

**A STYLISTIC STUDY OF PARALLELISM IN THE
PRESIDENTIAL SPEECHES OF PRESIDENTS BARRACK
OBAMA AND GOODLUCK JONATHAN**

BY

**BALOGUN SARAH
MA/ARTS/5143/2011-2012**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES,
FACULTY OF ARTS,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA**

JUNE, 2015

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The role of language in every society is multifunctional; it serves various purposes ranging from communication to command and persuasion. The language of politics is a persuasive one and hence, politicians are expected to be conversant with this characteristic of language. The elegant use of language to perform the task of persuading and emphasizing goes a long way in making the language of politics a beautiful language. One of the beautiful features of human language is the fact that it is used for social interaction. No wonder Bloch and Trager (1942) define human language as “a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group cooperates”. In social lives of humans, language is used to establish and maintain social relationships. It is by “virtue of our membership of social groups that we are able to interact with others and in doing so, to establish our individual identity and personality” (Lyons 1977:51). The act of speaking is one way by which human beings communicate feelings and emotions as well as ideas to other members of a social group.

Speaking is the cement that holds friendships, families, communities, societies and government together, (Philips et al, 1985 cited in Ahmed 2012). This communication at a formal level involves public discourse such as sermons, debates and political speeches and language is central to meaningful political discourse. Schaffner (1996) opines that any political action is prepared, accompanied, controlled and influenced by language.

In countries where true democracy is practiced, politicians can only come to power after effective campaigning. Therefore, for elections to be won, these

politicians have to be efficient in public speaking, hence, the relationship between language and politics is a very significant one, therefore, for any political speech to be successful there has to be a creative use of language by the politician. Language is used by politicians to convince, persuade but in most cases it is used to deceive. This study, however, is not concerned with the negative or deceptive use of language by politicians, rather, it seeks to analyse the linguistic devices used in political speeches, most especially that of foregrounding because that is where the concept of 'parallelism' falls.

The study of political discourse is as old as politics itself. The emphasis the Greeks placed on rhetoric is a case in point. Every aspect of their lives is concerned with giving public discourse and this is often political in nature, ranging from the speeches in the arena of any sporting events to senate debates. From Cicero (1871) to Aristotle (1891) the concern was basically with particular methods of social and political competence in achieving specific objectives. While Aristotle gave a more formal twist to these overall aims, the general principle of articulating information on policies and actions for the public good remains constant. This general approach continues today. Public speaking or political speeches are part of the political state of affairs. Thus, when a man/woman is elected president, he/she faces the daunting task of public speaking as acceptance and presidential speeches are part of the numerous speeches he/she is expected to deliver. Therefore, the focus of this study is to analyse how the foregrounding device of parallelism works in the presidential speeches of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan of Nigeria and President Barrack Obama of the United State of America.

Stylistics is the branch of linguistics that studies the use of language in specific contexts and attempts to account for the regularities that mark the language

use by individuals or groups. Stylistics, which is often referred to as "literary linguistics" is concerned with the linguistic choices that distinguished genres (Poetry, Drama, Prose...etc) and with the ways in which individual writers exploit language, Hancock (1986) cited in Ahmed (2012). Stylistics is not always concerned with literary analysis alone. In recent times, it has expanded its scope by delving into the analysis of other discourse types including political discourse, which is the main focus of this study. The label "Linguistic Stylistics" is given to those stylistic studies that are not a literary exercise. Ayeomoni (2004:177) sees Linguistic Stylistics as "an analytical approach that helps readers to objectively study both literary pieces and non literary materials". Linguistic stylistics is concerned with the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of texts of all categories, whether literary or non-literary, constructed with the verbal apparatus of language, from the perspective of linguistics. Short (1996) defines Stylistics from the perspective of linguistic study, he says "Stylistics is ... concerned with relating linguistic facts (linguistic description) to meaning (interpretation) ..." Ibid (1996:15). According to McMenamin and Dongdoo (2000), Linguistic Stylistics is the scientific analysis of individual style-markers as observed and identified in the idiolect of a single writer. In fact, the present study tackles the notion of parallelism as a unique style marker that is highly observed on different linguistic levels in the speeches of the American and Nigerian presidents.

Parallelism is a foregrounding device which refers to the use of words, phrases, clauses, or sentences that are similar in structure, in sound or in meaning. It is useful in the sense that it allows a writer or speaker to drive home an idea, image, or relationship, and to 'force' the reader or listener to pay attention. The theory of foregrounding is probably the most important theory within stylistic analysis, and foregrounding analysis is arguably the most important part of the stylistic analysis of

any text. One way to produce foregrounding in a text is through linguistic deviation. Another way is to introduce extra linguistic patterning into a text. The most common way of introducing this extra patterning is by repeating linguistic structures more often than would normally be expected to make parts of texts parallel with one another. Such parallel structures have the same overall grammatical structure (grammatical parallelism) and some of the words are repeated in identical syntactic locations.

Parallelism has numerous advantages in speech as it beautifies a speech or write-up. The patterned repetitions always beg for attention by the listeners/readers. Moreover, it intensifies the listener/reader's excitement and suspense. Most importantly, parallelism in political discourse serves to convey the meaning of the discourse more comprehensively. In other words, it is basic to meaning. It is where syntactic arrangement most deeply engages with reason. Thus, it is fundamental to the logical structure of language. The present study is a modest contribution that aims at analysing selected speeches by the United State President and the Nigerian President – Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan to explore the nature and effects of parallelism in the speeches. It investigates the notion of parallelism which characterizes the style of these two presidents.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Political speeches are often pregnant with meanings. People tend to misunderstand as well as give false interpretation to what is said and how it is said. President Jonathan's and Obama's speeches are laced with various types of parallelism, and the audience's inability to identify these parallel constructs will make them lose sight of the beauty and creativity that the device brought out in the

speeches. This study will attempt to find out if this rhetorical device of repeating similar patterns gives a better clarification and interpretation to political speeches. It will also examine how the use of similar patterns of repetition helps to add proper meaning and brings out creativity in these speeches.

There is always a disparity on the language use between a native speaker and a second language speaker. Therefore, the use of parallelism as a stylistic device between Presidents Obama and Jonathan cannot be the same due to the fact that one is a native speaker of English and the other is a second language speaker of English. This study investigates the disparities in these speeches, hence, the comparison between Obama – first language user and Goodluck – a second language user.

Parallelism as a stylistic device is not common in linguistic studies, that is why very few studies have been conducted on it in this field. Does it have any significance in linguistic analysis like it does in literary analysis? Can it be divorced from literary stylistics and experimented in political speeches? Will it have the same effectiveness in political speeches as it does in poetic analysis? These are a few problems that the researcher investigates.

1.3 Research Questions

The study will seek to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the vital roles and the effects of parallelism as used in political discourse?
2. How does parallelism contribute to the realisation of political meaning in speeches?
3. How does parallelism characterize Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan's style?

4. What similarities and differences exist in the use of parallelism in speeches of the President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan of Nigeria and President Barack Obama of the United States of America?

1.4 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The main concern of the present study is to carry out a linguistic study of parallelism as a significant stylistic device used in the selected Presidential speeches of Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan. However, the objectives are to:

1. Provide an account of the vital roles of parallelism and its effect in political discourse.
2. Illustrate the ways in which parallelism contributes to meaning in political discourse.
3. Establish parallelism as one of the effective stylistic devices that characterize Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan's style.
4. Account for the similarities as well as the differences between Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan's use of parallelism.

1.5 Justification for the Study

The topic under study is chosen particularly because the area of political discourse, most especially presidential speeches is one of the most interesting areas to investigate, because presidential speeches present a real political situation in which political language is used. In addition, choosing to explore the linguistic patterns of parallelism is due to the fact that parallelism is a strong foregrounding device that captures the reader's attention, serves to deliver the speaker's message, and marks the style of any piece of writing.

Chomsky (1957) modified the work of de Saussure's concepts of 'langue' and 'parole' and referred to them as 'linguistic competence and linguistic performance'. Competence refers to the entire knowledge one possess of a language and performance refers to one's ability to use the language. One of the things this study sets to find out is how far 'competence and performance' affect the skilful use of rhetorical devices. It seeks to justify how competence and performance work in a native speaker of English and a non-native speaker of English language. Hence, the comparison between the speeches of Barrack Obama (a native speaker) and Goodluck Jonathan (a non-native speaker). The effective use of parallel structures in their speeches (which were written and delivered in English Language) and the effects these have on their target audience will determine the extent to which they convey their message.

Another reason why the researcher embarked on this study is to analyze the stylistic effect of parallelism obtains in political discourse and how effective it serves as a foregrounding concept. Hitherto, most studies carried out on parallelism are usually related to literary works, most especially poetic studies. Hence, the research investigates the concept of parallelism in political discourse, to ascertain if it has the same effect as it does in literary works.

The reason for the comparison between presidents Barrack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan is because both men are quite educated. President Barrack Obama holds a Juris Doctor in Law while President Goodluck Jonathan holds a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Zoology. Furthermore, another reason for the comparison is due to the fact that President Obama is a native speaker of English while President Jonathan is not.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it studies how this powerful tool in discourse is manipulated by these presidents in their speeches and the study also uses the approach of stylistics. This is because parallelism is a stylistic device and can only be effectively explored in a linguistic stylistic study. Parallelism is one of the most noticeable stylistic device which is accepted not only as a traditional rhetorical device used in classical literature, but also as a common feature of style that characterizes political discourse. Thus, the present work aims at drawing more attention to parallelism as a stylistic device that characterizes the style of Presidents Barack Obama and President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches.

The study also seeks to discuss political discourse from Stylistic angle instead of Critical Discourse Analysis because Stylistics creates a good foundation for different aspects of style to be studied since politicians have their individual unique styles which usually characterize their personality. The study is also significant because it will expose the powerful effect that parallelism has in speeches, especially on the audience.

1.7 Scope and Delimitation of the Study

Stylistics as an aspect of linguistics is a multifaceted discipline. This is due to the fact that it discusses individual styles when it comes to language usage. It also expands and discusses linguistic features of any given text. This research is therefore, limited to the analysis of parallelism as a stylistic device in the presidential speeches of Presidents Barack Obama of The United States of America and Goodluck Jonathan of Nigeria. For President Barack Obama, his second tenure presidential speech of 2013 will be analysed, this is because a lot of work has been done on his first tenure

presidential speech, hence, it is expedient for his second tenure speech to be selected for the purpose of originality. The presidential speech of President Goodluck Jonathan's current administration delivered in 2011 on the occasion of his inauguration ceremony will be used for analysis. The research is designed to focus on parallelism as a rhetorical device in their language use. It will look at the types of parallel structures used in these presidential speeches and their effect on political discourse.

This study will look at parallelism under the four linguistic levels of phonological parallelism, syntactic parallelism, lexical parallelism and semantic parallelism. This will help to make the analysis clearer and understandable and sufficient examples will be drawn from both speeches.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Preamble

The review of Literature is done in two parts: Topical review and review of previous studies in the field of linguistic stylistics, this is then followed by a discussion of the theoretical framework.

Topical review focuses on the key words that make up the topic of the study such as:

- Biography of President Barrack Obama
- Biography of President Goodluck Jonathan
- Foregrounding
- Parallelism as a Foregrounding Device
- Types of Parallelism
- Political discourse
- Speech Making and Political Discourse
- Presidential speeches as a form of political discourse
- Language of politics
- Stylistics
- Oral and Written Styles

While Authorial review deals with related studies in the areas of parallelism and stylistics. A few of these works are reviewed and these include the works of: Ma. Le Chau Hoai Nhat (2008), Aisha Sa'adi Al-Subhi (2009) and Sana Fadi Adel Shamaileh (2011) etc.

2.1 Topical Reviews

This part of the review of literature deals with topics as they are related to the current study. Key concepts are reviewed below.

2.1.0 Biography of President Barrack Obama

Barack Hussein Obama II is the 44th and current President of the United States. He is the first African American to hold the office. Barack Hussein Obama II was born on August 4, 1961, at Kapi'olani Maternity & Gynecological Hospital in Honolulu, Hawaii, United States, son of a Kenyan senior governmental economist who later died in an automobile accident. His parents separated when he was two years old and they divorced in 1964. Obama Sr. remarried and returned to Kenya, visiting Barack in Hawaii only once, in 1971. From ages six to ten, Obama attended local schools in Jakarta, including Besuki Public School and St. Francis of Assisi School. In 1971, Obama returned to Honolulu to live with his maternal grandparents and attended Punahou School, a private College preparatory school, from the fifth grade until his graduation from high school in 1979. Obama's mother returned to Hawaii in 1972, remaining there until 1977 when she relocated to Indonesia to work as an anthropological field worker. She finally returned to Hawaii in 1994 and lived there for one year before dying of ovarian cancer. Following high school, Obama moved to Los Angeles in 1979 to attend Occidental College. After two years he transferred in 1981 to Columbia University in New York City, where he majored in Political Science with a specialization in International Relations and graduated with a B.A. in 1983. He worked for a year at the Business International Corporation, then at the New York Public Interest Research Group.

After four years in New York City, Obama moved to Chicago, where he was hired as director of the Developing Communities Project (DCP). He worked there as a

community organizer from June 1985 to May 1988. In late 1988, Obama entered Harvard Law School. He was selected as an editor of the *Harvard Law Review* at the end of his first year, and president of the journal in his second year. During his summers, he returned to Chicago, where he worked as a summer associate at the law firms of Sidley Austin in 1989 and Hopkins & Sutter in 1990. After graduating with a Juris Doctor (J.D.) *magna cum laude* from Harvard in 1991, he returned to Chicago.

Obama was elected to the Illinois senate in 1996, and reelected in 1998 and 2002. In January 2003, Obama became chairman of the Illinois Senate's Health and Human Services Committee. Obama resigned from the Illinois Senate in November 2004 following his election to the U.S. Senate. Obama was sworn in as a senator on January 4, 2005, at which time he became the only Senate member of the Congressional Black Caucus. *CQ Weekly* characterized him as a "loyal Democrat" based on analysis of all Senate votes in 2005–2007. The *National Journal* ranked him among the "most liberal" senators during 2005 through 2007. He enjoyed high popularity as senator with a 72% approval in Illinois.

On February 10, 2007, Obama announced his candidacy for president of the United States in front of the Old State Capitol building in Springfield, Illinois. The choice of the announcement site was viewed as symbolic because it was also where Abraham Lincoln delivered his historic "House Divide" speech in 1858. After McCain was nominated as the Republican candidate, three presidential debates were held between the contenders spanning September and October 2008. In November, Obama won the presidency by winning 365 electoral votes to 173 that McCain received, in the process capturing 52.9% of the popular vote to McCain's 45.7%, to become the first African American to be elected president. Obama delivered his victory speech before hundreds of thousands of supporters in Chicago's Grant Park. He was also re-

elected after winning the 2012 election. President Obama is also the first African-American President in US history and a Nobel Prize Winner.

2.1.1 Biography of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan

Jonathan was born on November 20th 1957 in what is now Bayelsa State to a family of canoe makers, he holds a B.Sc. degree in Zoology in which he attained Second Class Honours. He holds an M.Sc. degree in Hydrobiology and Fisheries biology, and a PhD degree in Zoology from the University of Port Harcourt. Before he entered politics in 1998, he worked as an education inspector, lecturer, and environmental-protection officer. President Jonathan is married to Patience and they have two children. He is a Christian, and he comes from the Ijaw ethnic group. On 29th May 1999, Jonathan was sworn in as Deputy Governor of Bayelsa alongside Diepreye Alamiyeseigha who was named as the governor of the state on the platform of PDP. Jonathan served as Deputy Governor until December 2005.

On 9th December 2005, Jonathan, who was Deputy Governor at the time, was sworn in as Governor of Bayelsa State upon the impeachment of the current Governor Diepreye Alamiyeseigha by the Bayelsa State Assembly after being charged with money laundering in the United Kingdom.

Dr Goodluck Jonathan was nominated as the running mate of President Umaru Musa Yar'adua to contest the 2007 general elections which they won. As Vice-President, Jonathan took on a very low profile while recognizing the constitutional limits of the Vice-President office, he participated in cabinet meetings and, by statute, was a member of the National Security Council, the National Defense Council, the Federal Executive Council, and was the Chairman of National Economic Council. Vice-President Jonathan was instrumental in negotiating an agreement with many of the

major militant groups in the Niger Delta, who were mostly his fellow Ijaws, to lay down their weapons and stop fighting as part of a government amnesty.

On 9th February 2010, a motion from the Nigerian Senate invested Goodluck Jonathan as acting President of the federation because President Yar'Adua went for medical treatment in Saudi Arabia in November 2009. As Acting President, Jonathan also promised to continue implementing the Seven-point agenda policy framework of President Umaru Musa Yar'adua. In accordance with the order of succession in the Nigerian constitution following President Umaru Yar'Adua's death on 5th May 2010, Vice-President Goodluck Jonathan was sworn in as President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria on 6 May 2010, becoming Nigeria's 14th Head of State. He cited anti-corruption, power and electoral reforms as focuses of his administration. He stated that he came to office under "very sad and unusual circumstances". On 18th May 2010, the National Assembly approved Jonathan's nomination of former Kaduna State governor, Namadi Sambo, for the position of Vice-President.

On 15th September 2010, Jonathan announced on Facebook that he had decided to run for his first ever political election to hold public office as President of Nigeria in 2011. In the contest for the Peoples Democratic Party nomination, Goodluck Jonathan was up against the former vice-president Atiku Abubakar and Mrs. Sarah Jubril. On 13th January 2011 the primary election results were announced in Eagle Square, Abuja with victory in two-thirds of the states of the federation counted and Jonathan was declared winner. For the general election in 2011, Jonathan and Vice-President Sambo attended political events and travelled the country to campaign for the nation's highest office. Jonathan won the general election against General Muhammadu Buhari and his running mate Nuhu Ribadu with 59% of the votes. On 18th April, Jonathan was declared the winner of the election.

2.1.2 Foregrounding

Foregrounding is seen primarily as a literary device. It refers to an effect brought about in the reader by linguistic or other forms of deviation in a literary text or a speech. The deviant features of the text, being unexpected, come to the foreground of reader's attention against the background of its normal linguistic features. The Prague School linguists consider foregrounding, which confers unexpectedness, unusualness and uniqueness on literary texts, as the differentiating factor between poetic and non-poetic language. However, foregrounding is not only a literary device; it is used in everyday conversation. Leech (1985:41) admits this stating that "deviant and surprising uses of language are to be found not only in literature, but also in other domains such as joke-telling, advertising, and ordinary conversation". He considers the maximisation of foregrounding as the function of poetic language but it can also be accounted for in ordinary discourse.

Leech (1985:41) points out that foregrounding demands from readers "an act of imaginative interpretation" besides the normal process of interpretation applicable to texts. When an abnormality comes to the forefront, efforts are made to make sense of it. It is in these imaginative acts of attributing meaning that the special communicative values of foregrounding lie. One way to produce foregrounding in a text or a speech is through linguistic deviation. Another way is to introduce *extra linguistic patterning* into a text. The most common way of introducing this extra patterning is by repeating linguistic structures more often than it would normally be expected to make parts of texts/speech parallel with one another. It is on this premise that parallelism comes into play, it is a device under foregrounding because parallel structures are often fore-grounded that is why they capture the readers/listeners attention because of their deviance.

2.1.1 Parallelism as a Foregrounding Device

Parallelism is the logical linking of two ideas by using parallel grammatical forms within a sentence. Parallelism is an arrangement of the parts of a composition so that elements of equal importance are balanced in similar constructions. This arrangement may be applied to words, phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, or complete units of compositions. Parallelism is a rhetorical device. The term comes from the Greek 'parallelos', meaning "beside one another."

Parallelism is a linguistic phenomenon, which explains the relationship that may be understood between units of linguistic structures, which are constructed parallel to each other or related in some other ways. There is always a relationship in the structures and ideas so juxtaposed generally in the form of synonymy, repetition, antithesis, apposition and other forms. All levels of language categories- a word, phrase, sentence, units of sound and meaning etc- may be engaged to function as parallelism. When these parallels achieve perceptual obtrusiveness, the deployment may be described as foregrounding- a means by which a particular idea or meaning or structure is made overt and most recognizable in the world of the text under consideration, in this case, presidential speeches. It is in line with the above view that this study situates parallelism as a linguistic concept and chooses to do a linguistic analysis of it.

Parallelism is a great way to make connections between ideas and claims and to advance an argument. Jones & Peccei (2004:51) state that parallelism is "a device which expresses several ideas in a series of similar structures. This can serve to emphasize that the ideas are equal in importance and can add a sense of symmetry and rhythm, which make the speech more memorable". In a speech, politicians always want the audience to focus on key features - salient points. And the parallel patterns of

discourse are seen as a best choice “to draw attention to a particular part of their message and make it stand out from the rest of the speech,” Jones & Peccei (2004:51). Using parallelism help politicians emphasize their key views, persuade audience to sympathize with their views, and make their speech more memorable.

Discussing parallelism, Short (1996:15) opines that parallelism has the power not just to foreground parts of a text but also to expose parallel or contrastive meaning links between those parallel parts. This may involve constructing new aspects of meaning for the words concerned, or in searching among the possible connotations that a word might have for the one that is most appropriate in particular structure. Consequently, meaning and interpretative connections can be made from these elements as they appear in parallel construction.

Taken as a predominantly literary feature, the term foregrounding refers to an effect brought about in the reader by linguistic or other forms of deviation in a text. The deviant features of the text, being unexpected, come to the foreground of reader's attention against the background of its normal linguistic features. Foregrounding is not limited to any one particular language pattern or poetic device. Basically it serves as an attention-calling device in a literary text or a discourse through the exploitation of a range of linguistic devices like repetition, coupling, and unexpected lexical collocations, syntactic inversions etc. Jan Mukarovsky (1958) refers to foregrounding as "the aesthetically intentional distortion of the linguistic components." This definition signifies that the concentration of any linguistic features - phonological, syntactic, or semantic - which are rare or unnoticed in ordinary speech but brought into prominence deliberately in the literary text or political discourse with the purpose of contributing to its total effect can result in foregrounding. This "calling of the reader's attention to linguistic structures", quite different from normal language use

is what makes parallelism beg for attention. Murana (2011) sees parallelism as a linguistic feature that corroborates indirection, he says it is a form of ‘tautology’ that does not lead to boredom but ensures communicative efficacy. This is because parallel structures are often repeated but this repetition beautifies the text or utterance and makes meaning clearer.

Linguistic parallelism refers to the pattern repetition in discourse for creating stylistic effect. It operates on different branches of linguistics, for example, it can be phonological when it takes the form of initial, medial or end rhyme and it is most distinguished with the presence of alliteration and assonance. It is lexico-semantic if it involves synonymous or antonymous words occurring in paradigmatic relation. It is however, syntactic when the parallel occurs at clausal or group level. At this level, the structures are equivalent – sameness of mood, textual pattern and thematic structure constitute parallelism, Murana (2011).

According to Shamaileh (2011), parallelism plays a significant role in strengthening, emphasizing, drawing attention to a parallel structure and achieving greater impact on recipient(s). Parallelism is when different parts of a sentence or thoughts are formatted similarly to emphasize either their commonalities or their differences. Parallelism gives a sentence a good rhythm and (usually) makes it easier to read. Parallelism means to give two or more parts of the sentences a similar form so as to give the whole a definite pattern. It is an expression used to refer to repetition of syntactic structure or form in two or more configurations with new or different content. A parallel constituent is usually connected via junctive expressions. There are four major types of junctive expressions suggested by de Beaugrande and Dressier (1983: 71) that are normally used to connect parallel constituents. Conjunction includes *and, also, moreover, furthermore, in addition, besides*, etc, disjunction is

achieved via the use of *or*, *either/or*, *whether or not*, etc, contrajunction is manifested by *but*, *however*, *yet*, *nevertheless*, etc and subordination includes *because*, *since*, *as*, *thus*, *while*, *therefore*, etc. Junctives have a significant function when used in a text; they link the text and establish a relation between the connected sentences. Moreover, junctives can be used to "have control over how relations are recovered and set up by receivers" (de Beaugrande and Dressier *ibid*: 74). Accordingly, junctions operate as cohesive ties in parallelistic structures.

de Beaugrande and Dressier (1983: 49, 75) describe parallelism as "Repeating a structure but filling it with new elements" or "...using surface formats but filling them with different expressions". Another definition of parallelism is provided by Ivany (1993: 49-50) who states that:

The parallel line does not simply repeat what has been said, but enriches it, deepens it, transforms it by adding fresh nuances and bringing in new elements, renders it more concrete and vivid and telling -that is, it generates new (contextual) semantic reality from the lexical (word) meanings of its components

Furthermore, Johnstone (1991: 33) in his attempt to define parallelism opines that "to say that two linguistic structures are parallel is to say that they share a common structural frame, and that within this frame, some element or elements differ in form". Jakobson (1968:600) is of the view that "Parallelistic systems of verbal art give us a direct insight into the speaker's own conception of grammatical equivalences".

Okunowo (2012) defines parallelism as a linguistic phenomenon, which explains the relationship that may be understood between units of linguistic structures, which are constructed parallel to each other or related in some other ways. He further

states that in parallelism, there is always a relationship in the structures and ideas so juxtaposed generally in the form of synonymy, repetition, antithesis, apposition and other forms. All level language categories- a word, phrase, sentence, units of sound and meaning etc- may be engaged to function as parallelism. When these parallels achieve perceptual obtrusiveness, the deployment may be described as foregrounding- a means by which a particular idea or meaning or structure is made overt and most recognizable in the world of the text under consideration. Short (1996) opines that ... parallelism has the power not just to foreground parts of a text for us, but also to make us look for parallel or contrastive meaning links between those parallel parts. This may well involve construing new aspects of meaning for the words concerned, or in searching among the possible connotations that a word might have for the one that is most appropriate in particular structure. Consequently, meaning abstractions and interpretive connections can be made from these elements as they occur in parallel constructions.

It can be argued that as a stylistic device, the rhetorical function of parallelism is to strengthen, empower, emphasize, persuade and have a bigger impact on recipients. The connection between parallelism and political speeches lies in the fact that politicians rely on linguistic repertoire in order to obtain and achieve their objectives and aims, one of these linguistic configurations is parallelism, Chilton and Schaffner (2002: 23) contend that "a language can be thought of as a 'resource', which is drawn upon in order for political goals to be achieved".

As politicians strive, first and foremost, to gain the trust and support of people, being persuasive is all what they need. Van Dijk (1997: 12) argues that "Persuasive function of text or talk is not limited to its rhetoric, but may also depend on style or meaning or coherence". The fact that politicians use an interwoven texture of

rhetorical features, style, coherence and meaning in order to persuade an audience supports Dijk's view.

2.1.2 Types of Parallelism

Taken the fact that parallelism is repetition of structure or form draws one's attention to the degree and type of resemblance that is manifested in parallel structures. In other words, the degree of resemblance between parallel structures may vary between complete and partial correspondence. Furthermore, parallelism may include semantic, phonological and morphological repetition, among others. The following researchers varied in their classifications to range from two to five types of parallelism.

Koch (1982) divides parallelism into two types, complete parallelism and cumulative parallelism. The former describes total correspondence in syntactic and semantic structures. However, the latter describes partial correspondence in syntactic and semantic configuration. Moreover, El-Shiyab (1990: 275) cited in Shamaileh (2011) describes occurrence of cohesion in partial parallelism as "a mixture of lexical cohesion and syntactic cohesion". Similarly, Al-Jubouri (1984: 107-108) divides parallelism into two types according to their degree of competence: complete parallelism where there is total or almost complete correspondence between the parallelistic structures, and incomplete parallelism where partial correspondence occurs between the parallelistic forms.

In Johnstone's work (1991: 102, 106), parallelism is classified into two types, one of which is different from the above classification, i.e. listing parallelism and cumulative parallelism. The former is used to describe structures that are similar in syntax but different in content. The latter describes a structure that is built on a

previous structure semantically which leads to rise in momentum. Johnstone argues that cumulative parallelism is not only a rhetorical device, but also a text-building device.

In contrast, Ivany (1993: 55-56) divides parallelism into five overlapping types: syntactic, semantic, morphological, prosodic and phonic; where none of them is dominant nor dominated by the other. It is important to note that in most cases there is an overlapping of several heterogeneous types of parallelism (semantic, syntactic, prosodic, morphological, phonic and so on) so that no single element may be considered as purely dominant or as purely concomitant, Shamaleh (2011).

A further classification of parallelism by Ochs (1979), discussed in Johnstone (1991: 29), includes phonological parallelism and morphological or syntactic parallelism. A substitution of the expression morphological parallelism with morphological echo and phonological parallelism with rhyme is presented by Holes (1995: 65-66), though he maintained the use of syntactic and semantic parallelism. Beeston (1974) contends that whenever a writer wishes to elevate his/her style he/she uses parallelism. He classifies parallelism into semantic parallelism, which includes synonymous parallelism: "This may come about by the second member [lexical item] repeating the content of the first [lexical item] in different words" (ibid: 134), antithetic parallelism which is when the second member contrasts the first and synthetic parallelism when the second member elaborates the thought and completes it, chiasmic parallelism occurs when the word order of one of the two parallel phrases, clauses or sentences is reversed in the other.

Another classification of parallelism presented by Jawad (2007) includes two types, parallelism with anaphora (i.e. repeating initial lexical items in a parallelistic structure) and parallelism with synonymy. He also argues that parallelism functions as

rhetorical and cohesive device: "Parallelism is considered to be a textual feature that brings about extra regularities in the text; the implication would be that it has some cohesive ends" Jawad (ibid: 2007). It is clear from the review of studies on parallelism that researchers' views are not the same with regards to the types of parallelism. Some of the classifications overlap, others have the same function but different naming as in Holes (1995) who substitutes morphological parallelism with morphological echo and phonological parallelism with rhyme. Another point worth mentioning is the variation in the number of classifications where they range between two to five types. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, the focus would be on the classification that captures the relation between types of parallelism, with particular emphasis on morphological parallelism, phonological parallelism, syntactic parallelism.

The above suggested classification can be justified based on the fact that repetition means repeating the same structure and content more than once which comes in a higher level than parallelism, which is based on repeating the same structure with new or different content. Moreover, morphological parallelism means repeating the same structure (i.e. morphological derivation) but with a different content which makes it a type of parallelism.

As for phonological parallelism, it is based on repeating the same structure with the same rhyme or phonological resemblance but with different content which considers it as another type of parallelism. The fact that the above mentioned types of parallelism have one thing in common which is repeating the same structure puts them under an overarching category which is syntactic parallelism which includes repetition of the same structure, word order and number of words.

From the above review of types of parallelism, it can be deduced that researchers have varied ideas on what constitutes a type of parallelism.

2.1.3 Political Discourse

Geis (1987), Fairclough (1989), Wilson (1990), van Dijk (1993), carried out researches on political discourse; however, their approaches were either based on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) or Pragmatics. Political discourse can be defined not only in textual terms but also in contextual terms i.e. location, timing, and roles of participants and aims of the political process. Van Dijk (2002: 225) states that "Political discourse is not primarily defined by topic or style, but rather by who speaks to whom, as what, on what occasion and with what goals". In other words, a speaker has to bear in mind a number of factors that would have an effect on his/her discourse and utterance. These factors may range from knowing the situation or occasion in hand to anticipating the reaction of the recipients; hence knowing what is appropriate to be said and what is not.

Political discourse is institutionalized and there are various genres of political discourse, Bakhtin (1990). However, our focus in this thesis is going to be on formal political speeches. In the majority of the cases, a political speech is written before it is read aloud. Chilton and Schaffner (2002: 7-8) contend that there are various functions of a written version of a political speech. On the one hand, it functions as a record that could be referred back to at any time, and on the other hand, a written version can be disseminated to the public via the media. Abu Libdeh (1991) looks at political discourse with reference to *power*, a key notion in discourse. He contends that *power* is realized through discourse which is governed by institutions: "An institution is an apparatus responsible for designing, executing and policing a certain policy or type of behaviour" (ibid: 112).

Institutional relations are classified into: intra-institutional and inter-institutional relations, Abu Libdeh (1991). As for the former, it is manifested between the institution and its individuals who share the same discourse that fulfil the requirements and the interests of an institution. Normally, an institution provides its individuals with a frame of action that guides them as how to talk and what terminology to use. On the other hand, the individuals help in creating rules and complying with them. Therefore, when politicians made use of parallelism, it was done deliberately and it became part of political speeches, where a speech would sound odd if it did not have parallel constituents. As for the latter, inter-institutional relations, it involves relations that occur between one institution and another. The relation between institutions is usually of power and solidarity. Therefore, every institution aspires to have a powerful position over other institutions. At the same time, it seeks to create bonds of solidarity with the other institutions to secure its dominance. Similarly, Fairclough (2001) distinguishes between two kinds of discourse and power: power behind discourse and power in discourse. In discourse types where power is present behind discourse, power is manifested in the hands of power-holders in an institution rather than in the hands of the institution. An example would be the relation between a lecturer and his students, where a conversation between them would be governed by authority from the lecturer's part and obedience from the students' part.

As for discourse types where power lies in discourse, relations of power are manifested and exercised in discourse. An example would be the discourse of the mass media, where it has power over its viewers. We might say that, in terms of 'power in discourse', discourse is the site of power struggles, and, in terms of 'power

behind discourse', it is a powerful mechanism for sustaining power Fairclough (2001: 61).

Shamaileh (2011) argues that political discourse has a communicative and sociolinguistic nature. Thereupon, politicians strive to get the allegiance and support of their people through manipulating them. This can be achieved via the use of linguistic features to stir peoples' emotions and persuade them. Chilton (2004: 204) argues that there are particular emotions that can be called political: "some politically relevant feelings, such as territorial belonging and identity ('home'), love of family, fear of intruders and unknown people ... Such emotions might have an innate basis and be stimulated automatically in the political use of language".

Politicians regularly rely on rhetorical tactics that help to achieve persuasive speeches. These tactics are described as "stylistic features which are intended to move the audience by appealing to them on a "poetic" level, to obtain their feedback, and perhaps win their applause, or at least grab total attention" (Mazraani, *ibid*:203).

Chilton (2004:3) classifies politics into two main strands: on the one hand, it is a dispute for power and on the other hand, it is based on cooperative ties: "politics is viewed as cooperation, as the practices and institutions that a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money, influence, liberty, and the like". Accordingly, politics can be further sub-classified into micro and macro levels as Chilton (*ibid*: 3-4) argues. At the micro level, struggle is manifested for dominance and interest, whereas, cooperation occurs between individuals and social groups. At the macro level, institutions of the state intervene in the two strands: on the one hand, in supporting the dominant power, and on the other hand in resolving conflicts. The macro level may also involve politicians, social movements, parties and interest groups. Many scholars

touched upon the notion of power with reference to language, including Kress (1985), Simpson (1993) and Logue and Miller (1995), among others.

Van Dijk (2002: 204) contends that there are three dimensions of the political domain, 'the base level' which consists of 'individual political actors' with their thoughts, discourse and beliefs, 'the intermediate level' which has to do with the base level of political actors and institutions with their beliefs, discourse and relations and 'the top level' which is constituted of the intermediate level and political systems with their discourse and the socio-cultural political processes.

According to Shamaleh (2011), political discourse can also be classified into inner-state and inter-state discourse, this is seen in speeches, treaties, press conferences, editorials, among others where political discourse takes various forms in each of them. Political discourse can be distinguished by a number of features, the most prominent of which is based on thematic criterion where political discourse refers to politics with all its activities and forms.

Another characteristic of political discourse concerns the audience where in many cases it is meant for a wider audience, since politics is becoming internationalized and not restricted to one country or culture. Culture-boundedness varies in its degree, at one end of the spectrum a political text may reflect social, cultural or historical period, while at the other end a political text may be internationalized and targets a wider audience.

Euphemism is another characteristic which political discourse has the tendency to adopt. Euphemism, in a negative light, is described by Al-Hammed (1999:10) as "the most useful weapon [politicians use] for telling lies". Similarly, Newmark (1991:156) agrees with Al-Hammed (1999) and states that "Euphemism

allied or identical with generalizing jargon is the politician's most useful weapons for telling lies ('being economical with the truth'). Newmark (1991) also contends that British politicians tend to use the term 'semantics' to avoid discussing sensitive issues and avert criticism. Therefore, when a politician avoids answering a question by saying 'it is only semantics' s/he gives the impression that the questioner is not welcomed to intervene further and discuss specific details. Newmark (1991:149) contends that there are a number of characteristics that give political concepts a prominent style: The four main facts about political concepts are that they are partly culture-bound, mainly value-laden, historically conditioned and like all concepts, abstractions in spite of continuous efforts to concretize them. The preference for abstract over concrete terms is one of the characteristics of political concepts as in capitalism, democracy, socialism, etc. The quality of value-laden in political terms refers to either positive or negative connotations, for instance the terms '*occupation*, '*propaganda*' have negative connotations whereas the terms '*supplements*', '*support*' have positive connotations.

Another distinctive feature that characterises political discourse is rhetoric which is an essential means of persuasion. This has been investigated by many scholars including Aristotle (1926), Whately (1963), Corbett (1966), Black (1978), Campbell (1988), Bryant (1972), Leff (1980) and Nakayama and Ktizek (1995). Rhetoric is described as "the art of persuasive discourse" (Gockrofts in Beard, 2000: 35), a further definition presented by Beard (ibid: 118) states that rhetoric "refers to persuasive writing-or speaking". In debates and public speaking, rhetorical skills, which reinforce the value of a speech, are very important if the audience is to be persuaded. Aristotle classifies the means of persuasion into three categories described by Beard (ibid: 37) as the following:

- Persuasion through personality and stance
- Persuasion through the arousal of emotion
- Persuasion through reasoning

These three categories are often used by speakers to reinforce their performances. Politicians especially, use all the three categories to reach out to their audience (the ruled) and to convince them when major issues are at stake. There are multiple factors (i.e. linguistic and physical) that are incorporated in the delivery of a political speech such as: the ability to attract the audiences' attention and having them follow the argument, gesture and dress, face and eye movements, among others. As political discourse is based on persuasion, rhetoric is also the art of persuading people. Persuasion and rhetoric are inseparable since the majority of writers equate these two concepts together (as shown earlier by Cockrofts (2002), Beard (2002), Charteris-Black (2005), Jowett and O'Donnell (1992), Metcalfe (1998), among others). Therefore, whenever there is persuasion there is rhetoric and vice-versa, Charteris-Black (2005: 9). Persuasion is defined as "an interactive communicative process in which a message sender aims to influence the beliefs, attitudes and behaviour of the message receiver" (Jowett and O'Donnell, 1992: 21-6). A similar definition by Metcalfe (1998: 398) states that "Persuasion can be defined as communication which influences and changes the beliefs, feelings, or behaviour of a listener. Persuasive speeches convince, stimulate, and actuate". Normally, persuasion intends either to confirm beliefs, attitudes or behaviours, or to challenge them, though they never present completely new ones.

Politicians regularly rely on rhetorical tactics that help to achieve persuasive speeches. These tactics are described as "stylistic features which are intended to move

the audience by appealing to them on a "poetic" level, to obtain their feedback, and perhaps win their applause, or at least grab total attention" Mazraani (ibid:203). The above reviews show that the use of persuasion by politicians is a deliberate attempt at convincing the audience to accept the politician's ideals, and to make them believe that positive changes will come if cooperation is given to the elected person. As Mazraani shows above, appealing to the audience on 'poetic level' involves the use of parallel structures because using these structures makes a speech to sound poetic, almost musical to the ears.

Furthermore, a common style used by politicians is 'passionate tone'. It is not a rhetorical tactic but it relates to the tone of the speech. This style shows that the politician is sincere, honest and involved in the issue of discussion. Therefore, when the public applaud the speaker, s/he would not wait for them to stop; on the contrary, the speaker would continue his/her speech without any interruption to show that what he/she is saying is more significant than acknowledging their applause. Consequently, it would have greater impact on the audience, build up tension among them and stir their emotions.

Other tactics are suggested by Tannen (1989) cited in Shamaileh (2011) such as "[the] use of repetition, imagery, detail, and constructed dialogue with reported speech and dialogue". These devices attract the audience's attention and create positive feedback from them as in applause, cheering, chanting or in press comments as a delayed feedback.

Beard (2000: 38-46) also presents an overlapping classification of rhetorical tactics used in political speeches. The first of which is claptrap, which is a method used by politicians to catch the applause of their audience. Second, is a list of three lexical items which complement each other. It is an attractive strategy for speakers

and listeners where it gives unity and a sense of completeness. A list of three can be of lexical items that share a general meaning or even a repetition of the same lexical item which includes prosodic features which are described as "features of spoken language, such as stress and tempo, which make up its overall rhythm and melody" (Beard, *ibid*: 118). Third, is the use of contrastive pairs or antitheses, which consist of two parts in opposition. Fourth, is the use of pronouns; politicians manipulate the use of pronouns to protect their image and the way people see them. All these rhetorical tactics which enrich political speeches can be incorporated within a parallel structure whether it is a sentence or a lexical item. This study highlights the key rhetorical and stylistic devices of political discourse as parallelism is only one of them, and a parallel configuration can incorporate some of these devices, though the focus in this thesis is going to be on parallelism.

2.1.4 Speech Making and Political Discourse

Speech is a salient feature of various political activities. Politicians, political parties and agencies use a special genre in their communication and tend to rely on special publicists whose task is to monitor and design their political language (i.e. wordings and phrasings).

Political life is characterized by speech making. Craftiness in giving or making speeches is a tool in the hands of politicians. This is because it is through speeches that they persuade the audience and validate their political claims. Political speeches are aimed at a wider audience, hence, language in the hands of politicians is a tool to convince, persuade and even deceive in most cases. Orwell (1969) was the first to draw attention to the political potential of language. This is seen in his classic article titled "Politics and the English Language" where he considers the way in which language may be used to manipulate thoughts and suggests, for example, that

‘political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible’ Orwell (1969:225). His examples are drawn from various types of inverted logic as seen in his novel ‘Nineteen Eighty Four’ and they echo through much of recent works on political discourse.

Political speeches are made in a formal setting rather than in an informal one. Michael and Suzanne Osborn state that political speeches take place in a social setting and become a social act. The success of elected politicians is dependent on the effectiveness of their speeches. (Osborn, M. & Osborn S. 1988:6). Therefore, the speeches must be properly prepared beforehand to reach the needed results and hold politicians popularity. Clark states that public speeches are in the form of a monologue, because there are almost no requirements for interaction. So, the speeches must be scripted for a proper organization (Clark, 1996:81). The Osborns also mention other important aspects associated with this area such as the faith in public communication, freedom of speech and also ethical responsibility of the speaker (Osborn, M., Osborn S., 1988:7). In other words, speaker’s belief into the power of speaking is important for his or her success. Other accompanying features to achieve success are speaker’s power to influence the audience and his or her honest intentions. Schaffner speaks about political texts as a part of the political life. They are usually determined by the political membership of the speaker and the topics are related to politics. These speeches are meant for members of the same political group, wider public or they can be addressed to the whole nation. The aim of the speaker is to give a relevant message to his or her audience and reach a specific political function (Schaffner, 1996:201-203). Beard agrees with these statements and points out that the political ideas cannot be separated from the language but the way language is used helps to shape the ideas (Beard, 2000:18).

Political speeches are often written for the speaker by professional speech writers which are then distributed to the press through press conferences, to be broadcasted the next day on the news and published in the newspapers. Normally, parts of the speech rather than the whole text are broadcasted and published. These parts are called sound bites which are described as "A short extract from a recorded speech or interview which is chosen because of its impact", Beard (2000:119). Normally, cases of parallelism can be found in these sound bites as they are short configurations which share the same structure, rhyme and in many cases a range of semantic relations. This makes them very appealing to recipients, draw their attention and have a stronger impact on them: "sound bites require economy of expression: they need to be brief, yet using language structures which encourage them to be often repeated and easily remembered", (Beard, 2000:43).

As political speeches are built on persuasiveness, languages may rely on different features to achieve persuasion. Mazraani (1997:212) states that "a political speech is an act of persuasion of an audience and like a conversationalist, the politician mobilizes a certain array of communicative skills to get his message across and to influence his listeners". Mazraani argues that English political discourse relies heavily on three main rhetorical 'tactics', first of which is listing three elements, second is contrasting pairs and third is the use of pronouns.

2.1.5 Presidential Speeches as a Form of Political Discourse

Political speeches are communicative, argumentative and persuasive texts that aim at getting an audience (i.e. readers or listeners) to take certain course of action and to react and behave in a given way. Presidential speeches do not defer from the above. It forms the focus of this study. Akmal (2010) sees a presidential speech as a part of the political state of affairs. He further opines that political speech reflects the

philosophy, values, and beliefs of a particular party, organisation, community and society. This is to say that when a president delivers a speech, though he does so as an individual, he is actually speaking on behalf of his government. In other words, in the words of Sapir (1921:36), “the society speaks through the individual”. Making or giving speeches is one of the fundamental duties of a president. These speeches are one way he reaches out to those he rules. Adetunji ((2006:234) views presidential speeches as representing institutional voices because presidents are considered the “most eligible representatives of their countries, whose words therefore bear a semantic load of their nations’ ethos and soul”. Because of this vital role performed by these speeches, every country has an archive of its presidents political speeches and this has led to series of linguistic studies into these political speeches.

Adetunji (2006) and Chilton & Schaffner (1997) investigated presidential speeches from a pragmatic viewpoint, while Miller (2004) and Okpanachi (2004) investigated through the platform of Discourse Analysis and Oha (1994) and Adegaju (2005) uses a stylistic framework. Presidential speeches involve inaugural speech, acceptance speech, campaign speech and even address to party congress as well as speeches on special occasions such as the independence day of any given country. According to Strachan (2010), presidential speeches delivered at the occasion of inauguration and acceptance speeches serve as “public rituals where the newly elected typically celebrates the democratic processes that empower them” (ibid:21). He further says that this type of political speech helps a country to celebrate its shared values in a process that explicitly describes the relationship between the executive and the people.

2.1.6 Language of Politics

Language prescribes the terms in which the world is seen, if not more. This idea was most poetically phrased by Heidegger who puts that "language is the house of being", a house in which we are captured and inside of which all our experiences of the world take place. Whether we agree with Heidegger (and many philosophers of the modern age) or not, language plays a very important role in our lives. Therefore, the nature of that influence, the power that language holds over us, becomes a worthwhile topic of inquiry. This was done ever so remarkably by the most prominent of French structuralists, Michel Foucault (1926-1984). Foucault (1972) held that language, and users of language, inevitably engages in relations of power. Unsurprisingly, language often serves to protect and even legitimate the power of the prevailing class and the power-structural relations that exist at that moment.

It is widely conceived that language and politics are interconnected; Ayeomoni (2005) opines that language is 'the vehicular expression of politics'. It is the means by which politics or political discourse and ideas are widely disseminated. Ali (1975:48) corroborates this when he asserts that language "is the most important point of entry into habits of thought of a people. It embodies within itself cumulative association derived from the total experience of its people". It is in the light of this that, Harris (1975:58) cited in Ayeomoni (2005:155) states that, "in politics words have a powerful effect". He (Harris) adds, "language is the means by which political ideas are transmitted to the community." Therefore, proper usage of the tools of language, that is, rhetorical devices such as parallelism will enable the politicians to capture the minds and interest of his audience. The relationship between politics and language is described by Chilton and Schaffner (2002: 3) as follows:

What is clear is that political activity does not exist without the use of language. It is true that other behaviours are involved: for instance, physical coercion. But the doing of politics is predominantly constituted in language.

In the same vein, Trosborg (1997: 119) asserts that "Politics is constituted to a great extent by text and talk. Not only, of course, since physical and economic coercion are involved, but these too depend on or utilise discourse".

Politicians recognize the power of language and its significant role in the making up of political speeches, an issue investigated by Newmark (1996) who states that "Politics is the most general and universal aspect and sphere of human activity and in its reflection in language it often appears in powerful emotive terms, or in impotent jargon" (ibid: 146). A successful politician is endowed with many characteristics, one of which is being a good orator, having the ability of convincing the audience and getting their support, presenting a vision of a better future and being able to lead the people. Chilton (2004: 5) contends that "Man is by nature a political animal".

Politicians have to be aware of the context of a political situation. They have to know the setting in terms of time and location, circumstances, participants, genre and common knowledge about the issue of discussion (Bitzer, 1981). Emotions play an important role in the context of situation in terms of using intonation, stress, and repetition, among others. A communicative situation is classified by Van Dijk (2002: 225) into the following categories:

- Overall domain: (e.g., politics)
- Overall societal action (presidential election)

- Current setting (time, location)
- Current circumstances (presidential inauguration)
- Current interaction (presidential speech)
- Current discourse genre (speech)
- The various types of role of participants (elected president, members of the ruling party, the general public, etc.),
- The cognitions of the participants (goals, knowledge, beliefs, etc)

The discourse type investigated in this thesis is political speeches that are delivered in particular events and settings by the presidents of the United States of America and Nigeria. The discussion so far has shown that language is the key factor in political behaviour most especially when it comes to mobilizing people to support and accept a political figure, idea or norm.

2.1.7 Stylistics: An Overview

Stylistics is the study and interpretation of texts from a linguistic perspective. As a discipline, it links literary criticism and linguistics, but has no autonomous domain of its own, Widdowson (1975). The preferred object of stylistic studies is literature, but not exclusively "high literature" but also other forms of written texts such as text from the domains of advertising, pop culture, politics or religion, Simpson (2004). It is on this premise that this study seeks to use stylistics as a foundation for the analysis of presidential speeches which is a domain of politics.

Stylistics also attempts to establish principles capable of explaining the particular choices made by individuals and social groups in their use of language,

such as socialisation, the production and reception of meaning, critical discourse analysis and literary criticism.

Other features of stylistics include the use of dialogue, including regional accents and people's dialects, descriptive language, the use of grammar, such as the active voice or passive voice, the distribution of sentence lengths, the use of particular language registers, etc. In addition, stylistics is a distinctive term that may be used to determine the connections between the form and effects within a particular variety of language. Therefore, stylistics looks at what is 'going on' within the language; what the linguistic associations are that the style of language reveals.

Stylistics is traditionally regarded as a field of study where the methods of selecting and implementing linguistic, extra-linguistic or artistic expressive means and devices in the process of communication are studied (Mistrík, 1985). In general, we distinguish *linguistic stylistics* and *literary (poetic) stylistics*. The division between the two is by no means easy or clear. In his book *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose* Mick Short comments on this problem as follows:

... stylistics can sometimes look like either linguistics or literary criticism, depending upon where you are standing when looking at it. So, some of my literary critical colleagues sometimes accuse me of being an unfeeling linguist, saying that my analyses of poems, say, are too analytical, being too full of linguistic jargon and leaving insufficient room for personal preference on the part of the reader. My linguist colleagues, on the other hand, sometimes say that I'm no linguist at all, but a critic in disguise, who cannot make his descriptions of language precise enough to count as real linguistics. They think that I leave too much to intuition and that I am not analytical enough. I think I've got the mix just right, of course! (Short, 1996:1)

Stylistic investigations were initially concerned with literary text, that is why it is sometimes called literary linguistics or literary stylistics. Nowadays however, the domain of stylistics has expanded into the analysis of various kinds of texts such as manuals, recipes as well as novels and advertisements. In addition, 'media discourses' such as films, news reports, song lyrics and political speeches have all come to be under the umbrella of stylistic analysis. (Brown, 2005; Finch, 1998 and Wisniewski, 2007).

2.1.8 Stylistics: A Brief History

The analysis of literary style goes back to Classical rhetoric, but modern stylistics has its roots in Russian Formalism and the related Prague School, in the early twentieth century, Jeffries and McIntyre (2010) In 1909, Charles Bally's *Traité de stylistique française* had proposed stylistics as a distinct academic discipline to complement Saussurean linguistics. For Bally, Saussure's linguistics by itself couldn't fully describe the language of personal expression, Talbot (1992). Bally's programme fitted well with the aims of the Prague School, Ulrich (1989).

Building on the ideas of the Russian Formalists, the Prague School developed the concept of *foregrounding*, whereby poetic language stands out from the background of non-literary language by means of *deviation* (from the norms of everyday language) or *parallelism*. According to the Prague School, the background language isn't fixed, and the relationship between poetic and everyday language is always shifting, Pope (2002)

In the twentieth century, Roman Jakobson had been an active member of the Russian Formalists movement, his views on Formalism and American New Criticism was given in his *Closing Statement* at a conference on stylistics at Indiana University

in 1958. Published as *Linguistics and Poetics* in 1960, Jakobson's lecture is often credited with being the first coherent formulation of stylistics, and his argument was that the study of poetic language should be a sub-branch of linguistics. The *poetic function* was one of six general functions of language he described in the lecture.

Michael Halliday is an important figure in the development of British stylistics. His 1971 study *Linguistic Function and Literary Style: An Inquiry into the Language of William Golding's 'The Inheritors'* is a key essay, Simpson (2004). One of Halliday's contributions has been the use of the term register to explain the connections between language and its context. For Halliday, register is distinct from dialect. Dialect refers to the habitual language of a particular user in a specific geographical or social context. Register describes the choices made by the user, choices which depend on three variables: *field* ("what the participants... are actually engaged in doing", for instance, discussing a specific subject or topic), *tenor* (who is taking part in the exchange) and *mode* (the use to which the language is being put).

Fowler comments that different fields produce different language, most obviously at the level of vocabulary, Fowler (1996: 192). The linguist, David Crystal points out that Halliday's 'tenor' stands as a roughly equivalent term for 'style', which is a more specific alternative used by linguists to avoid ambiguity, Crystal (1985: 292). Halliday's third category, *mode*, is what he refers to as the symbolic organisation of the situation. Downes recognises two distinct aspects within the category of mode and suggests that not only does it describe the relation to the medium: written, spoken, and so on, but also describes the genre of the text, Downes (1998: 316). Halliday refers to genre as pre-coded language, language that has not simply been used before, but that predetermines the selection of textual meanings. The linguist William Downes makes the point that the principal characteristic of

register, no matter how peculiar or diverse, is that it is obvious and immediately recognisable, Downes (1998: 309)

2.1.9 The Concept of Style

The term 'style' is used in linguistics to describe the choices which language makes available to a user, above and beyond the choices necessary for the simple expression of a meaning. Linguistic form can be interpreted as a set of possibilities for the production of texts, and thereby linguistic form makes possible linguistic style.

The understanding of the term style influences the characteristics given to Stylistics as one of several linguistic disciplines. Although the term *style* is used very frequently in Literary Criticism and especially Stylistics, it is very difficult to define. There are several broad areas in which it is used: (1) At its simplest, style refers to the manner of expression in writing and speaking, just as there is a manner of doing things, like playing squash or painting. It is possible to talk of someone writing in an ornate style, or speaking in a comic style. For some people, style has evaluative connotations: style can be good or bad. (2) One obvious implication of (1) is that there are different styles in different situations (e.g. comic vs. turgid); also that the same activity can produce stylistic variation (no two people will have the same style in playing squash or writing an essay). So style can be seen as variation in language use, whether literary or non-literary.

The term register is commonly used for those systemic variations in linguistic features common to particular non-literary situations, e.g. advertising, legal language, sports commentary. Style may vary not only from situation to situation but according to *medium* and may vary not only from situation to situation but according to *medium* and *degree of formality*: what is sometimes termed *style-shifting*. On a larger scale it

may vary, in literary language, from one genre to another, or from one period to another (e.g. we may talk of the style of Augustan poetry, etc.) Style is thus seen against a background of larger or smaller domains or contexts. (3) In each case, style is seen as distinctive: in essence, the set or sum of linguistic features that seem to be characteristic: whether of register, genre or period, etc. Style is very commonly defined in this way, especially at the level of text: e.g. the style of Keat's *Ode to a Nightingale*, or of Jane Austen's *Emma*.

Stylistic features are basically features of language, so style is in one sense synonymous with language (i.e. we can speak equally of the language of *Ode to a Nightingale*). What is implied, however, is that the language is in some way distinctive, significant for the design of a theme, for example. When applied to the domain of an author, style is the set of features peculiar to, or characteristic of an author: his or her language habits or idiolect. So the style can be Miltonic, or Johnsonese. (4) Clearly, each author draws upon the general stock of the language in any given period; what makes style distinctive is the choice of items, and their distribution and patterning. A definition of style in terms of choice is very popular, the selection of features partly determined by the demands of genre, form, theme, etc. All utterances have a style, even when they might seem relatively plain or unmarked: a plain style is itself a style. (5) Another differential approach to style is to compare one set of features with another in terms of a deviation from a norm, a common approach in the 1960's. It would be wrong to imply that style itself is deviant in the sense of abnormal, even though there are marked poetic idiolects. Rather, it is possible to match any text or piece of language against the linguistic norms of its genre, or its period, and the common core of the language as a whole. Different texts will reveal different patterns of dominant or foreground features.

Croft and Myer (2004) explain that style has to do with the way the text is written in terms of grammar, phonology, cohesion and graphology which are linked very closely to the purpose and consequently to the audience. That is to say, that in any language or literary product and analysis, the writer's choice of words and style used in writing them must not only be purpose and audience centred but also be believed or accepted to be justifiable semantically and pragmatically.

Style is not a mere ornament; rather it conveys important subtleties of meaning and evaluation, which define the nature of the writer, his basic attitudes, his presuppositions, his moral stance, and his relation to his subject and his reader. Style sharpens expressive meaning as well as referential meaning, intensifying the tone of writing, making prose more persuasive.

Wales (2001:372) opines that style refers to the perceived distinctive manner of expression in writing or speaking, just as there is a perceived manner of doing things, like playing squash or painting. It is similar to someone writing in an 'ornate style', or speaking in a 'comic style'. This is that different situations call for stylistic variations. Hence, style can be seen as variation in language use, whether literary or non-literary. Wales (2001:373) further sees style as a "commodity in the market place: a text can be 'packaged' in a particular style for a particular kind of customer or consumer". Bourdieu (1991) in the same vein says "that what circulates on the linguistic market is not 'language' as such, but rather discourses that are stylistically marked both in production and reception".

Crystal (1989:66) in attempt to explain the meaning of style and stylistics states that:

Style is seen as the (conscious or unconscious) selection of a set of linguistic features from all the possibilities in a language. The effects these features convey can be understood only by intuitively

sensing the choices that have been made... and it is usually enough simply to respond to the effect in this way. But there are often occasions when we have to develop a more analytical approach...here...our intuition needs to be supplemented by a more objective account of style. It is this approach which is known as stylistics.

Crystal and Davy (1969:9,10) cited in Murana (2011) identify four definitions of style as: a) referring to the language habit of a person; b) meaning some or all of the language habits shared by a group of people at one time or over a period of time; c) referring to the effectiveness of mode of expression; and d) tantamount to literary language. Murana (2011:2,3) defines style in ordinary term as manner of doing things – speaking, writing, dressing, walking, etc. he further says that style refers to the quality that makes something distinctive, fashionable or superior.

Style therefore, can be seen as the different kinds of options a narrator exercises from the linguistic system, and also from the social semiotic from which, according to Halliday, the linguistic system ultimately derives. Style, looked at in this way, is the complex of different paths through different social and linguistic systems, which generate the text.

2.1.10 Theories of Style

As earlier mentioned, style is a very controversial area and as such, scholars have come up with different theories of linguistic style. Some of these views as regards the theories of styles are:

- Style as Deviation from the Norm

The theory of style as a deviation contends that there are conventional or preset standards from which language users deviate for the purpose of communication. Leech (1985:40) cited in Murana (2011:7) notes that ‘to be

stylistically distinctive, a feature of language must deviate from some norm'. Lawal (1997: 28,29) argues that the theory of style as a deviation 'is hinged on the notion that language is both a rule-governed behaviour and an accumulation of norms'. He went on to say that 'accuracy' (grammatical correctness) and 'appropriateness' (social acceptability) are the hallmarks of the 'standard' variety of language. By implication, non conformity to the set standards amounts to deviation.

Halliday (1970:113) prefers the term prominence to deviation. He employs prominence to refer to 'the phenomenon of linguistic highlighting whereby some features of the language of a text stand out in some ways'. The fact that certain textual features stand out in a way that they become a clue for special observation and examination shows that they are marked and thereby communicatively suggestive. Osundare (1982:28) cited in Lawal (2003) raises the question of how to determine the norm and the criteria in establishing them. He states:

In some respects the relationship between the choice made by the writer and that made for him by language is not deterministic... the remarkable writer is one who has been able to bend, if not break, the pre-set rules of language, the linguistic outlaw who have flouted its hallowed thou-shalt-nots. Every language has within its system a loophole, an elastic edge for the adventurous user to widen and stretch. Not infrequently, language users ignore or even reject the choice forced on them by language... substitute their own choices, thus, liberating their styles and language itself in the process.

Deviation, which can come in the form of syntactic deviations, phonological deviations or even semantic deviations are therefore normal language behaviour as language users break rules to create effect.

- **Style as Choice from Variant Forms**

This approach considers style as deliberate choice from variant and competing forms. It is predicated upon the selectional possibilities and constraints within each language with regards to the paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations among linguistic elements.

Speakers and writers, though guided by the purpose of their communication, usually make their choices from available options within a paradigm. The English verb ‘killed’ for instance can be replaced with almost a dozen similar verbs depending on the situation of use, and a speaker would be required to select from within a paradigm one which is appropriate within the context of his speech.

John	Killed	A	Man
	Slew		
	Murdered		
	Assassinated		
	Shot		
	Slaughtered		
	Butchered		

- **Style as Idiosyncratic and Constant Form**

This theory is based on the premise that although language is public and social, every writer or speaker has his own way of combining the resources of language for effective communication purposes, Osundare (2003). This theory sees style as a study of individuality because every individual has his own idiolect, a unique way of using language.

Discussing this theory, Milic (1971:13) cited in Lawal (2003) says:

The style of an author has consistency due to the habitual nature of the writing process and this consistency can be determined, measured and used to determine consanguinity between an unknown and a set of authenticated texts.

Sometimes writers carve a niche for themselves through the style that characterizes their texts. Such writers are thus identifiable by the peculiarity of their style. Wole Soyinka is one of such writers, his unique style stood him out amongst his contemporaries so much so that his critics (Soyincritics) have styled him unimitable, Murana, (2011). The motivation behind this theory is the observed pattern – lexical, structural or notional in the texts produced by the same person. Osundare, (2003) however, argues that sound as this theory may be, it still has its own flaws. He argues that styles are sometimes more alike than appears to the cursory eye. This, according to him, is because the choice writers make is strongly determined by the language they use, the period of their writing, their chosen genre etc. A good example of this is the writings of Achebe and Amadi, they sound alike.

- **Style as a Dialectal Relationship between Message and Medium**

Some theorists of stylistics sees style as dialectal relation between content (or message) and form (or medium). This relationship in their opinion is inseparable. Professional views on the relationship between the message and the medium of a text can be broadly divided into two: the organic and the ornate perspectives Bathes (1971) in Lawal (2003:35-36). The organic or monist school of style claims that a text is an embodiment of unity with a form that cannot be separated without corresponding varying content and vice-versa. Osundare (2003:10) argues in line with this school of thought when he says that “a good work of art is nothing but a studied and well-wrought integration of form and content... form shapes content and content in turn illuminates form”. The Ornatists view of style as a medium-message inseparability is

contrary to that of the organist. The ornatists argue that it is not only possible to separate medium from the message but it is desirable to do so. This message-medium dichotomy has been a long standing controversy in the field of linguistics and other relevant fields.

2.1.11 Situating Stylistics in Linguistics

Defining the concept of stylistics is almost an impossible task because it is a very troubled and slippery concept which covers an area that is hard to delimit. However, several linguists have made attempts at defining the concept and a few of them are considered.

Turner (1973:7) defines stylistics as “that part of linguistics which concentrates on variation in the use of language often but not exclusively, with special attention to the most conscious and complex use of language in literature”. In this definition, Turner stresses the fact that writers are conscious in their use of language, and this consciousness serves to make their meanings efficacious as well as beacon the readers as well as listeners’ attention to the meaning made.

Firth, whose works inspired functional linguistics, has defined stylistics as a field of research which investigates the way a speaker fuses ‘the elements of habit, custom, tradition, the elements of past and the elements of innovation, of the moment, in which the future is being born in verbal creation’, (1958:184) Stylistics, according to this definition cannot be divorced from an individual’s habits, it goes to show that a person’s habits and environment shapes his style of using a language. This in turn will account for why a native speaker will be more skilful in the use of rhetorical devices than a non-native speaker as this study will reveal.

Fasold (1990) opines that Stylistics is the study of style used in literary and verbal language and the effect a writer or speaker wishes to communicate to the reader or hearer. It attempts to establish principles capable of explaining the particular choices made by individual and social groups in their use of language, such as socialization, the production or reception of meaning, literary criticism and discourse analysis.

Mistrík (1985) cited in Shamaileh (2011) defines stylistics as the study of choice and the types of use of linguistic, extra-linguistic and aesthetic mean, as well as particular techniques used in communication.

McArthur (1996) defines stylistics as a branch of applied linguistics, which studies style. In a similar vein, Malmkjaer (2002:510) also sees stylistics as “the study of style in spoken and written text”. Applied linguistics is the application of linguistic knowledge to language use, the above definition which sees stylistics as a branch of applied linguistics is simply buttressing the point that stylistic analysis has to do with styles in language use.

Prasad (2008:269) defines stylistics as the studies of the linguistic features of texts – phonological, lexical, syntactical which directly affect the meaning of an utterance. It studies the emotional overtones, emphasis, rhythm, symmetry, euphony, or ‘associative’ elements which place style in a particular register, such as literary, colloquial, and slang. It studies the use of proverbs or professional words in texts.

Stylistics or general stylistics can be used as a cover term for the analysis of non-literary varieties of language, or registers (D. Crystal & D. Davy in *Investigating English Style*, 1969; M. M. Bakhtin in *The Dialogic Imagination* 1981 and *The Problem of the Text*, 1986).

Stylistics describes the characteristic choice of words, the sentence structure and syntax of words, it equally examines figurative language of the text; the pattern of its rhythm and the component sounds; and its rhetorical aims and objectives.

In practical terms, Fairclough (1992) compares stylistic analysis to the taking of a car engine to pieces, looking at each component of the engine in detail, then observing its function as the whole engine starts to work. That is to say, that stylistic analysis can be seen as looking at texts in great detail, observing what the parts are, and saying what function they perform in the context of the passage.

Ullmann (1971:133) cited in Murana (2011) claims that “stylistics is not a mere branch of linguistics but a parallel discipline which investigates the same phenomena from its own point of view”. The implication of this according to Murana (2011) is that stylistics has the same levels of description as linguistics. No wonder many other linguists (Clusenaar, 1976:15; Lawal, 1997:25; McArthur, 1996) also accept stylistics as a branch of linguistics; an applied linguistic study. Stylistics is the branch of linguistics that studies the style of language and describes the norms and usage of literary language in speech, in various types of written works, and in public affairs.

Stylistics deals with language in the broad sense of the term, which includes speech, but stylistics differs from other areas of linguistics in that it is concerned with language and society and with sociolinguistics. Stylistics studies the means of expressing the supplementary (stylistic) information that accompanies the content of speech. A related subject of study is the system of a language’s synonymic means and potentialities at all levels. Stylistics also studies the linguistic norms of past periods of language development. Historical stylistics deals with these topics and also seeks to identify shifts and nuances in style, although its primary aim is to trace the history of

stylistic systems, the origin, formation, and development of stylistic variants within languages, and the history of the interactions among these variants.

2.1.12 Literary Stylistics and Linguistic Stylistics

In *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language*, Crystal observes that, in practice, most stylistic analysis has attempted to deal with the complex and ‘valued’ language within literature, i.e. ‘literary stylistics’. He further observes that in such examination, the scope is sometimes narrowed to concentrate on the more striking features of literary language, for instance, its ‘deviant’ and abnormal features, rather than the broader structures that are found in whole texts or discourses. For example, the compact language of poetry is more likely to reveal the secrets of its construction to the stylistician than is the language of plays and novels, Crystal (1987:71).

The stylistics of literature elucidates the methods of using language in literature and of combining aesthetic and communicative functions in language. The stylistics of literature also identifies the means by which language becomes a work of art within literature. Researchers in the field of literary stylistics indicate the distinctive features of texts, the methods of structuring various types of authorial narration, and the devices used to depict the speech of a given milieu. They also elucidate the methods of constructing dialogue, the functions of different stylistic strata of language in artistic speech, the principles of selecting linguistic means and of transforming them in literature, and the methods of concretizing aspects of language that are not significant in actual speech.

In trying to ascertain if there is a difference between literary stylistics and linguistic stylistics, it is helpful to consult the definition of stylistics given by *the Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* which defines it thus: the

discipline is quite broad: (a) methodically, stylistics is a procedure for the analysis of text; (b) normatively, stylistics is a directive for what is right in the use of language; (c) descriptively, stylistics is a text linguistic discipline, which explains the style of a text and sets it in relation to other features of the text. (Li Zichun, 2005:9) The above definition shows that stylistics is the platform used in studying literary works. However, what is studied in literary words are often the linguistic features inherent in such works. Therefore, literary and linguistic stylistics are like Siamese twin, they are inseparable.

In shedding more light on the differences between literary and linguistic stylistics, Leech said that stylistics is the “meeting-ground of linguistics and literary study” (Leech, 1969:2). He believed that within a text, it is possible to be more specific about how language serves a particular artistic function. Widdowson also provides an informative definition: “By stylistics, I mean the study of literary discourse from a linguistic orientation” and takes the view that “what distinguishes stylistics from literary criticism on the one hand and linguistics on the other is that it is essentially a means of linking the two and has no autonomous domain of its own.” (Widdowson, 1975:3) That is to say, literary and linguistic stylistics overlaps because both are linguistic and literary exercises, since language is the medium of literature and style contributes to meaning. Thus, stylistics serves as a bridge between linguistic and literary disciplines. According to McMenemy and Dongdoo 2000, stylistics is the scientific analysis of individual style-markers as observed and identified in the idiolect of a single writer.

2.1.13 Oral Versus Written Styles

The discussion of differences between oral and written language has a long and respectable history. Aristotle, in *The Art of Rhetoric* (Book III, Chap. XII), pointed out that writing and speech differ in both function and style. His discussion included some of the greater precision and detail found in writing, the greater amount of repetition found in speech, and differences caused by the availability of prosody (intonation, stress and rhythm) in speech but not writing. The Russian psychologist Vygotsky (1962) described many of the differences between writing and speech. He considered differences in sentence structure, precision, and detail ("In writing ... we are obliged to use many more words, and to use them more exactly"). He discussed the effects of prosody and gestures on spoken communication, citing a passage from Dostoyevsky in which the same spoken word is said to be used with six different meanings. Vygotsky's description of the uses of the two modes of language is especially worth considering:

Writing is addressed to an absent or an imaginary person or to no one in particular -- a situation new and strange to the child....In conversation, every sentence is prompted by a motive. Desire or need lead to request, question to answer, bewilderment to explanation. The changing motives of the interlocutors determine at every moment the turn oral speech will take. It does not have to be consciously directed -- the dynamic situation takes care of that. The motives for writing are more abstract, more intellectualized, further removed from immediate needs. In written language, we are obliged to create the situation, to represent it to ourselves. This demands detachment for the actual situation (p. 99).

The French novelist Sartre (1964) provides an analysis from a very different perspective. Recalling his shock the first time his mother read him a story, he writes:

I was bewildered: who was telling what and to whom? My mother had gone off: ... I didn't recognize her speech.... A moment later, I realized: it was the book that was speaking. Frightening sentences emerged

from it: they were real centipedes, they swarmed with syllables and letters.... Rich in unknown words, they were enchanted with themselves and their meanderings without bothering about me. Sometimes they disappeared before I was able to understand them; at other times I understood in advance; and they continued to roll nobly to their end without sparing me a single comma. That dis-course was certainly not meant for me (p. 46).

The style of written and spoken language differs in many ways. However some forms of writing are closer to speech than others, a good example of this is seen in political discourse. Below are some of the ways in which these two forms of language differ:

- Writing is usually permanent and written texts cannot usually be changed once they have been printed/written out. Speech is usually transient, unless recorded, and speakers can correct themselves and change their utterances as they go along.
- A written text can communicate across time and space for as long as the particular language and writing system is still understood. Speech is usually used for immediate interactions.
- Written language tends to be more complex and intricate than speech with longer sentences and many subordinate clauses. The punctuation and layout of written texts also have no spoken equivalent. However, some forms of written language, such as instant messages and email, are closer to spoken language. Spoken language tends to be full of repetitions, incomplete sentences, corrections and interruptions, with the exception of formal speeches and other scripted forms of speech, such as news reports and scripts for plays and films.

- Writers receive no immediate feedback from their readers, except in computer-based communication. Therefore, they cannot rely on context to clarify things so there is more need to explain things clearly and unambiguously than in speech, except in written correspondence between people who know one another well. Speech is usually a dynamic interaction between two or more people. Context and shared knowledge play a major role, so it is possible to leave much unsaid or indirectly implied.
- Writers can make use of punctuation, headings, layout, colours and other graphical effects in their written texts. Such things are not available in speech. Speech can use timing, tone, volume, and timbre to add emotional context.
- Written material can be read repeatedly and closely analysed, and notes can be made on the writing surface. Only recorded speech can be used in this way.
- Some grammatical constructions are only used in writing, as are some kinds of vocabulary, such as some complex chemical and legal terms. Some types of vocabulary are used only or mainly in speech. These include slang expressions, and tags like *y'know*, *like*, etc.

2.1.14 Approaches to Stylistics

Just as style can be viewed in several ways, so also stylistic approaches can be viewed from different perspectives. These varieties in stylistics are due to the main influences of Linguistics and Literary Criticism. Zyngier (2001) categorizes the approaches to stylistics into two main groups: text-oriented and context oriented.

Text-Oriented: Under the text-oriented approach, are the Formalist, the Mentalist and the Textlinguist approach.

- **Formalist Approach:** This approach was rampant in the 1960s, a number of analysts who were formerly of the tradition of Practical Criticism resorted to aspects of linguistics in search of a rigour which Practical Criticism did not offer. Their strategy was to concentrate on the text as an object and their main interests remained on the formalistic and mechanical description of patterns in phonology, lexis, and syntax at sentence level. In his early years, Sinclair (1963:98-99) cited in Zingier (2001) wrote what can be called a "declaration of principles" of this approach:

Literature is not a living organism, it is stone dead; it is marks on paper, or particular frequencies of the sound wave, or the visual and aural phenomena at a dramatic performance... poetry *is* the Unes, and nothing else.

It is this way of dealing with texts which is always criticised whenever stylistics is under attack. More recently, Mackay (1996) (1999) has resumed Fish's (1973) criticism on this particular point. It is true that a formalist orientation may turn out interesting lists of features and work for statistical accounts, but it disregards the way literature functions in context.

- **Mentalist Approach:** This approach is fashioned after the transformational Generative Grammar and the Chomskyan model of the 1960s. This approach follows the mentalist school. It values the relation of language to the mind. It is concerned with grammaticality and acceptability. Thorne (1981). an advocate of this approach equates the definitions of stylistics with judgements on manifestation of linguistic competence. He proposes that an investigation should be made on how the surface structure reflects the deep structure in an analysis. According to Thorne (1981) cited in Zyngier (2001:370)

...the basic postulates of both studies (generative grammar explicitly, traditional stylistics implicitly)

are mentalistic. In both cases, the most important data are responses relating to what is intuitively known about language structure.

Cook (1992:71) criticises this approach. He points out that the metaphor deep/surface is somewhat pejorative. Surface is associated to "trivial, false and empty-headed", whereas deep is "serious, genuine and thoughtful". In this sense, mentalist stylisticians believed they were engaging in more complex and meaningful analyses

- **Textlinguistic Approach:** this approach became prevalent in the seventies, analysts at this time began working on suprasentential level. They are concerned with form, they differed from formalist linguists, as now they saw the text as a unit, not as a string of sentences. For instance, textlinguists may apply narrative organisation to the study of literary texts. They may also investigate inter-sentential cohesion, look for patterns such as problem-solution (Hoey, 1983) to point out textual macrostructures (van Dijk, 1977). It is here that the term *discourse* also comes into the picture. According to Zyngier (2001) Textlinguists place their work on the level of discourse. In this case, the term *discourse* is equivalent to *text* and can be defined as "a continuous stretch of language larger than a sentence..." (Nunan, 1993:5). However, to other linguists, *discourse* means language in use and as such implies "... the interpretation of the communicative event in context" (Nunan, 1993, pp. 6-7).

Context-Oriented: Under the context-oriented stylistics, are the Pragmatics, Radical and Empirical approaches.

- **Context-oriented stylistics:** Contextualized stylistics is an umbrella term which refers to all those approaches which consider literature as an event within a specific situation.

- **Pragmatic Approach:** Pragmatic-oriented stylisticians look at everyday conversation as a means to understand literary discourse. According to Leech (1983)

cited in Zyngier (2001), it is the tendency to consider the text from an interactive point of view. Fowler (1979:15) explains: "At a more 'superficial' end of linguistics, illocutionary or pragmatic theory leads us to study explicitly *manipulative* constructions such as imperatives, interrogatives, responses, etc. At a more abstract level, implicature, presupposition, and other assumptions ... are highly promising for literary theory and analysis".

- **Radical Approach:** The term Radical Stylistics was first coined by Burton in 1982. The distinctive element of this approach is the critics' search for the ideological imprint of the text. Like pragmatic stylisticians, ideologically-oriented analysts go beyond text level into the social and historical forces which influence its production and reception, Zyngier (2001). Burton's arguments are that if texts depend on socio-cultural and political determinants, they are subject to value-judgement (Eagleton, 1983; Graff, 1990) and these value judgements should be discussed in clear terms. A text is a social construct, a part of a socio-economic, political and literary tradition, Durant & Fabb (1990); Montgomery et al. (1992). Pratt (1989:21) argues that "... an understanding of the social, historical and ideological dimensions of discourse can contribute a great deal to the interests of aesthetics". Van Peer (1991:130) adds that "textuality is partly a linguistic characteristic and partly the result of socio-cultural forces which provide the text its place and function within society as a whole". Birch (1989:167) cited in Zyngier (2001) shows where cultural studies ties in neatly with literature when he states that stylistics is "a study not just of structures of language and texts, but of the people and institutions that shape the various ways language means".

- **Empirical Approach:** This approach according to Zyngier (2001) is an approach that best accommodates developments in linguistic, literary and cultural theory. It

results from advances in what has been known as the Empirical Study of Literature (ESL). One of their main tenets is that text-meaning is not an intrinsic property of the physical text and that meaning is created in the process of response. They propose a shift of interest from text to text-focusing activities; from structures to functions and processes; from the literary object to the literary system. Hence, literature is more than a collection of texts. It is an event requiring participation of several elements involved in the process. Differing from radical stylisticians, they specify these elements. ESL proposes a "new" paradigm where the literary work is seen in the entire field of social interactions. Deriving its framework from a constructivist theory of cognition, ESL involves epistemological, methodological, ethical, and applicational aspects which may provide theoretical support for contextualized stylistics. ESL values the function of the text in the social system. Schmidt (1983:248) holds that:

...texts are no longer regarded as autonomous entities but always in relation to those actions which are necessarily performed by agents within the system of literature. As a result of this general orientation toward action, we obtain a model of literature as a social action system, which can be *structurally* defined through the causal and temporal relations between four primary action roles: the roles of producing, mediating, receiving, and post-processing those actions, objects, or events which are *considered literary* by agents according to the norms of poetics internalized by the agents.

The system of aesthetic communication then comprehends the following acts and roles:

Acts		Roles
Production	—————>	Authors, etc.
Mediation	—————>	Books, publishers, etc
Reception	—————>	Readers, etc.
Post-processing	—————>	Critics, etc.

Schmidt does not limit himself to the written text. He describes aesthetic communication in general which include both the written text as well as the spoken.

In summarizing the tenets of empirical linguistics, Zyngier (2001:374) says:

what I propose as empirical stylistics is the study of the sociocultural implications of the choices and effects that are responsible for the creation of instantial meaning in a text, which, in its turn, results from the articulation of different socio-historical agents.

2.2 Review of Previous Studies

A lot of studies have been carried out on political discourse. These studies looked at the various addresses that constitute political discourse, these range from coup announcements to memoranda and even presidential speeches. Presidential speeches have been subjected to linguistic inquiries for some time now. This focus is probably due to the institutional voices which these speeches project: presidents are considered the "most eligible" representatives of their countries, whose words therefore bear the semantic load of their nation's ethos and soul. A few studies have been carried out on presidential rhetoric as a form of political discourse often from not-too-clearly demarcated, heterogeneous perspectives. One way of categorising these works is according to their essential linguistic bases. In this direction, there have been linguistic enquiries into presidential speeches from the pragmatic standpoint (Adetunji, 2005; Ayodabo, 2003; Cap, 2002; Chilton and Schaffner, 1997; Rudd, 2004; Yusuf, 2003), from the discourse-analytic angle (Miller, 2004; Teittinen, 2000), and from the position of stylistics (Adegoju, 2005; Oha, 1994). Presidential speeches may also be delineated into thematic preoccupations. As such, there are studies on inaugural address (Adetunji, 2005; Cap, 2002), address to Party Congress (Chilton

and Schaffner, 1997) and positive projection of government's position for its people's endorsement (Miller, 2004; Rudd, 2004; Teittinen, 2000).

Few of those who carried out studies on political discourse include Ayeomoni (2005), Akinbiyi (2006), Akodu (2008), Anifowose (2009), and Abdurashed (2011). These scholars have attempted to analyse political discourse with respect to how language and politics interrelate. Ayeomoni (2005) carried out a linguistic-stylistic investigation of language of Nigerian politicians. He finds that the language of political elites in Nigeria is flavoured with excessive figurative and metaphorical expressions, and these features help to consolidate power and achieve their political goals and intentions. The current study, though similar to that of Ayeomoni (2005), in the sense that it is a stylistic study of political discourse as well, however, tries to investigate the use of parallel structures and their effect on political speeches.

Akinbiyi (2006) also carried out a study on the use of deixis in political discourse using Obasanjo's speeches as case study. He finds that the use of deixis makes political discourse or communication unambiguous, due to the functional use of personal, temporal, and spatial indexicals. This study differs from that of Akinbiyi because it investigates parallelism as another aspect or feature of political discourse and it studies its use by two presidents who are considered to be orators to see how effective the concept of parallelism works in political speeches

On the other hand, Akodu (2008) carried out a pragmatic study of ambiguity in political discourse in selected Nigerian Newspapers. She opines in her work that politicians deliberately use ambiguity to create confusion in the interpretation of political discourse. This study is a stylistic study and not a pragmatic one and it doesn't look at ambiguity, rather it focuses on studying the use of parallelism in the presidential speeches of the American president and his Nigerian counterpart.

Abdulrasheed (2011) also did a textual analysis of memoranda from the Federal House of Representatives, Abuja, Nigeria and established this as a form of political discourse. She finds that memoranda are used to make people believe in a certain ideology, persuade people to take a certain course of action, and these are characteristics of political discourse. The present work, although a linguistic stylistic study of political discourse, is different from the works reviewed above because it is investigating the stylistic device of parallelism as used by President Barack Obama, a native speaker of English language and President Goodluck Jonathan, a second language speaker of English language. It seeks to expose the peculiar way that politicians use parallel structures in persuading as well as imprinting an ideology or a concept in the minds of their audience.

Despite the vast literature on stylistic studies, few studies on parallelism have been carried out. Most of these studies examined parallelism in the Bible. According to Berlin "Most biblical studies focused on parallelism. They started as studies of biblical poetry, but sooner became studies of parallelism" (Berlin 1992:18).

Parallelism is studied by many scholars such as Ivany (1993), Johnstone (1991, 1983), Jakobson (1968), de Beaugrande and Dressier (1983), and Koch (1981) cited in Shamaileh (2011)

A most relevant study that is closely related to the current study is that of Nhat (2008) who carried out a study on the use of pronouns and parallelism on Obama's political speeches, most especially his campaign speeches while he was still a senator.

He found that parallelism was used by Obama as a tactical manipulation of rhetoric which helped him to achieve the final purpose which is that of convincing the public to believe and support his ideas and take part in his electoral campaign.

However, as the current study will show, the use of parallelism does not only serve the purpose of convincing audience by politicians, it has the advantage of making the key points in a speech to uniquely stand out from the rest of the speech. In other words, it also serves the purpose of emphasis.

Another meaningful work done in the area of Parallelism is the work of Al-Subhi (2009). She carried out a study of the linguistic analysis of parallelism as a stylistic device in Eloise Greenfield children's poetry. Each type of Parallelism was clearly identified in the selected poems, and then stylistically analyzed according to the patterns of parallelism in order to illustrate how parallelism creates unexpected effects upon the readers. The results of the study confirm the prominent existence of parallelism as foregrounded regularities on the three linguistic levels: phonological, grammatical, and semantic. They also show that the effect of parallelism varies according to the type of parallelism.

In as much as the work of Al-Subhi (2009) was a thorough work on parallelism, it is however concentrated on its effect on poetry most especially children poetry and a total deviation from the current study which is centred on political speeches and not on poetry.

Another closely related work to this study is the translation of parallelism in political speeches carried out by Shamaileh (2011), he focused on the translation of parallelism from Arabic to English in political speeches and finds that parallelism is not transferred in all the cases particularly where the structure of English varies from that of Arabic morphologically and phonologically, this is mainly manifested in translating feminine and masculine plurals, duality, feminine marker, assonance, alliteration, among others. However, this current study does not look at parallelism from the standpoint of translation, it tries to establish parallelism in English language

context and in real speech situation from a representation of the western world and Africa with the aim of assessing the intended effects on both sides and how the concept of parallelism works in general.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

The framework or the analytical procedure used for this study is the Crystal and Davy's (1969) general levels of Stylistic Analysis. Stylistic analysis is adopted for this study for the following reasons: in the first place, stylistics itself is described as a linguistic study of different styles (Chapman (1973), Ayeomoni (2002), Babajide (2002), Romano (2000), William (2002)), it is a product of social situation, implying that there is a common relationship between language use and socio-political situations because Stylistics as an integral part of sociolinguistics studies humans in relation to their society. Furthermore, stylistics could also be described as an academic field, which studies certain aspects of language variation. It is in this respect that Crystal and Davy (1969) stress that stylistics aims at "analyzing language habits with a view to identifying, from the general mass of linguistics, features common to English as used on every conceivable occasion..." (Crystal & Davy: 10) They describe stylistics as "[a study of] certain aspects of language variation" (Ibid: p. 9), and define it as a part of the linguistic discipline. They hypothesised that "any utterance, spoken or written, displays features which simultaneously identify it from a number of different points of view" (Ibid: p. 60). They introduced the term 'dimensions of situational constraint', and have identified eight basic areas of the extra-linguistic circumstances determining the style of a variety; they are: individuality, dialect, time, discourse, province, status, modality, and singularity.

- Individuality refers to those permanent features of the speech or writing habits, which identify someone as a specific person, distinguish the person from other

users of the same language, or the same variety of the language. Individuality is the basis of linguistic features which an individual uses unintentionally, and they are determined by the physical and psychological state, habits, education etc. This term is also used to cover both psychological and physical personal traits which could give rise to phonetic and graphic distinctiveness of any kind (Crystal and Davy, 1969:66). This dimension plays a crucial role in this study because the two presidents whose speeches are being analyzed are two distinct individuals, hence, differences must exist in their use of rhetorical devices.

- Dialect refers to features which can be used to give an indication of the person's place of geographical origin or his location on a non-linguistically based social scale.
- The dimension of time includes temporal features of an utterance of an individual which indicate exclusively diachronic information. Such information is of primary importance in any historical study of English, both in the general sense of the development of the language as a whole, and in the particular sense of the development of the habits of a single human being (ibid).
- Discourse includes two types variability in language medium which can be either speech or writing, and participation in the language event which can be monologue or dialogue (ibid).
- Province features identify an utterance with those variables in an extra-linguistic context which are defined with references to the kind of occupational or professional activity being engaged in. For example, the language of public worship, politics, advertising, science, or law (ibid:71). It refers to the occupational or professional activity of the author/speaker. In this

study, both presidents are politicians, however, they are from different continents and as such, their language use is expected to vary.

- The term status is related to different factors as formality, informality, respect, politeness, deference, intimacy, kinship relations, business relations and hierarchic relations in general.
- The dimension of modality allows a description of the linguistic features which are correctable with the specific purpose of an utterance which leads the user to adopt one feature rather than another, and to produce spoken or written format of his language which may be given a descriptive label (ibid).
- Singularity is a cover –term for those personal and occupational features which are only related to individual user. In other words, it describes those linguistic and idiosyncratic features which are regarded as markers of an authorship if they appear in a person’s usage. Therefore , there is a contrast between singularity and personality in the sense that the former is relatively continuous , permanent, and not to be manipulated in short or non-linguistic, whereas the latter is short, temporary , and manipulatable (ibid:76).

Additionally, there are some situational categories that must be distinguished within each dimension , such as formal, informal, political, legal, religious, etc. (ibid:82). These categories are in turn called “stylistic features” which correlate with the distinctiveness of a situation and operate at some or all of the phonological, grammatical , and lexical level (ibid:83).

So, the general stylistic method of analysis applied here, offers three major benefits in this study. First and foremost, it exposes the structural patterns of the language permeating a text so as to be able to identify the prominent or foregrounding stylistic features of the text. It also enables analysts to be consciously aware of the

kind of social variations, which the inherent linguistic features are identified with. Finally, of course, the approach also enables analysts to know the technique of putting these features down systematically in order to reveal the internal patterning of various texts. It is this phenomenon that has equally induced Crystal and Davy (1969) to argue that the central requirement of stylistics is to provide a single clear technique of description with which to cope with any piece of language. They opine that:

The central requirement of any linguistically oriented approach to the classification of stylistic effect is that it should provide a single, clear technique of description which will allow the student to cope with any piece of language he wants to study (Crystal & Davy: 13 – 14).

Consequently, the stylistic approach is usually synchronically applied to the codes available in the English language as in this study. This technique of description is what Chapman (1973) and Crystal and Davy (1969) refer to as codes and linguistic levels of analysis respectively. According to Crystal and Davy (*ibid*: 15), the levels of analysis could be: Phonetics/ Graphetics, Phonology/Graphology, Grammar/Lexis and Semantics.

The present study analyses and interprets Presidents Barack Obama presidential address for his second tenure and Goodluck Jonathan's presidential speech. The purpose of the study is to investigate their use of parallelism as a stylistic device in their political discourse and how this device is used to impress on the minds of the people the goals they wish to attain during the period that the people have voted them to be in power.

2.3 Summary

The study of stylistics devices is very important in political speech making. These devices teaches politicians how to speak well; it teaches politicians how to present ideas in vigorous and persuasive discourse, and to communicate their thoughts and impressions effectively. According to Jones & Peccei (2004), “language can be used to influence people’s political views by exploring in detail the ways in which politicians can use language to their own advantage”. Moreover, “Aristotle’s Rhetoric points out that we all employ rhetoric, the persuasive use of language, generally in trying to demonstrate the rightness of what we want the other person to accept.” (Joseph, 2006:110) The power of rhetoric is using persuasive discourse to convince an audience. Persuasion is considered as the ways of using language to exploit feelings, to foreground or to obscure responsibility and agency, to repeat equal ideas, or to draw attention to a particular part of the message, as shown in Jones & Peccei (2004:51-52) and Inogo-Mora (2004:47). Relying on the use of rhetorical devices, politicians make the impact of their ideas on the addressee increase to their own advantage. One of the rhetorical devices that politicians usually use in their speeches is that of foregrounding. Through foregrounding, sentences are used in parallel structures which is discussed in this study as parallelism.

The art of persuasion is further enhanced through the incorporation of specific linguistic devices. In Jonathan and Obama’s speeches, the stylistic device of parallelism combined with repetition became the carrier to emphasize main contents that the two presidents want the audience to notice. “Parallelism is a device which expresses several ideas in a series of similar structures. This can serve to emphasise that the ideas are equal in importance and can add a sense of symmetry and rhythm, which make the speech more memorable” (Jones & Peccei, 2004:51). One reason why

politicians use parallel patterns of discourse in their speeches is “to draw attention to a particular part of their message and make it stand out from the rest of the speech.”

Jones & Peccei (2004:51).

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Preamble

This chapter focuses on the methodology in which the research work is carried out. The sources of data, method of data collection, method of data analysis and analytical procedure form the main focus of this chapter.

3.2 Sources of Data

The data for analysis in this study is American President Barack Obama's second tenure presidential speech as well as Nigerian President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan's Presidential speech, both speeches were written and read in English language. The reason for choosing Obama's second tenure presidential speech is due to the fact that his first tenure speech has been used as source of data for several studies, hence, for the purpose of originality, his second tenure presidential speech has been chosen. President Goodluck's presidential speech happened to be the first presidential speech he will be giving after campaigning and winning the 2009 elections, hitherto, he was simply completing the tenure of the late Yar'adua's regime. The focus is on stylistic device of parallelism as used by the two presidents – one a native speaker of English and the other a second language speaker of English. The sources of data are from the internet, original text of the speeches of the selected presidents as made available to the press. The speech of Barack Obama was from the web address: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/01/21/inaugural-address-president-barack-obama>, and that of Goodluck Jonathan was downloaded from the web address: <http://www.getinspirednigeria.com/2011/05/30/president-goodluck-jonathans-inauguration-speech-full-text>. All examples used in this thesis are from these sources. The reason why these speeches are chosen for analysis is because

they present a formal and real political discourse in which political language is used. The speech of Barack Obama will be labelled appendix A while that of Goodluck Jonathan will be labelled appendix B.

3.3 Analytic Procedure

The analytic procedure for this research follows the Crystal and Davy's (1969) model of stylistic analysis in their work *Investigating English Style*. This is particularly chosen because their approach makes it possible for analysis to be done along the linguistic levels of analysis, which are phonological/graphological, syntactic, semantic and lexical levels of analysis. However, textual analysis will be employed as well in this analysis because textual analysis enables the researcher to include large amount of textual information and systematically identify its properties which includes the various devices used in the text – in this case parallelism, and makes valid conclusions on its function in the overall communicative event.

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the language of the presidents' speeches are analyzed stylistically. The analysis detects the different patterns of parallelism on different linguistic levels. Thus, all forms of parallelism in the presidential speeches are going to be identified and discussed on the four linguistic levels, phonological, lexical, syntactic and semantic.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.0 Preamble

This chapter discusses the presentation and the analysis of data. The synopses of both speeches are given and then stylistic analyses at the levels of phonology, lexical, syntactic and semantic were done on the two speeches and finally the findings of the study is also discussed here. The purpose of this analytical investigation is to examine at what levels parallelism is achieved in political speeches, the frequency of its occurrence and its effects in political discourse. The use of parallelism is a fairly typical feature of political discourse, particularly of persuasive texts such as presidential speeches.

4.1 Stylistic Analysis of Barack Obama's Speech

The following is a description of parallelism at the various levels of linguistic analysis. These categories were drawn on the corpus of analysis which is titled 'Appendix A'. Each level of parallelism is categorized by the researcher into sub-categories as necessary based on their frequency of occurrence.

4.1.2 Phonological Level of Analyses

This is an analysis of the speech based on the structural and sound patterns found in them.

Structure

The speech has a total of 23 paragraphs. Each paragraph has its own key topic or theme, ideals and tone. The speaker used political propaganda to steer the emotion of his audience because the speech was meant to motivate the people of United State of America to accept the speaker who is the newly elected president of United State of

America. It is also observed that each paragraph has an average of six (6) lines so as not to saddle each of the paragraphs with several themes.

Repetition and Alliteration

Parallel elements not only start with the same part of speech but also employ the repetition of a specific phrase or the same pattern of construction. The followings are examples of repetition.

Paragraph 1 has the following repeated words: “**We** gather to inaugurate a president, **We** bear witness to the enduring strength of our constitution, **We** affirm the promise of our democracy, **We** recall that what binds this nation together, **We** hold these truth to be self evident...” There is the repetition of the pronoun ‘we’ in the paragraph above, this incite the audience to have a feeling of togetherness and unity. The repetition of a specific phrase provides logic and rhythm and makes it easy for the hearer to understand as well as to focus on the message. We find these repetitions in the introductory phrases of paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 with the repetition of ‘**together we**’, followed by the strong active verbs ‘**determined**’, ‘**discovered**’, and ‘**resolved**’, Obama shows his audience he was willing to carry them along in the decisions on how the country should be run. He said in those paragraphs: “**Together we** determined that a modern economy requires railroad, **Together we** discover that a free market thrive, **Together we** resolved that a great nation must care for the vulnerable.” The use and repetition of the words ‘together we’ along with the active verbs as pointed above is a solid way of getting solidarity and collective responsibility from the audience, these parallel structures emphasize immediacy and collectiveness.

Paragraph 17 is also replete with examples of repeated phrases e.g

...our journey is not complete until our wives, mothers... our journey is not complete until our gay brothers...our journey is not complete until no citizen is forced to wait... our journey is not complete until we find... our journey is not complete until all our children...

The above repetition is powerful because it serves the purpose of emphasis, it helps to brand the message on the minds of the audience and as such, they go home with this melodious repetition and will keep talking about it for a while. This kind of repetition does not make the speech boring rather it is made attractive, captivating and easy to remember.

Alliteration

Alliteration is another phonological pattern found in Obama's speech. Paragraph four (4) has the following sounds 'sm' alliterating: '*fascism*', '*communism*'. This serves the purpose of creating musicality in the speech and it makes it memorable in the minds of the audience. In paragraph six (6), the /ʃ / sound alliterates in the following sentence: "**She** is an American, **She** is free, **She** is equal". Paragraph nine (9) has the following alliteration: **Medicare**, **Medicaid**. Paragraph fifteen (15) has the following alliteration: "Is the star that guide us **still**, through Seneca **falls** and stonewall**ll**"; We also have '**sung**' and '**unsung**'.

Paragraph seventeen has the following words repeated: "**These** words, **these** right, **these** values of life." The repetition of specific words and sounds provide logic and rhythm and makes it easy for the hearer to understand as well as to focus on the message.

Assonance

Assonance is when a series of words with similar vowel sounds are strung together or used side by side. The following are a few samples found in the speech:

Consonance

Consonance is when a series of words with similar consonant sounds are strung together or used side by side. The following are examples of consonance found in the speech:

Medicare and Medicaid and Social responsibility [par 9]

Through Seneca falls, and Selma, and Stone wall [par22]

4.1.3 Lexical and Syntactic Level of Analyses

Lexical parallelism occurs when two words are paired up and have various kinds of semantic relation to one another, that is, they may have same reference, they may relate as part to whole, they may belong to the same semantic field or maybe interpreted as antonyms – having opposed meanings.

- Antonymous Lexical Parallelism

The following excerpt is taken from paragraph five (5), where there are such pairs of words that are antonyms, that is, opposed in meaning, e.g.

“Through blood drawn by lash and blood drawn by sword, we learned that no union founded on the principles of liberty and equality could survive half-slave and half-free. We made ourselves anew, and vowed to move forward together.”

It is obvious here that ‘blood drawn by ‘*lash*’ is opposed to ‘blood drawn by ‘*sword*’’, there is also ‘*half-slave*’ opposing ‘*half-free*’. Here, Obama infers that without equality and liberty, (virtues for which he is fighting so hard for as a ‘Black

American' who must have tasted the bitter pill of racial discrimination) there will not be a completely 'free American'. The contrast drives home this point in a very subtle way using this rhetorical device.

Another example of placing two opposing ideas in a sentence is found in paragraph 14, "... The commitments we make to each other through Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, these things do not sap our initiative, they strengthen us." The placing side by side of this two opposing idea serves to foreground the effect of 'strengthen us' as against 'sap our initiative'.

- **Synonymous Lexical Parallelism**

Lexical parallelism can also be identified when equivalent phrases are put in a sequence. A good example of this is drawn from paragraph 21:

"You and I, as citizens, have the power to set this country's course. You and I, as citizens, have the obligation to shape the debates of our time"

The above sentence is made up of equivalent phrases and equal grammatical classes thus, You and I, as citizens//have the power//to set this country's course

You and I, as citizens//have the obligation//to shape the debates of our time

"We must act, knowing that our work will be imperfect. We must act, knowing that today's victories will be only partial"

The above examples follow action-result-effect pattern and that makes it musical and imprinted on the minds of the audience easily.

We must act//knowing that//our work will be imperfect

We must act//knowing that//today's victories will be only partial

“Our celebration of initiative and enterprise, our insistence on hard work and personal responsibility”.

The above is also made up of equal grammatical classes as well.

Our//celebration of//initiative and enterprise

Our//insistence on//hard work and personal responsibility

Three-part structural constructions as seen above prove to be repeatedly used by Obama, mostly for the sake of creating the effect of continuity and reinforcements, and sometimes their half-rhymes may create some sound bites that is pleasing to the ears, thus making the speech interesting without a boring moment.

Syntactic Parallelism

There are three ways to identify Syntactic parallelism these are:

- Each section of the text contains the same classes of phrases and words
- Corresponding phrases bear similar grammatical and thematic relations to the predicator
- Corresponding phrases and words are in the same order in both sections of the text.
- **Each section of the text contains the same classes of phrases and words**

“Our celebration of initiative and enterprise, our insistence on hard work and personal responsibility, these are constant in our character.”(Par 8)

In the above example, it is glaring that the first two phrases have equal and same grammatical class.

‘Our celebration of initiative and enterprise’

‘Our insistence on hard work and personal responsibility’

The above phrases followed the same pattern of a personal pronoun, followed by a noun phrase, a coordinating conjunction and another noun phrase.

“What makes us exceptional, what makes us American” (Par.2)

What//makes//us//exceptional

What//makes//us//American

The above is also another example of two part equal constructs and its use shows that the speaker did not just use a random sentence; it is a deliberate attempt at foregrounding the parallel constructions.

- **Corresponding phrases bear similar grammatical and thematic relations to the predicator**

“We cannot mistake absolutism for principle, or substitute spectacle for politics, or treat name-calling as reasoned debate. “

The predicator in the above example is: *‘We cannot’* followed by verbal phrase and noun phrase.

Predicator	Verbal phrase	Noun phrase
We cannot	Mistake	Absolutism for principle
	Substitute	Spectacle for politics
	Treat name-calling	As reasoned debate

“We recall that what binds this nation together are not the colors of our skin or the tenets of our faith or the origins of our names.” [par 1]

The predicator ‘what binds this nation together’ carries each of the phrases that follows it equally e.g

What binds this nation together are not	the colors of our skin
	the tenets of our faith
	the origins of our names

- **Corresponding phrases and words are in the same order in both sections of the text.**

“that when times change, so must we; that fidelity to our founding principles requires new responses to new challenges; that preserving our individual freedoms ultimately requires collective action.” (Par. 9)

The introduction of each phrase in the above excerpt with a demonstrative pronoun gives the impression of orderliness.

Isocolon as a Form of Syntactical Parallelism

Isocolon is a device in which parallelism is reinforced by members that are of the same length. Good examples of this are found in the speech and they are:

“as one nation and one people”. (par9)

“youth and drive; diversity and openness” (Par 10)

“an endless capacity for risk and a gift for reinvention”. (Par 10)

Tricolon as a Form of Syntactical Parallelism

Tricolon is one of the commonest forms of isocolon. It is a sentence with three clearly defined parts of equal length, usually independent clauses

“We bear witness to the enduring strength of our Constitution. We affirm the promise of our democracy. We recall that what binds this nation together is not the colors of our skin or the tenets of our faith or the origins of our names”.

We bear

We affirm

We recall

We also have the following tricolons in the same paragraph

The colors of our skin

The tenets of our faith

The origins of our names

Another example of tricolon is also found in paragraph 5

“Together, we determined that a modern economy requires railroads and highways to speed travel and commerce, schools and colleges to train our workers.

Together, we discovered that a free market only thrives when there are rules to ensure competition and fair play.

Together, we resolved that a great nation must care for the vulnerable, and protect its people from life’s worst hazards and misfortune.” (Par 5)

Together, we determined that a modern economy

Together, we discovered that a free market

Together, we resolved that a great nation

...Because she is an American; she is free, and she is equal (Par 11)

She is an American

She is free

She is equal

*“So we must harness new ideas and technology to **remake our government, revamp our tax code, reform our schools, and empower our citizens with the skills they need to work harder, learn more, reach higher**”*

Remake our government

Revamp our tax codes

Reform our schools

More examples are:

‘Work harder’

‘Learn more’

‘Reach higher’

*“We recognize that no matter how responsibly we live our lives, any one of us at any time may face **a job loss, or a sudden illness, or a home swept away in a terrible storm.**”*

A job loss

A sudden illness

A home swept away

More of tricolons can be found in the following examples:

“Together, we determined that a modern economy...; Together, we discover that a free market...; Together, we resolved that a great nation.....”[par 3]

The above is another good example of tricolon where the speaker choose his words artfully to show the strength in unity by using the words ‘together’ to make the people have a sense of being carried along.

“Medicare and Medicaid and Social responsibility”[par 9]

“Through Seneca falls, and Selma, and Stone wall”[par22]

“Humbled by the task before us, grateful for the trust you have bestowed, mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors”

“Our journey is not complete until no citizen... Our journey is not complete until we find ... Our journey is not complete until all our children” (Par.21)

“We gather to inaugurate a president, we bear witness to the enduring strength of our constitution, we affirm the promise of our democracy” (par 1)

All of the above tricolons are used by the speaker to emphasize his points and draw attention to the significance of what he is trying to say. In all cases, the intensively used three-part structure as explained above may also display reinforcement of meaning connection by means of repetitions of words and phrases, or by repeatedly using words from the same semantic field.

4.1.4 Semantic Parallelism

Semantics is the study of meaning. Semantic parallelism is a situation where two sections of a text have parallel meaning. This may arise as a result of lexical parallelism, where two words are interpretable as being parallel to one another. It is more particular in cases where the only difference in meaning of the two larger sections is due to the difference between the two words concerned. Semantic parallelism can either be:

- Similarity of meaning
- Opposition of meaning

Similarity of Meaning

The following extracts illustrate similarity of meaning in speech

*“These **pursuit of life and liberty** and the **pursuit of happiness**” (par 17)*

*“By crises that **steeled our resolve** and **proved our resilience**”.*

*“An endless **capacity for risk** and a **gift for reinvention**”.*

The first excerpt shows similarity of meaning. ‘The pursuit of life and liberty’ ultimately lead to the ‘pursuit of happiness’. There cannot be the pursuit of happiness when there is no life and liberty.

The second excerpt also shows similarity in meaning of the two phrases that made up the sentence. A ‘steeled resolve’ will definitely amount to ‘resilience’ on the part of the citizens. The president here encourages the citizens to prepare for the worst unpleasant situation. Despite war with other countries, the country should continue to maintain their freedom and democracy. So even if something worst than war occurs, they should be able to weather the storm.

The third excerpt is not different from the others, the two phrases that made up the sentence are similar in construction and meaning. The speaker shows that the country is not afraid of taking risks, which could involve putting enemies in check but it also has the gift for creativity. That is to say, they just do not take risk without being creative, if they have to take the risk of going to war, they should also be creative enough to strategize on how to win the war and build enough technology that will enhance their chances of subduing their enemies.

Opposition of Meaning

The extracts below show instances where opposition of meaning is used in the speech.

*“ While freedom is a gift from **God**, it must be secure by **people here on earth**”.*[par 2]

*“ That preserving our **individual freedom** ultimately requires our **collective efforts**”.*[par 4]

In the first excerpt, ‘God’ is contrasted with ‘people on earth’. This is because, God created us all as free moral agents, however, it is man who subject his fellow man to

slavery, so the politician is making it clear that although God gives freedom, it is people on earth who have to fight to secure this freedom.

In the second excerpt, ‘individual freedom’ is contrasted with ‘collective efforts’. The president makes it clear that ‘individual freedom cannot be preserved by the individual alone, it takes a ‘collective effort’ for such ‘individual freedom’ to be preserved.

*“We will **extend a hand** if you are willing to **unclench your fist**”.*

*“Know that your people will judge you on what you can **build**, not what you can **destroy**”.*

The two excerpts above also shows a play of contrasting ideas being put together in a sentence. We see the examples in an ‘extended hand’ as against an ‘unclenched fist’ as well as ‘build’ as against ‘destroy’. These clear opposites serve to create contrast, thereby, making meanings stand out emphatically.

4.3. Stylistic Analysis of Goodluck Ebele Jonathan’s Presidential Speech

This section is a stylistic analysis of parallelism as they operate at all the four levels of linguistic analysis. The various categories were drawn from the corpus of the study which is titled ‘Appendix B’.

4.3.1 Phonological Level of Analysis

This is the aspect of the analysis where all the sound features of the speech will be brought to bare. The structure of the speech as well as the various sound patterns will be analyzed in this section.

Structure

The speech has many paragraphs that may bore the reader. The speech has forty-one (41) paragraphs. This is in contrast with that of the United States President which has just twenty three (23) paragraphs. The disadvantage of this is that it becomes too wordy and therefore, people will hardly remember a stunning quote to take home. Another problem with the structure of the speech is the use of the proper pronoun “I”, examples of such are: “I stand in humble gratitude to you, “I will like to acknowledge...”, “I salute you”, “I will continue to fight”, “I will do my utmost”, “I would like to specially acknowledge”, “I owe a debt”, “I thank you”, etc. Frequent use of this phrase made the speech to be a one sided sermon instead of a speech that should move people’s emotions. There are a lot of grammatical errors, improper use of punctuation marks and lack of cohesion in some of the paragraphs. For example, in paragraph 5, the president used full stop improperly. The use of full stop after the word “wife” is improperly constructed. The sentence should have flowed as “my dear wife, Patience.... The word “inconvenience” in paragraph 9, should have been “inconveniences”. ..”Nigerians endured all manner of inconvenience(s) just to secure.....” Additionally, the word “voters cards” is grammatically incorrect. It can either be “voters’ card” or “voter cards”. Paragraph two is a short paragraph with two lines but it has five commas and two full stops. The predominant use of commas distorts the meaning of the words and it also prevents free flow of the speech.

Repetition and Alliteration

Repetition is the deliberate use of a word or phrase more than once in a sentence or a text to create a sense of pattern or form or to emphasize certain elements in the mind

of the reader or listener or to make words very catchy. Repetition is a major rhetorical strategy for producing emphasis, clarity, amplification, or to create emotional effect.

On the other hand, The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms defines the term alliteration as “the repetition of the same sounds – usually initial consonants of words or of stressed syllables – in any sequence of neighbouring words”, remarking that in some poetry “alliteration rather than rhythm is the chief principle of repetition” (“alliteration”).

Repetition

The following examples show the constant use of repetition in the speech. In paragraph two, there is a repetition of the personal pronoun ‘I’ as in *I* thank you ..., *I* want to ..., that *I* will... In paragraph five, there is the repetition of the possessive pronoun ‘my’ - *My* friend and brother, *My* dear wife. In paragraph twelve, there is a repetition of the words ‘our’ and ‘strong’ as in ‘Today, *our* unity is *strong*, and *our* purpose is *strong*’.

Paragraph thirty six has the strongest form of repetition. Here, the president repeatedly says:

“I will continue to fight for your future”

“I will continue to fight for improved medical care”

“I will continue to fight for all citizens”

“I will continue to fight for electricity”

“I will continue to fight for an efficient...”

“I will continue to fight for job creation”

The repetition of the above phrase ‘I will continue to fight’ serves the purpose of emphasis. The president used the continuous tense ‘will’ and a verb ‘continue’ to show his resilience and his strong-will to make all the things stated work. He is determined to make a difference in the lives of all Nigerians with those powerful lines

which happened to be the heart of the speech. The repetition of a specific phrase provides logic and rhythm and makes it easy for the hearer to understand as well as to focus on the message. With the repetition of '*I will continue to fight*', Jonathan emphasized equal importance among reshaping the economy, providing a bright future for Nigerians, renewing his determination to create jobs, investing in electricity, providing access to first class education, efficient and affordable public transport system, and improving medical care for all citizens.

Moreover, other repeated words or phrases found in his speech are as follows:

Par17 '*We must demonstrate, we must strengthen*'

Par19 '*The leadership, the transformation*'

Par20 '*I have, I therefore*'

Par21 '*we must, we will*'

Par26 '*To cooperate, to ensure*'

Par27 '*We will create, we will pay*'

Par30 '*The bane of corruption, The fight against corruption*'

Par 37 '*and I will never, never let you down*'.

Par 41 '*God bless you all, God bless the Federal Republic of Nigeria*'.

Alliteration

Alliteration is the repetition of the same sounds or of the same kinds of sounds at the beginning of words or in stressed syllables of a phrase. This is when a series of words beginning with the same letters are strung together. In this speech, there are a few cases of alliteration which are discussed below:

In paragraph eight, the letter 'f' alliterates - Our founding fathers

In Paragraph sixteen, the letter 'f' also alliterate - free, and fair

In Paragraph twenty three, the letter 'c' alliterates - Communities, cites, and country

In Paragraph twenty eight, the letter ‘b’ alliterates - We will avoid the boom and bust cycles

In paragraph thirty two, letter ‘d’ alliterates - Decolonization, democratization

Assonance

Assonance is when a series of words with similar vowel sounds are strung together or used side by side. The following are a few samples found in the speech:

In paragraph thirty four, we have the diphthong /aue/ coming together side by side thus: “This is *our hour*.”

In paragraph thirty four, we have the vowel /e/ being used side by side in the words “My fellow country*men* and *women*”

In paragraph thirty three, there is the occurrence of assonance in the words “*Missions* abroad are to accord this *vision*”

Consonance

Consonance is when a series of words with similar consonant sounds are strung together or used side by side. The following are examples of consonance found in the speech:

In paragraph six, there occurs the consonance: Galvaniz*ing*, mobiliz*ing*

Paragraph twelve has the consonants /th/ as well as /st/ occurring side by side: North or in South; East or in the West

In Paragraph twenty two, we have “Leaders*hip*, followers*hip*”

Paragraph twenty nine, we have “Equity and national unity”

In paragraph thirty, we have the consonant /th/ being used together “Growth of our commonweal*th*”

Paragraph thirty four has “*Cynicism* and *Skepticism*”

Paragraph thirty three, there is “*Bilateral*, *multilateral* level”

4.3.2 Lexical Level of Analysis

Lexical parallelism is an effect of repetition of the same words or certain relationships between words, mostly belonging to the same word group, such as verbs or nouns. It may occur when two words are paired up and have various kinds of semantic relation to one another, that is, they may have same reference, they may relate as part to whole, they may belong to the same semantic field or maybe interpreted as antonyms, having opposed meanings.

Antonymous Lexical Parallelism

Examples of antonymous parallelism are found in paragraph 11, 21 and 22 and they are shown below:

Paragraph 11 “That spirit has, over the years, *stirred our hopes, doused our fears*, and encouraged us to gather ourselves to build a strong nation even when others doubted our capacity”.

In this example, we find ‘hope’ as against ‘fear’, there cannot exist hopes where there is a morbid fear, that is why the president here used the verbs ‘stir’ which means to propel the hope in Nigerians which will eventually ‘douse’ their fear.

Paragraph 21 “My dear *countrymen and women*”. This is another example of opposition of meaning. Men are the counterpart of women, hence, the president meant to include every Nigerian in his address.

Paragraph 22 “The Nigeria of our dreams must be built *on hard work and not on short cuts*”. The opposed parallel structure in this example is ‘hard work’ as against

‘short cut’. One who is hardworking will not look for shortcut means to attain success. The president is here emphasizing the importance of success achieved through credibility and not fraudulence.

Synonymous Lexical Parallelism

Synonymous parallelism refers to those sentences that have similar structures and similar meaning. Examples of such structures in Jonathan’s speech are discussed below:

Paragraph 12 “Today, *our unity is firm, and our purpose is strong our determination unshakable.*

Our//unity is//firm

Our//purpose is//strong

Our//determination//unshakable

In the above extract, we see that each of the phrases is introduced by a pronoun then followed by a noun and an adjective. This equal grammatical structure makes it a synonymous lexical parallel.

Paragraph 18 “It is the supreme task of this generation to give *hope to the hopeless, strength to the weak and protection to the defenseless*”.

Hope//to//the//hopeless

Strength//to//the//weak

Protection//to//the//defenceless

The above also have similar grammatical units and therefore, it is a clear example of synonymous lexical parallels.

4.3.3 Syntactic Parallelism

This is also referred to as a more extensive parallelism. That is to say, parallel elements are not always set in lists of words that are the same part of speech. Sometimes, these elements are difficult for the hearer to see. Syntactic parallelism is one of the common forms of grammatical parallelism. It involves a structural identity between two sections of text. There are three ways in which syntactic parallels can be identified.

These are:

- Each section of the text contains the same classes of phrases and words
- Corresponding phrases bear similar grammatical and thematic relations to the predicator
- Corresponding phrases and words are in the same order in both sections of the text.

Each section of the text contains the same classes of phrases and words

Paragraph 38 “See a new beginning; a new direction; a new spirit”

A//new// beginning

A//new//direction

A//new//spirit

The above contains same classes of words, that is, an article followed by an adjective and then a noun.

Paragraph 40 “Let us work together; let us build together; let us bequeath a greater Nigeria to the generations to come”

Let//us//work//together

Let//us//build//together

The example above is also a case of same word class. A noun phrase and a verb phrase.

Paragraph 12 “Today, *our unity is firm, and our purpose is strong our determination unshakable.*

Our//unity is//firm

Our//purpose is//strong

Our//determination//unshakable

In the above extract, each section of the text contains the same classes of phrases and words.

Paragraph 18 “It is the supreme task of this generation to give *hope to the hopeless, strength to the weak and protection to the defenceless*”.

Hope//to//the//hopeless

Strength//to//the//weak

Protection//to//the//defenceless

In the above extract, it is very obvious that each section of the text contains the same classes of phrases and words.

Corresponding phrases bear similar grammatical and thematic relations to the predicator

In paragraph 13 “*A land of justice, opportunity and plenty*”

Predicator	Noun
A land of	Justice
	Opportunity
	Plenty

In paragraph 20 “*Let me salute the Nigerian workers who **build our communities, cities and country***”.

Predicator	Noun
Build our	Communities
	Cities
	Country

Still in paragraph 20, “*We must grow the economy, create jobs and generate enduring happiness for our people*”

Predicator	Verb phrase	Noun phrase
We must	Grow	The economy
	Create	Jobs
	Generate	Enduring happiness

In paragraph 29 “*In the interest of justice, equity and national unity*”

Predicator	Noun
In the interest of	Justice
	Equity
	National Unity

In paragraph 32 “*We will support the consolidation of democracy, good governance and human right in the continent*”

Predicator	Noun phrase
We will support the consolidation of	Democracy
	Good governance
	Human right

Corresponding phrases and words are in the same order in both sections of the text.

- In paragraph 32, “*We fought for decolonization. We will now fight for democratization*”

- In paragraph 40 “*Let us work together; let us build together; let us bequeath a greater Nigeria to the generations to come*”

In the two examples above, the sentences are introduced with same part of speech. In the first sentence, the pronoun ‘we’ was used to introduce the parallel structures while in the second sentence, the noun phrase ‘let us’ was also used to introduce the parallel phrases. This helps to maintain orderliness and composure in the speech.

Isocolon as a Form of Syntactical Parallelism

Isocolon is a device in which parallelism is reinforced by members that are of the same length. Good examples of this are found in the speech and they are:

- *Stirred our hopes, doused our fears* (Paragraph 11)
- *The movement is right. The signs are heart-warming* (Paragraph 23)
- *We fought for decolonization. We will now fight for democratization* (Paragraph 32)
- *Cynicism and skepticism* (Paragraph 34)
- *Let us work together; let us build together* (Paragraph 40)

Tricolon as a Form of Syntactical Parallelism

Tricolon is one of the commonest forms of isocolon. It is a sentence with three clearly defined parts of equal length, usually independent clauses. Examples are italicized below:

- *Your excellences, Distinguished ladies and Gentlemen* (Paragraph 9)
- *Our unity is firm, and our purpose is strong. Our determination unshakable* (Paragraph 12)
- *A land of justice, opportunity and plenty* (Paragraph 13)

- *Give hope to the hopeless, strength to the weak, and protection to the defenseless* (Paragraph 18)
- *Let me salute the Nigerian workers who build our communities, cities and country.* (Paragraph 20)
- *We must grow the economy, create jobs and generate enduring happiness for our people* (Paragraph 20)
- *The time for lamentation is over. This is the era of transformation. This is the time for action.* (Paragraph 34)
- *See a new beginning; a new direction; a new spirit* (Paragraph 38)

In the examples given above, the consistent use of sentences with three clearly defined parts of equal length helps to foreground the sentences, makes those lines unforgettable in the minds of the audience and shows the skilfulness of the speaker with words. It also helps to reinforce the message he wants his audience to go home with and to imprint this message on their minds.

4.3.4 Semantic Parallelism

Semantics is the study of meaning. Semantic parallelism is a situation where two sections of a text have parallel meaning. This may arise as a result of lexical parallelism, where two words are interpretable as being parallel to one another. It is more particular in cases where the only difference in meaning of the two larger sections is due to the difference between the two words concerned. Semantic parallelism can either be:

- Similarity of meaning
- Opposition of meaning

Similarity of Meaning

The following extracts show the examples of the use of similar words being strung together to create a meaningful whole in the speech.

- In paragraph 20, “*We must grow the economy, create jobs and generate enduring happiness for our people*”
- In paragraph 32, “*We fought for decolonization. We will now fight for democratization*”
- In paragraph 40 “*Let us work together; let us build together; let us bequeath a greater Nigeria to the generations to come*”

In the first excerpt, which is found in paragraph 20, the parallel structures are similar in meaning. The economy of any given nation cannot grow without jobs being created for the jobless and happiness is only possible under an economy that is favourable to all citizens.

In the second excerpt on paragraph 32, there is the similarity of meaning in the two similarly constructed phrases. Decolonization was fought for before it was achieved, the president is again calling for a fight for democratization. Those similar phrases was put together because decolonization was achieved through collective effort of fighting for it, therefore, the president also believes that if democratization is fought for it will also be achieved.

In the third excerpt, noun phrases are followed by verb phrases and they form similar structure as well as similar meaning. If we don't work together we definitely cannot build together and if we cannot build together we will have no greater Nigeria to bequeath to the next generation.

Opposition of Meaning

The putting together of opposing ideas in same sentence is another tool that helps to distinguish an artful speaker, examples of these are extracted in the following examples

- *“The time for lamentation is over. This is the era of transformation”*. (Paragraph 34)
- *“We will avoid the boom and bust cycles”* (Paragraph 28)

In the first excerpt above, the use of ‘lamentation’ along with ‘transformation’ is very creative as it brought out the desired effect of contrasting one with the other. When there is a bad government, the people lament, however, when there is transformation and good governance, the people flourish. The opposition of meaning was very clear and it sent the desired message of hope into the minds of the audience.

Excerpt two is also a good example of opposition of meaning with the words ‘boom’ and ‘bust’. The president here used those words to caution about problems with policies that will bring about boom and then bust afterwards, that is, fast growth and sudden decline in resources.

4.4 General Discussion

This chapter presents analyses of the data used for this study. The data is analysed on the linguistic levels of phonological analysis, lexical analysis, syntactic analysis and semantic analysis. On the phonological level, repetitions, alliteration, assonance and consonance were identified as the various ways that parallel structures manifest itself. On this linguistic level, Barack Obama's speech was found to be more apt when it comes to structure, for example, while that of Obama has just twenty one (23) paragraphs which made it compact and easy to assimilate, that of Goodluck Jonathan has forty four (44) paragraphs which is too wordy jam-packed with too many unnecessary issues. The reason why one seems to use the language better than the other must be as a result of one of the elements which Crystal and Davy (1969) identified in their 'dimension of situational constraints', where they itemized eight basic areas of extra-linguistic circumstances determining the style of a variety. One of the eight extra-linguistic circumstances is 'individuality'. Individuality refers to those permanent features of the speech or writing habits, which identify someone as a specific person, distinguish the person from other users of the same language, or the same variety of the language. Presidents Obama and Jonathan both used the same variety of English language in their speeches that is, the Standard English language. However, individuality accounts for why their usage differs from each other. They are two unique people with different personalities and geographic location; hence, their performance can not be the same as one enjoys a native-like influence while the other grapples with a second language user's influence.

At the lexical level, the analysis was done using antonymous lexical parallel and synonymous lexical parallels. On this level, that of President Obama is complete with numerous examples while that of President Jonathan had to be critically

examined for these parallels to be identified. A lot of factors are considered to be responsible for this, looking at Crystal and Davy (1969)'s 'dimensions of situational constraints', individuality plays a crucial role because from what is discussed above, it marks two people as being distinct in their language habits. There is also the dimension of 'modality', this dimension explains why a speaker adopts one feature of a language rather than another, chose to use specific linguistic features in an utterance and to produce written or spoken forms of that language correctly.

The third linguistic level of analysis is the syntactic level, on this level, analysis was done using three criterion, that is, each section of the text contains the same classes of phrases and words, corresponding phrases bear similar grammatical and thematic relations to the predicator and corresponding phrases and words are in the same order in both sections of the text. Both speeches met this criterion and were replete with numerous examples which were cited and analysed. In addition to the above model, tricolons and isocolons were also dealt with under this level and copious examples were given from both speeches. However, President Obama did better in this than President Jonathan. The reason for this can be traced back to some of the eight dimensions of Crystal and Davy (1969), 'province' might be responsible for this. Province features identify an utterance with those variables in an extra – linguistic context which one defined with references to the kind of occupational or professional activity being engaged in. For example, the language of public worship, politics, advertising, science, or law (ibid:71). It refers to the occupational or professional activity of the author/speaker. In this study, both presidents are politicians, however, President Obama is not just a politician but a seasoned lawyer, studying law is not complete without studying literature, and literature is replete with knowledge and examples of linguistic features of texts, hence, President Obama's

occupation outside politics must have equipped him with rhetorical use of English language while president Jonathan is a specialist on zoology, this is a core science oriented course and as such has no business with the art of oration, he may not have had any reason to read any literary based materials and as such, this may have hampered his use of rhetoric. The fact that they are from different continents as well is explicated under the dimension of ‘dialect’, the geographical location they are from also played a major role in the way and manner they manipulate the English language, hence, the differences in their use of parallelism.

Finally, the semantic level of analysis dealt mainly on similarity in meaning and oppositions in meaning and examples were drawn from both speeches and analyzed as appropriate. Examples of this abound more in the speech of President Obama, this maybe as a result of the dimension of ‘status’. The term status is related to different factors as formality, informality, respect, politeness, deference, intimacy, kinship relations, business relations and hierarchic relations in general. All of these were brought to bear in the numerous examples analysed from Obama’s speech. Another dimension responsible for Obama’s better usage than Jonathan could be the dimension of ‘singularity’. Singularity is a cover – term for those personal and occupational features which are only related to individual user. In other words, it describes those linguistic and idiosyncratic features which are regarded as markers of an authorship if they appear in a person’s usage. Several researchers have branded President Obama as an ‘orator’ from the study of his first presidential speech which was given in 2009 (Gunawan, 2010).

4.5 Findings

This work examined the stylistic analysis of Parallelism in the presidential speeches of presidents Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan. It acknowledges the existence and usage of the concept of parallelism in political discourse and from the general discussion, the following findings obtains:

- Parallelism exists in the speeches analyzed to motivate the audiences and to make important information stand out.
- In the speeches of both presidents, four types of parallelism were constant and these are Phonological parallelism, Semantic Parallelism, Lexical and Syntactic Parallels
- Obama and Jonathan do not use a ‘dry’ language of economists; they prefer the language of poets.
- Though the two presidents used similar types of parallelism, the frequency of their usage varies.
- The breaking ground for this study is the discovery is the discovery that parallelism is not a stylistic device meant for only literary studies; it is also obtainable in linguistic studies.

4.6 Discussion of Findings

- Political speakers have often used words in form of parallelism to motivate the audiences and to make important information stand out. From the analyses in chapter four, it is obvious that the use of parallelism is an indispensable tool in political speeches because it plays very important role in persuading, convincing and in carrying the audience along. The use of Parallelism by the presidents created a satisfying rhythm in the language. It was also discovered that both Presidents used parallelism to express similar ideas. While Obama was trying to convince the public to support him in his new innovation, as we see in paragraph 7 were he says “*America’s possibilities are limitless, for we possess all the qualities that this world without boundaries demands: **youth and drive; diversity and openness; an endless capacity for risk and a gift for***”

reinvention. *My fellow Americans, we are made for this moment, and we will seize it -- so long as we seize it together*". President Jonathan was using parallelism to jeer Nigerians to be united and work together if they are to benefit from democracy, this is also see in paragraph 40 where he says "*Let us work together; let us build together; let us bequeath a greater Nigeria to the generations to come*". However, both presidents aimed at capturing the attention of their audience. Contrary to Nhat (2008) who finds that the use of parallelism most especially by President Barack Obama is to convince the public to believe and support his ideas and take part in his electoral campaign, the current study finds that parallelism was also used by the Presidents to highlight important information and make important points stand out. On the need for global economic cooperation, Barrack Obama used parallelism to present his ideas clearly, concisely, and smoothly. This is seen in paragraph 9 "*we must harness new ideas and technology to remake our government, revamp our tax code, reform our schools, and empower our citizens with the skills they need to work harder, learn more, reach higher*". Without the use of Parallelism, his speech would have been awkward and confusing. Thus, Obama use of parallelism made his lengthy speech clear, pleasing to the ears and persuasive. Parallelisms are often used together for the purpose of emphasis and clarity. This is obvious in paragraph 36 of President Goodluck Jonathan's speech. It helps the reader or listener to remember what he/she has read or heard. Parallelism helps point out the structure of the sentence, showing readers what goes with what and keeping them on the right track.

- The analysis shows that four types of parallelism were constant, these four types of parallelisms are: Phonological, lexical, syntactic and semantic. Under the phonological parallels, we find that repetition was used more often than alliteration, assonance and consonance. In lexical parallels, there were the antonymous and synonymous lexical parallels being used, on the syntactic level, Obama is discovered to be a specialist on the use of tricolons and isocolons, though there are a few examples of Jonathan using tricolons as well but they do not beg for attention as much as those of Obama. Finally on the semantic level, both presidents used opposition of meaning and similarity in meaning to make contrast and to emphasize cogent points that the audience

would not forget in a hurry. This is however contrary to previous works which divided parallelism into either two or five types - Johnstone (1991: 102, 106) classifies parallelism into two types, listing parallelism and cumulative parallelism and Ivany (1993: 55-56) divides parallelism into five overlapping types: syntactic, semantic, morphological, prosodic and phonic; where none of them is dominant nor dominated by the other. For ease of analysis, convenience and clarity, this study finds that using the four linguistic levels of analysis in classifying the types of parallelism is more effective.

- Findings show that both presidents can be referred to as ‘orators’, no wonder Hart (1997) compares an orator – a persuader – with a poet, being “artistically creative, both work with symbols to breathe life into ideas” and use “their imaginations to engage their audience’s imaginations”. The ‘symbol’ in this case is that of rhetorical devices, where we find parallelism as a powerful tool in speech-making.

- The study finds out that though the two presidents used similar types of parallelism viz: phonological parallelism, lexical parallelism, syntactic parallelism and semantic parallelism to add meaning to their speeches and to keep the audience focused and attentive, however, the frequency of its use varies. It was discovered that President Barack Obama used Parallelism more frequently in his speech than President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan. The researcher feels that this must be due to the effect of linguistic competence and performance of both presidents. There is a native speaker’s influence on President Obama’s use of English language because English language is his L1, as he lives in an environment where it is probably the only language spoken, therefore, his performance is skilful hence, his fluent use of rhetorical devices. President Jonathan on the other hand is a second language user of English and it is even suggested in some quarters that English may not have been his L2 as he is said to be fluent in Ogbia-Ijaw language, Igbo, Nigerian Pidgin as well as the English language. This must have affected his performance and more so, he grew up in a region where several languages co-exist and Nigerian Pidgin is the dominant form of English spoken as such his limited use of rhetoric. Moreso, the ‘dimensions of situational constraints’

which were discussed by Crystal and Davy (1969) have helped a great deal in understanding why President Obama seems to perform better in the use of rhetorical devices than President Jonathan.

- The breaking ground for this study is the discovery that parallel structures or parallelism can be safely transported from literary studies and experimented with linguistic studies as in this case of political discourse. The fact that it was easy to find examples of the four types of parallelism in the two speeches analysed shows that it is not a device that is only obtainable in literary studies of poetry and fiction, it is also used in political language as well.

4.7 Comparism between Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan's use of Parallelsim

This study carries out a stylistic analysis of the use of parallelism by President Barack Obama of the United States of America in his second tenure presidential speech and President Goodluck Jonathan of Nigeria in his first tenure presidential speech. President Obama is a native speaker of English, as such, English language is his L1. It is therefore, expected that he will have no problem manipulating the English language in order to produce numerous parallel structures. President Jonathan on the other hand is a non-native speaker of English, English language is neither his L1 nor his L2 as he hailed from the Southern part of Nigeria where numerous languages co-exist and Nigerian Pidgin is the dominant form of English spoken in that region. Therefore, it is expected that there will be disparities in their use of parallel structures and these disparities is what will be discussed below, using the four types of parallelism obtainable in this study.

Phonological Parallelism

Under the phonological parallels, there are repetition, alliteration, assonance and consonance. Both presidents used these forms of phonological parallels, however, president Goodluck Jonathan used more of these forms than president Barack Obama. The entire paragraph 36 of President Jonathan's speech is a continuous chain of repetition that is,

"I will continue to fight for your future"

"I will continue to fight for improved medical care"

"I will continue to fight for all citizens"

"I will continue to fight for electricity"

"I will continue to fight for an efficient..."

"I will continue to fight for job creation"

There is no paragraph that is replete with such repetitive phrase as this in the speech of President Barack Obama. More so, President Jonathan used more of assonance and consonance while no example of assonance was found in President Obama's speech.

Lexical Parallelism

Under the lexical level, the analysis was done using antonymous lexical parallels and synonymous lexical parallels. On this level, that of President Obama is complete with numerous examples while that of President Jonathan had to be critically examined for these parallels to be identified. Under synonymous parallels, we find President Obama following a deliberate action-result-effect pattern e.g *"You and I, as citizens, have the power to set this country's course. You and I, as citizens, have the obligation to*

shape the debates of our time”. This action-result-effect pattern makes his speech musical and his message got imprinted on the minds of the audience easily.

Syntactic Parallelism

On this level, analysis was done using three criterion, that is, each section of the text contains the same classes of phrases and words, corresponding phrases bear similar grammatical and thematic relations to the predicator and corresponding phrases and words are in the same order in both sections of the text. Both speeches met this criterion and were replete with numerous examples which were cited and analysed. In addition to the above model, tricolons and isocolons were also dealt with under this level and copious examples were given from both speeches. However, President Obama did better in this than President Jonathan. In the analysis of President Obama’s speech, over twelve (12) different examples of tricolons were drawn from paragraph 1 to the last paragraph of his speech. This shows that he is an expert on the use of this device.

Semantic Parallelism

This is the fourth type of parallelism discussed in this study. The semantic level of analysis dealt mainly on similarity in meaning and opposition in meaning and examples were drawn from both speeches and analyzed as appropriate. Examples of this abound more in the speech of President Obama, the use of contrastive statements is one powerful tool of emphasis he employed in his speech. Though examples of such were also drawn from President Jonathan’s speech, they beg for attention in that of Barack Obama while a critical evaluation had to be done on Goodluck Jonathan’s speech before they are identified.

On the whole, the two presidents compete fairly on the four types of parallelism identified in this study. However, while President Jonathan used more of phonological parallels than President Obama, he failed to meet up on the syntactic level most especially in the use of isocolons and tricolons which are forms of semantic parallelisms.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.0 Preamble

This chapter summarizes the study, draws implication of the findings and the conclusion. It also provides recommendations and discusses the limitation of the study, consequently, areas for further research were proposed.

5.1 Summary

Parallelism is the key concept in this research. It is a term that is often associated with literary study. However, the researcher has divorced this term from literary studies and brought it to the fore in political speeches. Parallelism is the logical linking of two ideas by using parallel grammatical forms within a sentence. Parallelism is an arrangement of the parts of a composition so that elements of equal importance are balanced in similar constructions. This arrangement may be applied to words, phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, or complete units of compositions. Parallelism is a rhetorical device as well as a foreground device which refers to the use of words, phrases, clauses, or sentences that are similar in structure, in sound or in meaning. It is useful in the sense that it allows a writer or speaker to hammer home an idea, image, or relationship, and to force the reader or listener to pay attention. Okunowo (2012) opines that Parallelism is a linguistic phenomenon, which explains the relationship that may be understood between units of linguistic structures, which are constructed parallel to each other or related in some other ways. He goes on to say that there is always a relationship in the structures and ideas so juxtaposed generally in the form of synonymy, repetition, antithesis, apposition and other forms. All levels of language categories- a word, phrase, sentence, units of sound and meaning etc-

may be engaged to function as parallelism. When these parallels achieve perceptual obtrusiveness, the deployment may be described as foregrounding- a means by which a particular idea or meaning or structure is made overt and most recognizable in the world of the text under consideration, in this case, presidential speeches. It is in line with the above view that this study situates parallelism as a linguistic concept and chooses to do a linguistic analysis of it.

Parallelism is a great way to make connections between ideas and claims and to advance an argument. Jones & Peccei state that parallelism is “a device which expresses several ideas in a series of similar structures. This can serve to emphasize that the ideas are equal in importance and can add a sense of symmetry and rhythm, which make the speech more memorable” (2004:51). In a speech, politicians always want the audience to focus on key features - salient points. And the parallel patterns of discourse are seen as a best choice “to draw attention to a particular part of their message and make it stand out from the rest of the speech,” Jones & Peccei (2004:51). Using parallelism help politicians emphasize their key views, persuade audience to sympathize with their views, and make their speech more memorable. It is on this premise that the researcher undertake to study how this rhetorical device has helped in shaping the presidential speeches of the United States’ President Barack Obama and Nigeria’s President Goodluck Jonathan.

This study set out to find how useful Parallelism is in political speeches, most especially presidential speeches and offer a stylistic analysis of it. The research has attempted to answer questions such as:

1. What are the vital roles and the effects of parallelism as used in political discourse and how do they contribute to the meaning of the speeches?

2. What are the different types of parallelism that can be identified in the selected presidential speeches?
3. How does parallelism characterize Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan's style?
4. What similarities and differences exist in the use of parallelism between the presidents of Nigeria and the United States of America?

Furthermore, appropriate justification has been provided for the study in terms of its suitability and viability. One of the compelling reasons for embarking on this study is to see if the stylistic effect of parallelism obtains in political discourse as much as it does in literary studies and how effective it serves as a foregrounding concept. The study chooses presidential speech as an aspect of political speeches because it presents a real political situation in which political language is used and the researcher chooses to explore parallelism in political speeches because it is a strong foregrounding device that captures the reader's attention, serves to deliver the speaker's message and marks the style of an individual. Also, the study sets to find out how far 'competence and performance' affects the skilful use of rhetorical devices. It seeks to justify how competence and performance works in a native speaker and a non-native speaker. Hence, the comparison between the speeches of Barack Obama (a native speaker) and Goodluck Jonathan (a non-native speaker). The effectiveness of their use of parallelism will determine the extent of their use of rhetorical devices.

Literature was reviewed topically and authorially. Key concepts associated with the study were reviewed under topical review while recent works relating to parallelism were critically reviewed under the authorial review. Theoretical framework adopted for this research was presented and discussed. In this regard, the

study used Crystal and Davy's general linguistic stylistics as the framework for the research.

The methodology used in data collection and data analysis were presented and discussed. The sources of data, method of data collection, method of data analysis and analytical procedure were presented.

The presidential speeches of Presidents Goodluck Jonathan and Barack Obama were presented and all the parallel structures were extracted for analysis. The analysis was done on the four linguistic levels of phonology, syntactic, lexical and semantics. Crystal and Davy's (1969) model of general linguistic stylistics was used in the analysis. The findings were outlined and discussed providing answers in line with the research questions of the study.

Finally, summary of the research as well as the conclusions arrived at and areas for further studies were also proposed in order to widen the scope of research in the areas of parallelism and political speeches.

5.2 Conclusion

Parallelism is the result of mixing up tactics when composing a sentence. This happens when a speaker wants to make a sentence more interesting, especially when the sentence is long or complex. Politicians often use parallelism to make a cogent point, and they do not want their audience to forget such points. From the analyses and summary of the findings, the following conclusion is reached. Parallelism is an indispensable tool in political discourse. It is also seen from the analysis that the skilful use of this device helps to foreground the important points the political speaker

wishes the audience to take home and it brings other unimportant issues to the background.

The analysis of Barack Obama's Presidential Address suggests that the speech was made by a skilful orator, who employed various linguistic and rhetoric devices for the efficiency of the address. They are tightly linked together and, at times, it is hard to separate one from another as they are often multifunctional. The researcher thinks that the high level of education of the speaker was helpful when setting various tools in collaboration, so that the use of them produced the effect of a desirable message, the one which the audience accepted as if it had come from an ancient orator. Learning from Ancient Greeks, President Barack Obama uses didactic poetry: persuading, convincing and easy-to-be-remembered rhythmic style when addressing a wide audience of the Americans. Didactic poetry rests upon repetition and parallelism, which are the basic tools for creating an easily memorized message. Focusing on parallelism employed in the speech, the researcher finds that repetition plays a significant role in creating a foregrounding effect. These devices positively correlate with a rhetorical style, which the orator chose for the speech.

Goodluck Jonathan's speech, though not as captivating and compelling as that of Barack Obama when it comes to his use of rhetorical devices, most especially that of parallelism, effort is made to motivate his audience and to jeer them to accept his transformation agenda and to imbued in their heart his dedication to making democracy work in the country.

Though it was established at the onset of this work that the concept under investigation is often used for poetry and biblical passages, most especially the books of Psalms and Songs of Solomon because of the believe that it can only be effectively used in didactic poetry, on the whole, this study reveals that parallelism can be safely

transported into the language of politics. Its effectiveness in political speeches has been seen in the analysis of these two speeches and it can be said that it is a tool that adds aesthetics to speech, that engrave a major point in the minds of the audience, persuades and that adds to the oratory skills of its user.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdulrasheed, R.S. (2011). "Textuality; an analysis of memoranda from the Federal House of Representatives, Abuja, Nigeria". Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
- Abo Libdeh, A. (1991). *A Discourse Perspective on Figurative Expression in Literary Works with Reference to E/A Translation*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Herriot-Watt University, Edinburgh.
- Abochol S. I. (2011). *Language and Society: An Introduction*. Abuja: Chartered Graphic Press.
- Adegoju, A. (2005). "A stylistic study of the speeches of some key actors of the 'June 12' crisis in Nigeria (1993 – 1998)". Unpublished Phd Thesis, University of Ibadan.
- Ahmed, Y. (2012). A critical discourse analysis of negation in selected United States of America and Nigerian presidential speeches. An Unpublished M.A Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
- Akinbiyi, A. (2006). "Inclusion and exclusion in political discourse: deixis in Olusegun Obasanjo's speeches, *Journal of Language and Linguistics* Vol. 5
- Akmal, S. (2004). The language of power and justification: a study of evaluative and interactive devices of discourse analysis in Bush and Blair political speeches. Unpublished M.A Thesis, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Liverpool, UK.
- Akodu, E.F. (2008). "A pragmatic analysis of ambiguity in political discourse in selected Nigerian newspapers (1999-2005)". Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
- Al-Hammed, (1999). *Political Discourse Analysis: An Arabic-English*
- Al-Jubouri, A. (1984). 'The Role of Repetition in Arabic Argumentative Discourse,' In Swales, J & Mustapha, H (eds.), *English for Specific Purposes in the Arab World*. Birmingham: Aston University
- Al-Subhi A. S. (2009). *Parallelism in Selected Children's Poems by Eloise Greenfield: A Stylistic Study*. Unpublished M.A. thesis submitted to the Department of English, Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia.
- Ali M. (1975). *The Political Sociology of the English Language*. The Netherlands; Monton and Co
- Ayeomoni, M.O. (2001), 'Style in Nigerian Political Speeches' in *IFE Studies in English Language Journal*, Dept of English, OAU: Ile- Ife, Vol.5
- (2005). "A Linguistic-stylistic investigation of the language of the Nigerian Political Elite. *Nebula* VOL.2.2

- Aristotle, (1926). *The Art of Rhetoric*. Translated by Freese, J.H. London: Heinemann.
- Ayodabo, J.O. (2003). "A pragma-stylistic study of M.K.O. Abiola's Historic Speech of June 24, 1993" in Adebayo Lawal (ed) *Stylistics in Theory and Practice*. Ilorin: Unilorin Press.
- Babajide, A. O. (2000), "Of Style and Stylistics" in Adeyemi O.B. (ed.) *Studies in English Language*. Ibadan: Crownfit Publisher
- Bakhtin, M. (1990). 'The Problem of Speech Genres', in Bizzell, P. and Herzberg, B. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston: Bedford.
- Bally, C. (1951). *Traité de stylistique française*, 2 vols., 3rd. ed., Geneva & Paris.
- Beeston, A. (1974). 'Parallelism in Arabic Prose'. *Journal of Arabic Literature*, V, PP.134-145.
- Berlin, A. (1992). *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Birch, D. (1989). *Language, Literature and Critical Practice*, London: Routledge.
- Bitzer, L. (1981). 'Political Rhetoric', in Nimmo, D., and Sanders, K, *Handbook of Political Communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. pp. 225-48.
- Black, E. (1978). *Rhetorical Criticism: a Study in Method*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bloch, B. & Trager, G. (1942) *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bryant, D. (1972). 'Rhetoric: its function and its Scope', in Ehninger, D, *Contemporary Rhetoric*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foreman. Pp. 15-37.
- Beard, A. (2000) *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge,
- Campbell, G. (1988). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Cap, P (2002): *Explorations in Political Discourse: Methodological and Critical Perspectives* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag
- Chapman, R. (1973), *Linguistics and literature; An Introduction to Literary Stylistics*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Chilton, P. and Schaffner, C. (1997). "Discourse and Politics". *Discourse as social interaction, Teun A. Van Dijk (ed.) London: Routledge*.
- (2002) *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chomsky, N. (1957) *Syntactic Structures* Mouton
- Cicero, M.T. (1871) *Six Lectures Introductory to the Philosophical Writings of Cicero* edited by Thomas Woodhouse Levin
- Clark, U. (1996). *An Introduction to Stylistics*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes.
- Clauseenar, A. (1976) *Introduction to Literary Stylistics*. Batsford: London.
- Cook, G. (1992). *The Language of Advertising*, New York & London, Routledge.
- Corbett, E. 1966. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal D 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Crystal, D. and Davy, D. (1969), *Investigation English Style*. London: Macmillan Press.
- de Beagrande and Dressier (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Diane L. S., Glenn M. K. & Ann D. R. (1977). *Analysis of Differences Between Written and Oral Language*. Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois.
- Durant, A.& Fabb, N. (1990). *Literary Studies in Action*, London, Routledge.
- Eagleton, T. (1988), *Literary Theory. An Introduction*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- El-Shiyab, S. (1990). *The Structure of Argumentation in Arabic: Editorials as a Case Study*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Herriot-Watt University, Edinburgh.
- Fairclough, N., 1985. 'Critical and Descriptive Goals in Discourse Analysis'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 9, 739-63.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1984). The order of discourse. In M. Shapiro (ed.) *Language and Politics*. New York: New York University Press, pp. 108–138.

- Fish, S. E. (1973). "What is stylistics and why are they saying such terrible things about it?", in S. Chatman (ed.), New York, Columbia University Press.
- Fowler, R. (1979). "Linguistic theory and the study of literature", in *Essays on Style and Language*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Freeman, D. (1981). *Essays in Modern Stylistics*, London, Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Geis, M. (1987). *The Language of Politics*. New York: Spring-Verlay.
- Graff, G. (1990), "Other voices, other rooms: organizing and teaching the humanities conflict", *New Literary History*, 21, pp. 817-839.
- Gunawan S. (2010). *Style of Obama's Inauguration Speech*. Kata Journal, Vol. 12, 92-107
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1970). 'Language Structure and Language Function' In Lyons J. (ed) *New Horizon in Linguistics*. Pelican.
- (1990), *Language as Social Semiotics. The social interpretation of language and meaning*, London, Edward Arnold.
- Harris P. B. (1979), *Foundation of Political Science*. Melbourne Sidney: Johannesburg
- Hoey, M. (1983). *On the Surface of Discourse*, London, George Allen & Unwin.
- Holes, C. 1995. The Structure and Function of Parallelism and Repetition in Spoken Arabic: A Sociolinguistic Study. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, XL/1, 57-81.
- Ínigo-Mora I. (2004). *Journal of language and politics* 3:1, 27-52. Universidad de Sevilla
- Ivany, T. 1993. Dynamic vs. Static- a Kind of Parallelism in Al-Hamadani's Maqamat. *Colloquium on Arabic Lexicography and Lexicography.*, 49-58. Budapest, Hungary.
- Jakobson, R., 1968. Poetry of Grammar & Grammar of poetry. *Lingua*, 21: 597-609.
- Jawad, H., 2007. Paraphrase, Parallelism and Chiasmus in Literary Arabic: Norms and Translation Strategies. *Babel*, 53: 3, 196-215.
- Johnstone B. (1994) Repetition in Discourse: A Dialogue. In Johnstone, Barbara (ed.). *Repetition in Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Vol. One. New Persey: Alex Publishing Corporation.
- Jones J. and Peccei S.J. (2004) What is language and what does it do? Language and politics. *Language society and power*.
- Joseph, J. (2006). *Language and Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Kress, G., 1985. 'Ideological Structures in Discourse', in Van Dijk, T., *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Vol.4: Discourse Analysis in Society. London: Academic Press, pp. 27-42.
- Lawal, A. (1977). 'Aspects of a Stylistic Theory and the Implication for Practical Criticism' In Lawal A. (ed) *Stylistics in Theory and Practice*. Ilorin: Paragon Books.
- _____ (2003). "Aspect of a stylistic theory and the implications of practice criticism" in Adebayo Lawal (ed). *Stylistics in Theory and Practice*. Ilorin: Unilorin Press.
- Leech G. (1985). 'Stylistics' In Van Dijk (ed) *Discourse and Literature*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Leech, G. and Short, M.H.(1981) *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Longman.
- Leff, M. (1980). *Interpretation and the Art of the Rhetorical Critic*, Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44 (4): 337-49.
- Logue, M., and Miller, E. (1995). 'Rhetorical Status: a Study of its Origins, Functions, and Consequences', Quarterly Journal of Speech, 81 (1): 20-47.
- Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press
- Mackay, R. (1996). "Mything the point: a critique of objective stylistics", *Language and Communication*, 16(1), pp. 81-93.
- , R. (1999). "There goes the other foot - a reply to Short et al.", *Language and Literature*, 8 (1), pp. 59-66.
- Malmkjaer, Kirsten (Ed.) (2002) *The Linguistics Encyclopedia* 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mazraani, N. (1997). *Aspects of Language Variation in Arabic Political Speech-Making*. Surrey: Curzon Press.
- McMenamin, G.R. and Dongdoo, C. (2002) *Forensic Linguistics: Advances in Forensic Stylistics*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Metcalf, S. (1998). *Building a Speech*. Philadelphia: The Harcourt Press.
- Mey, J. L. (1993) *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Miller, D. (2004). "...to meet our common knowledge: ENGAGEMENT strategies of alignment and alienation in current U.S. international discourse." In Gotti, M. And Candlin, C. (eds). *Textus XVIII*. Retrieved from the internet 10th Nov. 2011

- Montgomery, M. et al. (1992). *Ways of Reading. Advanced reading skills for students of English Literature*, London & NT, Routledge.
- Mukarovsky, J. (1958). "Standard Language and Poetic Language," *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics Literary Structure, and Style*, ed. and trans. P.L. Garvin Washington D.C: Georgetown UP.
- Murana M. O. (2011). *An Introduction to Stylistics*. Zaria: Nasif Press and Publishers
- Nakayama, T. and Krizek, R. (1995). 'Whiteness: a Strategic Rhetoric', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 81 (3): 291-309
- Newmark, P. (1996). *About Translation*. London: Longdunn Press Ltd.
- Nhat M. (2008). 'The Use of Pronouns, Parallelism in Obama's Two Political Speeches'. *Essays in Discourse Analysis*, Hogskolan Dalarna University
- Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing Discourse Analysis*, London, Penguin Books Ltd.
- Ochs, E. (1979) "Social foundations of Language" in *New Directions in Discourse Processing*. Vol. 2, Norwood, N. J.: Ablex, pp.207-221.
- Oha, O. (1994). "Language in war situation: A Stylistic study of the war speeches of Yakubu Gowon and Emeka Ojukwu." An Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Ibadan.
- Okpanachi, M.I. (2004). "Discourse analysis of President Obasanjo's National Address on the Nigerian Labour Congress on 18th of October, 2003". *Journal of Humanities*. Vol. 11 pp.51-69
- Orwell, G. (1946). 'Politics and English Language' In *Inside the Whales and Other Essays*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Osborn, M. and Osborn, S.(1988) *Public Speaking*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Osundare, N. (1982). 'Language and Style in African Literature'. A Paper Presented at the 1982 Ibadan Annual African Literature Conference.
- (2003). *Cautious Path Through the Bramble*. Ibadan: Hope Publications.
- Peer, W. Van (1991), "But what is Literature? Toward a descriptive definition of literature", in R. D. Sell (ed.), *Literary Pragmatics*, London: Routledge.
- Pratt, M. L. (1989), "Conventions of representation. Where discourse meet", in W. Van Peer (ed.), *The Taming of the Text*, London & New York, Routledge.
- Romano, T.M (2000), "Blending Genre, Altering Styles." Portsmouth: NH: Heinemann/Boymton
- Rudd, P.W.(2004) "Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Unshared Referents of Bush's Rhetoric". *Pragmatics* 4.4:499-525.

- Sapir E. (1921). *Language*. New York: Harcourt and Brace.
- Sartre, J. 1964. *The Words* (translated by B. Frechtman). New York: George Braziller, Inc.
- Schaffner, C. (1996) Editorial: Political Speeches and Discourse Analysis. *Current Issues in Language and Society* [online] vol. 3.
- Schmidt, S. J. (1982). *Foundation for the Empirical Study of Literature. The Components of a basic theory*, Hamburg, Buske.
- _____ (1983). "Interpretation: sacred cow or necessity?", *Poetics*, 12, pp. 239-258.
- Shamaleh S. F. A. (2011). "The Translation of Parallelism in Political Speeches". An unpublished Ph.D thesis submitted to the School of Languages, University of Salford, Salford, UK
- Short, M. (1996), *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*, Essex, Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.
- Strachan, J. C. (2010). "Does gubernatorial rhetoric matters? An analysis of gubernatorial inaugural rhetoric in three distinct States". A paper presented at the 2010 State Politics and Policy Conference, Springfield, June 3-5.
- Tannen, D. (1989). 'Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery' in *Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Teittinen, M (2000) "Power and Persuasion in the Finnish Presidential Rhetoric in the early 1990's." [http://www/natcom.org/conferences/Finland/MariTeittinen](http://www.natcom.org/conferences/Finland/MariTeittinen).
- Thorne, I. P. (1981). "Generative Grammar and Stylistic Analysis". In Freeman. D. C. (ed.) *Essays in Modern Stylistics* New York: Methuen, pp. 42-52.
- Trosborg, A. (1997) *Text Typology and Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- Turner, G.W. (1973) *Stylistics*. Armondsworth: Penguin
- Ullman, S. (1971) 'Stylistics and Semantics' in Chantmann (ed) *Literary Style: A Symposium*. London: OUP.
- Van Dijk, T., 1997. *Discourse as Structure and Process*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Van Dijk, T., (2002). 'Political Discourse and Political Cognition', in Chilton, P., and Schaffner, C. *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse*, Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language* (translated by E. Haufmann & G. Vakar). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Wales, K (2001) *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London. Longman.
- Whately, R., 1963. *Elements of Rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G.(1975). *Stylistics and the Teaching of Literature*. London Longman
- Wilson, J (1990) *Politically Speaking: The Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Yusuf, Y.K (2003) "Dysphemisms in the language of Nigeria's President Olusegun Obansajo". In Makoni, S and V.H Meinhof (eds) *Africa and Applied Linguistics* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins (pp104-119).
- Zingier S. (2001). 'Towards a Cultural Approach to Stylistics'. CAUCE, Revista de Filologia y su Didactica, Vol 24, pp365-380
- <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/01/21/inaugural-address-president-barack-obama>
- <http://www.getinspirednigeria.com/2011/05/30/president-goodluck-jonathans-inauguration-speech-full-text>
- <http://www.jstor.org/journals/caas.html>.

APPENDIX A

Presidential Address by President Barack Obama on the occasion of his second tenure inauguration

1. THE PRESIDENT: Vice President Biden, Mr. Chief Justice, members of the United States Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow citizens:

Each time we gather to inaugurate a President we bear witness to the enduring strength of our Constitution. We affirm the promise of our democracy. We recall that what binds this nation together is not the colors of our skin or the tenets of our faith or the origins of our names. What makes us exceptional -- what makes us American -- is our allegiance to an idea articulated in a declaration made more than two centuries ago:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

2. Today we continue a never-ending journey to bridge the meaning of those words with the realities of our time. For history tells us that while these truths may be self-evident, they’ve never been self-executing; that while freedom is a gift from God, it must be secured by His people here on Earth. (Applause.) The patriots of 1776 did not fight to replace the tyranny of a king with the privileges of a few or the rule of a mob. They gave to us a republic, a government of, and by, and for the people, entrusting each generation to keep safe our founding creed.

And for more than two hundred years, we have.

3. Through blood drawn by lash and blood drawn by sword, we learned that no union founded on the principles of liberty and equality could survive half-slave and half-free. We made ourselves anew, and vowed to move forward together.

4. Together, we determined that a modern economy requires railroads and highways to speed travel and commerce, schools and colleges to train our workers.

Together, we discovered that a free market only thrives when there are rules to ensure competition and fair play.

Together, we resolved that a great nation must care for the vulnerable, and protect its people from life’s worst hazards and misfortune.

5. Through it all, we have never relinquished our skepticism of central authority, nor have we succumbed to the fiction that all society’s ills can be cured through government alone. Our celebration of initiative and enterprise, our insistence on hard work and personal responsibility, these are constants in our character.

6. But we have always understood that when times change, so must we; that fidelity to our founding principles requires new responses to new challenges; that preserving our individual freedoms ultimately requires collective action. For the American people

can no more meet the demands of today's world by acting alone than American soldiers could have met the forces of fascism or communism with muskets and militias. No single person can train all the math and science teachers we'll need to equip our children for the future, or build the roads and networks and research labs that will bring new jobs and businesses to our shores. Now, more than ever, we must do these things together, as one nation and one people. (Applause.)

7. This generation of Americans has been tested by crises that steeled our resolve and proved our resilience. A decade of war is now ending. (Applause.) An economic recovery has begun. (Applause.) America's possibilities are limitless, for we possess all the qualities that this world without boundaries demands: youth and drive; diversity and openness; an endless capacity for risk and a gift for reinvention. My fellow Americans, we are made for this moment, and we will seize it -- so long as we seize it together. (Applause.)

8. For we, the people, understand that our country cannot succeed when a shrinking few do very well and a growing many barely make it. (Applause.) We believe that America's prosperity must rest upon the broad shoulders of a rising middle class. We know that America thrives when every person can find independence and pride in their work; when the wages of honest labor liberate families from the brink of hardship. We are true to our creed when a little girl born into the bleakest poverty knows that she has the same chance to succeed as anybody else, because she is an American; she is free, and she is equal, not just in the eyes of God but also in our own. (Applause.)

9. We understand that outworn programs are inadequate to the needs of our time. So we must harness new ideas and technology to remake our government, revamp our tax code, reform our schools, and empower our citizens with the skills they need to work harder, learn more, reach higher. But while the means will change, our purpose endures: a nation that rewards the effort and determination of every single American. That is what this moment requires. That is what will give real meaning to our creed.

10. We, the people, still believe that every citizen deserves a basic measure of security and dignity. We must make the hard choices to reduce the cost of health care and the size of our deficit. But we reject the belief that America must choose between caring for the generation that built this country and investing in the generation that will build its future. (Applause.) For we remember the lessons of our past, when twilight years were spent in poverty and parents of a child with a disability had nowhere to turn.

11. We do not believe that in this country freedom is reserved for the lucky, or happiness for the few. We recognize that no matter how responsibly we live our lives, any one of us at any time may face a job loss, or a sudden illness, or a home swept away in a terrible storm. The commitments we make to each other through Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, these things do not sap our initiative, they strengthen us. (Applause.) They do not make us a nation of takers; they free us to take the risks that make this country great. (Applause.)

12. We, the people, still believe that our obligations as Americans are not just to ourselves, but to all posterity. We will respond to the threat of climate change,

knowing that the failure to do so would betray our children and future generations. (Applause.) Some may still deny the overwhelming judgment of science, but none can avoid the devastating impact of raging fires and crippling drought and more powerful storms.

13. The path towards sustainable energy sources will be long and sometimes difficult. But America cannot resist this transition, we must lead it. We cannot cede to other nations the technology that will power new jobs and new industries, we must claim its promise. That's how we will maintain our economic vitality and our national treasure -- our forests and waterways, our crop lands and snow-capped peaks. That is how we will preserve our planet, commanded to our care by God. That's what will lend meaning to the creed our fathers once declared.

14. We, the people, still believe that enduring security and lasting peace do not require perpetual war. (Applause.) Our brave men and women in uniform, tempered by the flames of battle, are unmatched in skill and courage. (Applause.) Our citizens, seared by the memory of those we have lost, know too well the price that is paid for liberty. The knowledge of their sacrifice will keep us forever vigilant against those who would do us harm. But we are also heirs to those who won the peace and not just the war; who turned sworn enemies into the surest of friends -- and we must carry those lessons into this time as well.

15. We will defend our people and uphold our values through strength of arms and rule of law. We will show the courage to try and resolve our differences with other nations peacefully -- not because we are naïve about the dangers we face, but because engagement can more durably lift suspicion and fear. (Applause.)

16. America will remain the anchor of strong alliances in every corner of the globe. And we will renew those institutions that extend our capacity to manage crisis abroad, for no one has a greater stake in a peaceful world than its most powerful nation. We will support democracy from Asia to Africa, from the Americas to the Middle East, because our interests and our conscience compel us to act on behalf of those who long for freedom. And we must be a source of hope to the poor, the sick, the marginalized, the victims of prejudice -- not out of mere charity, but because peace in our time requires the constant advance of those principles that our common creed describes: tolerance and opportunity, human dignity and justice.

17. We, the people, declare today that the most evident of truths -- that all of us are created equal -- is the star that guides us still; just as it guided our forebears through Seneca Falls, and Selma, and Stonewall; just as it guided all those men and women, sung and unsung, who left footprints along this great Mall, to hear a preacher say that we cannot walk alone; to hear a King proclaim that our individual freedom is inextricably bound to the freedom of every soul on Earth. (Applause.)

18. It is now our generation's task to carry on what those pioneers began. For our journey is not complete until our wives, our mothers and daughters can earn a living equal to their efforts. (Applause.) Our journey is not complete until our gay brothers and sisters are treated like anyone else under the law -- (applause) -- for if we are truly created equal, then surely the love we commit to one another must be equal as well. (Applause.) Our journey is not complete until no citizen is forced to wait for

hours to exercise the right to vote. (Applause.) Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as a land of opportunity -- (applause) -- until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country. (Applause.) Our journey is not complete until all our children, from the streets of Detroit to the hills of Appalachia, to the quiet lanes of Newtown, know that they are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.

19. That is our generation's task -- to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American. Being true to our founding documents does not require us to agree on every contour of life. It does not mean we all define liberty in exactly the same way or follow the same precise path to happiness. Progress does not compel us to settle centuries-long debates about the role of government for all time, but it does require us to act in our time. (Applause.)

20. For now decisions are upon us and we cannot afford delay. We cannot mistake absolutism for principle, or substitute spectacle for politics, or treat name-calling as reasoned debate. (Applause.) We must act, knowing that our work will be imperfect. We must act, knowing that today's victories will be only partial and that it will be up to those who stand here in four years and 40 years and 400 years hence to advance the timeless spirit once conferred to us in a spare Philadelphia hall.

21. My fellow Americans, the oath I have sworn before you today, like the one recited by others who serve in this Capitol, was an oath to God and country, not party or faction. And we must faithfully execute that pledge during the duration of our service. But the words I spoke today are not so different from the oath that is taken each time a soldier signs up for duty or an immigrant realizes her dream. My oath is not so different from the pledge we all make to the flag that waves above and that fills our hearts with pride.

22. They are the words of citizens and they represent our greatest hope. You and I, as citizens, have the power to set this country's course. You and I, as citizens, have the obligation to shape the debates of our time -- not only with the votes we cast, but with the voices we lift in defense of our most ancient values and enduring ideals. (Applause.)

23. Let us, each of us, now embrace with solemn duty and awesome joy what is our lasting birthright. With common effort and common purpose, with passion and dedication, let us answer the call of history and carry into an uncertain future that precious light of freedom.

Thank you. God bless you, and may He forever bless these United States of America. (Applause.)

APPENDIX B

President Goodluck Jonathan's Inauguration Speech

Below is President Goodluck Jonathan's inauguration Speech on the occasion of his swearing-in as President/Inauguration , Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Nigeria on May 29, 2011 at Abuja.

PROTOCOL

1. My Dear Compatriots, I stand in humble gratitude to you, this day, having just sworn to the oath of office as President, Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of our great nation.
2. I thank you all, fellow citizens, for the trust and confidence, which you have demonstrated through the power of your vote. I want to assure you, that I will do my utmost at all times, to continue to deserve your trust.
3. I would like to specially acknowledge the presence in our midst today, of Brother Heads of State and Government, who have come to share this joyous moment with us. Your Excellencies, I thank you for your solidarity. I also wish to express my gratitude, to the Representatives of Heads of State and Government who are here with us. My appreciation also goes to the chairperson of the African Union and other world leaders, our development partners, and all our distinguished guests.
4. I want to specially thank all Nigerians for staying the course in our collective commitment to build a democratic nation. To members of the PDP family and members of other political parties, who have demonstrated faith in our democratic enterprise, I salute you.
5. At this juncture, let me acknowledge and salute my friend and brother, Vice-President Namadi Sambo; and my dear wife, Patience, who has been a strong pillar of support.
6. I thank her for galvanizing and mobilizing Nigerian women for the cause of democracy. In the same vein, I owe a debt of gratitude to my mother and late father. I cannot thank them enough.
7. I cannot but paytribute to our late President, Alhaji Umaru Musa Yar'Adua, with whom we won the Presidential election four years ago, when I contested as his running mate. May God bless his soul.
8. I also wish to pay tribute to our founding fathers, whose enduring sacrifices and abiding faith in the unity and greatness of our country, laid the foundation for the nation. We take enormous pride in their contributions. The pivotal task of this generation is to lift our fatherland to the summit of greatness.
9. Your Excellencies, Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, earlier this year, over seventy-three million eligible Nigerians endured all manner of inconvenience just to secure their voters cards,in order to exercise the right to choose those that will govern them.
10. At the polls, we saw the most dramatic expressions of the hunger for democracy. Stories of courage and patriotism were repeated in many ways, including how fellow citizens helped physically challenged voters into polling stations to enable them exercise their franchise. The inspiring story of the one hundred and three year-old man, and many like him across the country, who struggled against the physical limitations of age to cast their vote, is noteworthy.

11. Such determination derives from the typical Nigerian spirit of resilience in the face of the greatest of odds. That spirit has, over the years, stirred our hopes, doused our fears, and encouraged us to gather ourselves to build a strong nation even when others doubted our capacity.

12. Today, our unity is firm, and our purpose is strong. Our determination unshakable. Together, we will unite our nation and improve the living standards of all our peoples whether in the North or in the South; in the East or in the West. Our decade of development has begun. The march is on. The day of transformation begins today. We will not allow anyone exploit differences in creed or tongue, to set us one against another. Let me at this point congratulate the elected Governors, Senators, members of the House of Representatives and those of the States Houses of Assembly for their victories at the polls.

13. I am mindful that I represent the shared aspiration of all our people to forge a united Nigeria: a land of justice, opportunity and plenty. Confident that a people that are truly committed to a noble ideal, cannot be denied the realization of their vision, I assure you that this dream of Nigeria, that is so deeply felt by millions, will indeed come to reality.

14. A decade ago, it would have been a mere daydream to think that a citizen from a minority ethnic group could galvanize national support, on an unprecedented scale, to discard ancient prejudices, and win the people's mandate as President of our beloved country. That result emanated from the toil and sacrifice of innumerable individuals and institutions, many of whom may never get to receive public appreciation for their effort.

15. Only a couple of days ago, I received an entry on my Facebook page. It was sent by Mr. Babajide Orevba. He wrote to inform me that I had lost a great fan. That fan was his father, Mr. Emmanuel Bamidele Orevba. The deceased, the son told me, was no politician, but had campaigned enthusiastically for my ticket. Tragically, overwhelmed by the joy of our victory, he collapsed, and passed on three days later. I pray God Almighty to grant his soul eternal rest.

16. The success of the 2011 elections and the widespread acclaim which the exercise received was due to the uncommon patriotism and diligence exhibited by many Nigerians, including members of the Armed Forces, National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) and others. Unfortunately, despite the free, fair and transparent manner the elections were conducted, a senseless wave of violence in some parts of the country led to the death of ten members of the NYSC and others. These brave men and women paid the supreme sacrifice in the service of our fatherland. They are heroes of our democracy. We offer our heartfelt prayers and condolences in respect of all those who lost their lives.

17. In the days ahead, those of us that you have elected to serve must show that we are men and women with the patriotism and passion, to match the hopes and aspirations of you, the great people of this country. We must demonstrate the leadership, statesmanship, vision, capacity, and sacrifice, to transform our nation. We must strengthen common grounds, develop new areas of understanding and collaboration, and seek fresh ideas that will enrich our national consensus.

18. It is the supreme task of this generation to give hope to the hopeless, strength to the weak and protection to the defenceless.

19. Fellow citizens, the leadership we have pledged is decidedly transformative. The transformation will be achieved in all the critical sectors, by harnessing the creative energies of our people.

20. We must grow the economy, create jobs, and generate enduring happiness for our people. I have great confidence in the ability of Nigerians to transform this country. The urgent task of my administration is to provide a suitable environment, for productive activities to flourish. I therefore call on the good people of Nigeria, to enlist as agents of this great transformation.

21. My dear countrymen and women, being a Nigerian is a blessing. It is also a great responsibility. We must make a vow that, together, we will make the Nigerian Enterprise thrive.

22. The leadership and the followership must strive to convert our vast human and natural resources into the force that leads to a greater Nigeria. The Nigeria of our dreams must be built on hard work and not on short cuts. Let me salute the Nigerian workers who build our communities, cities and country. They deserve fair rewards, and so do the women that raise our children, and the rural dwellers that grow our food.

23. The moment is right. The signs are heart-warming. We are ready to take off on the path of sustained growth and economic development. In our economic strategy, there will be appropriate policy support to the real sector of the economy, so that Small and Medium Enterprises may thrive. Nigeria is blessed with enormous natural wealth, and my Administration will continue to encourage locally owned enterprises to take advantage of our resources in growing the domestic economy. A robust private sector is vital to providing jobs for our rapidly expanding population. But this must be a collaborative effort.

24. We must form technical and financial partnerships with global businesses and organizations. We live in an age where no country can survive on its own; countries depend on each other for economic well-being. Nigeria is no different. Returns on investment in Nigeria remain among the highest in the world. We will continue to welcome sustainable investment in our economy.

25. We will push programs and policies that will benefit both local and foreign businesses, but we must emphasize mutual benefits and win-win relationships. The overall ongoing reforms in the banking and financial sectors are therefore designed to support the real sector of the economy.

26. To drive our overall economic vision, the power sector reform is at the heart of our industrialization strategy. I call on all stakeholders, to cooperate with my administration, to ensure the success of the reforms.

27. Over the next four years, attention will be focused on rebuilding our infrastructure. We will create greater access to quality education and improved health care delivery. We will pay special attention to the agricultural sector, to enable it play its role of ensuring food security and massive job creation for our people.

28. The creation of the Nigerian Sovereign Investment Authority will immensely contribute to strengthening our fiscal framework, by institutionalizing savings of our commodity-related revenues. With this mechanism in place, we will avoid the boom and bust cycles, and mitigate our exposure to oil price volatility.

29. The lesson we have learnt is that the resolution of the Niger Delta issue is crucial for the health of the nation's economy. In the interest of justice, equity and national unity, we shall actively promote the development of the region. I believe that peace is a necessary condition for development.

30. Fellow citizens, in every decision, I shall always place the common good before all else. The bane of corruption shall be met by the overwhelming force of our collective determination, to rid our nation of this scourge. The fight against corruption is a war in which we must all enlist, so that the limited resources of this nation will be used for the growth of our commonwealth.

31. I am confident that we have every reason to look to the future with hope. We owe ourselves and posterity the duty of making this country respectable in the comity of nations. Nigeria, as a responsible member of the international community, will remain committed to the maintenance of global peace and security. We will continue to play an active role in the United Nations. Our role in the African Union, ECOWAS, and the Gulf of Guinea will be enhanced to ensure greater human and energy security.

32. Your Excellencies, Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a new dawn for Africa. We fought for decolonization. We will now fight for democratization. Nigeria, in partnership with the African Union, will lead the process for democracy and development in Africa. In particular, we will support the consolidation of democracy, good governance and human rights in the continent. Africa must develop its vast resources to tackle poverty and under-development.

33. Conscious of the negative effect of insecurity on growth and development, my Administration will seek collaboration at bilateral and multilateral levels, to improve our capability in combating trans-border crimes. In this regard, we will intensify our advocacy against the illicit trades in small arms and light weapons, which have become the catalyst for conflicts on the African continent. All Nigerian diplomatic missions abroad are to accord this vision of defending the dignity of humanity the highest priority.

34. My fellow countrymen and women, Nigeria is not just a land of promise; it shall be a nation where positive change will continue to take place, for the good of our people. The time for lamentation is over. This is the era of transformation. This is the time for action. But Nigeria can only be transformed if we all play our parts with commitment and sincerity. Cynicism and skepticism will not help our journey to greatness. Let us all believe in a new Nigeria. Let us work together to build a great country that we will all be proud of. This is our hour.

35. Fellow Compatriots, lift your gaze towards the horizon. Look ahead and you will see a great future that we can secure with unity, hard work and collective sacrifice.

36. Join me now as we begin the journey of transforming Nigeria.

- I will continue to fight, for your future, because I am one of you.

- I will continue to fight, for improved medical care for all our citizens.

- I will continue to fight for all citizens to have access to first class education.

- I will continue to fight for electricity to be available to all our citizens.

- I will continue to fight for an efficient and affordable public transport system for all our people.

- I will continue to fight for jobs to be created through productive partnerships.

37. You have trusted me with your mandate, and I will never, never let you down.

38. I know your pain, because I have been there. Look beyond the hardship you have endured. See a new beginning; a new direction; a new spirit.

39. Nigerians, I want you to start to dream again. What you see in your dreams, we can achieve together. I call upon all the Presidential candidates who contested with me to join hands with us as we begin the transformation of our country.

40. Let us work together; let us build together; let us bequeath a greater Nigeria to the generations to come.

41. I thank you! God bless you all! And God bless the Federal Republic of Nigeria