



**Speech Acts of Threatening and Warning in
Selected Political Speeches by Donald Trump**

Kamila. Kadhim .Abid

Iraq: University of Al-Qadissiyah

This paper looks into how warnings and threatening were employed by American President Donald Trump throughout his political public speeches. It focuses on the language constructions and pragmatic skills used to carry out these two acts. It demonstrates that these speeches tend to favor particular tactics over others. This study is divided into six sections. The first section gives a bird eye view on the two concepts of warning and threatening which are so closely connected speech acts, and how it is difficult for readers to distinguish between them. The second section sheds light on the aim of this study by listing them. Successively, the third and fourth sections deal with the pragmatic strategies of warning and threatening. The fifth section sheds light on the methodology and data analysis of Trump's selected speeches in light of the two acts of warning and threatening. Finally, the conclusion sums up the finding of this study.

1. Introduction

Because warning and threatening are so closely connected speech acts, it is difficult for readers to distinguish between the two. As a result, issues will develop once these students are in control. Considered to be well-intentioned actions, warning statements, such as "be cautious", inviting behaviors are essentially designed to serve the notion of warning which is, broadly speaking, a declaration or an occurrence informing someone that something bad or unpleasant will happen in the future so they can avoid it (Hornby, 2010:1735).

Kreckle asserts that warnings don't exist in general and that warnings are only formed in terms of interaction. The standards that have been established and upheld in real social interactions are what determine what constitutes a warning (Taylor and Cameron, 1987:57). In fact, this description is more appealing and complete since it emphasizes the dynamic aspect of this speech act rather than its static and solid characteristics, which are less important in determining how it will be shaped in social interactions. Threatening, on the other hand, implies that the listener will suffer pain and discomfort if the speaker's wishes are not followed. Threats are not publicly and openly articulated, and as a result, they are not explicitly constructed, which conflicts with polite standards and conventions that are consistent in any given language. However, there are only a few circumstances in which the SA of threatening is issued directly, such as when raising children. In response to threat acts, explicit threats are often made. For illustration, consider the following exchange:

(1) A: I'll punch you on the nose.

B: Don't threaten me (Stubbs, 1983:156).

Threats are often used favorably by managers, officers, supervisors, instructors, and others to carry out their objectives since they are successful activities that ultimately result in beneficial outcomes, despite being hostile, undesired actions. Unfortunately, thieves and criminals occasionally use this act negatively to carry out their evil, nasty, and destructive aims. As a result, the criminal's threat to seize the poor man's money and bankrupt him, delivered to him while brandishing a loaded revolver, is heard as "Your money or your life." Additionally, threats are employed for a variety of different reasons, such as to express rage, garner attention, save face, achieve a desired result, subvert authority, give humor, etc. (Quirk, et al., 1985:933; Allan, 1986:196).

According to Leech (1983), warning is equivocal between the "directives" and "assertives" classes because it either tries to get the hearer to do something or it informs him that something bad is going to happen to him. Nevertheless, because it eventually conveys a message of "not doing," most linguists classify it as a directive speech act. Threatening, on the other hand, is classified as a hybrid speech act because it is speaker-oriented. While Leech (1983) includes it with commissives, Searle (1969) allows it within directions. Threats are viewed as unfavorable promises that do not obligate the speaker to carry them out, which leaves the threateners' intentions open to change. For this reason, threats can be carried out by nonhuman beings, e.g. "Clouds can threaten heavy rains."

2. Aim of the Study This study aims at:

1. Detecting the readers' abilities to distinguish between warning and threatening, particularly when they take on similar structures in political speeches.
2. Identifying the most common linguistic expressions of warning and threatening used in political speeches.
3. Investigating presidents' strategies of expressing the speech acts of warning and threatening in public speeches. This aim implies investigating the ability of those presidents to vary their options of the kind of strategies in harmony with the socio-cultural considerations of situations

3 Pragmatic Strategies of Warning

3.1 Direct Warning (Explicit and Implicit)

When an utterance's form and purpose are closely related, according to Yule (1996:54), it is said to be a direct SA. Palmer (1981:162) asserts that when the speaker uses a phrase referring to the behavior, explicit warnings are created. Let's take the following exchange between the zoo-keeper (A) and a visitor(B):

A: I warn you that the bull is dangerous.

B: Er...I'll keep away

It is possible to place the adverb hereby before an explicit performative verb because, in general, explicit performatives are syntactically designated by the first person as their subjects with the verbs in the present simple tense (Yule, 1996:51). As such, A's opening move can be paraphrased as "I hereby warn you that the bull is dangerous."

Implicit warning is typically achieved via imperatives. According to Mey (2009:1002), implicit speech acts are distinguished by the fact that they lack the performative verb designating them. However, there is a correlation between an utterance's structure and function. Consider the following exchange between someone (A) and his friend (B) who has been suffering from high blood pressure:

A: You look pale. What's the matter?

B: I have a terrible headache. I had salty soup in the morning.

A: Oops! Avoid excessive amounts of salt and fat. They're harmful for you.

3.2 Indirect Warning

Indirect SAs, such as warning, enable the hearer to refrain from performing the action suggested by the speaker because they are motivated by face-saving, which is common in conversational exchanges. According to Leech (1983), "the degree of indirectness correlates to the degree to which the addressee is permitted to refuse to carry out the requested action." Consider the following dialogue between a foreign student (A), tired of looking for a lodging to temporarily live in, and the owner of (B) of a flat to be rented:

A: A friend told me I might find some accommodation here.

B: Yes, I have got a vacancy. A: How much is it?

B: IQD.150,000 a month, including lightning.

A: Could I have look at the room?

B: Yes. But, if you don't pay the rent in advance, you won't get the room. (Ockenden, 1980: 32)

The owner cautions his partner not to put off paying the rent in the previous conversation. The condition is part of the if clause for the warning statement in bold type. Warning is sometimes phrased as a question in specific situations. This tactic is typically used by inferior individuals to caution superior individuals to maintain the unbalanced relationships that exist between them.

4. Pragmatic Strategies of Threatening

4.1. Direct Threatening

The Pollyanna principle, put forth by Leech (1983:147), states that people typically prefer happy topics over unpleasant ones while conversing. Because of this, the interlocutors use euphemism to cover up harmful actions like threats with flattering phrases. To put it another way, threats and insults are not performed in the sense of the verbs that denote them (Austin,1962:31):

Kenneth: No you don't have anything. You're just a hypochondriac, sorry. Or looking on the bright side, congratulation.

Joe: (feeling upset and taking step for Kenneth)

Kenneth (taking out a gun and pointing it shakily at Joe)

Joe: You know I am gonna get you up!

Kenneth: Holdit! Don't make me kill you when there is nothing wrong with you! (Hernandez, 2001:238)

4.2. Indirect Threatening

Seperber and Wilson (1995: 15–16) define context as a collection of assumptions and inferences that the H utilizes to predictably interpret utterances. Because of this, the people who are being threatened are likely to determine the illocutionary act of threatening utterances based on contextual factors such as the threatener's mentality and intentions as well as the concrete features of the world in a particular context, a process that is consistent in issuing and interpreting all indirect SAs. As a result, one interprets the teacher's comment to one of his students in the case below as threatening SA. In other words, the student is not free to select what he prefers, therefore it is not seen as an alternative:

Ex. Either you shut up or you have to leave the classroom. (spoken by a teacher to one of his pupils).

5. Methodology and Data Analysis

Humans use discourse to give things meaning and to make sense of the social world or to put it another way, representation becomes apparent because political speeches are designed to be persuasive. The majority of current studies on warning and threatening language might be characterized as "armchair" investigations that focus on reflections rather than real word data. As a result, data from the chosen addresses are analyzed to demonstrate the type of communication technique used in the illocutionary conduct.

Brazil's discourse-pragmatic approach to intonation reconceptualizes conventional educational descriptions of intonation and offers proof that presentations that predominantly link intonation to grammatical function or attitudinal expression have serious flaws. The meaning of the intonation system is not located in the grammatical structure or emotive content of language, therefore it is not entirely foreseeable based on what is happening in these parts of the language system, even if intonation obviously corresponds with these elements in the discourse. Instead of considering the intonation system as a whole, by concentrating on specific places, we are effectively pulling out certain parts of the system and attempting to make sense of them (Brazil, 1975:17)

The essential tenet of the methodology put forth here is that the intonation system is fundamentally pragmatic in nature; that is, it autonomously contributes to the discourse by tying the information to a world or context that the listener can understand. This method acknowledges that intonation choices function within a context and lose their significance when this context is diminished or eliminated since this context fluctuates constantly between speakers and hearers in naturally occurring discourse (Ibid.)

The four basic systems of the model that will be introduced here are:

1. dividing speech into units
2. highlighting prominence information within speech units
3. choosing the pitch pattern on the unit's tonic syllable (or focus word)
4. choosing the pitch height on prominent syllables or the tonic syllable.

The data is represented in phrases or words that Trump used in his talks, therefore David Brazil's discourse intonational model employed a descriptive qualitative approach to analyze and understand the data. The technique utilized in this analysis is gathering secondary data, and the four processes are locating data, classifying data, and assessing the data's output. A clip from the meeting that was examined by choosing the right utterance was included in the data that was gathered via YouTube.

Donald Trump used in one of his political public speeches this statement "are threatening to loot and riot tomorrow if they don't get their way" which expresses the illocutionary point of threatening acts in the discourse. If Biden's supporters do not get their way, Trump warns his supporters that post-election violence may break out in the nation. On the contrary, one can contend that Trump is announcing to his supporters that a civil war is coming or will come since each side sees the other as a "danger" to the nation. They, the implicative form of the pronoun, here refers to the supporters of Biden. The future tense of the verb "don't get" implies hostility and is likely to do so. In this sentence, Trump makes a strong case for the damaging consequences of delaying "Biden's far-left supporters" intended conclusion. He was aware that many of his fans would not cast their ballots without any reservations. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s3yM4xgW7Fk>).

The expression Trump used about "A vote for Biden is a vote to give control of government over the globalists and communists and socialists and the wealthy liberal hypocrites" is a warning threat informing his supporters of the possible consequence of particular behavior, but it is ultimately to his benefit. In addition, the statement indicates the function that a phrase with particular illocutionary forces serves in the context in question. Since it is clear that these statements are the result of introspection and that their general ability is at best dubious, the main objective was to terrify his followers. In this situation, Trump intentionally causes social friction with the addressee by using conditional language as a communication tactic. It may be argued that he was attempting to sow discord in order to win over the people. From this brief analysis, it is clear that the warning threat's main purpose is to be rude. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w1TrNLtA7Og>.)

The excerpt Trump recited in one of his political public speeches "Joe Biden is not a saviour of America's soul. He is a destroyer of America's jobs. He is the destroyer of the American greatness." makes

assertions about Biden's words and deeds that are not true with particular reference to "American greatness." The pronoun "He" reveals the S's intention and highlights the personality of the accused. The text supplies information regarding Trump's plan to carry out future actions once he is re-elected. In this phrase, he takes a direct aim at Biden's assertion battling for the soul of the country, proclaiming that "Joe Biden is not a savior of American soul." He added that "He is the destroyer of American's jobs, and if given the chance, he will be the destroyer of American greatness." In the context of this speech, he invites his supporters to reject Biden jointly and applies commissives and a politeness strategy to communicate his directives. In addition to the above information, the analysis shows that Trump is speaking appropriately loud enough to be understood (<https://www.irishtimes.com/news/world/us/joe-biden-is-not-a-saviour-of-america-s-soul-says-trump-1.4340901>.)

In the following speech "We will not bend. We will not break. We will not yield. We will never give in. We will never give up. We will never back down. We will never ever surrender," Trump responds to "never surrender." His use of referring plus high tone with high pitch emphasizes his view and shows that he takes this matter seriously. This phrase conveys his physiological state of mind and emphasizes that his goals must be successful. This message suggests that Trump is proclaiming some reality that needs to be taken into account, according to the discourse intonation model developed in Brazil. The result is that Trump motivated and encouraged his supporters to carry on the struggle. He also makes an effort to incorporate the acts of ordering, forewarning, and condemning, as well as pleading and disagreeing. The future nature of the speaker's intention or conduct is captured by the modal auxiliary "will" in this phrase. As a result, Trump engages in the illocutionary act of threatening and warning against doing something, the effects of which will be seen later. Here, Trump's use of "we" conveys a sense of unity. Along with the previously mentioned details, analysis demonstrates that Trump is communicating clearly and loudly enough. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n4wb2ALiXtE>.)

6. Conclusion

What truth underlies Trump's beliefs in the three discourses is clearly clear in light of these seemingly obvious facts. The format data appear to indicate two broad tendencies: warning and threatening. As was already mentioned, tone is crucial in conveying emotions and feelings. The approach received a perfect score for identifying stress using the six waveform analysis. The aforementioned data and tables provide strong evidence that when threats and warnings are used in a speech act set, they reinforce one another. Every sample has strong personal opinions about the 2020 presidential election. The statements suggest that Trump is using a variety of illocutionary acts to command, direct, advise, claim, declare, warn, and threaten people. The linguistic context also leads to the conclusion that the analyzed illocutionary acts are deliberate and consist of sentences with content. The three addresses all share the same political goal, which is to induce listeners to react or act in the manner that Trump intentionally planned, according to an examination of the four texts.

References

- Allan, K. (1986). *Linguistic Meaning*. New York: Routledge.
Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
David Brazil (1975). *Discourse Intonation*. Michigan: University of Michigan.
Hornby, A.S. (2010). *Oxford University Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Leech, Geoffrey (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
Mey, J. L. (2009). *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.
Palmer, F.R. (1981). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum and Svartvik Leech (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman Group Limited.
Seale, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Seperber, D. and D. Wilson. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis: Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Languages*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
Taylor, Talbot. J. and Deborah Cameron (1987). *Analysing Conversation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Yule, George (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.