

Constructing a Common Creed: A Stylistic Analysis of Pronoun Deixis, Syntactic Parallelism, and Historical Allusion in Obama's 2011 Westminster Hall Address

Original Research Article | Volume 1 | Issue 5 | 2026 | Article Number: 026

Accepted: 17 September 2026 | Published: 10 October 2026 | ISSN: 2979-8582 (Online)



Crossref : <https://doi.org/10.67693/BJCR-RJZ87U4M>



Adepoju Thany Babajide

Department Of English, College Of Humanities, Tai Solarin Federal University Of Education, Nigeria

 ATB [0009-0007-1376-1369](https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1376-1369)

Correspondence: Adepoju Thany Babajide, adepojutb@tasued.edu.ng

Abstract

This article performs a stylistic analysis of Barack Obama's 2011 speech to the UK Parliament at Westminster Hall to investigate how syntactic parallelism, pronoun deixis and historical allusion are employed in building the US-UK relation as more than a government/diplomacy between two nation states. The paper proposes that these three stylistic features should be viewed not as ornamentations of rhetoric, but as co-functioning devices through which shared identity, moral legitimacy, and historical continuity are linguistically constructed. Drawing on methods of close reading which blend stylistics and the study of political discourse, this essay analyzes, the dominant anaphora and tricolon, Obama's choices in terms of the reference of his pronouns (who he addresses and where 'we' extends), and the function of those historical allusions which serve his strategic interests in construction. This article argues that there is clear syntactic precedent for a "we" that dissolves boundaries between speakers and listeners. It continues that there is a concomitant stylistic tendency to reframe the motivations behind the alliance away from self-interest and towards shared virtue. In addition, the stylistic choices with which Obama constructs the special relationship seem deeply indebted to the tradition that binds Locke, Blackstone, Churchill and to this present day relationship. I will show how, stylistically, the "special relationship" emerges from the present-present-now relationship among Britain and America through the deployment of these three inter-locking devices of stylistic choice.

Keywords: Stylistics, Political Discourse, Deixis, Syntactic Parallelism, Allusion, Barack Obama

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Barack Obama is only the fourth individual in history and second sitting American president to ever give a speech to both Houses of the United Kingdom Parliament from the lectern in Westminster Hall, as such following in the footsteps of Queen Elizabeth II, Nelson Mandela, and Pope Benedict XVI. Before Obama uttered a word, there seemed to be an air of profound symbolic resonance to the speaking occasion, and it appears that in his address, the speaker has a conscious design for the discourse itself to engage in generating an invitation, through this linguistically constructed communal feel, to a 'common creed' to share. In this speech, a moral and political construction begins to take shape around a notion that language could somehow itself enact this shared humanity.

What this paper seeks is a language-related reason for how a common creed is forged through linguistic interaction, specifically Obama's address to Parliament. To do so, the article identifies three interrelated ways this can be, and in fact is, constructed within Obama's address: through syntactic parallelism (specifically tricolons, antitheses, and anaphoras), the speaker's deixis and choice of pronouns, and the inclusion of a number of historically referential allusions that ground his speech in a common intellectual tradition. These three linguistic elements do not merely serve as decoration; rather, as a stylistics practice, they work together as interlocking mechanisms through which shared identity, moral legitimacy, and historical continuity are created within the context of a foreign policy discourse. I draw upon stylistic methods such as anaphora, tricolon, and antithesis to foreground the speaker's attention to the grammatical structure that gives order and mnemonic potential to language. By tracing the speaker's selection of pronouns, from which it is readily apparent that Obama uses second and first-person pronouns differently based on the audience at hand, I begin to sketch out the speaker's construction of a linguistic, as well as a diplomatic, relationship with this particular audience. Furthermore, I will use allusions in the speech that link the modern Anglo-American alliance to figures of great intellectual, governmental, and moral significance as one of the principle ways that Obama attempts to invoke and maintain the historical weight of this partnership through the use of allusion. In so doing, I provide stylistics analysis of this specific political context, which seeks to bridge linguistics and literary analysis. This paper presents evidence for how, stylistically, style alone is an affective practice in political discourse, one which endeavors not simply to describe the special relationship between Britain and America but actually to constitute it.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There are a lot of places that this paper may draw upon from the tradition of stylistics—a study that bridges linguistic methods and literature and rhetorical criticism to ask how language produces meaning and effect (Wales). Where some scholars have been focused primarily on the stylistic features of literary art and poetry, this article is interested in political speech since it has an explicit, direct, as well as immediate political, aim. As Giles says in a paper that analyzes stylistics methods on a range of genres, stylistics enables researchers to discover and interpret how meaning is made out of language through patterns, for political style works to both manage the audience, as well as mold opinion in favorable ways. By bringing stylistic methods to political rhetoric, writers can begin to understand the ways in which what the speaker says and the grammatical features through which he says it might be mutually co-dependent in constructing political power.

This paper centers on an argument for how Barack Obama construes the "special relationship" between Britain and America as an intrinsically formed identity tied to historical precedent, common philosophy, and united moral interests that is conveyed through grammatical and linguistic selection. The core of my thesis is centered upon the grammatical and rhetorical means that Obama uses as integrated, functioning mechanisms to enact a discourse that molds its audience rather than simply informs it. This chapter takes a

brief look at how stylistics, at large, is engaged by scholars of political communication who employ linguistic tools to analyze various discursive situations. It then seeks to locate this article within this body of scholarship while building on previously acquired knowledge.

For the analysis of the language of political discourse, the pronominal deixis holds a particular position; as on the smallest level of grammar 'pronoun choice defines who is a speaker's own constructed community (an "in-group") and who is not. Indeed for political speakers, pronoun choice is, 'one of the most obvious and salient resources...for the construction of in-groups and out-groups, because choice between 'we (exclusive)' and 'we (inclusive)', or choice between 'we' and 'you', has 'ideological overtones even for audiences who take them for granted.' (Wilson 89) igo-Mora discusses the parliamentary form of this notion more concretely, exploring how first person plural pronoun in political language 'is almost never an undifferentiated static index' and how tracking the 'constant shifts between narrowly and broadly construes communities according to the context-dependents rhetorical aims of speakers' reveals 'the processes by which political identification is under construction in a speech' (igo-Mora 29).

Such an observation is, of course, profoundly relevant to the analysis of the Westminster Hall address where, as this paper will demonstrate, the pronoun 'we' switches constantly between a bilateral conception of America and Britain and a far broader, human value.

As for historical allusion, while it is not an area of investigation which has until now commanded quite the same degree of attention within stylistics per se as its syntactic and deictic counterparts, its function as a persuasive mode in political oratory is thoroughly documented within political rhetoric. Charteris-Black's account of the rhetoric employed by effective political orators notes that persuasive political language frequently operates through the construction of 'myth', that is, a coherent and emotively resonant story, in which the success of the oration is measured not by its logic but its appeal 'to deep-seated associations, common assumptions and collectively perceived truth'. It is in order to establish such a myth, Charteris-Black demonstrates, that orators engage extensively with history and cultural references. Thus, when combined with Chilton's concept of legitimacy as a primary goal of political discourse, where speakers 'seek to establish or reinforce the rightfulness of their positions', through invoking 'accepted history, tradition or moral principles' (Chilton 46), it can be seen how historical allusion is deeply implicated with pronoun deixis and syntax.

Together, those bodies of research are able to provide the theoretical framework within which to undertake this analysis of syntactic patterning, pronominal deixis and historical allusion not as separate, but complementary aspects of a cohesive political utterance by Barack Obama.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The approach of this thesis has been one of intensive qualitative case-study, reading texts close to the theoretical underpinnings outlined in my introduction-that is, stylistics and the political discourse analysis perspective. I used Barack Obama's address to the British Parliament in Westminster Hall, dated 25 May 2011, as my sole textual source material, undertaking numerous, successive readings of the whole transcript. I noted instances of: syntactical patterning (namely, anaphora, tricolon and antithesis), pronoun deixis, and historical/cultural allusion; then explored them in the context of immediately surrounding text and overall speech structure as per the assumption within stylistics that meaning always exists within its given discourse context.

Many instances were also considered across the corpus; as the claim of the paper as a whole is not just one of the presence of these devices but their interactional construction at specific places within the speech. The nature of this work is such that it focuses intensely on a single corpus of text with nothing being

claimed about that this corpus is universally representative of Obama or indeed any public oration. The aim has been instead to provide a concentrated analysis of how these three pragmatic categories intertwine in one particular utterance in order to show how style can, I hope, prove useful for the analysis of other, similar pieces of public rhetoric.

4.0 ANALYSIS

4.1 Syntactic Patterning: Anaphora, Tricolon, and Antithesis

Syntactical devices work as structural supports throughout the address to give substance to the rhetoric of Obama's speech.

We see, throughout Obama's address to Parliament at Westminster Hall, evidence of devices that seem to transmute political argument into well-patterned prose. Chief among those devices is anaphora, the repetition of a syntax-construction at the onset of consecutive clauses. In this speech we see the effect very prominently: We are the nations that helped to build the modern world. We are the nations that fought side by side in the trenches of the First World War and on the beaches of the Second....

Obama deploys the anaphoric unit, "We are the nations that" more than just a tool for list formation; this structural repetition enacts at the grammatical level the solidarity that the statement asserts.

It builds rhetorical momentum and audience belief without audiences taking conscious cognizance of the propositional content as each clause passes: Obama builds rhetorical force through syntactic iteration. This pattern of syntactical repetition is, I observed, later adapted. After having established a shared historical perspective, Obama shifts from declarative syntax towards more elliptical constructions, suggesting a shift from historical commemoration to programmatic commitment: "...

By investing in the skills of our workers. By supporting new industries and technologies. By ensuring that the rewards of recovery are shared by all".

Here, the repetition of "By" is freed from any preceding main verb, creating sentence fragments which, due to their parallel syntax and rapidfire pace, take on the brevity of slogans.

They shift the discourse from one characterized by expansive declarative pronouncements to succinct proclamations; even though the grammatical technique that underpins both instances of sentence-level anaphora is identical. Of course, such forms may also overlap with tricolon-a series of three parallel elements-which is present at several key points in the oration: refusing to live in fear; refusing to back down in the face of threats; standing up for what is right. Here the first two members of the triad share the negating construction "refusing to", thereby creating emphasis as well as providing momentum in a repetition that is carefully tuned. The third member, with its positive formulation, "standing up for", works to signal both an endpoint for the sequence and an emphasis on the values it enumerates.

Obama employs a similar technique later with four such parallel units rather than three: that freedom is universal; that every person deserves a chance to pursue their dreams; that justice must be blind; that the rule of law must be upheld.

With this expansion Obama has created a greater sense of build-up, allowing Obama to more concretely and forcefully pile together abstract political tenets and beliefs in a well-rounded list structure.

The passage with the greatest density of rhetorical figures within the speech as a whole, however, is not merely repetitive, but rather elliptical, with the two opposing members of each antimetabole paired up, one against the other, with syntactically parallel structure. This tripartite movement frames the relationship in this way: 'It is an alliance rooted not in fear, but in hope. Not in the desire to dominate, but in the commitment to defend.

Not in the pursuit of narrow self-interest, but in the recognition that our interests are best served when others have the chance to thrive as well.'

The cluster of tripartite, antithetical statements is clearly doing more work in terms of sustained argumentation than with the earlier triplet, but it clearly benefits from a measured pace. The three oppositions both propose and reject a possible cynical understanding of the relationship (fear, domination, self-interest), then substitute it with a loftier ideal (hope, defence, mutual prosperity). It is explicitly pre-emptive-the cynical readings are both offered up first, but by voicing them the speaker preempts the speaker of this paper and the potential opposition. This resembles what the classical rhetoricians called concession, though rather than explicitly granting the opposition its say, Obama brings these claims fully to him/herself.

Each opposing couplet, 'not X, but Y,' builds upon the last, moving both sentence-structurally and semantically: The third such instance, "Not in the pursuit of narrow self-interest, but in the recognition that our interests are best served when others have the chance to thrive as well," marks a definite peak and allows us, here, to ponder the argument, which is both very simple and surprisingly complex.

All three sets build on each other with a syntactically insistent parallel-construction, offering a trio of antithetical pronouncements that serve not as decoration, but as argument designed to elevate political claims past pragmatism to the level of creed or vow – the specific stylistic convention we will draw our title from as a point of contrast to Obama's pragmatic framing of the alliance throughout his talk: 'With courage and purpose, with humility and with hope, with faith in the promise of tomorrow, let us march forward together.' I urge the reader to consider that though these latter three statements are equally tricolon in formation as those that followed the first tripartite list of concrete proposals, the shift in form reflects a shift in the moral register; indeed, there is something in all three latter phrasings, which draw out notions of internal psychological conviction in conjunction with moral clarity, which suggests that this is the true heart of what Obama is getting across. Let us take into consideration just what exactly is being said by these final sentences and this closing statement.

We may compare these to those opening tripartite statements Obama offers and learn the distance between the practical and ideational registers of the speech by how the phrasing is changed. Though all three lists follow the same, tripartite prepositional pattern, the transformation from the list in the earlier section to the list in the latter demonstrates how an identical rhetorical construction might represent dramatically different ideological sentiments, depending on its context-how the pragmatism of "By investing, by supporting, by ensuring..." functions very differently from "With courage and purpose, with humility and with hope...". It might best be summarized by saying that syntactical parallelism is, in these instances and throughout much of this speech, not simply a stylistic tic, but rather a means of bridging and merging these discrete ideological or thematic registers, tying these disparate halves of the speech into one cohesive rhetorical project of moralistic elevation from practical application.

4.2 Pronoun Selection and Deixis

Person deixis, or use of grammatical markers to indicate writer and audience position and relations to each other and the speaker(s), is a fundamental stylistic choice that Obama invokes in more pervasive ways than almost any other resource in this speech; indeed, the way that he manipulates such grammatical categories is a central aspect of the construction of audience affiliation which is characteristic of the entirety of the speech.

The constant use of first-person plural ("we" and its variants) throughout is quite remarkable, but it is their fluctuating reference that should arrest the reader's attention; instead of being simply and pragmatically

tied to the speaker's own nation plus the nation addressed, the subject reference of this "we" shifts strategically between a dyadic conception of a unified US and UK, an expansive consideration of all of mankind, and a simple inclusive declaration intended simply to pull the audience towards alignment by assuming unity is already a given-'We are the nations that helped to build the modern world.' Indeed, there are different functions to this dyadic 'we,' the first of which establishes a concrete, combined presence shared between speaker and listener throughout the historical, values-laden, and mythic-laden sections of the speech. The audience is asked, it appears, to identify as constituent members of this shared historical legacy not simply by listening, but by enacting the pronoun 'we', here, through active recognition. This subject is used consistently to combine the distinct actors of US and UK, thereby eliding differences through linguistic assimilation.

A more expansive use of 'we' takes occurs with the statement 'These values are not American or British, they are human,' a turning-point in the deictic flow.

The broadening of this previously dyadic 'we' into a universal human category helps to redefine the alliance's purpose away from a simple bi-national partnership toward a broader project in whose service the US and UK partner as guardians of universal moral values, another key element to Charteris-Black's notion of the mythic dimension of political self-creation (21)-and also of paramount persuasive importance to an audience of foreign legislators who might otherwise remain skeptical of American hegemony disguised as alliance. Least conventional, perhaps, of Obama's stylistic choices regarding pronoun use, is the marked almost-total omission of any second-person address. Despite a direct, personal address to Parliament in a public setting before a foreign assembly, instead of using second person pronouns like you have and your nation the speaker continuously assimilates this group to the same we used to encompass the shared histories and futures of the US and UK alike, placing the audience grammatically within the boundaries of his constructed coalition.

As Wilson reminds us in her exploration of pronoun selection and ideological work, every usage or non-usage on the part of the rhetor must be accounted for.¹⁰⁰ Rather than engaging in a persuasive rhetoric directed toward an audience, Obama addresses them as already included, their agreement already established by the language being used to discuss them; This construction places the audience in the impossible position of not wanting to be persuaded that there is something important shared between them, because they are already speaking. I agree with the observation Igo-Mora makes of his article, which claims that deixis in this speech tends toward first-person pronouns because 'the speaker's intention is to establish unity, through first-person plural pronouns, as a basis for social action'. She claims that it relies upon the repetition of one cohesive pronoun throughout as the key way of creating a solidarity of collective action for political ends and is so effective at integrating the members of both groups together into a singular body.

Not only are specific group pronouns maintained in this collective framework, but even concessions that the alliance is 'imperfect' are subsumed within the pronoun. 'our own imperfect paths to democracy' not only subsumes responsibility as being shared among a mutual subject, but thereby washes both partners in equal measures with a necessary measure of humbleness; A second category of deixis should also be examined: the use of demonstrative adjectives (often tied to such pronouns as "we" and "you") like "these" to designate which things are of relevance. Instead of using third-person designations and then explicitly identifying what "those" items that are being referenced by the third-person form of the verb, these latter demonstratives refer to objects of concern implicitly rather than explicitly. By keeping its referents fluid, this demonstrates flexibility and nuance on the part of the speaker, enabling a sense of immediacy, though potentially also allowing for ambiguity at moments when there are many distinct subjects of discussion. The choice to not single out or separate the partners through the selective deployment of second-person

reference ultimately cements the unified vision of the alliance that he strives tirelessly to realize. So is this use of pronoun selection simply habit, a characteristic manner of address?

It depends whom you ask.

However, in the case of such prominent individuals, this grammatical tendency seems a rhetorical choice of extreme design, one to which a serious audience attending political rhetoric ought to pay especially close attention if the rhetor aims, ostensibly, to draw that audience towards a closer participation within an established framework or pact of friendship and mutual benefit—a feat this rhetorical choice helps him to achieve brilliantly. This rhetorical choice, then, should be seen in the context of a general attempt to consolidate disparate group(s) under a singular linguistic banner for pragmatic ends.

4.3 Historical and Cultural Allusion

The third stylistic device employed within the address, historical and cultural allusion, is utilized in order to situate the contemporary alliance within a continuum beginning from 17th century philosophy, continuing with armed conflict, and leading all the way to the ongoing Arab Spring at the very point Obama was addressing the parliamentarians. The rhetorical device of allusion within the speech serves a legitimising function apart from, yet intertwined with, the identities established by pronoun deixis. While deixis construes an 'us' grammatically speaking, allusion serves the purpose of giving the 'us' historical lineage, causing it to appear less constructed and merely 'found' by the speaker for the purpose of his speech.

In the case of the allusion strategy employed within the address, it is significant that Obama commences the discourse with humor. He claims that "The last three speakers here have been the Pope, Her Majesty the Queen, and Nelson Mandela, which is either a very high bar or the beginning of a very funny joke," thereby legitimizing himself by associating himself with revered and morally authoritative figures while a comedic interpretation of the situation guards him from assuming an imposing posture. He continues with two other humorous historical allusions that acknowledge genuine, albeit historical, contention between the United States and the United Kingdom: "a small scrape about tea and taxes" (an allusion to the Boston Tea Party and the American Revolutionary War) and "The White House was set on fire during the War of 1812." *Litotes* occurs in each instance here, reducing genuine conflicts to amicable disagreement between old friends. This cannot be considered a flippant or incidental instance of wit for it not only overlooks historical animosities, as other potentially inconvenient facts are ignored, but renders conflict into evidence of an enduring relationship sturdy enough to laugh about, confident of itself such that there is no need to ignore its scars.

Following the humorous allusions that precede, the address takes on a seriously historical stance, namely, the acknowledgement that "the trenches of the First World War, and on the beaches of the Second." This transition from comedy to solemnity is paralleled in the speech where allusions appear to transition from playful remarks about past grudges to formal declarations about mutual experience. This serves, along with his acknowledgment of their shared past, to reinforce Obama's subsequent claims about the genuine importance of their alliance.

Without doubt, the most crucial allusion relative to this paper's thesis is intellectual rather than historical: "the Declaration of Independence was shaped by the writings of Locke and Blackstone." The value of this single allusion goes far beyond merely spicing up his oration. It is this allusion which makes Obama's central thesis in the address ("the importance of shared values") historically and philosophically tenable by asserting the ancestry of American political thought in British philosophy. While his earlier allusions declare that their countries have fought battles together, this statement announces that their governments

think and believe together, meaning that America's philosophical tradition originated from Britain. This is probably the allusion that carries the most weight in terms of what argument it is attempting to make, making Obama's claim that their beliefs align part of a shared intellectual inheritance in much the same way Chilton describes political discourse as functioning as an appeal to tradition (46).

Most direct in terms of quotation of an established figure in this allusive strategy is when near the end Obama quotes Winston Churchill, "In the long history of the world, there has never been a time when the Will of Man was more exalted." In this final quoted statement, Obama makes an effective use of quoting an undeniably venerated figure who can lend his discourse great weight and authority; this is even more the case considering that he is speaking before the British parliament. The structure of using this particular quotation can be observed as strategic for he uses it at a point right before the three-part ending of the speech and thereby connects Churchill's declaration to his own call to action: to "march forward together."

He ultimately continues the tradition of referring to something familiar by adding a layer of contemporary actuality as well, by referring to the fact of the ongoing Arab Spring with "From Cairo to Tunis, from Benghazi to Damascus." Although different from his more historical allusions (as they don't refer to past shared history but future contemporary history), this particular allusion demonstrates how the belief of the United States and the UK can serve as more than just something they carry with them but something that can impact on unfolding world events. Overall, Obama uses allusions that represent comic, historical, and philosophical discourse to illustrate that his assertion that the alliance between these two nations is rooted in the past is a completely logical and valid one, making it feel that the alliance is not only valid in the present, but necessary given its history.

5.0 DISCUSSION: SYNTHESIS

Taken separately, the 3 different allusive tactics are very compelling, and are very effectively used in a singular unit by each speaker. If combined, they present something much more than what one would expect out of a solitary instance of linguistic strategy: an address where style and rhetoric can never be wholly separated from speech. In so doing, Obama achieves his main goal for the address by never actually simply declaring the United States and the United Kingdom have common ground, but rather showing its existence.

Notice how the antithesis passage mentioned in 4.1 and the reference to Locke and Blackstone made in section 4.3 create opposite effects on the reader/hearer that come to the same conclusion. One speaks of motives, the other speaks of a long history of shared philosophical thought in addition to warfare. However, they both use an argumentative style that Chilton identifies as integral to political discourse by having each piece create a separate case for the United States-United Kingdom alliance, thereby making it appear self-evident to the hearer(s).

Perhaps the most crucial of the processes discussed that makes both of these moves possible is the use of pronouns; a narrative detailed at section 4.2. One cannot establish this division and subsequent collapse without this constant almost obsessive repetition of an inclusive 'we', which seems to erase the boundary between speaker and auditor, one cannot accept the antithesis passage for the sake of argument as another nation's self-justification to another nation, nor one cannot accept the Locke and Blackstone citation as slightly clumsy flattery of a foreign nation. The argument appears in the rhetorical edifice Obama builds; by that point Parliament has been woven into this we, so the moral argument appears as not an argument to them but truths they need to accept about themselves; in this way the discourse functions exactly in the deictic manner that Wilson and Igo-Mora highlight within their texts, through grammar in the construction of a community as opposed persuasion *per se* (Wilson 89; Igo-Mora 29). The allusive and syntactic elements would have arguably failed in their purpose without it being so firmly in place before Obama

embarked upon those moves; syntax can be described as becoming increasingly anaphoric to allusions that become increasingly precise in a similar way to how deixis draws an audience into speaker's worldview.

The manner in which the syntactic structures develop seems equally closely allied to allusions progression through the address, the anaphoric structure of the former becomes increasingly important and tight throughout the speech as allusions become increasingly solemn and central, whereas the first few casual allusions come with a relatively informal syntactical style reminiscent of spoken language, the tight syntactical constructions of the middle of the speech are accompanied by serious historical allusion, and the very final explicitly quoted allusion also occurs alongside an equally final syntactical tricolon that serves no pragmatic purpose, but solely affective persuasion, so there are two phenomena moving in conjunction throughout the speech. This indicates a relationship between aspects of rhetorical expression rather than a listing of devices; indeed as Charteris-Black states, politicians use myth as the underpinning of rhetoric which is a complex and emotionally rewarding narrative about their nation (21). Therefore, one should arguably be reading the mythologising of Anglo-American ideology not as coming from one device, but from all of them working in tandem; without any one of the syntactic structures, the allusions, or the pronouns it would fall apart, the allusions become less important and the syntax less tightly related to it.

This suggests a level of syntactic-allusion synergy present which is a result of deixis. This conclusion goes beyond the immediate data: political rhetoric could also be defined through these interactions, not an isolated catalogue of devices; in Obama's Westminster address, but by extension, and presumably in general, the devices that carry rhetoric are the sum of their parts (11; 13; 21).

By analysing this syntactical parallelism, pronoun deixis, and historical allusion, the paper concludes that rather than the features operating independently from one another, their interplay leads to a powerful cohesive syntactic-allusive entity; the core concept and claim about shared values appears and develops through the discourse. The syntax is structurally sound and supports not just argumentation but pre-empting criticism of an alliance; allusions anchor these claims in the nation's past. But most importantly, and perhaps singularly of all the discussed devices, his selection of pronouns throughout the speech has entirely erased the line between speaker and listener, so far that he may as well have asked Parliament 'what is it that we already think', then persuaded Parliament to accept his point of view. This type of conclusion reinforces the idea that these stylistic traits do more than ornament; they are the very apparatus with which politicians perform persuasion, and not merely display their understanding. The next logical course of analysis must compare these traits across the broader tradition of Anglo-American relations as well as across different speeches by the same leader and others (Charteris-Black 21; Leech and Short 221-2, 251).

6.0 CONCLUSION

The current paper has been aimed at exploring the way in which Barack Obama's address of 2011 to Westminster Hall attempts to create the Anglo-American alliance through stylistic choices as "something immeasurably greater than either just the special relationship... Or merely a military pact". This examination of the construction of this particularly deep bilateral relationship and argument by means of syntactical parallelism, personal pronouns, and historical allusion has tried to claim the following: that it is not just an accumulation of disparate individual strategies, but the co-ordination of them working in tandem in a singular project to build the 'common creed' explicit within Obama's sentence structure.

The paper has argued that Barack Obama's use of anaphora, tricolon, and antithesis is essential in shaping the overall rhythm and structure of the speech, transforming political claims of no real weight (since a democratic US cannot directly control UK policy) into the building blocks of a tangible argument and, in central antithesis, undermining the possibility of a skeptical response to a notion that the US and UK

actually have all that much in common, prior to its establishment in the speech itself.

The paper has also focused on Obama's use of pronoun deixis; in eschewing all but one second person, directly confronting and informing (and consequently confronting and challenging) parliament, Obama creates an audience, in grammatical construction at least, who has always been part of this "common creed". Thus finally, Obama's varied historical references are seen to have not merely decorated an already established concept of alliance, but embedded it within a tradition and structure that lends to an unquestionable feel of discovered truth, and consequently genuine shared destiny between speaker and listener. These points help solidify the essay's attempt to demonstrate that individual stylistic choices can be a powerful form of political persuasion; if these insights gleaned about stylistic elements in one speech from one prominent US politician can demonstrate how identities and alliances can be constructed in political discourse, an identical comparative analysis to other instances of Anglo-American diplomatic speech rhetoric, or any comparable political orator speaking in foreign governments, could prove just as revealing, particularly if extended as part of a broad, inclusive study.

References

- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: the persuasive power of metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
- Iligo-Mora, I. (2004). 'On the use of the personal pronoun 'we' in communities'. *Journal of language and politics*, 3(1), 27-52.
- Leech, G. and Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: a linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. Pearson Longman.
- Obama, B. (2011, May 25). Remarks by President Barack Obama to the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Westminster Hall, London.
- Wales, K. (2011). *A dictionary of stylistics*. Routledge.
- Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically speaking: the pragmatic analysis of political language*. Basil Blackwell.



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)