

UDK 81'42:32

Izvorni naučni rad

Daniela MATIĆ (Split)

Sveučilište u Splitu

Fakultet elektrotehnike, strojarstva i brodogradnje

daniela.matic@fesb.hr

PRONOUNS IN AMERICAN POLITICAL SPEECHES

This paper studies personal pronouns and their derived forms as ideological discourse features. The aim is to identify, compare and contrast these pronominal forms within speech acts used in the speeches delivered by two presidential candidates of two ideologically opposed political parties (Speech 1 and Speech 2) to establish whether their syntactic style reflects their ideological world view, divides or unites the electorate around a common goal as well as whether the speeches fit in the “ideological square” (van Dijk 1998, 2008). The methodology draws on critical discourse analysis and the speech act theory. This analysis first shows the occurrence of personal, possessive and reflexive pronouns and adjectives and changes in their referents within speech acts and verbs and verbal tenses. We concluded that the speeches did not follow the principle of van Dijk’s “ideological square”, since we did not find the opposition of the collective “us” and “them”. However, the ideological difference was observed in the speakers’ choice of the pronoun “you”, in the division of the electorate and in the number of directives addressed to the audience – a higher number in S1, and, on the other hand, indirect directives and call for cooperation and unity of the whole nation in S2. The ideological opposition was also detectable in their choice of speech acts and verbal forms, i. e. whether the speaker was more prone to promising, both in singular and plural form in S1, which could be interpreted as a populist move, or to stating some wishes in the singular form, suggesting a more cautious approach, as in S2.

Key words: *personal pronouns, possessive adjectives, political speeches, critical discourse analysis, speech acts*

1. Introduction

The term “ideology” has many definitions and it may be perceived, e.g. as a system of beliefs that can be expressed in “symbols, rituals, discourse and other social and cultural practices” (van Dijk 1998:26), whereas in the Marxist tradition, when struggle for political power is at issue, ideologies are “ideas which arise from a given set of material interests” (Fairclough 2001a:77). According to van Dijk (1998:208), “ideologies are organized first of all by group self-schemata, with such categories as Membership Criteria, Activities, Goals, Values/Norms, Social Position and Resources”.

Ideology can enter discourse at the level of form and at the level of content. In politics, “discourse” is “a socially constituted set of such genres, associated with a social domain or field” (van Dijk 1998:196). Political speech is a genre of political discourse and is part of public discourse, rarely just personal, but always ideologically colored, often characterized by formal lexis and monolog form.

In political discourse the use of pronouns, as one of the syntax features, may be very suggestive of group (ethnic, racial or religious) identity, ideological preferences or political party affiliations, and also of manipulation and power relations. In Chilton (2004:56), “‘indexical expressions’ or ‘deictic expressions’ are linguistic resources used to perform *deixis* – that is, to prompt the interpreter to relate the uttered indexical expression to various situational features”. They index participants in discourse “at the same time expressing forms of political or social inclusion or exclusion” (van Dijk 1998:183).

2. Aim

In this paper we study pronouns as formal discourse features that perform deictic functions and may be ideologically marked. According to Chilton and Schäffner (1997:227), “it is the pronouns *I*, *you*, *we*, and *they* (and their variants) that have a special function in producing a social and political ‘space’ in which the speaker, the audience, and others are ‘positioned’”. The aim of this paper is to identify, compare and contrast pronominal forms within speech acts used in the speeches delivered by two presidential candidates of two ideologically opposed political parties in the United States presidential election in 2008 to establish whether their syntactic style, that is, the choice of pronominal forms and referents, reflects their ideological stance, serves to manipulate voters, produces strong national charge, divides the electorate or unites the electorate around a common goal as well as whether the speeches fit in the “ideological square” as presented by van Dijk (1998, 2008).

3. Corpus

The corpus of this paper was collected from the two transcribed speeches delivered on October 21, 2008 by the Republican Party candidate John McCain (Speech 1 or S1 henceforth) and the Democratic Party candidate Barack Obama (Speech 2 or S2 henceforth) in the presidential election campaign. The audience consisted of the listeners, probably supporters, present at the rallies, then political opponents, and finally those that could consume the speeches via mass media.

4. Methodology

The methodology framework in this paper draws on the postulates of critical discourse analysis, which sees language as social practice, adapted to the aim of research (Fairclough 1992, 1995a, 1995b, 2001a, 2001b, 2003; Fairclough and Wodak 1997; van Dijk 1997, 1998, 2001, 2008; Chilton and Schäffner 1997; Chilton 2004). The research will be further supported by the speech act theory. This analysis will show the occurrence of personal, possessive and reflexive pronouns and adjectives and changes in their referents within speech acts and the verbs and verbal tenses which follow.

5. Analysis and discussion

In Tables 1 and 2 the personal pronouns “I”, “you”, “we” and “they” served as “umbrella terms” in the occurrence of all pronouns and adjectives indicated in parentheses.

5.1 Speech 1

There are 2597 words in the speech.

Table 1: Occurrence of personal, reflexive and possessive pronouns and adjectives and their distribution

Personal, reflexive and possessive pronouns and adjectives		Occurrence (N)	Distribution (%)
1) "I" (I, me, my, myself)		86	3.31%
2) "You", singular and plural – (you, your, yours, yourself/selves)		46	1.77%
- "You, your" referring to people in general		4	0.15%
- "you and I"		0	0
3) "We" (we, us, our, ours, ourselves)	- exclusive use, referring to the speaker and his team	29	1.11%
	- inclusive use, referring to the speaker and all citizens	67	2.57 %
4) "They" (they, them, their, theirs, themselves)	- refers to opponents	2	0.077%
	- refers to some others (people, citizens, voters, organizations)	16	0.61%

1) The S1 speaker most often speaks on his behalf, which is a common form of address in presidential campaigns personalized by definition, so on no occasion does he mention the Republican Party whose member he is and which nominated him, or some other political organizations for that matter. Sometimes, in the examples that refer to his military or political career, he emphasizes his private identity in order to underline his merits (*"I've been fighting for this country since I was 17 years old, and I have the scars to prove it", "I've fought for you most of my life"*).

The nominative personal pronoun "I" appeared 28 times in commissive and 31 times in assertive speech acts distributed evenly throughout the whole speech. The commissives express promises, *topoi* of political speeches, but they usually do not and cannot meet all the felicity conditions (Searle 1969): namely, they do express some future action, which necessarily makes them *ir-realis*, but we do not know if the speaker is able to perform what he promises, nor do we know whether all listeners want what the speaker promises, which are preparatory conditions (*"I'm not gonna let that happen, my friends", "I will freeze government spending on all but the most important programs"*). The topic of sincerity is an ethical question in its own right and it is beyond linguistics to study whether the speaker intends to keep his promise or not, so we cannot say if the sincerity condition is felicitous or not. Finally, the essential condition cannot be met either, as we are not able to tell whether the

mere uttering counts as the undertaking of an obligation by the speaker to do what he promises. Nevertheless, people very often trust politicians solely on account of their ethos. The verbal tense of these speech acts is future and they are often apodoses preceded by some adverbial conditional or temporal clause in protases (“If *I’m elected* president, *I will fight* to shake up Washington”, “When *I’m elected* president, *I won’t fine* small businesses and families with children”). The speaker often expresses his promises in the form of “I will” (6 times), “I’ll” (6 times) or “I won’t” (5 times) and he accepts some obligation and responsibility. On the other hand, he never states his desires or wishes in the form of “I want” or “I don’t want”, which could imply less determination and more speculation or fantasizing on his part. In almost all the commissives the speaker is directed toward some goal he has to reach and fulfill, and therefore the process he expresses is action except for one mental process.

As to the assertive speech acts in which the speaker informs the audience using the personal pronoun “I”, we cannot tell whether the speaker has evidence for the truth of his propositions, whether they are informative for the audience, whether the speaker believes in what he is saying and whether the acts represent the actual state of affairs (Searle 1969). Most of these pronouns are attached to the verbs that represent state as a process (13 cases, such as “*I’m proud* to introduce”, “*I’m not dumb enough*”, “*I have the scars* to prove it”), whereas mental activity (6 cases, such as “*I know* my history lessons”, “*I heard*, maybe you did too”), action (5 cases, such as “*I also asked* millions of Americans”, “*I choose* to fight”) or verbal process (1 case used in a metalinguistic clause “Again, *I’ll repeat* to you) are more sporadic. In these speech acts we do not find examples of epistemic modality except in “*I think I may’ve detected* a little pattern with Senator Obama” where he used the modal phrase “I think” followed by the modal verb, but it is questionable whether the speaker really expressed subjectivity, doubt or uncertainty or he used the modal forms for stylistic reasons, since politicians in general try to represent themselves as authoritative persons undisturbed by some doubts. The verbal tenses are more varied when compared to the commissives, since the speaker states what things are or epistemically expresses his opinion (17 cases, such as “*I’m not afraid* of the fight; *I’m ready* for it”, “*I have* a plan to protect the value of your home”, “*I think I may’ve detected* a little pattern with Senator Obama, it’s pretty simple, really”), but also what they were or have been (7 cases, such as “*I noted* Senator Obama’s eloquence. But *I also asked* millions of Americans to pay attention to the words”, “*I’ve been fighting* for this country since *I was* 17 years old”), whereas future forms are rare (2 cases, such as “Again, *I’ll repeat* to you”) and used in commissives.

In all the cases the speaker is the subject of the clause except in 3 cases where the S1 speaker is in the accusative form, acting as an indirect object in directives (“Now my friends, let *me* give you, let *me* give you some straight talk, you need it. Let *me* give you the state of the race today”, “Let *me* just ask you”) where he asks for permission though he does not wait for it to be granted. According to the Politeness Principle (Brown and Levinson 1987²), directives in general, and these directives as well, are negative, face-threatening acts, but it is highly unlikely that the audience should feel any kind of imposition of power since these acts function more as discourse markers or introductory phrases than directives that would demand action (granting permission) on the part of the audience.

Finally, the possessive adjective “my” was found in 23 cases, but 15 times in the direct and vocative term of address “my friends”, signifying some in-group membership or closeness. This use could be due to the fact that the space where the speech was delivered was a hall in a factory which held a limited number of listeners, so it could bring about the feeling of intimacy. The rest of the nouns are “opponent’s claim”, “opponent”, “first day in office”, “last (day in office)”, “desk”, “history lessons”, “money”, “life”, “answer”, rather few, too diverse and heterogeneous for us to draw any sound conclusion. Neither the possessive pronoun “mine” nor the reflexive pronoun “myself” were used.

2) The S1 speaker addresses the audience directly on many occasions. As the subject of a clause, the nominative plural “you” appeared 14 times in directives in the imperative form where “you” is formally not pronounced (“Forget apparent. Forget apparent”), or at the very end of the speech where the speaker directly addresses the audience in the speech acts that can only partly satisfy the felicity conditions, since the speaker cannot know whether the audience is able to do the act (“Don’t give up hope. Be strong. Have courage and fight.”, “Stand up to defend our country from its enemies. Stand up, stand up and fight”). In these directives, though, the speaker does not ask of the audience to vote for him, but to fight for their county, which could mean that the goal of the election is not winning as many votes as possible, but fighting against unnamed enemies. As to other 15 occurrences, most of them are in assertive speech acts (“I know *you*’re worried”, “Now, Joe didn’t ask, *you* know that Joe didn’t ask for Senator Obama to come to his house”, “We face many challenges here at home, *you* know that”) which may contain some modal forms that make them epistemic (“And I heard, maybe *you* did too”, “As *you* know, Senator Obama has argued to delay drilling for more oil and gas”) but they hardly satisfy any of the felicity conditions for assertives since they do not bring any new information to the audience, we do not know if the

information is true and whether the speaker believes in it. As it was already mentioned, the propositional content, as well as some modal expressions are not used to inform; here, the speaker often panders, in a populist manner, to the voters. In several cases “you” as the subject of the clause appears in the rhetorical questions which have both expressive and assertive function of exposing often biased opinions (“*You* might ask: how do *you* cut income taxes for ninety-five percent of Americans, when more than forty percent pay no income taxes right now? How do, how do *you* reduce the number zero? Well, that’s the key to his whole plan“, “*You* need to spend your tax dollars on that now? No, my friends”, “Now the same pundits who wr- wrote off our campaign on numerous occasions, *you* know what they forgot? They forgot to let you decide, my friends”). In some cases we find this pronoun as part of commissives (“And my friends, the next time a pork barrel earmark bill comes across my desk, I will veto it and I’ll make ‘em famous and *you* will know their names”, “I’ll make sure *you* keep the same health care plan if *you* change jobs or if *you* leave the job to stay at home”).

The choice of verbal tenses that accompany this nominative case pronoun shows that the speaker is not interested in the past (1 verb only), nor does he talk about the future (also 1 verb only), but he states the present moment (17 verbs). These verbs, as processes, often express some mental activity (8 cases, such as “*you* know that Joe didn’t ask”, “*you* will know their names”) and action directed toward some goal (7 cases, such as “how do *you* reduce the number zero”, “if *you* change jobs or if *you* leave the job to stay at home”), 2 occasions where the same verb of state was repeated (“I know *you*’re worried. I know *you*’re worried”), only 1 case that represents verbal activity (“*you* might ask”), and only 1 that represents event (“live on a budget just like *you* do”).

The S1 speaker uses the singular accusative personal pronoun “*you*” twice as the indirect object at the very beginning of the speech when he expresses his thanks to his associate Lindsey and the wife Cindy and 18 times as the plural direct or indirect object. This accusative case form appears in assertive speech acts (“We need *you*”, “They forgot to let *you* decide, my friends”, “My answer to *you* is YES”) and some are *irrealis* as they express prediction (“Senator Obama will. He will force them and *you* into a new huge government run health care program, while he keeps the cost of the fine a secret until he hits *you* with it”) that bring some information, but it is difficult to say whether they satisfy any other of the felicity conditions. On the other hand, the speaker, through these speech acts, panders to the voters he calls “friends”. “You” as object is also found in the metalinguistic expression “Again, I’ll repeat to *you*: we’re sitting on the world’s largest reserves of coal”. The speaker uses the pronoun in his directives (“Now my friends, let me give *you*, let me

give *you* some straight talk”, “Let me just ask *you*: will we continue to lead the world’s economies or will we be overtaken?”) again as a modal expression to announce some change of topic or tone of the speech or draw the audience’s attention to what he is about to say. At the end of the speech we find the plural “*you*” in the expressive “Thank *you* and God bless *you*. And God bless America. Thank *you*“, which satisfies all the felicity conditions for its category.

We found also “*you*” 4 times referring to people in general, but as the speaker shifts his reference from the audience to some generalized and less defined referent, sometimes it is hard to discern between the two (“*You* might ask: how do you cut income taxes for ninety-five percent of Americans, when more than forty percent pay no income taxes right now? How do, how do *you* reduce the number zero? Well, that’s the key to his whole plan. Since *you* can’t reduce income taxes on those who pay zero, the government will write them all checks called a tax credit”, “It weakened the dollar and made everything that *you* buy much more expensive”).

The possessive adjective “*your*” was found 12 times, but there were no reflexive or possessive pronouns. The adjective was found with nouns that are supposed to have some affective and positive connotation, such as “with *your* help”, “*your* piece of pie”, “*your* home”, but also nouns that inevitably connote the well-being of the nation that may be endangered (“I’m not gonna spend seven hundred fifty billion dollars of *your* money just bailing out the Wall Street bankers and brokers”, “keeping tax rates low creates jobs, keeps money in *your* hands”, “I won’t spend nearly a trillion dollars more of *your* money”, “You need to spend *your* tax dollars on that now?”).

We also found the discourse marker “you know” on 5 occasions; being a petrified modal expression used to check the communication channel or just a verbal crutch, its occurrence and distribution were not included in Table 1.

3) As to the umbrella term “*we*”, we also find a diversification of meaning due to a number of referents. Namely, the nominative “*we*” as the subject personal pronoun (66 examples), its derived form “*us*” (8 examples) and the possessive adjective “*our*” (22 examples) are used sometimes as exclusive pronominal forms referring to the speaker and his team that work or will work with him: however, the S1 speaker more frequently speaks inclusively, that is, in the name of all the citizens or at least in the name of those who are present at the rally or as a member of the nation with which he shares the same views. He often shifts from “*we*, the team” to “*we*, the citizens”, so it is the context that helps us establish, though not always inconclusively, who the referents are.

The speech acts that the nominative personal pronoun “*we*” appears in 35 times are assertives as they bring some information though they do not always satisfy other felicity conditions. The verbal forms that follow the person-

al pronoun “we” in 13 cases express epistemic modality, which is not a high occurrence compared to the remaining number of assertives and other speech acts. These forms are mostly modal verbs used to state what must be done, what they know or believe as the team or what is needed (“*We know* Senator Obama won’t have the right response”, “In this country, *we believe* in spreading opportunity”, “*We need* to win Pennsylvania on November the fourth”, “*We must keep* people in their homes and realize the American dream”). Besides assertives, we find this pronoun 28 times in the commissives that express promises; once again, we cannot say whether they satisfy all felicity conditions as we do not know whether all the people in the audience want what the speaker promises. Listeners have “separate mental lives” and each one of them can understand the speech in their own way and have separate desires and expectations, what Clark and Carlson (1991[1982]:183) call *individual recognition assumption*. The commissives of this type are commonplace (“When I’m president, *we’ll start* drilling now. *We will invest*, *we will invest* in all energy alternatives, nuclear, wind, solar and tide. *We will encourage* the manufacture of hybrid, flex-fuel and electric automobiles”) and expected, but the sincerity condition cannot be satisfied without asking the speaker and his team whether they meant what they said. These conditions once again prove to be rather uncertain. As it was the case with the “I” personal pronoun, the speaker used the future simple forms to express his promises, so we found mostly exclusive “we will” 15 and “we’ll” 3 times (the verb of desire, “want”, appeared once in its affirmative and once in its negative form). We also find this pronoun in 2 coordinated rhetorical questions used for stylistic and expressive reasons (“*Will we continue* to lead the world’s economies or will *we* be overtaken?”).

Verbal tenses that the speaker used after the pronoun “we” can show what his interests are directed to: only 6 of them were in some of the past forms, 28 were in present tense forms and 33 in some of the future forms in commissive speech acts (none of them were *irrealis* assertives). As to the processes, these verbs most often express some action directed toward a goal (26 cases, such as “*We’re gonna change* America and *we’re gonna clean up* the mess, and *we’re gonna drain* the swamp, my friends”), or mental activity, that is, perception, cognition or desire (19 cases, such as “*We’ve finally learned* what Senator Obama’s economic goal is”, “*we’ve seen* that act from the left”). Fewer verbs express event (11 cases, such as “*We will invest*”, “*We will drill*”) and state (10 cases, such as “*We’re sitting* on the world’s largest reserves”, “*We have* fourteen days to go”) but none of them express verbal activity.

The accusative form “us” in the direct or indirect object position is used both inclusively and exclusively in 8 instances altogether (inclusive “us” in “As Joe has now reminded *us* all”, “He opposed the surge strategy that is

bringing *us* victory in Iraq and will bring *us* victory in Afghanistan”, “The explosion of government spending over the last eight years has put *us* deeper in debt”; exclusive “*us*” once in “The national media has written *us* off”).

The possessive pronoun “ours” was found once only, and the possessive adjective “our” 22 times followed by the nouns used mostly inclusively, that is, the nouns that refer to the referents shared by all the members of the nation (3 times “*our* country”, “*our* military”, “*our* troops”), those referents that belong in the semantic field of economy or finance (4 times “*our* economy”, “*our* goods”, “*our* trade”, “*our* money”), those that carry some affective meaning (3 times “*our* children”, 2 times “*our* future”, “*our* interests”). Only in 2 instances do we find possessive adjectives that are used exclusively (“*our* vote”, “*our* campaign”). The reflexive pronoun “ourselves” was not found.

4) As to the third person plural personal and possessive adjectives and pronouns, the occurrence is low. These forms are used mostly to refer to some people other than the speaker’s direct opponents, so in only 2 cases does the speaker refer to the opponent’s team using once “their” and once “them” in one intertextual example, “Senator Biden told *their* campaign donors that when that crisis hits, they would have to stand with *them*”. The opponents represented by some pronominal form are not active participants in verbal processes and are not found in speech acts.

It is obvious that the speaker does not build the ideological opposition using the binary pronominal formula “us vs. them”. Since American presidential campaigns are personalized, the speaker is not interested in some indefinite and mystified “them” but in his direct opponent, so he mentions him 21 times by his last name, never omitting his official title “senator”. “Obama” is also the referent of possessive adjectives and pronouns in 39 cases, 2 times this personal name premodifies a noun („the Obama tax increase“, „the Obama campaign“), and 2 times Obama is referred to by the speaker as “my opponent”, all in all 64 times.

5.2 Speech 2

There are 4063 words in the speech.

Table 2: Occurrence of personal, reflexive and possessive pronouns and adjectives and their distribution

Personal, reflexive and possessive pronouns adjectives		Occurrence (N)	Distribution (%)
1) “I” (I, me, my, myself)		93	2.28%
2) “You“, singular and plural – (you, your, yours, yourself/selves)		66	1.62%
- “You” referring to people in general		10	0.24%
- “you and I”		3	0.07%
“We” (we, us, our, ours, ourselves)	- exclusive “we” referring to the speaker and his team	23	0.56%
	- inclusive “we” referring to the speaker and all citizens	93w	2.28%
“They” (they, them, their, theirs, themselves)	- refers to opponents	8	0.19%
	- refers to some others (people, citizens, voters, organizations)	23	0.56%

1) When addressing the audience, the S2 speaker also most often speaks on his behalf, not mentioning his party affiliation, or the Democratic Party itself (except in 3 cases where he speaks of unity of all Americans, Republicans, Democrats or independents, no matter what political option they support). His private identity surfaced only when he spoke of his mother and the ordeal she had been through (“This issue is personal for *me*. My mother died of cancer at the age of fifty-three. *I’ll never forget* how she spent those final months of her life lying in a hospital bed”).

The nominative personal pronoun “I” appeared 11 times in commissive and 61 times in assertive speech acts. As it was already mentioned in the S1 analysis, the commissives express promises which cannot satisfy the felicity conditions as proposed by Searle (1969) except that the speaker predicates his future act, which is the propositional content condition. The questions of his ability, sincerity and intention to perform what he promised, as well as the audience’s interest in the speaker’s fulfilling the promise can only be a matter of speculation (“*I will cut* taxes for all the working Joes, all the small business-people across this country”, “*I will finally fix* the problem of our health care system”). The verbal tense of these commissives is future, except one present

form (“*I promise you*”), and the process is action, as the speaker is directed toward some goal, fully determined to reach it. In several cases we do find the promises as apodoses to some temporal or conditional clauses (“That’s what *I’ll do* when *I’m* president”, “If *I am* president, we’re going to invest fifteen billion dollars a year”, “When *I’m* president, we’re going to make sure”). Unlike his opponent, the S2 speaker uses the future simple form far less often, so we found “*I will*” 3 times, “*I’ll*” 3 and “*I won’t*” 1 time. His commissives are therefore fewer and this may suggest that he is more cautious in his promises.

As it was the case in S1, we classify the speech acts as assertives only because they carry some informational content, but the remainder of felicity conditions cannot be satisfied as these conditions are simply not applicable to some acts. As to processes, the nominative personal pronoun “*I*” precedes in most cases the verbs that express some mental process, cognition, understanding, desire (33 cases, such as “So *I know* these are difficult times, Florida, *I know* many of you are worried. But hear me now. *I believe* that we can steer ourselves out of this crisis because *I believe* in this country. Because *I believe* in you. *I believe* in the American people”, “*I wanna* put a middle-class tax cut in the pockets of ninety-five percent of workers and their families”), followed by action as a process directed toward a goal (23 cases, such as “...this notion that *I’ve been attacking* Joe the Plumber”, “Miami, that’s why *I’m running for* president of the United States of America”), state (15 cases, such as “Now, now *I’m hopeful* about the outcome”, “He was right then. *I’m right* now”), and 1 verbal process (“*I said*, ‘No, no, no, no...’”). In these speech acts we do find forms used to express epistemic modality, mostly modal verbs or verbs of cognition in 24 cases, such as “*I can put* more money into education, but *I can’t be* a parent. *I can’t turn off* the TV set, you’ve got to do that. *I can’t make* your kids do your homework, you’ve got to do that. Fathers, *I can’t be involved* in your child’s life, you’ve got to be involved”, “*I don’t think* young people in America are an interest group, *I think* they’re our future”, “*I know* that many of you are cynical and fed up with politics. *I understand* you’re disappointed and even angry with your leaders and you have every right to be”). However, these examples are not meant to suggest any weakness or indecisiveness on the part of the speaker, but present him as an empathetic, caring and understanding politician. Again, verbal tenses show what concerns the speaker: the present (52 cases), expressed often by verbs of desire that are not promises yet (“*I wanna help* rebuild the middle class”) or the already mentioned verbs of cognition. The verb “want” appeared far more often than in S1, either in the form of “*I want*” (2 times) or “*I wanna*” (9 times) The future forms are reserved for promises, which are not frequent, so in the assertive speech acts we found only 2 cases of future forms (“*I’ll never forget* how she spent those final

months of her life”, “*I’m gonna need all of you*”). The past forms were used only in 8 cases, some of them to testify to the speaker’s political moves (“Nine months ago back in January *I called for* a stimulus plan”, “Last August, *I called for* a Jobs and Growth Fund to help states put people to work”), or are used for some intertextual examples (“This morning, *I had* the opportunity to catch a little of Senator McCain’s speech in Pennsylvania on TV“, “You know, recently, recently, *I heard* Senator McCain say...”).

The S2 speaker appears 10 times in a direct or an indirect object position or a complement of a preposition in the speech (“Then, Senator McCain and Sarah Palin called *me* “socialistic”, “This issue is personal for *me*”, “And if you will stand with *me*, if you will organize with *me* and make phone calls with *me*, if you’ll struggle with *me* over these next fourteen days”); 4 times in the directives in the imperative mode (“But hear *me* now”, “Now, let *me* be, let *me* be clear”, “Le-le-let *me* tell you something”). These directives are used as phrases to check the communication channel and do not impose any kind of obligation on the part of the audience.

The possessive adjective “my” appeared 10 times in the speech, with nouns such as “plan” (2 times), “opponent” (3 times), “character”, “commitment”, “mother”, “health care plan”, “opponent’s chief economic advisor”, nouns mostly connected with economy and politics. The possessive pronoun “mine” was not found, but the reflexive pronoun “myself” appeared only once in “as I think to *myself*”.

2) The S2 speaker addresses the audience in several ways using the personal pronoun “you”. Once at the very beginning and twice at the end of the speech he uses the plural nominative form together with the personal pronoun “I”: “Florida, in just fourteen days, in just fourteen days *you and I* can begin to bring some badly-needed sunshine to Washington D. C.”, “we will win this general election and *you and I* together, we’ll restore the dream. We will change this country. *You and I* together will change this country and we’ll change the world”. These two subject pronouns suggest the unity of the speaker and his audience intensified also by the adverb “together”, but also the fact that every one of them has to do different tasks in order to contribute and bring about the change.

“You” in the singular nominative or accusative case form was not found, but the plural “you”, used to directly address the audience or to refer to the audience, appears in both functions. As the subject of a clause, the nominative plural “you” appeared 26 times in assertives and commissives. The speech acts we found are very often informative for the audience as the speaker presents his tax plan and promises (“If *you make* less than a quarter-million dollars a year, and that includes ninety-eight percent of small business owners, *you will*

not see your taxes increase, not one dime”) or addresses young people and promises again (“If *you are willing* to serve your country or your community, work in a homeless shelter, work in a veterans’ home, join the military, join the Peace Corps, whatever *you decide* to do, if *you give back* to your country or your community, then we will make sure that each and every one of you get the money *you* need for tuition, no ifs ands or buts. *You* invest in America, we’ll invest in you”). These acts are in fact commissives to be performed on the part of the speaker if the audience satisfies the stated conditions, which could mean that the speaker sees the rule as a responsible partnership of the administration and the people. Some acts where this pronoun appears can be interpreted as assertives, as the speaker states the facts, but also as indirect speech acts, that is, indirect directives (“I can’t turn off the TV set, *you’ve got to do* that. I can’t make your kids do your homework, *you’ve got to do* that. Fathers, I can’t be involved in your child’s life, *you’ve got to be* involved. That’s your responsibility”). Some assertives are not informative and do not satisfy the felicity conditions as proposed by Searle (1969), but are there to show the speaker’s empathy (“I know that many of *you* are cynical and fed up with politics. I understand *you’re* disappointed and even angry with your leaders and *you have* every right to be”). “You” as the subject appeared 5 times in the directives in the imperative form where the subject is not pronounced except once, for the sake of emphasis (“But hear me now”, “Everybody raise their hand”, “Hold on, everybody alright over here?”, “No, no, hold on a second”, “And if people ask how are we going to do all this, *you* just tell them...”, “Believe in yourselves, believe in each other, and believe in the future we can build together”), and these are used to check the communication channel, to draw attention to what the speaker is about to say and to stir up emotions though they do not satisfy the felicity conditions for directives.

The speaker addresses the audience when he asks of them to act or when he shows that he understands how difficult and troublesome life of many people is. However, he does not ask of them directly to vote for him and only once does he prompt them to go to the polls, which could mean that his ultimate goal is not winning the election, but winning in order to bring about some change together with all the people. The speaker does not address the audience with any term of endearment, but he sees it as a collective body determined by geography; therefore, he metonymically speaks to the city of Miami twice or to the state of Florida 4 times, as the rally was held in open air in front of 30,000 people.

As to the verbal tenses that follow the nominative pronoun, we found mostly the present tense forms (18 cases), only 2 verbs in the past form and 4 verbs in the future forms. As to processes, these verbs most often express

some mental activity (11 cases, such as “Whatever *you decide* to do”), or state (11 cases, such as “I understand *you’re* disappointed and even angry with your leaders and *you have* every right to be), only 4 verbs that express action (“If *you make* less than a quarter-million dollars a year”) and 2 that express some event (“*You’ll struggle* with me over these next fourteen days”). There was no verb that would express some verbal activity on the part of the audience.

The accusative form “you” appeared 15 times as the direct or indirect object and the complement following a preposition mostly in the assertives (“Because I believe in *you*”, “My opponent doesn’t want *you* to know this”), but there are some indirect directives (“I ask *you* to believe”), and commitives (“You invest in America, we’ll invest in *you*”, “I promise *you*”). It could be said that the speaker does not objectify his audience but sees the members of it as active subjects and participants in his plan to change the country.

“You” referring to people in general was also found 5 times, out of which 4 pronouns appeared in one assertive (“You know, *you* really have to work hard to violate Governor Palin’s standards on negative campaigning”, “That’s what *you* do when *you* are out of ideas, when *you’re* out of touch, and *you’re* running out of time”). There are some other cases that can be interpreted in both ways, but we did not include them into this group.

The possessive adjective “your” appeared 23 times, but the pronoun “yours” was not found. The adjective was found with nouns that belong in the field of economy, such as “gas tank”, “piece of pie”, “attention”, “taxes”, “payroll tax”, “income tax”, “capital gains tax”, “premiums”; nouns that refer to everyday family life, such as “community” (2 times), “kids”, “homework”, “child’s life”, “responsibility”; nouns which evoke the positive feeling of rootedness and patriotism, such as “country” (2 times), “leaders”, “past”, “parents” (2 times), “grandparents” (2 times), “great-grandparents”.

The reflexive pronoun “yourselves” appeared once in the directive “Believe in *yourselves*, believe in each other, and believe in the future we can build together” which is a speech act that cannot, in this form, satisfy all the felicity conditions since the speaker does not know whether the listeners can perform what he asks, or whether they would do it without being asked and in the end, he cannot check the illocutionary effect, that is, whether they had understood what they had to do and whether they did anything.

The discourse marker “you know” was found 7 times, and it was used 2 times to introduce some intertextual or interdiscursive examples. It was not included in Table 2.

3) In this speech as well, the personal pronoun “we”, the accusative form “us” and the possessive adjective “our” have a number of referents and are therefore used inclusively and exclusively, like in S1. Sometimes it is dif-

difficult to say what referent the speaker had in mind and the act of referring may be open to discussion, as the speaker shifts from “we, the team” to “we, the nation”. Judging from the occurrence of inclusively used nominative pronoun “we”, it can be concluded that the speaker finds it important to be seen as one of the citizens, and not one of the politicians that speak exclusively. We found that the nominative personal pronoun “we” appeared on 94 occasions in mostly assertives. Some of the assertives express epistemic modality achieved by modal verbs or verbs of cognition, so we found this pronoun with these verbs on 10 occasions (“But *we can’t let up*, Florida“, “*Because one thing we know* is that change never comes without a fight“, “*We should not be bailing out* Wall Street, *we should be restoring* opportunity on Main Street”) used both inclusively and exclusively. Some of the assertives are *irrealis* since they express some future action, but they cannot be classified as promises: “But *we’re gonna to have to work* for it, *we’re gonna to have to struggle* for it, *we’re gonna to have to fight* for every single one of those fourteen days to bring our country the change that we need“, “*We’ll rise and fall* as one nation, as one people“, “*We’re all going to need* to tighten our belt, and *we’ll all need* to sacrifice. *We’ll all need* to pull our own weight”). “We” appeared in several commissives (11 cases) used as promises, often in its exclusive function, “*We’ll ensure* that *we act* quickly to help struggling home owners stay in their homes“, “And *we’ll invest* in preventive care and new technology to finally lower the cost of health care for families and businesses, and the entire economy“, also as apoduses in conditional clauses “If I am president, *we’re going* to invest fifteen billion dollars a year in renewable sources of energy to create five million new, green jobs over the next decade” but there are also 3 instances where the speaker uses “we” inclusively in the commissives, “And you and I together, *we’ll restore* the dream. *We will change* this country. You and I together will change this country and *we’ll change* the world”. The future simple affirmative form appeared in the commissives as “we will” 3 and as “we’ll” 9 times and the negative form “we will not” and “we won’t” only once each. Neither assertives nor commissives satisfy the felicity conditions; nevertheless, they do communicate some propositional content despite often low informational content and promises that cannot be fulfilled. It seems that the speaker more easily expresses commissives in the future simple form with the plural pronoun than with the singular form; instead of the future form, the verb of desire “want” was often used with “I”, and in assertives this verb appeared only twice as “we want” and “we wanna”.

As to the verbal tenses that followed the pronoun “we”, the present forms (52 occasions) outnumber the past forms (17 occasions) and future (25 cases, most often in commissives). As to processes, the mental processes were

found 48 times (“*We just learned* that here in Florida we lost nearly eleven thousand jobs just in September”, “*We decide*”, *We want to* grow the pie and then *we wanna* slice of the pie”), followed by action (34 verbs, such as “Now, these are the steps that *we have to take* right now to start getting our economy back on track”, “If *we can spend* ten billion dollars a month in Iraq, *we can spend* some of that money rebuilding the United States of America”), state (16 verbs, such as “*We’re* all connected, *we’re* all in this together”, “*We are* the United States of America. And *we are* a nation that has faced down war and depression, great challenges and great threats”), event (11 verbs, such as “*We’ll rise and fall* as one nation, as one people”, “We all love this country, no matter where *we live*, no matter where *we come* from.) and only 1 verbal process (“*We’ve been talking* about it for too long”).

“Us” as the accusative, that is, direct or indirect object form, or the complement of a preposition was found on 14 occasions and was always used inclusively except for one case which can be interpreted as the “exclusive *us*”: “Let’s give those tax breaks to companies that are creating American jobs right here in Florida”. Even though the speaker insists on the unity of his team and all the voters in bringing about the change, in this example it is the political administration that can give tax breaks, not the voters’ enthusiasm. In other examples this form suggest that the speaker and the people in the audience have the same plans, the same problems and come across the same difficulties in their everyday lives: “The careless, outrageous comments, all aimed at working, keeping *us* from working together”, “And I won’t let banks and lenders off the hook when it was their greed and irresponsibility that got *us* into this mess in the first place”, “We will not allow countries to out-teach *us* today so they can out-compete *us* tomorrow”.

The possessive pronoun „ours“ (31 cases) was not found in the speech and the possessive adjective “our” used mostly inclusively was found followed by nouns whose referents are shared by all members of the community. Some of them belong in the field of economy, broadly speaking (5 times “*our* economy”, 2 times “*our* roads, *our* bridges, *our* schools”, “*our* Federal Reserve chairman”, “*our* health care system”, “*our* dependence on Middle East oil”), some of these are abstract (“*our* destiny”, “*our* future”), and there are those that evoke patriotism (“*our* country”, “*our* battlefields”, “*our* leadership”, 2 times “look past *our* differences”). Only 2 adjectives and nouns are used exclusively: “*our* cause” and “*our* ideas”.

The reflexive pronoun “ourselves” was found twice in its inclusive meaning: “I believe that we can steer *ourselves* out of this crisis because I believe in this country”, “the same chances that we had for *ourselves*”.

4) As to the third person plural personal and possessive adjectives and pronouns, the occurrence is low in this speech as well. These forms are also used mostly to refer to some people other than the speaker's direct opponents, so the nominative personal pronoun "they", meaning "opponents" was used 4 times only, but 23 times it referred to some other people, organizations, etc. The accusative form was not found referring to the opponents, nor was the possessive adjective and the reflexive pronoun "themselves" referred once to the opponent and his political co-workers ("But if you don't have health insurance, you'll be able to buy the same kind of health insurance that members of Congress, including John McCain, give *themselves*"). The speaker refers to his opponent 50 times by his name, 14 times by his given and last name ("John McCain"), 9 times by the official title and his last name ("Senator McCain"). "McCain" is the referent to 23 possessive adjectives and pronouns, and the speaker refers to him as "my opponent" 4 times. The speaker also mentions the opponent's advisors 5 times, President G.W. Bush 8 times and his running mate Sarah Palin 3 times, but also 2 times her current official title ("governor Palin"). It seems that the election is seen as a clash of two persons and their concepts of rule and not two party programs.

6. Conclusion

Having compared and contrasted the pronominal forms in these two speeches, as well as accompanying verbal forms within speech acts, we noticed more similarities than differences regardless of their different ideological background. As to similarities, both speakers spoke using "I" pronominal forms, they expressed their private identity and mention some intertextual examples that often served as a springboard for further speech acts. The choice of verbal tenses and processes were similar and they may differ only in the occurrence of certain forms, which approximately corresponds to the different length of the speeches. As to differences, the nominative case form in S1 had a higher occurrence of commissives and future tense verbal forms than in S2, which shows that the S1 speaker was more prone to giving promises. On the other hand, the S2 speaker often expressed his wishes as speech acts that could be interpreted as assertives, but also indirect directives. As regards other forms, "my" was used more often in S1, mostly in the phrase "my friends", whereas the S2 speaker did not use any term of endearment or vocative form, hence the lower occurrence of this possessive adjective.

The use of "you" and all the derived forms shows fewer similarities: the plural nominative and accusative "you" were found in commissive speech acts, but in S2 the commissives were coupled with a condition that has to be

satisfied by voters, so that the speaker could fulfill his promise, whereas S1 did not contain acts that would demand some collaboration on the part of the audience. Again, as in “I” forms, the verbal tenses and processes were similar. We also found “you” referring to people in general and the possessive adjective “your” in somewhat higher occurrence in S2. What these two speeches differ in is that in S1 the speaker used the accusative plural form in the directives which serve as modal expressions to announce some change in topic or to draw attention to some point. This form and nominative case are hidden and formally not pronounced in the directives in which the speaker tries to move the public to action. The accusative plural case in S2 was found most often in assertives, which saw the voters as active participants of change, and less often in indirect directives and commissives. The nominative case in S1 was also found in some rhetorical questions which we did not find in S2. In S2, however, the nominative plural “you” was found in the directives which were used more often to check the communication channel and less often to stir up emotions. The nominative plural case in S2 was found also in assertives that could be interpreted as indirect directives. Neither of the speakers asked of the listeners to vote for their political options, but to stand up and fight against some enemies by voting, as expressed in S1, or to stand with the S2 speaker and win the election together in order to change the country. Consequently, the S2 speaker used one expression not found in S1 and that is “you and I”, which may suggest the unity of the S2 speaker and the voters in fighting *for* their common goal, unlike the S1 speaker who fights *against* someone or something. This use indicates the main political and ideological difference between the speakers: the S1 speaker tends to divide the electorate into “friends” and “enemies”, whereas the S2 speaker insists on cooperation and unity of the whole nation, regardless of ideological preferences.

The occurrence of “we” and the derived forms shows the same tendency in both speeches: namely, both speakers more often spoke inclusively than exclusively and sometimes epistemically and this was observed in both nominative and accusative case forms. This may mean that both speakers suggested their viewpoints (since neither of them mentions their political parties) corresponded to the viewpoints of people they spoke to. Again, the verbal tenses and processes were balanced in their occurrence. We found the inclusive nominative plural form mostly in assertives, but also in commissives, usually in their exclusive function. The difference is that we found a higher number of commissives used as promises in S1, which is a comparatively shorter speech. The possessive adjective “our” in both speeches was used mostly inclusively, followed by nouns whose referents are shared by the whole nation.

The occurrence of “they” and the derived forms was low in both speeches and these forms had referents other than the speakers’ direct opponents. They were, however, mutually referred to by their last name and often their official title. This use perfectly fits into the marketing concept of presidential campaigns which are highly personalized.

The speeches did not follow the principle of van Dijk’s ideological square, since we did not find the opposition of the collective “us” and “them”, which the speakers never contrasted in that form. The speakers also never spoke of or for their ideological parties. The discursive polarization was achieved through the opposition of “I” of “we” and “the opponent” called by his name, that is, the opposition of two candidates expressed through positive self-presentation and negative other presentation. Two other moves that this square consists of, suppressing positive information about “them” and negative about “us”, never surfaced and the speakers never mentioned their political *faux pas*, let alone mitigated them. The shifts between two referents of the personal pronoun “we” were not very often and were not used manipulatively. The ideological difference was observed in the speakers’ choice of the pronoun “you” and in the number of directives addressed to the audience – a higher number in S1, and, on the other hand, indirect directives and call for unity of the whole nation in S2. More frequent address to the audience in S2 may reflect the speaker’s world view in which the voters are perceived as partners in the speaker’s endeavor to change the country. The ideological opposition was also detectable in their choice of speech acts and verbal forms that follow the pronouns, i. e. whether the speaker was more prone to promising, both in singular and plural form in S1, which could be interpreted as a populist move, or to stating some wishes in the singular form, suggesting a more cautious approach, as in S2.

References

- Biber, Douglas et al. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Brown, Penelope, Steven C. Levinson (1987²). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chilton, Paul (2004). *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
- Chilton, Paul, Christina Schäffner (1997). Discourse and Politics. In: Teun van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume 2*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., 206-230.

-
- Clark, Herbert H., Thomas B. Carlson. (1991[1982]). *Speech Acts and Hearers' Beliefs*. In: Steven Davis (ed.). *Pragmatics: a reader*. New York: OUP, Inc. 177-198.
 - Fairclough, Norman (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
 - Fairclough, Norman (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
 - Fairclough, Norman (1995b). *Media Discourse*. London: Hodder Arnold.
 - Fairclough, Norman (2001a²). *Language and Power*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
 - Fairclough, Norman (2001b). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In: Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London-Thousand Oaks-New Delhi: Sage Publications Ltd., 121-138.
 - Fairclough, Norman (2003). *Analysing discourse*. Abingdon-New York: Routledge.
 - Fairclough, Norman, Ruth Wodak (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In: Teun van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume 2*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., 258-284.
 - Fowler, Roger (1991). *Language in the news: discourse and ideology in the Press*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
 - Searle, John R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: CUP.
 - Searle, John R. (1979). *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge: CUP.
 - Šiber, Ivan (2003). *Politički marketing*. Zagreb: Politička kultura.
 - Šiber, Ivan (2007). *Političko ponašanje*. Zagreb: Politička kultura.
 - Van Dijk, Teun A. (1997). Discourse as Interaction in Society. In: Teun van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume 2*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., 1-37.
 - Van Dijk, Teun A. (1998). *Ideology*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications Ltd.
 - Van Dijk, Teun A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

ZAMJENICE U AMERIČKIM POLITIČKIM GOVORIMA

U ovome radu bavimo se zamjenicama i njihovim izvedenim oblicima kao ideološkim sredstvima diskursa. Cilj rada bio je naći sličnosti i razlike u upotrebi zamjenica unutar govornih činova iz dvaju političkih govora (Speech 1 i Speech 2) koje su održali predsjednički kandidati iz dviju ideološki različitih stranaka kako bi se ustanovilo je li sintaktički stilovi govornika odražavaju njihove ideološke stavove, je li dijele ili ujedinjuju biračko tijelo i je li se govori uklapaju u „ideološki kvadrat“ (Van Dijk 1998, 2008). Kao metodološku podlogu odabrali smo kritičku diskurzivnu analizu i teoriju govornih činova. Analiza ovih pronominalnih oblika prvo je pokazala učestalost pojave ličnih, posvojnih i povratnih zamjenica i posvojnih pridjeva, promjene referenata u govornim činovima te glagolske oblike i glagolska vremena. Zaključili smo da govori nisu slijedili „ideološki kvadrat“ Van Dijka, jer nismo naišli na suprotstavljanje „nas“ i „njih“. Međutim, ideološka se razlika uočava u upotrebi zamjenice „vi“, u podjeli biračkoga tijela u S1 te u broju direktiva upućenih publici – u većem broju u S1, a u S2 uočavamo indirektne direktive i poziv na suradnju i jedinstvo nacije. Ideološka se suprotnost uočava i u odabiru govornih činova i glagolskih oblika, to jest, je li govornik češće obećava, što se može smatrati populističkim postupkom, koristeći zamjenice i u jednini i množini u S1 ili češće konstatira svoje želje i planove, što je oprezniji postupak vidljiv u S2.

Ključne riječi: *lične zamjenice, posvojni pridjevi, politički govori, kritička diskurzivna analiza, govorni činovi*