



ISSN: 0975-833X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF COMMISSIVES IN SOME SELECTED AMERICAN POLITICAL TEXTS

* Dr. Bushra Ni'ma Rashid

Baghdad University, College of Education, Ibn Rushid for Human Sciences, English Department

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 17th September, 2015
Received in revised form
20th October, 2015
Accepted 27th November, 2015
Published online 21st December, 2015

Key words:

Social,
Religion
and Political relationships.

ABSTRACT

The four commissive acts (promise, threat, guarantee, pledge) are found in most languages. They are considered as important acts in maintaining the social relationships between individuals in any society. These acts can be performed in different fields of life, such as: social, religion, and political relationships, whether they can be used explicitly or implicitly. But, sometimes, an ambiguity may arise in applying the previous acts in political speeches because these acts happened between the presidents and their peoples. Thus, in order to clarify this ambiguity, the best way is to analyze the text pragmatically. This paper aims to analyze specific commissive acts (promise, threat, guarantee and pledge) in Some Selected American Political Speeches. A language studies the speeches of four American presidents: George Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush and Baraq Obama. This study deals with the problem of applying the Speech Acts Theory in political speeches. It also attempts to reveal the overlapping of these acts in political speeches. In order to suit the objective of the work, this study attempts to modify John Searle's Felicity Conditions and semantic rules of promise for the acts of threatening, guaranteeing and pledging by extracting some semantic rules for the Speech Act of threatening, guaranteeing and pledging and taking into account the general framework that is proposed by John Searle. This study also proposes a specific classification for these acts, in order to overcome the overlapping and ambiguity.

Copyright © 2015 Bushra Ni'ma Rashid. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Bushra Ni'ma Rashid, 2015. "A pragmatic analysis of commissives in some selected American political texts", *International Journal of Current Research*, 7, (12), 23805-23814.

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Language is the key of communication between people. People can understand each other through the shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer. Van Dijk (1985: 61) states that language is a major mechanism within the process of social construction. It can be seen as an instrument for consolidating and manipulating concepts and relationships in the area of power.

1.2 Pragmatics and Politics

Language represents a site of cultural politics; ways of speaking, reading and writing become ideological issues. People invest in their words and thoughts and whether consciously or not, subjects choose certain ways of languaging the world over others (Leonardo, 2003: 68). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) focuses on the intersection between language, discourse and speech, and social structure. Furthermore, the ways of social structure and discourse patterns are uncovered.

The purpose of CDA is that as well "to analyze opaque as transparent structural relationship of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language"

1.3 Language of Politics

Language as a term is used in order to describe the political and social consequences of linguistic differences between people on occasion, the political consequences of the way a language is spoken.

Gee (1999: 2) states that "politics" today includes "democrats" and "republicans" parties. He adds that "politics" means anything and anyplace where human social interactions and relationship have implications for how "social goods" (a group of people believe to be a source of power, status, or worth) ought to be distributed. Fairclough (1989: 23) goes further still and states that politics is not just conducted through language but much of politics is language: 'politics partly consists in the disputes which occur in language and over languages' (Ibid).

1.4 Political Discourse

Van Dijk (1998: 50) demonstrates that the term '**political discourse**' is not a genre but class of genres which is

*Corresponding author: Dr. Bushra Ni'ma Rashid

Baghdad University, College of Education, Ibn Rushid for Human Sciences, English Department

identified by social domains known as politics, e.g. political speeches and the debates of politicians as various genres that go under politics. Woods (2006) argues that political discourse has been affected by the rapid media and mass communication system. People always restrict themselves to listen to speeches by politicians. The building of political systems requires an employment of unelected policy making pieces of advice and consultants (Ibid: 46).

1.5 Language of Persuasion

Persuasion uses language and symbolic action. In politics, politicians use language in order to persuade people to vote for or support them by using various means such as: using advertisements, speeches, news, websites and other means.

"Persuaders" use variety of techniques to grasp our attention to establish credibility and trust, to stimulate desire for the product, or policy, and to motivate us to act (buy, vote, give, money). These techniques are called "**Language of Persuasion**".

1.5.1 Persuasion

Persuasion is considered as a powerful instrument in political process in order to comprehend the political language. The political language is characterized by the arts and techniques of persuasion by politicians.

1.5.1.1 Strategies of Persuasion

Johnstone (2008: 246-247) recognizes the strategies of persuasion and points that:

1. The first strategy is '**quasilogical**' as stated by Perelman, et al., (1969, cited in Johnstone: *ibid*). They use this term in order to focus on the structure and wording of argumentation whether in formal logic or mathematics but are not logical in strict sense, i.e.

(1.1). "Let's invite Kathy to the party. She and Chris would probably get along, since; they're both friends of Ann's".

Here in this example, the speaker constructs an argument that is based on the logical principles of "**transitivity**", as follows: if **A** implies **B** and **B** implies **C**, then **A** implies **C**. This explanation cannot be denoted that the friendship ... the fact is that if **A** likes person **B** and person **B** likes **C**, this does not mean that person **A** will like person **C**. So, in this case, this argument is called **quasilogical** (*ibid*).

2. Another persuasive strategy is called '**presentational**' in contrast with **quasilogical** persuasion. Presentational is a process of a rational convincing based on the assumption that being persuaded is being moved, swept along by a rhythmic flow of words and sound, in the way that swept along with poetry (*Ibid*).

SECTION TWO

COMMISSIVES IN ENGLISH

2.1 Introduction

This section is devoted to the analysis of commissives in English, focusing on the analysis that the Speech Act Theory

of promising, threatening, guaranteeing and pledging in English can be applied to political speeches by analyzing their FCs.

2.2 Speech Acts Theory

Yule (1996: 47) characterizes Speech Acts (SAs) as "**actions performed via utterances**". Thus, the term SAs covers 'actions' such as: '**requesting**', '**commanding**', '**informing**' and '**complaining**'.

Searle (1969: 16-17) explains the reason why the focus is often made on Speech Acts stating that "**the concentration on the study of speech acts is that all linguistic communications involve linguistic acts**".

2.2.1 Components of Speech Acts

Austin (1962: 6) holds the fact that in issuing any word or an utterance, a speaker can perform three acts: a locutionary, an illocutionary and a perlocutionary act.

1. A locutionary act: to say something means to do something including "the utterance of certain noises.
2. An illocutionary act: an act is performed in saying something such as making promise, a request or give advice. The distinction between locutionary and illocutionary acts is not an easy task.
3. A perlocutionary act: an act when it is performed has a great effect upon the feelings or thoughts of the audience (Austin, 1962: 101).

The perlocutionary effect comes as a result of both the locutionary and illocutionary force that the hearer recognizes utterances.

For examples

- (2.1). John told to me, you can do it. A locution.
- (2.2). John refuses the offensive treatment. An illocution.
- (2.3). John disturbs me. A perlocutionary.

2.2.2 Speech Act Classifications

Many attempts have been made in order to classify SAs. An approach based on linguistic ground is suggested by Searle's (1969) "**The Philosophy of Language**".

2.2.2.1 Searle's Classification of Speech Acts

Speech act has undergone various modifications and attempts at systematization. Searle is the famous theorist in the development of Speech Act. He tries to establish set of rules in order to systematize and formalize Austin's work. Searle (1971) criticizes Austin's taxonomy of illocutionary acts on overlapping criteria. Searle states that not all verbs are illocutionary verbs, e.g. '**systematize**', '**regard as**', '**name to**', '**intend**' and '**shall**'

As a result, Searle (1975: 356-364) lists twelve dimensions through which Speech Acts can be differentiated: Illocutionary

Point, Direction of Fit, Expressed Psychological State, Force of Strength, Social Status, Interests of the Speaker or Hearer, Discourse- Related Functions, Propositional Content, Speech Act or Speech Act Verbs, Societal Institutions and SAs, SAs and Performatives, and Style, (Ibid: 29-30).

2.3 Commissive Verbs

Commissives refer to those verbs that are recognized as subgroups of illocutionary acts. They are obligating one or proposing oneself to do something specified in the propositional content.

Austin (1962: 151-152) states that commissives "are typified by promising or otherwise undertaking; they commit you to do something but include also declarations or announcements of intention, which are not promise and also rather vague things which we may call espousals, as for example, siding with".

Searle repeats that "commissives then are those illocutionary acts whose point is to commit the speaker (again in varying degrees) to some future course of action" (Trosborg, 1997: <http://books.google.com>).

2.3.1 Pragmatic View of Commissives

The pragmatic function of an utterance is often expressed in the grammatical structure of the sentence. Given a command context the person may expect typical uses of pronoun (you) imperative syntactical structure selection of typical lexical items, (Van Dijk, 1977: 245). Thus, the main aim of pragmatics is to specify the condition the so-called appropriateness conditions, under which an utterance functions as an appropriate Speech Act in some context.

2.3.2 Semantic View of Commissives

Speech Act is the most important activity in maintaining the social fabric of everyday lives. In semantic field, commissive demands two main features: the first one is the realization of a future action, while the second, the agent of the future action is to be the addressees.

(2.4).e.g. **Kim will take out the rubbish**

In this example, Kim is (command). While indirect illocution of an utterance is any further illocution, the utterance may have, e.g. **can you pass the salt?**

2.3.3 Syntactic View of Commissives

Perroult (1980: 2) states that there are three types of sentences: declarative, interrogative and imperative sentences. Declarative sentences are primarily and most frequently used for Speech Acts, as: **asserting, claiming, and stating** but also **accusing, criticizing, promising** and **guaranteeing**, all performative sentences are the declarative type. Interrogative sentences are used for eliciting information, asking questions, introducing deliberations and imperatives have their basic use in all attempts to get or advise the hearer to do something, i.e.:

Speech Acts, such as: **orders, requests, suggestions, prescribing appeals.**

(2.5).e.g.: John is taking out the garbage.

(2.6).Is John taking out the garbage?

(2.7).Take out the garbage, John!

2.4.1 Pragmatic View of Promise

Searle (1969: 57) affirms that promise can be often interpreted as a commitment on the part of the speaker to carry out a future action (propositional content condition). Moreover, the addressee should want the speaker to do so (preparatory condition), and the speaker should have the intention of performing the action (sincerity condition).

Austin (1962: 10) states that "**promising is not merely a matter of uttering words. It is an inward and spiritual act**". According to Austin (ibid: 69), promise can be expressed in two different ways: explicit and implicit (primary performative) for example:

(2.8).'**I shall be there**' (primary utterance).

(2.9). '**I promise that I shall be there**' (explicit performative)
In the second example an explicit is made action which is being performed in issuing the utterance, i.e. '**I shall be there**'.

2.4.2 Semantic View of Promise

The verb 'promise' should cover a truth intention in order to fulfil the act of future action.

(2.10).e.g. **I promise I'll kiss you if you come any closer.**

In this example, this utterance is uttered by a stranger and he is unsure that the hearer's reaction to this proposal. And the speaker cannot be sure what the 'hearer' prefers the promised act to be achieved (Allan, 1986: 125, cited in Al-Sulaimaan, 1997: 59).

There are two types of Speech Act: direct and indirect Speech Acts. The direct performance of a commissive produces an utterance which contains an explicit reference by the speaker with his intention to commit himself to do something. For example,

(2.11). "**I promise to be there promptly**", can be deemed as an explicit utterance.

The second type is an indirect act. The indirect performance of a commissive produces an utterance which contains an implicit utterance through which the speaker obligates himself to do certain future course of action.

(2.12).e.g. '**I'll be there**', implicit utterance.

2.4.3 Syntactic View of Promise

The verb '**promise**' always indicates a future action. Two models: shall/ will are the most frequently associated with the verb '**promise**'.

(2.13).e.g. "the enemy will be defeated".

(2.14).We shall fight confidently

According to Palmer (1981: 164), there are modal verbs, such as: shall/ may / can, are used to make promise and give permission and must be to lay obligation.

2.5.1 Pragmatic View of Threat

The pragmatic aspect of language represents the functional side in which the participants manipulate with language forms through the act of communication.

Threat means that (to do something), it is a statement in which one tells somebody, that he will be punished or harmed, especially if he does not do what you want, to make threats against somebody.

2.5.2 Semantic View of Threat

Threats can be used in different fields of life whether in politics, economics or in religious texts. And it can be expressed in several ways whether verbally or non- verbally.

Searle (1969: 58 and 1972: 142) demonstrates that 'threat is a pledge to do something to you, not for you' because threats can be seen as an intention to punish or harm somebody .Saeed (1997: 219-220) adds that there are two faces for threats: the negative and positive face.

The negative face potentially damages an individual autonomy, includes: orders, requests, suggestions and advice.

(2.15).e.g. I'll kill you.

2.5.3 Syntactic View of Threat

The verb '**threat**' indicates a future act. It is stated by the speaker to attack the hearer in order to oblige him to do something through the act of threatening.

(2.16).e.g. I threaten you to continuing discussion

Also, there are certain modal verbs that can be used to express the act of threatening, i.e.: shall and will.

(2.17).e.g. I'll punish you

(2.18).We shall destroy the enemy

But there are certain types of threats that could not be very aggressive and it is uttered by the speaker or included for the benefit of the addressees.

(2.19).e.g.: I will beat you if you do not study hard

Generally speaking, it can be noticed that with the verb 'threat' usually but not always the 'if- clause' comes with it as in the previous example.

2.6.1 Pragmatic View of Guarantee

In the act of guarantee, the speaker commits him\herself to achieve certain things in the future. As Partridge (1982: 115) states that COMMIT performatives allow speaker's comprehension. The explicit mention of the addressees (indirect object) is optioned in declaring the intention of guarantee (<http://www.press.umich.edu/pdf/>):

(2.20).e.g.: I guarantee ((to) you).

2.6.2 Semantic View of Guarantee

The word '**guarantee**' indicates that the speaker intends to perform or to do something in the future.

1. Guarantee as a noun:

(2.21).e.g.: He gave me a guarantee that it would never happen again.

(2.22).They are demanding certain guarantee before they sign the treaty.

2. It also means a written promise:

(2.23). e.g.: we provide a five years guarantee against- ruts

3. ~ (of something) ~ (that...) something that makes something else certain to happen:

(2.24). e.g.: career success is no guarantee of happiness.

(2.25).There is no guarantee that she'll come (= she may not come)

4. Money or something valuable:

(2.26).e.g.: We had to offer our house as a guarantee when getting the loan (The British National Group Corpus, 2006: 688).

2.6.3 Syntactic View of Guarantee

The word '**guarantee**' comes as a verb and it means to promise to do something, to promise something will happen. The verb 'guarantee' denotes that a speaker indicates a course of action and it is always followed by infinitive, (Sundari, 2009).

(2.27).e.g.: I guarantee to pass the exam. (infinitive)

2.7.1 Pragmatic View of Pledge

The word '**pledge**' denotes that a speaker indicates a future course of action. The pledge has a commitment by the pledgor (speaker) in which he commits himself to do something to the pledgee (hearer) in the future.

In order to understand the act of pledge, it is essentially to declare the speaker's intention. Moreover, the first person plural pronoun can be used.

(2.28).e.g.: Together we all pledge allegiance to the flag.

2.7.2 Semantic View of Pledge

Pledge as a noun means (to do something) a serious promise synonymous to commitment: a pledge of support.

(2.29).e.g.: Will the government honor its election pledge not to raise taxes?

Pledge as a verb (to somebody/ something) to formally promise to give or do something.

(2.30).e.g.: The government pledged their support for the plan (The British National Group Corpus, 2006: 1157).

2.7.3 Syntactic View of Pledge

Pledge as a verb denotes that a speaker indicates a course of action and it is always followed by infinitive. They are prospective and concerned with speaker's commitment to the future action, i.e.: I promise, I guarantee (Sundari, 2009). It is something (to somebody/ something) formally promise to give or do something.

2.8.1 Suggested Model

This study is concerned with the analysis of the pragmatic and structural features of selected political speeches which are delivered by the American presidents: George Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Baraq Obama. The analysis offers the following level: the pragmatic level is based on the types of commissives that are employed in these speeches because there are specific kinds of commissive acts which may seem similar for more than one situation. This level is based on the approaches of Speech Acts and how they are categorized into groups of verbs that convey illocutionary forces that are made either direct or indirect.

In this level the following commissive acts are used: (promise, threat, guarantee and pledge). *Promise* is an act which is done by the speaker to do good things for the hearer in the future,

(2.31).e.g. "I promise be there tomorrow".

Threat is uttered by the speaker to do bad things or something unpleasant for the hearer,

(2.32).e.g.: "the enemy will be defeated".

Guarantee is a firm promise by the speaker about something will happen in the future,

(2.33).e.g.: I guarantee to pass the exam.

While, *pledge* is a serious promise used by the speaker :

(2.34). e.g.: "We pledge an end to the era of deadlock".

SECTION THREE

DATA ANALYSIS

3.1 Introductory Note

This chapter aims at providing analysis of the pragmatic of Speech Acts. The model that has been adopted for data

analysis falls into two main parts: part one is concerned with pragmatic level while the second part deals with structural level.

3.2 Speech Act of Promise

One of the most properties of Speech Act of promising is that the directive utterances about saying something take place in the future. Furthermore, the speaker who utters promise commits himself to do something whether explicitly or implicitly.

3.3 Speech Act of Threat

Threat is directed from a higher authority to certain directions. It can be uttered in several ways: performatively, explicitly and implicitly. Also, threatening can be expressed either verbally or non- verbally by a speaker who commits himself to fulfill his threat in the future. In this case, there is seriousness in the speaker's intention to do his threat to the hearer.

In addition, threat is expressed whether in a directive or as a request which is not performed for the interest for the hearer.

3.4 Speech Act of Guarantee

Guarantee is uttered by a speaker to do something in the future. The act of guarantee demands that the hearer comprehends the speaker's intention in fulfilling his guarantee in the future. Furthermore, the guarantor should be serious when he utters his guarantee. In addition, this act demands a shared knowledge between the participants.

As a matter of fact, a survey of many presidential speeches has showed that the act of guarantee cannot be found in the American presidential speeches, since, none of the president sacrifices his position to achieve some goals. There are certain cases which oblige a person to sacrifice his rank, his family or even his life, but when the case is touched the chair of presidency, all these ideals will be declined.

3.5 Speech Act of Pledge

Pledge is a serious promise by the speaker to do something in future, through which the speaker commits himself stronger than needed. For pledge it is extremely odd for a speaker to pledge himself to do something in the future. And also, pledge has the meaning of swear and when it is uttered by the speaker, he strongly obliges himself in order to fulfill his pledge.

3.6 Concluding Remarks

The above analysis shows that there are specific points of similarities and differences between the pragmatically and structural features appear in the stated speeches acts of promise, threat, guarantee and pledge. The following points reveal the areas of similarity and difference:

1. The Speech Acts of (promise, threat, and pledge) are mostly expressed in an indirect way through the declarative positive constructions whereas the act of guarantee cannot have any place in the presidential speeches.

Table 3.1. Speech Acts of Promise

The name of the President	Speech Act Promise	A- Pragmatic Level	B- Structural Level
President Bush	(I come before you and assume the Presidency at a moment rich with promise. We live in a peaceful, prosperous time, but we can make it better).	President Bush obliges himself to do good things to his people when he is elected. He commits himself to make a peaceful and prosperous life. He affirms that a new era will begin in his reign which accompanies the reboring of freedom. The speaker has the ability to achieve his goal and he intends to perform his aim seriously without any interpersonal benefit.	From the syntactic point of view, the act of promise is expressed implicitly through the employment of a declarative positive sentence
	(We know what works: Freedom works. We know what's right: Freedom is right. We know how to secure a more just and prosperous life for man...).	Bush commits himself to do a set of good things. He speaks about freedom and describes it as a right thing. Bush attempts to secure and make a prosperous life for man on earth. His speech is convinced since it is morally good.	The speaker issues his promise to do something to the hearer, through using the syntactic structure of a declarative positive sentence
President Bush	(No president, if he can do these things, then he must).	Bush talks about the conditions of American's life. He states that there is no president or government that can teach American people to do what is the best in the current state. He adds that if people can find the right man who has the ability to do difference through his leadership, and the success of his regime is not made of gold and silk but of better hearts and finer souls, if this man can do these things, he will be a successful president. The president utters his promise implicitly because he has ability to achieve his aim sincerely in the future.	The modal 'must which is used, here, represents an obligation and logical necessity with a high degree of judgment. This modal is connected with the use of power or authority assigned to the speaker who relies on this modal in issuing promise to do something to the hearer. The syntactic structure of this utterance is shown by a declarative positive sentence
President Clinton	(Communications and commerce are global; investment is mobile; technology is almost magical; and ambition for a better life is now universal. We earn our livelihood in peaceful competition with people all across the earth).	Here, the president Clinton expresses an implicit promise. He speaks about the developing of communications and commerce. He also speaks about his government which invests money, development in all fields of life in order to prepare a better life for American people and to the coming generations. Clinton adds that he wants to seek a peaceful life to compete with other nations in the world. His speech seems satisfied, since, it is made by an authorized agent, Clinton, and since the things promised are morally good.	The president expresses his implicit promise in a declarative positive sentence
	(American deserves better ... let us resolve to reform our politics, so that power and privilege no longer shout down the voice of the people. Let us put aside personal advantage so that we can feel the pain and see the promise of America).	President Clinton praises America and asserts that America deserves the best things, because in this country there are good men who really want to do better. The speaker uses an implicit promise for his people. He commits himself to do set of reformations to reform politics, because the voice of people is always repressing. Clinton obliges himself to put aside the personal advantage because he feels people's pain and their suffering. His speech is convinced, since, the implicit promise is issued by the president who has the power to fulfill his goal.	The speaker uses a positive imperative sentence to express his implicit promise
	(Let us resolve to make our government a place for what Franklin Roosevelt called "bold, persistent experimentation" a government for our tomorrows, not our yesterdays).	The president Clinton commits himself to make the American government in the high rank and this cannot be achieved without being bold and has a persistent experimentation for best tomorrows. He obliges himself to change the current condition of the government with the aid of people. His speech seems persuasive since the promise is uttered implicitly by Clinton through his authority and he intends to perform his promise sincerely in the future.	Clinton expresses his promise in imperative declarative sentence to a certain course of action.
3.President Bush	G.W. (It is the American story...Americans are called to enact this promise in our lives and in our laws...).	G.W. Bush obliges himself to perform the action. He commits himself to fulfill the American promise which states that everyone, who lives in USA, deserves a chance of interesting with all opportunities that the government will make it available to him, and no insignificant person was even born. He also urges himself to go forward in order to achieve this aim. His speech seems persuasive, since he declares his intention publicly and makes a commitment. Here, the speaker makes an explicit promise.	The president expresses his promise in a declarative positive sentence.

Continue.....

(Today... Today we affirm a new commitment to live out our nation's promise...).	Here, G.W. Bush assures his people that he will begin a new era which is based on his commitment to spread throughout America, the civility, courage and compassion. In return, he wishes from American people to be good and change their characters in order to attain these reformations.	Here, there is an explicit promise by the speaker who expresses his promise in a declarative positive sentence.
(Together, we will reclaim America's schools ... we will reform Social Security and Medicare... we'll reduce taxes... we will build our defenses beyond challenge... we will confront weapons of mass destruction ...).	G.W. Bush commits himself to do series of reformations such as: reclaiming America's schools, reforming Social Security and Medicare, reducing tax's fees in order to recover the momentum America's economy. America will reward its citizens and appreciating their efforts parallel to their work. The speaker has a serious intention to keep his words and protect America from enemies. He also obliges himself to destroy the weapons of mass destruction that threaten people's life. His speech is satisfied, since, Bush has the authority and control to achieve his promise in the future.	Will expresses the determination and intentions by the speaker to the hearer to do something in the future. The modal 'will' is interpreted as a future act which is expressed in a declarative positive sentences
(Today I say..... America, they will be met).	Obama makes a strong commitment, through which he obliges himself to confront all the challenges that America might be faced through his regime. He realizes that these challenges should be defeated bravely. Obama announces frankly that these challenges are not easily getting rid in a span of time but he assures his people to defeat these challenges. His speech is satisfied, since, he has the authority to do it in the future. This utterance is also persuasive, since, the declaration of Obama's intention will be performed because he has the choice to make a promise implicitly.	The speaker uses the modal 'will' which is interpreted as a future act.
(we remain a young..... to carry forward that precious gift,. That noble idea, passed on from generation to generation...).	Obama calls his nation a young nation in its behaviour and conducts and he recommends that America should not be like this. He declares that according to the Holly Words of Scripture, it must be set aside from childish things. Obama commits himself to pure the American spirit in order to choose better history because history is passed from one generation to another. Then, he talks about the justice of God, all people are created equally and freely. In addition, they deserve a chance to live happily. His speech is convinced, since, Obama makes a promise implicitly without using the word 'promise'. The speaker's declaration of his intention obliges himself to fulfill his promise in the future.	The speaker uses a declarative positive sentence to express his promise.
(For everywhere.... we will build the roads and bridges...we will restore science to its rightful place ... we will harness the sun and the wind and the solid.... And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities).	Obama obliges himself to perform good things. He commits himself to do a series of work and argues to re-change the economy and in order to make it successful. He also commits himself to create new jobs for his citizens and build roads and bridges. The president adds that he will develop science and feed commerce wields technology's wonders in order to raise its quality and lower its cost. He also declares to make use of the natural gifts, such as the sun, the winds and soil to fuel the cars and factories. This promise is like a desire, in addition, to transform schools, colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age. His utterance seems persuasive, since, Obama has the power and control to achieve his promise in future.	The modal 'will' is used to indicate a future course of action. Will is expressed in a declarative positive sentence which is exploited to lay obligation on the speaker

- The four Speech Acts have the following percentages as follows: the act of promise is (%21), the act of threat (% 49.5), the act of guarantee (%0), while the act of pledge is about (%50).
- The use of the passive voice construction is rarely used and especially the if- clause in the realization of the three Speech Acts. It is mentioned as: for the act of promise just (one) time and in the act of pledge (one) times.
- As for the sentence mood, the English data of the three acts show that (93 times) for the declaration.

- It is observed that the frequently used the modal 'will' about (16) times, while the modal 'must' (4) times, and can (3) times.
- The cases of plurality 'we' in English data distributed as follows: for the act of promise mentioned (17) times, for the act of threat (2) times, whereas the act of pledge (5) whereas the third person plural pronoun (they) for promise (1) times while the first singular pronoun (I) for promise (zero) time and for pledge (1) time.

Table (3.2) Speech Acts of Threat

The name of the President	Speech Act\ Threat	A- Pragmatic Level	B- Structural Level
President Bush	(While many of our citizens ... we do not accept this; and we will not allow it...).	Bush discusses the doubt of many Americans concerning the promise of America which is based on justice and quality among its citizens who live prosperously and peacefully. Also, the Americans are about to be hopeless concerning the circumstances of their birth. Therefore, Bush commits himself to refuse all these feelings and he will not allow anymore. The president threatens all these conditions in which the American people believe implicitly according to his context of speech. His speech seems satisfied because as a president he has the right to treat all the bad things and the people know that the president will achieve his threat in future.	From the syntactic view, the speaker indirectly expresses his threat in declarative negative sentences. Also, the speaker uses the modal 'will' to predicate future act contained in the words stated.
President Obama	(The question we ask... And those of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account...).	The Obama commits himself to continue to do good things for his nation whether to grant wages and help the families to live in a dignified way and assure their expenditures but if there are a group of people oppose the government, in return, the government will stop all public expenditures and will punish all the guilty people who spend money in unwisely way and those who have bad habits. The president states that his enemies do not prefer to be punished. Obama has the authority over them of course; he has a sincere intention to achieve his threat in future.	From the syntactic point of view, president Obama uses the modal 'will' which is exploited to lay obligation on the speaker to perform the action proposed in the issued utterance. Threat is expressed in a passive voice sentence

Table (3.3) Speech Acts of Pledge

The name of the President	Speech Act\ Pledge	A- Pragmatic Level	B- Structural Level
President Bush	(No president ... if he can do these things, then he must...)	Bush states that people remember the best things and this process cannot be made by any president unless people do it. He obliges himself to assist and protect people as the core of his duties as a president which are interpreted as a pledge; in addition, all the pledged deeds that are uttered have a strongest achievement in his in future. The president utters the act of pledge implicitly. And the PC of pledge is expressed by the speaker to perform a future act and has a serious intention to achieve his act because of the declaration of his intention.	The speaker expresses his commitment through the use if-clause sentence. He uses the modals 'must' and 'can' to refer to a strong obligation by the speaker to fulfill a future act.
	(The old solution ... we will do the wisest thing of all. We will turn to the only resource...).	Bush declares that the old idea was money could solve the problem that face the countries but this is a wrong idea because money alone could not achieve happiness. The president commits himself to do good things in the future. He obliges himself to make proper decisions which are based on honesty and faithfulness. George Bush directed his pledge to his people to do certain things as one of his task. The president assures his people to perform A in the future by using his authority over his country.	Will is used to indicate a future act. This modal indicates an obligation by the speaker to fulfill his goal in the future.
President Clinton	(Through our challenges... We must bring to our task today the vision and the will of those who came before us.).	President Clinton obliges himself to hold the task of bringing the experiences and visions of the ex-presidents before him to use in his regime and commits himself to face all the challenges that confront USA. The FCs are uttered by the power to achieve his goal strongly in the future.	The modal 'must' has a strong obligation in carrying out the speaker's action in the future.
	(Our democracy must be not only the envy of the world but the engine of our own renewal...). (Appendix, Text:2, Group: A, P: 18)	Clinton declares that American's democracy must not be to envy the other countries but to renew the American renewal. The president obliges himself to reform and cure everything wrong that face America because this adjustment is the core of his duties.	The modal 'must' denote a serious commitment by the speaker to do something in the future. Must is expressed in a declarative negative sentence.

Continue.....

President G.W. Bush	(And this is my solemn pledge: I will work to build a single nation of justice and opportunity). (Appendix, Text:3, Group: A, P: 9)	President G.W. Bush directly commits himself to work for making America as the nation of justice and obliges himself to provide opportunities to the American people. He describes his pledge as a solemn and determines to fulfill his act in future.	Pledge through the utilization of will be interpreted as future act through which it lays an obligation on the speaker to do something in future. Pledge is used in a declarative positive sentence
	I know this..... We are guided by a power larger than ourselves). (Appendix, Text:3, Group: A, P: 10)	G.W. Bush knows very well what a kind of task is directed to him as president and obliges himself to do set of reformations and spread equality among the members of society. The president pledges to do things in the future.	The speaker uses a declarative positive sentence to express his pledge.
President Obama	(On this day we come to proclaim an end to the pretty grievances and false promises). (Appendix, Text:4, P: 10)	Here, Obama commits himself to do and change certain things in the country. He obliges himself to proclaim to end the grievances and false promise, the recriminations and worn out dogmas that are far from American's politics. He pledges to do all these deeds in the future.	The speaker uses a declarative positive sentence to express the act of pledge
	(We remain a young ...the time has come to set aside childish things...). (Appendix, Text: 4, P: 12)	Obama declares that America is a young nation but they should follow the words of Scripture which states that all the childish things should be aside and obliges himself to reaffirm American enduring spirit in accordance with time. The president commits himself to choose a better history and taking the noble idea that is passed from generation to generation. He also pledges to spread equality among people because God creates all people equal and all deserve a chance for happiness.	The speaker expresses his act of pledge in a declarative positive sentence which denotes an obligation by the speaker.

SECTION FOUR

Conclusion

The following conclusions can be drawn from the pragmatic investigation conducted in this study:

1. The analysis shows that the Speech Acts of promising, threatening and pledging, except the act of guaranteeing can be applied in political speeches.
2. The study reveals that promise as a commissive act in political speeches is used more frequently than other types of commissives.
3. The analysis shows that in most cases the commissives in political speeches are expressed in an indirect illocutionary acts rather than direct illocutionary acts.
4. Pragmatically, the meanings of the four commissive acts namely: promise, guarantee, threat, and pledge in speeches are always directed to people but their application is achieved in future.
5. It is also found, that in most cases of political speeches, the illocutionary acts of promising, threatening, and pledging are expressed implicitly by using specific modals such as: will, must, and can.
6. The subject form can vary in the acts of promise, threat and pledge, between the first person singular and the person plural followed by these acts.

REFERENCES

- 1971. *An Article: A classification of Illocutionary Acts*. Great Britain: University of California.
- 1975. "Indirect Speech Acts". In: Cole, p. and Morgan, J.L., (eds).
- 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Vol. 4. London: Academic press.
- 1998. *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Vol. 1. London: SAGE publications.
- Al. Sulaimaan, M.D. 1997. *A Study of Three Speech Acts: Promise, Threat and Warning in Three Shakespearean Tragedies With Reflected to Their Realization in Arabic*. (unpublished PhD dissertation). University of Mosul.
- Allen, K. 1986. *Linguistic Meaning*. Vol.2. London: Roulledge Kegan Paul, Inc
- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How To Do Things With Words*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Fairclough, N. 2003. *Analyzing Discourse*. Routledge; London and New York.
- Gee, J.P. 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnstone, B. 2008. *Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell publishing.
- Leonardo, Z. 2003. *Ideology, Discourse and School Reform*. New York: London.
- Palmer, F.R. 1981. *Semantics*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perroult, C.R. 1980. *A plan: Rased Analysis of Indirect Speech Acts*. University of Toronto, Candar and James and Allen, F. university of Rochester. Rochester and New York.
- Saeed, J.L. 1997. *Semantics*, 1st ed. Oxford: Blackwell publishers Ltd.
- Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sundari, D. 2009. *A Pragmatic Analysis of Commissive Utterances in Aristocratic Movie Manuscripts*. University of Surakarta.

- The British National Group Corpus 2006. *Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: OUP, Lancaster and the British library.
- Trosborg, A. 1997. *Language and Disciplines. Rhetorical Strategies in Legal Language: Discourse Analysis of Status, Commissive Verbs*. <http://books.google.com/books?id=ex id>
- Van Dijk, T.A. 1977. *Text and Context, Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. New York: Longman.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
