

- Coates, J. (1995). The expression of root and epistemic possibility in English. In J., Bybee & S., Fleischman (Eds.) *Modality in Grammar and discourse* (pp. 55-66). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Egins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th edition). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Holmes, J. (1982). Expressing doubt and certainty in English. *RELC Journal* 13/2, 9-28.
- Lock, G. (1996). *Functional English grammar: an introduction for second language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Masaitiene, D. (2009). Expression of interpersonal meaning in conversation. *Man & the Word / Zmogusirzodis* 11/ 1, 61-65.
- Palmer, F. R. (1990). *Modality and the English modals*. London: Longman.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perkins, M. R. (1983). *Modal expressions in English*. London: F Pinter.
- Simpson, P. (1990). Modality in literary-critical discourse. In W., Nash (Ed.). *The writing scholar: Studies in academic discourse* (pp.63-94). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Simpson, P. (2000). *Language, ideology and point of view*. London: Routledge.
- Thompson, G. (1996). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- URL <www.americanrhetoric.com/barackobamaspeeches.htm> (accessed 1 June 2016)
- URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/3536131.stm> (accessed 1 June 2016)
- Wärnsby, A. (2006). *(De)coding modality: The case of must, may, måste, and kan*. Lund: Lund University, Dept. of English.

but his proposition might be true in the future. Second, Obama exploited deontic modality more frequently than Blair. It could be argued that he had the authority to command his combat brigades to undertake the actions and to offer his support.

Further, the findings have proven the fact that modality can be widely realized through the use of modal auxiliaries. Both speeches include the high number of modal auxiliaries to show the speaker's attitude of the proposition. The additional fact has been proven which is that both political speeches obviously lack objective expressions. This is because objective expressions are mainly common in written language while subjective expressions can be widely used in spoken language.

In brief, these findings lead to the most important conclusion which is that British politicians, unlike American ones, tend to be more cautious when delivering the message to their audience due to the different culture and different ideologies. It can be seen that British people are more conservative than Americans. It seems challenging to convince the British society to wage the war against Iraq. This is required much justification and many sentences with careful and somehow implicit language. Thus, this fact illustrates why the language used by Tony Blair is more hedged and modalized than Barack Obama.

References:-

- Al-Majali, W. (2015). Discourse Analysis of the Political Speeches of the Ousted Arab Presidents during the Arab Spring Revolution during Halliday and Hasan's Framework of Cohesion. *Journal of Education and Practice* 6/ 14, 96-108.
- Blas Arroyo, J. (2010). Interpersonal issues in political discourse. In M., Locher & S., Graham (Eds.) *Interpersonal pragmatics* (pp. 405- 434. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Bloor, T. & Bloor, M. (2004). *The functional analysis of English*. London: Arnold.
- Coates, J. (1990). Modal Meaning: The Semantic-Pragmatic Interface. *Journal of Semantics* 7, 53-63.

- (199) " It is possible that even with all of this, nothing would have happened."(explicit and objective).

It should be obvious that Blair exploits merely four objective expressions in his language (it is now apparent, it was obvious, it was obviously and it is possible). Similarly, Obama also exploits these expressions four times only (it is important, diplomacy and assistance is also required to, it is time for Iraq to be and it is necessary) .

On the other hand, when the speaker is stating his attitude using the auxiliary modals and modal adverbs, it is said he is implicitly expressing the proposition: it is either presented as an objective judgment, as in using adverbial forms, or being said to be subjective, as in auxiliary modals (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) . One example will be taken into account from both corpuses to show how these are employed.

- (70) " and that Iraq's WMD, even on our own case, was not serious enough to warrant war, certainly without a specific UN resolution mandating military action." (Blair's corpus)
- (169) " We have learned that we must always weigh the costs of action, and communicate those costs candidly to the American people," (Obama's corpus).

Conclusions

There are a number of conclusions to be drawn from this examination of two political discourses. Based on the results of the research, following conclusions can be produced.

The data found that the predominant use of epistemic modality throughout two political discourses suggest the fact that politicians delivered their speech in a tentative way, i.e. they expressed their attitudes without strong confidence and certainty in addition to communicate their doubts. As already mentioned, epistemic modality dealt with the speaker's degree of possibility and certainty towards the judgment being said. Because Blair's intention was to persuade his audience that his decision to take part in the war against Saddam's regime was correct and right, he expressed his opinions and views epistemically, that is to say, he was not sure and confident

even this year or next he will use his weapons." (Blair's speech)

It has been noted from the examples that one sentence includes more than one type of modality- modal auxiliaries, lexical verbs and adverbs.

With regard to Personal judgments of likelihood such as (I think, I am certain), Perkins (1983) comments that lexical verbs with first person pronoun I (e.g. I think, I know) are the most explicitly subjective, whereas he regards modal adverbs and adjectives forms as the most explicitly objective modal expressions. Similarly, Halliday & Matthiessen (2014) refers to projecting mental clauses explicitly but they also illustrate that the modal verb operators (e.g. may, must) are the most implicitly subjective .

Therefore, as suggested by Lock (1996), personal judgments are more common in face- to- face conversations. They are restricted to spoken language. On the other hand, such explicitly impersonal assessments of likelihood such as (it is probable that ...) are more common in formal written language and restricted to written language. From this perspective, the analysis reveals that both politicians express their opinions and judgments subjectively rather than objectively as shown in table 4.7 (5) which exhibits that the frequency of using modal auxiliaries and lexical verbs are striking compared with other modal expressions.

The following extract is selected from Obama's text.

- (81) " And under the Status of Forces Agreement with the Iraqi government, I intend to remove all U.S. troops from Iraq by the end of 2011."(explicit and subjective)
- (175) "And as long as I am your Commander-in-Chief, I promise you that I will only send you into harm's way when it is absolutely necessary, " (explicit and objective).

Notice other instances chosen from Blair's texts to be considered.

- (108) " I did not consider Iraq fitted into this philosophy, though I could see the horrible injustice done to its people by Saddam."(explicit and subjective)

As for *might*, the analysis reveals that it is used three times in Blair's materials. Blair exploits this modal in his speech to show his less certainty as given in the following example. So, *might* is used epistemically to express possibility .

- (188) " My view was and is that if the UN had come together and delivered a tough ultimatum to Saddam, listing clearly what he had to do, benchmarking it, he may have folded and events set in train that might just and eventually have led to his departure from power."

modality	Blair's speech	Average	Obama's speech	Average
Modal auxiliary	54	21.09%	56	26.16%
Lexical verbs	36	14.06%	18	8.41%
Nouns	15	5.85%	4	1.86%
Adverbs	35	13.67%	11	5.14%
adjectives	15	5.85%	4	1.86%

Table (5) the frequency of all types of modal systems

To sum up, the data analysis as given in table (5) reveals that the difference in number is the most striking for using various modal expressions in both discourses. In other words, a variety of epistemic and deontic modal devices are spread throughout the discourse. The materials show that both speeches exploit modal auxiliaries more frequently than others. This fact illustrates the central use of modal auxiliaries in English to express both the possibility and obligation. The use of lexical verbs is relatively high in both discourses after the use of modals auxiliaries. Another striking point to be considered in the analysis is the comparatively less frequent use of modal adjectives and nouns. Consider the following examples taken from both texts to show how different types of modal systems have been exploited .

- (74) " There will surely be difficult periods and tactical adjustments. (75) But our enemies should be left with no doubt:" (Obama's speech)
- (24) " It is said we claimed Iraq was an imminent threat to Britain and was preparing to attack us. (25) In fact this is what I said prior to the war on 24 September 2002: (26) "Why now? People ask. (27) I agree I cannot say that this month or next,

in Iraq politically instead of militarily. On the other hand, Blair uses deontic must only once whereas uses deontic have to eight times. This reflects the fact that Blair intends to make clear that he is not responsible for the proposition he is saying. So, the use of must in discourse means that the speaker directly imposes obligation on the listeners and involves himself in the speech (Coates, 1990).

Accordingly, Blair, in exploiting have to, wants to distance between himself and his audience as well as to make clear that he does not have the authority since the use of must means he has strong authority on his addressees and the obligation imposed is strong too. Notably, only once modal auxiliary (have to) is used in Obama's texts. Let us consider the following example taken from Blair's data.

- (291) " This agenda must be robust in tackling the security threat that this Islamic extremism poses; and fair to all peoples by promoting their human rights, wherever they are."
- (73) "We were saying this is urgent; (74) we have to act".

With regard to should, it is commonly used to indicate requirement rather than likelihood (Lock, 1996). The following two instances taken from Obama's and Blair's speech illustrate the way they express a less strong sense of obligation through the use of modal auxiliary should.

- (84) " The drawdown of our military should send a clear signal that Iraq's future is now its own responsibility ."
- (4) " Rightly they say the Government should concentrate on the issues that elected us in 1997: the economy, jobs, living standards, health, education, crime."

Moving to the modal *would*, if it is used with if conditional, according to Lock (1996), it implies unreal condition only. Palmer (1990, p. 59) claims that would is the tentative form of will. It can be paraphrased as "I should think that ...". Consider the following example from Blair's speech.

- (131) " But if they could have killed 30,000 or 300,000 they would have rejoiced in it."

sentence might be used to express a prediction rather than a statement in spite of the fact that this fact reflects the debate among philosophers whether they treat future sentences as declaratives or as modalized propositions.

Following Lock (1996, p. 162), the use of will in the context can be interpreted as expressing " a judgment of likelihood". He also suggests that will is used for predictions.

Thus, the modal will can be interpreted in the paper epistemically i.e. it will refer to likelihood. It should be obvious that Obama exploits this modal 50 times in his message while Blair uses it merely 12 times .

Turning to the modal *may*, the auxiliary modal may can be used epistemically or deontically. Blair uses epistemic may in his discourse only five times. On the most likely interpretation, all of them make judgments about the probability of the truth of the proposition.

Here are a couple of instances from Blair's speech:

- (48) " And I actually think this [Iraq] may be one of those cases where it was even more dangerous than we thought".
- (244) " this war is not ended. (245) it may only be at the end of its first phase".

The first instance from Blair's data can be paraphrased as (Iraq is probably one of those cases...). And the second example can be interpreted as (it is probably the end of its first phase). On the contrary, Obama does not apply this modal may in his language.

In terms of *must*, like may, it can be used epistemically or deontically. Obama uses it more frequently than Blair. Obama uses must in his speech 13 times. Obama as well as Blair refer to must deontically in all its cases. Below is an example from Obama's speech in which he applies must in his discourse:

- (48) " We have acted with careful consideration of events on the ground; with respect for the security agreements between the United States and Iraq; and with a critical recognition that the long-term solution in Iraq must be political -- not military ."

In this example, Obama clearly takes the responsibility for the imposing of necessity and obligation. He insists to solve the problem

throughout Obama's discourse. In terms of Blair's text, it would appear that his speech about terror threat as well as terror of Iraq expresses his judgment about the possibility of what he is saying. He is probably not sure and uncertain whether Iraq would cause any terror to the Great Britain. By contrast, Obama exploits modals which express obligation relatively more frequently than those in Blair's speech. It would seem that Obama wants to get his marines do what he orders them. Obviously, not only is deontic modality realized through modal auxiliary but also through other expressions (is required and necessary) as shown in the following instances taken from Obama's and Blair's data .

- (96) " Diplomacy and assistance is also required to help the millions of displaced Iraqis."(Obama's speech)
- (175)" And as long as I am your Commander-in-Chief, I promise you that I will only send you into harm's way when it is absolutely necessary, and provide you with the equipment and support you need to get the job done."(Obama's speech)

Epistemic	probability	Frequency	Will
Blair's speech	124	4	14
Obama's speech	24	6	50

Table (2) the frequency of epistemic modality

Deontic	Obligation	Inclination
Blair's speech	16	9
Obama's speech	28	13

Table (3) the frequency of deontic modality

Modal auxiliaries	will	can	could	would	shall	Should	may	might	must	Need to	Have to
Blair's speech	12	11	6	23	/	5	5	3	1	/	8
Obama's speech	50	16	/	3	/	5	/	/	13	1	2

Table (4) the frequency of modal auxiliaries

First modal will be investigated is *will*. Lyons (1977) points out that to express future in language, it can be through only modal forms because there is no future tense in Proto- Indo-European languages. He adds that these future sentences sometimes indicate nonfactual such as hypotheses. Thus, he claims that a future

Thus, Blair's speech was divided into 256 sentences. Epistemic modality was written in bold, deontic modality was underlined and dynamic was written in italics. Similarly, Obama's discourse was divided into 214 sentences and a similar criterion was conducted.

Analyses and Discussions

The major purpose of this section is to provide an analysis of the aspect of linguistic organization in a political discourse. both speeches are mainly compared and identified the most prominent features.

Modality

Modality is taken into account in this section. Table 1 summarizes the information obtained from the data. It shows the frequency of two modality systems used in English language: epistemic and deontic modality. It can be noted that the speakers produce a large amount of epistemic modality, yet Blair's number of such clauses is larger. This fact suggests that he expresses his uncertainty and the lack of confidence in his speech. Therefore, Blair uses tentative forms of modals more than Obama's speech as shown in table (4). Obama, on the other hand, produces more deontic modals than Blair. This fact suggests that Obama tends to direct his addressees to do things. That is to say, he has the authority to ask his audience to undertake the action. He might want to convince his addressees to end the war but he continues to offer his help and support to Iraq. A clear analysis to each modal used in the data will be examined later.

modality	Number of sentences	Epistemic	Deontic
Blair's speech	256	142	25
Average		55.46%	9.76%
Obama's speech	214	80	41
Average		37.38%	19.15%

Table (1) the frequency of modality system

Whereas table 2 and table 3 display the frequency of subclasses of epistemic modality as well as deontic modality in both texts. The data shows that Blair uses the modals to express attitude and the knowledge toward the proposition more than imposing obligation to his addressees or expressing his ability to do things. A further striking characteristic is that epistemic modal will is widely distributed

Materials

In order to conduct the research, this part will deal with choosing and collecting data. The two sets of data deal with closely related topics i.e. political speeches, particularly the war in Iraq. Nevertheless, the main purpose of these two political speeches is different. The materials consist of two political speeches given by Tony Blair who is the former British prime minister and Barack Obama who is the former president of the United States. The former delivered his speech in March 2004 to speak about the terror threat facing the UK and defending the Iraq war. The latter delivered his speech on 27 February 2009, in Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. The purpose of his speech is to end the war against Iraq.

Both messages chosen dealt with the language of war i.e. how politicians seek to persuade their audience towards participating in waging war (Blair's speech) and ending the war (Obama's speech). The discourse by Blair's was obtained via (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/3536131.stm), whereas Obama's speech was obtained via (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/barackobamaspeeches.htm>).

Methodology

Two political speeches were analyzed in terms of modality. Keys were presented for each analysis. These analyses were presented in appendices 1 and 2. Appendix (1) relates to the modality analysis of Blair's speech, whereas appendix (2) refers to the modality analysis of Obama's speech. The data was analyzed so as that such questions might be answered:

- How do politicians persuade their addressees through applying modal systems into their language?

This study, as already mentioned, chose three sub-categories of modal system: epistemic, deontic and dynamic modality. So, both discourses were divided into sentences rather than words or clauses and the modal expressions were analyzed according to these sub-categories. It can be noticed that the size of data was not similar. In order to draw a valid comparison between the two discourses, the two sets of texts could be counting the number of sentences rather than words so as to match the size of data as similar as possible.

Be ... to" (e.g. you are sure to be right) and "Be ... that" (e.g. It is certain that) constructions and modal adverbs (e.g. allegedly) .

Another important distinction that has been of considerable interest to linguists is that subjectivity and objectivity. A modal expression is known as subjective if the degree of a speaker highly involves in the proposition and the subject of the claim is the personal pronoun (I) or (We) such as (I think), whereas objectivity of the utterance refers to the modal expressions when they are in a separate clause whose subject is anticipatory (it) as in (It is likely). Another important point to be considered is modality can be expressed explicitly or implicitly. (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) .

Here is the matrix of four feature combinations as illustrated by Halliday & Matthiessen (2014):

subjective	objective
Implicit Must	Certainly
Explicit I agree	"it is apparent.
pistemic modality	

Epistemic modality can be defined, as stated by Coates (1995, p. 55), as 'speaker's assumptions of possibilities' and it indicates the degree of confidence that expressed in the truth of proposition. Thus, as Palmer (1990) identifies it, it is characterized, in addition to the truth, by belief and knowledge in relation to the proposition .As for epistemic and deontic modality the distinction is made and illustrated by the use of possible and necessary .

Deontic and Dynamic modality

As has already been mentioned, event modality can be identified into deontic and dynamic. The former associates with obligation or permission, whereas the latter associates with ability or willingness which comes from internal factors (Coates, 1990). Warnsby (2006) refers to deontic modality as performative since it is used when the speaker gives or grants permission, imposing obligation or make a promise. Warnsby identifies that dynamic modals are used to express the ability of the subject to perform the action stated in the proposition.

Modality

In spite of the fact that the study of modality is problematic and controversial, there is a general consensus among researchers regarding the role and function of modality (Coates, 1995; Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Palmer, 2001; Simpson, 1990; Simpson, 2000). Modality is regarded a major exponent of the interpersonal function of language (Simpson, 2000). Modals play a vital role in discourse as they help to establish the relationship between speakers in everyday communication and express their attitudes and stances. Another important use of modality is that it places a distance between the speaker and his audience (Masaitiene, 2009).

Thompson (1996) simply defines modality as "the space between yes and no" because the message can be understood according to a wide range of degrees of certainty or usuality. That is to say, it is regarded, as Halliday & Matthiessen (2014, p. 691) put, as "the intermediate ground between positive and negative polarity". Further definition of modality offered by Simpson (1990, p.66) is considered. He defines modality as "a speaker's attitude toward or opinion about the truth of a proposition expressed by a sentence and toward the situation or event described by a sentence. Eggins (2004) notes that in exchanging information and whether a receiver affirms or denies, there are a large number of choices of degrees of certainty or of usuality in between these two poles. Thus, modality here expresses probability and frequency of a proposition. This type of modality, as Eggins (2004) and Halliday & Matthiessen (2014) identify, is known as modalization. On the other hand, when the speaker expresses his judgments or attitudes about events, and he can express degrees of obligation and inclination of a proposal, this kind of modality is called modulation (ibid).

According to Coates (1990), notions such as possibility, necessity, obligation, ability and volition are associated with modality. Modality can be realized through many ways. First and the most common one is modal auxiliary. The second device is lexical verbs and finally modal adjuncts. Similarly, Simpson (2000) argues that not only modal auxiliaries are central in the modal system but also modality may be grammaticized through a range of other devices such as modal lexical verbs (e.g. I think), adjectives in the familiar "

Introduction

Language has a variety of purposes. The main functions of language are expressing feelings and attitudes, getting people to do things, offering help, and making friends. Native speakers tend to modify their judgments through using a variety of linguistic devices (Holmes, 1982). That is to say, they hedge their judgments and strengthen their opinions by exploiting modal in their language .

From systemic functional language (SFL) point of view, there are three broad metafunctions of language used by human beings- interpersonal metafunction, ideational metafunction and textual metafunction. The present study will focus on one of these metafunctions, namely interpersonal one. Interpersonal metafunction is concerned with language use in communicative acts. In other words, people use language in order to participate with others in communication so as to take on roles and express feelings, attitudes, opinions and judgments. (Bloor & Bloor, 2004).

The present study will focus on one device of interpersonal metafunction- Modality. Since the present study will focus on political language, the research will give a space to this field in this part. Political language, as Al-Majali (2015) puts, is concerned with the most moral senses as well as it basically deals with issues such as war and peace affairs. Politicians mainly deliver their speeches in order to persuade their audience with their opinions and attitudes by using strategies such as modality which is the focus of the study. Seidel (1985) (as cited in Al-Majali, 2015) points out that a political speech constitutes three main elements: the speaker, the listener and the speech itself. Political discourse, as supposed by Blas Arroyo (2010), differs from the ordinary conversation in a way that it manifests as a public discourse in which the participants act as social persons rather than individuals.

The present study aims at Showing how politicians utilize modal systems in delivering their speech concerning war affairs, namely justifying his consent of taking part in the war after one year of the war (delivered by tony Blair) and ending the war (delivered by Barack Obama).

Abstract:-

The present study is based on the data composed of two political speeches delivered by the British Prime Minister Tony Blair and the president Barack Obama. The domain of politics is a rich field to investigate. Political discourse in this paper is analyzed from a linguistic point of view, and it is an exercise on how language is used by politicians to arrive at the intended objective. In order to persuade the audience, politicians exploit persuasive devices throughout their speech. Of these persuasive devices is modality. Modality here expresses probability and frequency of a proposition. Two types of modality was concerned in this paper: moralization and modulation.

The analysis revealed that despite the fact that both political discourses include a wide range of modal devices, epistemic expressions are widely distributed throughout the texts. In this respect, the speaker while delivering the speech is trying to appear uncertain and less confident. Finally, a striking finding could be reached through the analysis..

Key words: political speech, modality, persuasive devices, epistemic modality, deontic modality.

المخلص:

تعتمد هذه الدراسة على الخطاب السياسي والتي تتألف من خطبتين القاها الرئيس الامريكى باراك اوباما ورئيس الوزراء البريطانى تونى بلىر. ان ميدان السياسة غنى للتعرف عليه. تم تحليل الخطاب السياسي في هذا البحث من ناحية لغوية وانها تدرس كيفية استخدام اللغة من قبل السياسيين للوصول الى اهدافهم. ولهذا يوظف السياسيون الوسائل المقنعة من خلال كلامهم لإقناع الجمهور. وواحدة من هذه الاساليب في الاقناع هي المودالتي (الافعال الشكلية). وتعتبر هنا بالاحتمالية وتكرار الفرضية. ركزت الدراسة على نوبين من المودالتي (الافعال الشكلية).

اظهرت الدراسات ان التعبيرات (epistemic) هي الاكثر استخداما من غيرها من الأفعال والتعبيرات الاخرى خلال النص. وهذا يدل على ان المتكلم يحاول خلال القاء الخطبة بالظهور بعدم التأكد وقليل الثقة. وفي الخاتمة يعتبر المودالتي (الافعال الشكلية) من الاساليب المقنعة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الخطاب السياسي، الافعال الشكلية، الوسائل المقنعة، الافعال الاحتمالية، الافعال الالزامية.

Modality in political discourse

Lect. Asst.

Nada Mohsin Taher Aboghunaim

University of kufa - College of education

nadam.taher@uokufa.edu.iq

الأفعال الشكلية في الخطاب السياسي

المدرس المساعد

ندى محسن طاهر أبوغنيم

جامعة الكوفة - كلية التربية