CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT THREAT IN SELECTED POLITICAL SPEECHES

Zahraa Salah[1]
Huda Abed Ali Hattab [2]

Abstract

Post-World War II is regarded as the period at which the world has experienced the rise of two great forces : the United States and Soviet Union that never interact and agreed with each other and were controlled by many leaders , among them were Donald Trump and Vladimir Putin who face with threat the recent issues most of which are the war on terrorism and the issue of Ukraine. Consequently, the study is expected to answer some of the following questions: What are the linguistic features most frequently used by the presidents in their threat? Which of the presidents reflects more certainty in his threatening speech? What social practices do the Russian and American presidents want to achieve through threat? The current study aims at examining the linguistic features most frequently used by presidents in performing their threat, investigating whether Trump or Putin seems to be more certain of his threat and revealing the social practices that presidents seek to achieve through threat. The study hypothesizes that the most frequently used linguistic tools are figurative language and active –passive verbs and Putin seems to be more certain in conducting his threat than Trump. It also hypothesizes that the two presidents seek to minimize the social effects of persecution and show their hegemonic power with it , and they can end that persecution.

This study adopts an eclectic model of Fairclough (1989). It reveals that Putin and trump use cohesive devices and figurative language more than other linguistic elements and Putin seems to show more certainty than Trump. Also the study reveals that the presidents depend on the context and situation in which they tend to threat to minimize peoples' suffering, misbehaviors regimes and to keep showing their solidarity and power among the world.

Keywords: Threat, Direct Threat , Indirect threat , Critical Discourse Analysis, figurative language.

[1] M.A.Student. University of Baghdad/ College of Education (Ibn Rushd)/ Dept. of English
Zahraasalah646@gmail.com.

[2] Asst. Prof. University of Baghdad/ College of Education (Ibn Rushd)/ Dept. of English.

تحليل الخطاب النقدي للتهديد المباشر وغيرالمباشر في خطابات سياسية مختارة

زهراء صلاح [3]

هدى عبد علي حطاب [4]

ملخص

تعد فترة ما بعد الحرب العالمية الثانية فترة ظهور القوى العظمى المتمثلة بالولايات المتحدة والاتحاد السوفييتي، اللتان لم تتفاعلا أبدًا ولم تتفقا مع بعضهما البعض، فسيطر على هاتين الدولتين عدداً من الزعماء من بينهم دونالد ترامب وفلاديمير بوتين، اللذان يواجهان العالم بالتهديد. ان الدافع وراء هذا البحث هو دراسة زيادة استخدام الرؤساء للتهديدات، الأمر الذي أدى إلى إثارة الكثير من الجدل حول أيديولوجياتهم الساسية ومعتقداتهم الشخصية والاستراتيجيات اللغوية المستخدمة لنقلها. ولذلك من المتوقع أن تجيب الدراسة على بعض التساؤلات الاتية: ما هي السمات اللغوية الأكثر استخداماً من قبل ترامب وبوتين في تهديدهما؟ أيَّ من الرؤساء يعكس يقينا أكبر في خطابه التهديدي؟ ما هي الممارسات الاجتماعية التي يريد الرئيسان الروسي والأميركي تحقيقها من خلال التهديد؟ ان الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو الكشف عن السمات اللغوية الاكثر استخداما من قبل الرؤساء في تنفيذ تهديدهم، والتحقيق فيما إذا كان ترامب أو بوتين يبدو أكثر يقيناً بتهديده، فضـلاً عن الكشـف عن اي ممارسـات اجتماعية التي يسـعى الرؤسـاء إلى تحقيقها من خلال التهديد. وتفترض الدراسة أن الأدوات اللغوية الأكثر اسـتخداماً هي اللغة المجازية والأفعال المبنية للمجهول، ويبدو أن بوتين أكثر يقيناً في تنفيذ تهديده من ترامب. كما افترضت الدراسـة بأن الرئيسـين يسـعيان إلى تقليل الآثار الاجتماعية للاضـطهاد وإظهار قوتهما المهيمنة بحيث يمكنهما إنهاء هذا الاضطهاد. تعتمد هذه الدراسة الانموذج الانتقائي لفيركلاف (1989). تكشف نتائج البيانات أن بوتين وترامب يسـتخدمان وسـائل متماسكة ولغة مجازية أكثر من غيرها، ويبدو ان غاية بوتين هي التفاعل مع الجمهور وكشـف الخطر الفعلي نجده يظهر اليقين أكثر من ترامب. ولقد كشـفت نتائج الدراسـة أن الرؤسـاء – وبالاعتماد على السـياق والوضـع الذي يعيشـون فيه– يميلون إلى التهديد بالتقليل من معاناة الشعوب وسوء سلوك الأنظمة والاستمرار في إظهار تضامنهم وقوتهم بين العالم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التهديد ، تهديد مباشر، تهديد غير مباشر ، تحليل الخطاب النقدي، اللغة المجازية .

1 Section One:

1.1 The Problem

Messages are generally intended to be conveyed to the audience through spoken or written language. These messages may be overt or covert. CDA methodology is required for the analysis and interpretation of linguistic discourses from political or social viewpoints. Speakers embed an action in their voice in order to achieve

[3] جامعة بغداد/ كلية التربية (ابن رشد) للعلوم الانسانية/ قسم اللغة الانكليزية.

[4] جامعة بغداد/ كلية التربية (ابن رشد) للعلوم الانسانية/ قسم اللغة الانكليزية.

communication goals, in addition to conveying any words. According to Isna & Sari (2017), people build grammatical structures of utterances not only to communicate themselves but also to carry out actions. Every word a person says in real life is made up of speech acts that have a variety of objectives, including commanding, warning, and expressing the speaker's intentions. Additionally, Austin (1962) claims that speech actions are separated into three categories: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts when evaluating the speech act composed of utterance. One of the categories of illocutionary act is threat which is typed as direct and Indirect.

The current study focuses on the main types of threat: (direct and indirect) and specially on threatening speeches of the Russian and American Presidents. Most of the listeners ignore whether the communication is an actual threat or not, what are the linguistic factors of threat, what is the hidden ideology of the speakers, judging how dangerous the threat may be and how likely threat will be carried out.

Accordingly, and to tackle the above mentioned phases of problem, this study tries to answer these questions:

1.What are the linguistic features most frequently used by Trump and Putin in their threat?

2.Which of the presidents reflects more certainty in his threatening speech?

1.2 The Objectives of the Study

In respect to the questions of the study, the objectives will be:

1. Examining the linguistic features most frequently used by presidents in performing their threat.

2. Investigating whether Trump or Putin seems to be more certain of his threat.

1.3 The Hypotheses of the Study

It will be hypothesized that:

1. The most often utilized linguistic devices are active-passive verbs and figurative language.

2. Putin seems to be more certain in conducting his threat than Trump .

1.4 The Procedure

The steps followed in carrying out the research include the following:

1. Defining in-depth and completely all the theories and concepts used in the study, and examining the prior research .

2. Collecting data by selecting political speeches of the two American presidents.

3. Analyzing the political speeches in which illocutionary speech act is prominent by using the elected model. And Discussing the findings of the analysis.

4. Drawing conclusions based on the results of the analysis.

1.5 The Limits

The study will be limited to examine the use of threat in selected texts of Trump's and Putin's political speeches. Their speeches have been selected due to their rich content of various types of threat, the study will examine three texts for each president by using quantitative and qualitative methods with Fairclogh's three dimensional model.

1.6 The Value

For academics interested in linguistics in general and critical discourse analyses in particular, the researcher believes that this work will provide useful knowledge and insight. Additionally, academics interested in language analysis of political speeches will find it useful.

Section Two
Literature Review
2.1 Preliminary Remarks

Many linguists and social scientists have extensively studied Critical Discourse Analysis. Fairclough and Wodak (1993) among the others define discourse as any form of language that a society utilizes to communicate information at a contextual level. In order to comprehend the speaker's ideological background and the language techniques that he utilizes to convey attitudes and intents toward others, it can be helpful to analyze sentences and words.

2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

The concept and methodology behind CDA look at how individuals and institutions utilize language. Therefore, CDA deals with both internal factors like ideology, authority, and inequality as well as outside forces like broader social challenges. It applies social and philosophical philosophy to the analysis and interpretation of spoken and written words. Regarding CDA according to Fairclough (2001b: 26), CDA analyzes texts and interactions but does not begin with them. Instead, it begins with social issues and issues that are addressed in sociology,

political science, and/or cultural studies. These are challenges that people experience in their social life.

Van Dijk (2001:352), cited in Muhammed& Flaifel (2015), defines CDA very clearly: It is "a branch of discourse analysis that focuses on how text and talk in social and political contexts abuse social power, reinforce dominance, and create inequality and oppose it" Fairclough and Wodak (1997, pp. 271-80) argued that the general principles of CDA are:

1. It deals with social problems and Power relations are considered as discursive.

2. Discourse constitute culture and society and it performs an ideological work.

3. Discourses are historical. They mediate connection between society and text.

4. It is explanatory and interpretative. Social action shapes discourse.

2.3 Threat

The act of 'Threatening' is viewed as a way to improve mischief-makers by stopping them from making such mistakes and avoiding punishment.

Threat according to The American Heritage College Dictionary (1994) "is a declaration of an intention to inflict pain, evil, or punishments, an indication of impeding danger or damage to menace" (p.1070).

Merriam – Webster (1994) defines threat as an expression or warning on intent to inflict evil, injury, or damage an indication of something pending. Threats are purposeful speech acts since they are delivered by one person and convey person's intentions. Additionally, threats are described as unfavorable acts expressed in words that indicate the speaker intends to harm, worry, or annoy the hearer. This results in the intimidation of the hearer by subsequent disapproval, humiliation, and punishment unless the hearer does what is demanded. Searle (1985) (cited in Majeed (2022)) presents a classification of speech acts which includes directive, representatives, expressive, commissives, and declaration.

Leech (1983) mentions that threat in conflictive speech act whose illocutionary goal conflicts with the social goal , calling for negative effect ;i,e, speaker by performing destructive , disruptive , hostile and aggressive behavior goes against hearer's wishes or disregards their freedom of acting in their own will.

2.4 Types of Threat

Accordingly, in the book Ceremonial Violence, by Jonathan Fast, threats can be categorized into four types:

• A direct threat is a specific act against a specific target, made in an unambiguous manner. 'I am going to put a bomb in the gym.'

• An indirect threat is in, some manner, veild , vague, and ambiguous. 'I could kill everyone in this school.'

2.4.1 Direct Threat

Direct threat often mention both the victim, the type of harm intended to befall the victim, and the threatener as the agent of the harmful act:

(1) We will kill all of you.

 (2) I'm going to destroy your car.

Disregarding their level of credibility, the type of harm is mentioned as the fairly unspecific act of killing in (1) and the more precisely defined act of bombing in (2). The intended victims are designated as the rather fuzzy group of all of you in (1), and the car of the intended victim in (2). Finally, the threateners as agents are in both cases referred to by first person pronouns, plural we in (1) and singular I in (2). It is not unusual for threateners to use 1pl we to refer to themselves, even when there is in fact only one person behind the threat, "as if to instill credibility and fear through the invocation of a large and mysterious group" (Kadhim &Abbas ,2015 as cited in Simons & Tunkel, 2013: p. 203).

2.4.2 Indirect Threat

Generally speaking, Yule (1996: p.133) states that "whenever one of the forms (interrogative, imperative, or declarative) is employed to carry out a function other than (question, command, or statement), the outcome is an indirect speech act." Threatening speech, according to Tsohatizidis (1994: p17), is an indirect speech act that depends on the listener's understanding of what the speaker is trying to convey, e.g.

3. Don't you know I have a pistol?

Such a statement can be taken as menacing, it doesn't ask as to whether the recipient is aware that I am carrying a gun or not. Therefore, if the form of a statement does not fit the function, the speech act of threatening might be seen as an indirect speech act (Parker & Riley, 2005:19). Since we can do one illocutionary act through an indirect utterance in order to conduct another, we can threaten through a statement. (Horn and Ward, 2006:468"), e.g.

4. Now, you are dead.

As a result, the interpretation of an indirect threat is dependent on the context and has an intended meaning that differs from the threat's literal meaning. It is similar to the mother who addresses her son by saying:

5. Your father is coming.

In the event that the son does something wrong, Example (5) may be interpreted as a threat. If a mother asks her son to get ready to go out with his father, it may be construed as an order.

The concept of "non-literality" exists, as noted by Horn and Ward (2006: p468). It implies that we use language to convey a different meaning, e.g.

6. I receive my foe warmly.

It is uttered to threaten someone ironically. That is to say if he "my foe" comes, I kill him.

However, as Yule (1996: p. 133) notes, "humorous" is also expected; in other words, it is feasible to have a "comical effect" if a listener doesn't catch a speaker's indirect speech act, e.g.,

7. A. Don't you realize I could have killed you ten times by now?

   B. No, I don't know. (And walks away) Here, B instead of recognizing that A is threatening him, he replies to the question literally.

Section Three (Methodology)

3.1 Preliminary Remark

Chapter three presents in details the adopting methodology in this study and submits the description and selection of data by giving certain information about the two president.

3.2 Methodology of the Study

In the present study, quantitative and qualitative approaches to study are both recognized in the realm of research. In contrast to qualitative research, which places an emphasis on an individual's lived experience and subjective interpretation of events, quantitative research places a premium on data and accuracy. The qualitative method is achieved by examining the selected data according to the model(s) that are adopted in the study. The method helps to understand the texts sufficiently without statistics (Babbie, 2014, p50). Qualitative research works on social or political phenomenon, this is from one side. From the other side, the quantitative method is applied by the researchers to gain numerical and statistical results for the data analysis depending on different mathematical and statistical systems (Given, 2008, p.68).

3.3 Data Collection

Online websites are considered as one of the essential sources of political speeches. Since the previous periods the presidents choose websites to post heir

written and spoken speeches specially threatening speeches for its easiness, highly reached and seen by people. The data which is used in this research comes from the political speeches of the presidents Donald Trump and Vladimir Putin.

3.4 Data Description

The current study investigates six online threatening speeches from two political speeches of Putin the Russian president and Trump the American president.

3.5 Model of Analysis

The present study aims at analysis the linguistic factors of threat that existed in the speeches of two presidents which are collected as written from online websites and uncover the hidden ideological implication of them .So the researcher analyzed the collected data by using eclectic Fairclough Socio-Cultural model (1989) .

3.5.1 The description level (Text Analysis): Since the term "text" refers to more than only linguistic constructions like clauses and sentences, it can also refer to the analysis of both verbal and visual texts. The current level will put an emphasis on cohesive devices, figurative language and verb types.

3.5.2 The interpretative level (Discursive practice): It alludes to the steps involved in creating and analyzing the content. This dimension focuses on the relationship between the text's authors and its production context, as well as how the work is perceived by its audience. The focus right now is on modality.

3.5.3 The explanation level (Sociocultural practice): It is used to describe the parameters that control historical and social processes as a component of a social activity. In other words, the creation and reception are influenced by social activities. This aspect also demonstrates the connection between discourse, ideology, and power.

Section Four

(Data Analysis, Results and Discussion)

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the data analysis is presented and discussed. The findings of the study will be presented in the table for a better understanding of the significant findings of the study.

4.2 Data Analysis

Trum's Political Speeches

Extract (1)

"The United States has great strength and patience, but if it is forced to defend itself or its allies, we will have no choice but to totally destroy North Korea. Rocket Man is on a suicide mission for himself and for his regime." *(speech 1, Lines 152-154 ,2017,9,19).*

On the first level of Fairclough 's three dimensions, Trump uses passive voice in verb *(if it is forced)* to make focus on the contradict status that expects his opponents will force him to do as well as show an emphasis on the condition that will break America's and Trump's patience .

Trump uses *"it"* as anaphoric reference to United States, he regards it as a single unit with the possessive adjective *"its"* to in order to make connection with text. Further, Trump uses plural pronoun *"We"* as a reference to (himself and American forces), he also uses reflexive pronoun "*himself*" and possessive pronoun *"his"* that refer to the president of North Korea. Trump uses additive conjunction *"and"* for the sake of addition, and uses adversative conjunction *"but" to* show opposite between two notions, as well as conjunction *"or"* is also used to give further option.

On figurative language, Trump uses hyperbolic expression *"great"* to describe America's strength as if he is trying to frighten North Korea and force them to stop their misbehaving. He also uses metonymy by using word *"allies"* to symbolize the countries that assist him. President Trump tries to show America loyalty to its allies and tries to prevent North Korea grumbling. Irony in *"Rocket man is on a suicide mission for himself and for his regime"* is appeared to state his futuristic intention and expectation towards Kim Jong Un and to convey a meaning that's opposite of its literal meaning as a way to make vagueness and irony in his speech. Further, president Trump compares Kim Jong Un to Rocket man as metaphor to show similarities between Kim Jong On and character of rocket. In fact, within that comparison Trump shows his ideology or belief towards Kim Jong Un as he is danger and firing rockets a lot. Concerning repetition, he repeats *"and"* for the sake of producing clear and interconnected threat.

(Extract 2)

"**We will stop radical Islamic terrorism, because we cannot allow it to tear up our nation, and indeed, to tear up the entire world. We must deny the terrorists safe haven, transit, funding and any form of support for their vile and sinister ideology. We must drive them out of our nations."** *(Speech 1, Lines 207-210)*

Trump uses active voice with the model auxiliaries *(we will stop), (we cannot allow) ,(we must deny), and (we must drive)* to show focus on the subject and the necessity

of his action. Trump uses subject pronoun "*we*" as a reference to himself and America , he uses *"it"* as anaphoric reference to Islamic terrorism in which he regards it as a single unit and possessive adjective "*our"* is used that connects with possessive pronoun we to show their possession. As well as, he uses possessive adjective *"their"* that refers to the possession of Islamic terrorism in which he regards it as a group of people to show high average of connection in his threat

Trump uses *"and"* as additive conjunction and utilizes objective pronoun '*them* 'refers to the group of Islamic terrorism and possessive adjective '*our'*. Concerning collocation, he uses adjective + noun to form collocation of *(Islamic terrorism)* to specify the terrorism that America is threatening and it considers metonymy that symbolize the terrorist acts. Trump uses repetition of certain words including *"nation* " to reveal his interest in his nation's protection and repeats *"terrorists"* to reveal his enmity to the terrorist as well as he repeats pronoun *"we"* to show his insistence to speak on behalf of all people .

(Extract 3)

"It is time to expose and hold responsible those countries who support and finance terror groups like Al Qaida, Hezbollah, the Taliban and others that slaughter innocent people" *(Speech 1, Lines 211-213)*

The analysis of direct threat. Trump uses active voice verb in *"slaughter innocent people"* to reveal the crimes committed by terrorists.

Trump uses personal pronoun "*it"* is used as a reference to the present time. In addition, the president uses demonstrative pronoun *"those"* and *"that"* to demonstrate the goal that he insists to expose and hold responsibilities and to link and modify the groups that were supported by countries. Additive conjunction *"and"* thee times to link two items that modify subject and to link two items that modify the countries. Concerning collocation, he uses adjective and noun to form *"innocent people"* in which he shows sympathize with people who were affected by terrorist groups.

2- Discourse Practice (Interpretation) of extracts 1, 2 and 3

 Concerning the second level of analysis, in extract no.1 the president uses modal *"will''* which is preceded by conditional structure to signal the epistemic probability that has medium value in meaning of probability and shows the speaker's less truth of his proposition ..

 In extract no.2 the president reused modal *"will"* as a modal that reflects speaker's keen to do something and stated in the medium level of inclination. In this regard, Trump displays his extreme desire to stop movements of radical Islamic terrorism,

to show America's power that enables him to fight terrorists and he also uses model *"cannot allow"* which symbolizes disallow of the speaker.

3- Social Practice (Explanation) of extracts 1, 2 and 3

Trump on situational level in his first session before Americans assembly , starts with orally talking about *''defending its self and its allies''* mentioning that America's patience and strength are no longer existed if it will be obliged to defend itself and its citizens. Trump particularly addresses North Korea and its president as well as terrorist's movements that were supported by regimes including North Korea's regime and slaughter the innocent people as the target of his direct threat to frighten them and force them stop threatening America's nations.

On social level , Trump points out that united states face threats with rockets through comparing Kim Jong on with *"rocket man "*and the entire world faces radical Islamic terrorism that was supported by many countries including Al Qaida and Hezbollah. In addition, he mentions America's willingness to bring the end to Kim Jong On and his regime and shows up his sarcastic reaction towards his threat.

Putin's Political Speeches

1- Textual analysis (Description)

(Extract 1)

"As for the military sphere, today, modern Russia, even after the collapse of the USSR and the loss of a significant part of its capacity, is one of the most powerful nuclear powers in the world and possesses certain advantages in some of the newest types of weaponry. In this regard, no one should have any doubts that a direct attack on our country will lead to defeat and horrible consequences for any potential aggressor" (*speech 1*, *Lines 75-79, 2022/2/24*)

Putin uses active voice verb *"possesses"* and connecting it with modern Russia as the subject and advantages as object to show emphasis on Russia as the possessor. And concerning references he uses possessive adjectives as *"Its* "and *"our"* that refer to Russia 's possession and demonstrative references "that" in which he modifies doubts that he tries to make people dismiss

Putin uses additive conjunction *"and"* to combine his additional notions and uses adversative conjunction *"even"* to add something more than expectation about Russia, as well as temporal conjunction *"in this regards "*to combine his successive sentences and notions. Moreover, Putin utilizes *"military sphere"* as a collocation that regularly used by people. Putin also uses figurative language to show deep comprehension to his speech, he uses hyperbole in the phrase *"the most powerful nuclear powers"* in which he uses superlative structure and adjective to show his exaggeration hint in describing Russia's power. Also metonymy is used in *"modern*

Russia" to symbolize Putin's government, and uses the abbreviation *"USSR"* that symbolize the ancient Russian government led by Linen.

(Extract 2)

 "The course of events and the incoming information show that Russia's clash with these forces is inevitable. It is only a matter of time: they are getting ready; they are waiting for the right time. Now they also claim to acquire nuclear weapons. We will not allow this to happen." *(Speech 1, Lines 118-121)*

Putin uses active voice *"show", "claim" and "will now allow"*. To form his sentences uses cohesive devises to combine contents in term of references and conjunctions as well as collocations. Thus, he utilizes personal pronoun *"it"* that refers to Russia's clash t time after it Putin's reaction will change and he uses pronoun *"they"* to show his emphasis on NATO and Ukrainian forces, also he uses plural pronoun *"we"* that refers to him (president of Russia) and the Russian army. In addition, he uses adverbial demonstrative *"now"* that refers to the continuous claiming of having nuclear weapon.

He uses additive conjunction *"and"* for the purpose of adding additional items and uses collocation *"nuclear weapon"* to help him obviously reflect his point of view and full comprehension of Ukrainian claims and intention. Putin makes the use of hyperbole by the use of adjective *"inventible"* to show his exaggeration in describing his futuristic intention and his insistence of facing them and makes the repetition of pronoun "*they"* to illustrate that his hegemonic attitude is focusing on the groups that oppose Putin.

(Extract 3)

 "I decided to launch a special military operation, its goal is to protect people who have been subjected to abuse and genocide by the regime in Kyiv for eight years. And for this, we will pursue the demilitarization and denazification of Ukraine, as well as bringing to justice those who committed numerous bloody crimes against civilians, including citizens of the Russian Federation." (*Speech1, Lines 129-136)*

Putin makes the use of active voice as in "*I decided"* and *"we will pursue"* to express the action and its agent. In addition, he uses passive voice "*people who have been subjected"* to make obscurity in term of the agent . Putin uses personal pronouns *" I"* that refers to himself (Russia's president) and uses "Its" that refers to the goal that possessed by military operations , Putin also uses Plural pronoun *"we"* that refers to himself and Russia's military . Furthermore, Putin utilizes selective nominal demonstrative *" this"* that refers to near single entity which is the goal of Russia that he implies it is the closest and the only idea in Putin's mind at this period

, he uses *"those"* that refers to close group of people .Putin makes the use of additive conjunction *"and"* and *"as well as"* to combine his notions and for the sake of adding further attitudes towards people , he uses causal conjunction "for this "that combines the result of Peoples' persecution in Kyiv. Putin utilizes collocations *"military operation"* and *"bloody crimes"* these two collected expressions are utilized since they are common in public life of Russia people.

According to figurative language Putin tends to use hyperbole with the use of adjective *"bloody"* in which he exaggerates in describing the crimes in Kyiv, that reflects his ideology towards the severity of people there.

2- Discourse Practice (Interpretation) of extract 1, 2 and 3

Concerning discourse analysis Putin in extract no .1, with the production of his speech tends to use modal verbs that reflect his implied meaning during the production of his speech. Furthermore, it shows his demanded attitudes on the side of liners. On the basis of that , Putin makes the use of modal *"Should''* that signals deontic meaning of supposition and places in the middle of obligation scale which encodes that the speaker gives require , supposed and allowed meanings to the listeners.

On the basis of extract, no .2, Putin and Russia in particular are facing unity of countries that cooperate with Ukraine as a way to unified their forces against Russia. Therefore, Russia and Putin particularly tends to response against the cooperated countries who work and prepare to improve nuclear weapons that was against Russia conditions. Thus, concerning modality Putin's speech is formed with the use of adjective *"inevitable"* which marks a high value on epistemic scale to denote the epistemic meaning of certainty. On the basis of that, he is certain of Russia's clash with the cooperated countries and those countries are going to face clash with Russian army that will fight at undefined time. In addition, Putin makes the use of verb "*allowed"* that gives allowance or permission as one of its significance and placed in the low rate of obligation.

In extract no.3 Putin remarks after the series of body crimes among innocent people in Kyiv, show his amount of keen through the use of modal *"will''*. Thus, Putin and Russian army show their extreme desire to pursue the demilitarization and punishing criminals in Ukraine.

3- Social Practice of Extracts 1, 2 and 3

On the third level of Fairclouph's model and particularly on situational level, Putin's speech pertains an aspect of communicative events that reveals to Russian and Ukrainian audience. Further expansion of the NATO infrastructure and the beginning of military development in Ukraine's territories as in''*I am referring to*

the expansion of the NATO to the east'' was one of the aspects that urges Putin to threat. His disagreement with NATO makes him look put of any NATO's movements, makes him prepare Russian army and reminds them of nuclear weapon that remains the most powerful power even after the collapse of UUSR. Moreover, he mentions the infringement that people of Kiev suffer from as well as the internal betrayed that Russia faced in the current period. Putin seeks to reveal his ideology and consideration towards NATO and America in their attempts to expand with Ukraine, he regards it as policy of containment of Russia and spying on their movements. On the other hand, he declares his response, outrage at and condemnation of Persecution and kill process faced by People in Kiev as well as Russian people.

On Social level, Putinism ideology in which he focuses on the social rehabilitation of the territories of the Soviet Union and hostile to the West, forces him as the president of Russia and leader of military process to protect Russia with its citizen from the possibility of NATO to intervene and spy. On the other hand, his threats against Kiev's regime shows his desire to protect Ukrainian society that supports him and Russian citizens from Ukraine regimes that abuse those people

4.3 The Findings of Trump's and Putin's Textual Analysis

Table 1 *The Frequency and Percentage Textual Analysis of Both Presidents*

Model	Frequency	Percentage
V Types 1. **Active** (13) 2. **Passive** (2)	15	22%
Cohesive Devices 1. **References** (26) 2. **Conjunctions** (12) 3. **Collocations** (6)	44	66%
Figurative Language 1. **Hyperbole** (4) 2. **Irony** (1) 3. **Metonymy** (2) 4.**Metaphor** (1) 5.**Repetition** (5)	8	12%
Total	67	100%

This table shows that the selected presidents mostly use cohesive devices, it is used 44 times with rate 66% in which references are utilized rather than others and utilized colocations as the least of all. As for the second highest category, presidents employ figurative language with a total of 8 times and with rate 12% of the textual categories. The most used figure of speech is repetition and the least is Irony and Metaphor. In term of verbs, passive and active voice are utilized 15 times (22 %) in which active voice verbs are highly used.

4. 4 The Findings of Trump's and Putin's Discourse Analysis

Table 2 *The Frequency and Percentage of Modality in Trump's Extracts.*

Modality	1	2	3	Frequency	Percentage
1-Probabiliy	1			1	20%
2- Possibility					
3 –Certainty		2			
4- Keen		1		2	40%
5- Willingness				1	20%
6- Allowed		1			
7- Supposed				1	20%
Total				5	100

The above table that is concerned with Trump's usage of modality, and it shows that Trump uses meaning of certainty more than others, its repeated in 40% percentage of the total percentage.

Table 3 *The Frequency and Percentage of Modality in Putin's Extracts.*

Modality	1	2	3	Frequency	Percentage
1-Probabiliy					
2- Possibility					
3 –Certainty		3			
4- Keen				3	50,5%
5- Willingness					
6- Allowed			1	1	16,5%
7. Supposed		1			
				1	16,5%

	1			1	16,5%
Total				6	100

The above table that is concerned with Putin's usage of modality shows that Trump uses meaning of certainty more than others , its repeated in 50,5% percentage of the total percentage .

4.5 Discussion of Results

Stand Points can be made after having a look at the results.

1- The result of the textual analysis reveals that president tend to use cohesive devices and followed by figurative language to form their threats this indicates their willing to use high level of linguistic elements for the sake of making threat . In addition, active and passive verbs are the least of them to their focus on the use liking vocabularies and the shared knowledge elements.

2- In regard of certainty meaning, it could be said that Putin, depending on the results, seems to use it more than Trump through his insistence and emphasis of some aspects of threat and it is done with various linguistic elements including modal verbs, adjectives and adverbs.

Section Five

5.1 Conclusions

The researcher is going to highlight the essential conclusions concerning the hypothesis that some of them were verified and neglected and were investigated depending on the results that were discussed. For instance, first hypothesis (*The most frequently used linguistic tools are cohesive devices and active, passive verbs)*. The findings show that these tools are used in presidents' threat. However, the results indicate that the most *frequent* tools are cohesive devices and figurative language, which verifies part of the hypothesis and reject the other.

The second hypothesis that states (*Putin seems to be more certain in conducting his threat than Trump*) is verified by the findings in which it stated that Putin seems to be more confident in the truth of his speeches.

References

Al-Utbi, M. I. K. (2019). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Hate Speech. *Journal of the College of Languages (JCL), (39),* 19–40. https://doi.org/10.36586/jcl.2.2019.0.39.0019

Austin, J. L (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of language.* London: Longman. [8]

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 121-138). London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. L (2001b). "Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research". In R. Wodak, and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods*

of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for social*

research. New York: Routledge.

Jahedi, M., Abdullah, F. S. & Mukundan, J. (2014). An Overview of Focal Approaches of Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies, 2* (4), 28-35.

Lafta, A. H., & Mustafa, S. S. (2022). Ideological Polarization as a Deception Strategy in the Discourse of American Think Tanks: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *Journal of the College of Languages (JCL), (45*), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.36586/jcl.2.2022.0.45.0001

Majeed, Rimah .(2022).84A Pragmatic Analysis of Illocutionary Act in Selected Presidential Speech on COVID-19.*Journal of the college of languages,(45),*48-107. https://doi.org/10.36586/jcl.2.2022.0.45.0084.

Muhammed, M. M., & Flaifel, M. S. (2015). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the 2012 American Presidential Election Debates. *Journal of the College of Languages* (JCL), (32). https://jcolang.uobaghdad.edu.iq/index.php/JCL/article/view/143

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning.* Cambridge University Press

Searle, J. R. (1985). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts. Cambridge* University Press

Van Dijk, T. (1998). Ideology: *A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London:

Sage.

Van Dijk, T., A.(2001). Multidisciplinary Critical Discourse Analysis: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T., A. (2003). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D.Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (ed), *The Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Maiden, MA: Blackwell.