enemies** to fight. You are all my **friends** and we share a common destiny.*
*We are not sworn **enemies**. We are not **irreconcilable foes**. We are neighbours who sometimes offend each other but can always **sit down to talk** over our differences.*

In the first example of the quotable quote above, Goodluck Jonathan deliberately deployed reiteration of antonymous lexical relations to highlight his ideological stance in terms of the type of relationship people should keep. He indirectly says that people should embrace each other in 'love' rather than 'hate', and instead of having any 'enemies' to fight, he would rather make 'friends' with everyone. However, an idea of friendliness and mutual relationship is being addressed in the second excerpted expression, which features both synonymous and antonymous relations to draw a parallel between good and bad relationships. 'Enemies' also means 'foes', whereas 'irreconcilable' and 'sit down to talk over differences' are two expressions that are congruously opposite in meaning. All these are pointing to one fact about Jonathan's ideological posture; mutual agreement, friendliness, lack of resentment in relationship, love and unity, which emphasize some of his ideologies.

*   **No institution of government is above the law** *and public servants must appreciate the effect of their actions on the polity.*

    The most urgent task, with regard to the judiciary at this time, is to **protect and ensure the sustenance of that tradition of respect for the law***.*
    *We must do everything **legitimate** to ensure that …*

The expressions in bold prints in the above quotations foreground Jonathan's belief in respect for the rule of law. He makes it unequivocally clear with repeated lexical items that the 'law' or 'everything legitimate' will be upheld. He is not only sees it as a task to be performed urgently but also as something the people should be warned about so that they can be prepared to face the consequences of their actions.

Conclusion

This paper has carried out a stylo-ideological analysis of Goodluck Jonathan's *No Enemies to Fight* using a combination of linguistic and conceptual frameworks of Halliday's Systemic linguistics and stylistics respectively. By critically examining some stylistic features like syntactic structures, person deixes and reiteration of lexical items, Goodluck Jonathan's personal political ideologies become unraveled and these include political conviction based on simplicity, accessibility, friendliness, forgiveness, humility, loyalty, honesty, fairness, openness, accountability and regard for the rule of law, among others. The predominant simple sentences painted a picture of a Goodluck Jonathan who always liked to appear simple and easily accessible/understood while his prevalent use of the inclusive person deixes reflects him as someone whose political vintage is positioned closer to the people and who enjoins public participation in the affairs of governance. In addition, a critical look at some of the reiterated lexical items in the text either as synonymous or antonymous relations has not only underscored the highlighted political views but strengthened them. Through the outcome of this research, it becomes clear what Halliday (2003) is saying that both context and lexical items are important to the unraveling of specific ideologies.

References

Akinkuolere, S. O. (2011). "A speech act analysis of selected political speeches of President   Umaru Musa Yar'Adua". An unpublished M. A. Thesis of Department of English,Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife.

Aiyeomoni, M. O. (2012). "A pragmatic analysis of victory and inaugural speeches of PresidentUmaru Musa Yar'Adua". *Theory and practice in language studies*. Vol.2. No 3. Pp 461 –   468.

Berry, M. (1975). *Introduction to systemic linguistic structures and systems*. New York: St Martin.

Chilton, P. and Schaffner, C. (1997). "Discourse pragmatics". In Van Dijk. T (ed) *Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. London: Verso.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1979). "Modes of meaning and modes of expression: Types of grammatical structure and their determination by different semantic functions". In Alberton, D. J., Carney, E, and Holdcroft, D (ed.) F*unction and context in linguistic analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp 57 – 79.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. 2nd edition. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2002). "How do you mean?"In *On language and linguistics.* Vol. 3 in the collected works of M. A. K. Halliday, ed. Jonathan Webster, 352 – 368. London and New York: Continuum.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2003a). "Language and the order of nature". In *On language and linguistics.*Vol. 3 in the collected works of M. A. K. Halliday, ed. Jonathan Webster, 116 – 138. London and New York: Continuum.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2003c). "A recent view of misstep in linguistic theory" (Review article of John M. Ellis. Language thought and logic). In *On language and linguistics*. Vol. 3 in the collected works of M. A. K. Halliday, ed. Jonathan Webster, 232 – 247. London and NewYork: Continuum.

Hasan, R. (2005a). "Code, register and dialect". In *Language, society and consciousness*. Vol. 1 of the collected works of Ruqaiya Hasan, ed. Jonathan Webster, 160 – 193. London and Oakville: Equinox.

Holman, C. H. (1980). *A handbook to literature*. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill Edu. Publishers.

Leech, G. N. and Short, M. (1983). *Style in fiction*. London: Longman.

Lucas, F. l. (1955). *Style*. London: Cassell & Company.

Lukin, A (2017). *Ideology and the text-in-context relation: Functional Linguistics*. 4(16).

Maiyanga, A. A. (1990). "A semantic and pragmatic analysis of selected speeches of Nigerian heads of State". An unpublished M. Phil Dissertation of the Department of English, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

McLellan, D. (1986). *Ideology: Concepts in the social sciences*. Open University Press.

Minar, D. W. (1961). "Ideology and political behaviour." *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 5(4): 317-31.

Nnoli, O. (2003). *Introduction to politics*. Pan- African Centre for Research on Peace and Conflict Resolution. Pp 177 – 178.

Norgard, N., Busse, B., and Montoro, R. (2010). *Key terms in stylistics*. London and New York: Continnum International Publishing Group.

James, P. and Manfred, S. (2010). Globalization and culture, Vol. 4: *Ideologies of globalism*. London. SAGE Publications.

Jonathan, G. (2013). *No enemies to fight: Goodluck Jonathan on the marble*. Abuja: Clear Coast Communications Ltd.

Oha, O. (1994). "Language in war situation: A stylistic study of the war speeches of Yakubu Gowon and Emeka Ojukwu". An unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan

Olajide, S. B. (2003). "Style in scientific prose: A case study of in an ESL context". In *Stylistics in theory and practice* by Lawal A. (ed.). Ilorin: Paragon Books. Pp 93 – 104.

Olaniyan, K. (2015). "A stylistic reading of General Ibrahim Babangida's independence day broadcasts 1985 - 1993". In *Papers in English and linguistics (PEL).* Volume 16, No. 2. Pp 133 – 164.

Osundare, N. (2008). *Style and literary communication in African prose fiction in English*. Ibadan: Hope Publications.

Omojuyigbe, D. (2015). "Discourse markers and meaning in Chief Olusegun Obasanjo's letter to President Goodluck Jonathan". In *Papers in English and linguistics (PEL)*. The Linguistic Association, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife Vol. 16 No. 2

Opeibi, B. O. (2009). *Discourse, politics and the 1993 presidential election campaigns in Nigeria*. Lagos: Nouvele Communications Limited.

Pratt, E. L. and Traugott, C. (1980). *Linguistics for students of literature*. New York: Harcourt Brace Hovanorich Publishers.

Teittenen,M.(2000)."Power and persuasion in the Finnish Presidential rhetoric in the early 1990's" retrieved from http://www/natcom./org/conferences/Finland/Mari Teittenen.

Verdonk, P. (2002). *Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.