

دراسة التحوط في خطابي اوباما وترامب

تحليل خطاب

رسل داود سلمان النصراوي

قسم هندسة الطاقة - كلية الهندسة / المسيب / جامعة بابل

بابل - العراق

The Study of Hedge In Obama and Tramp's Speeches

A Pragmatic Analysis

Rusul Dawood Salman Al-Nasrawi

Dept. of Energy Engineering -College of Engineering/ Al-Mussaib-

University of Babylon

Babylon- Iraq

Rusu2016dawood@gmail.com

Abstract

Hedge is a linguistic phenomenon of full commitment . Hedging can be viewed as a pragmatic phenomenon and the interpretation is based on the context of situations. Any linguistic unit can be characterized as a hedge whether in speeches or writings.

e.g. “ **I think** it's a little odd”. { the underlined word is a hedge }.

“**I think** about you all the time”. { the underlined word is not a hedge }.

In the previous examples , there are a different interpretations , once the speaker decides that is a hedge in the first sentence , while in the second he views it as not a hedge . This is depending on the pragmatic factors .

Hedges are used in the literary words to make the reader or listener wonders because the use of vague language. Thus , the study aims to clarify this vagueness by identifying hedges and assigning the hedges strategies in Obama and Tramp's speeches and describes the hedges that are used in these speeches .The researcher touched through the study to illustrate the hedge definitions and classifications in section two while section three demonstrated the strategies. The language that used in hedging illustrated in section four whereas section five clarified the data analysis. The research ends with conclusions and references .

Key words : hedges , commitment , lexical hedges.

المخلص

يعتبر التحوط ظاهرة لغوية تحتوي على الالتزام , و يعتمد تفسيرها على سياق الكلام . تعمل ظاهرة التحوط كغطاء لغوي يستخدم في الخطابات والكتابات .

اما في فعلى سبيل المثال " اعتقد انها غريبة بعض الشيء" فكلية "اعتقد" تحوط المثال الثاني "افكر فيك طوال الوقت" , كلمة " افكر" ليس تحوطا .

هناك تفسيرات مختلفة في الامثلة السابقة في الجملة الاولى يعتبر تحوطا بينما في الجملة الثانية لا يعتبر تحوطا وذلك يعزو الى عوامل تداولية.

يستخدم التحوط بالكلمات الادبية لجعل اللغة غامضة ولكي يجعل القارئ او المستمع يتساءل . تهدف الدراسة الى توضيح هذا الغموض من خلال تحديد تلك التحوطات وتعين استراتيجيات التحوط في خطابي اوباما و ترامب ووصف التحوطات المستخدمة فيها .تطرق الباحث خلال الدراسة لتوضيح ماهية التحوط واستراتيجياتها بالإضافة الى تحليل البيانات .ينتهي البحث بالاستنتاجات والمصادر . تم الافتراض بان افعال النموذج قد تم استخدامها اكثر من الاستراتيجيات الاخرى.

الكلمات المفتاحية : التحوط , الالتزام , التحوطات المعجمية.

1-Introduction

Hedging is a rhetorical approach that can be illustrated by imposing a certain structure or a specific type of utterance on which the speaker does not fully commit to either the class membership of an item within the utterance (content mitigation) or the utterance meant illocutionary force (force mitigation). As a result ,the attenuation within which the utterance has full value (Fraser,2010:201).

The researcher tackles with Obama and Trump speeches. The first speech is given by Obama in opposition to the Iraq war, while the second is given by Trump in his first inaugural address.

The goal of hedging is to improve the discourse and the act of communication by improving the language that is used.

Hedging is a challenging topic to be grasped in linguistics. It covers subjects such as pragmatics, semantics, logic, and language philosophy (Shoroder and Zimme, 1997, quoted in Bashir et al, 2018:60).

Hedging is a linguistic phenomenon that conveys the grammatical and lexical cognizance that can be stated to be a hedge in the context of situation. (Bloomer and Bloomer , 2007:103). Lakooof shares this viewpoint, stating that natural language notions have hazy bounds and fuzzy edges (1972:183-195).

Distinct researchers, such as Crompton (1997), Hyland (1996), (1998), Myers (1989), Salager –Meyer (1994), (1997), have offered different meanings to Hedges.

According to Myers (1989:13), a science that seems a claim however it includes no hedging is most in all likelihood no longer assertion of new understanding (Livytska ,2019:38).

Every one of us **need to infer** himself into social conversations to **exhibit** our thoughtfulness in our social interactions. When a listener or a reader is unable to understand, grammatical **classes might also be shaped** in order to fulfill grammatical **that means** as a **complement** to lexical **characteristic all through** the **verbal exchange** process.

(Abdul- Majeed, 2010)

Hyland shares this viewpoint; he categorizes hedges in scientific speech based totally on their language reality and pragmatic cause in the literature (Hyland 1996a, 1996b). He goes on to say that hedging is usually articulated through modal verbs [would, may, could, should, should, will], epistemic adjectives, epistemic adverbs, and nouns (Marta, 2019:1532). (Ibid).

Hedges are further divided into two categories by Lakoff (1977: 28-29): lexical hedges and sentential hedges.

e.g. “ **it’s all kind of funny , isn’t it**”.

“I think everyone knows they are unhappy”.

"I believe everyone is aware that they are miserable."

As an example of lexical hedging, in the first line, the hedge mitigates the single adjectival lexical item " funny" whereas in the second sentence, the hedge mitigates the entire speech act (Lafi , 2011: 8).

It is critical for the speaker to possess conversational abilities that need the creation and use of hedges.

Hedges are techniques that used to lessen the effect of a speech. They may be adjectives or adverbs, however they also can incorporate clauses. Furthermore, due to the fact hedges are so essential withinside the system of communication, they're used purposefully or by chance in spoken and written language. Hedges resource audio system and writers withinside the correctness and truthfulness in their assessments (Do Thi Kim Cuc, 2013,No .p).

Hedge can be divided into two types:

1-Approximations: those that have an effect on propositions' truth conditions.

"His feet were sort of blue," for example.

2-Shields: they have no effect on the truth circumstances, which reflect the severity of the situation.

e.g. “ I think his feet were blue “ (Prince et al, 1982:85).

2-1 Hedging/ Hedges

Hedging is seemed as a language prevalence that may be represented each orally and in writing. It also can be interpreted as a communicative technique that weakens the illocutionary force of the sentence, making it sound hard or unfriendly at

the contrary Lakoff became the first one who initially introduced Hedge (1972). He described hedges as phrases or expressions which might be used to make matters fuzzier or much less fuzzier, and he said that they're used to decrease the which means of expressions such as [kind of, a little bit] or to beautify the which means of expressions such as [very, really, very]. As a result, the idea of hedges became tested from the perspective of politeness, as mentioned through Brown and Levinson (1978).. It's recognized as [Speech Act Hedging] (Lakoff,1972:195). They start through defining the term "facial threatening acts" and growing high-quality politeness techniques, i.e. techniques for keeping off grievance via high-lighting fixtures friendlessness and solidarity. Hedges, in keeping with Brown and Levinson (Ibid), have the capacity to soften and improve a phrase.

Furthermore, hedging employs linguistic techniques to weaken commitment to a statement for the functions of politeness, as described by Brown and Levinson, or to make what someone says or does " more palatable to other people". As a result, writers write something long-winded and uncertain, such as:

- ' I just wondering if you'd got my email ' rather than ' did you get my email ? ' .
- ' I think you've got the wrong number ' rather than ' wrong number ' .

The above phrases can be considered normal behavior and it is best to show that there is no respect for someone else's feelings. People have different views on language, or [those who provide "professional" language advice] have in mind that the term " hedging" is the enemy of effective communication. Therefore, all these concerns are related to the culture of humanity [Internet resources 1].

2-1-1 Classifications of Hedges

Hedge classifications vary of their procedures to research. From a practical standpoint, Prince et al (1982) positioned forth the primary influential one. Hedges may be traced again to the Nineteen Eighties in phrases of pragmatics, after which to the Nineties in phrases of semantics. Hedges are not hazy withinside the equal manner that semantic and pragmatic hedges are. They do not have an effect on the statement's clarified meanings; rather, they mirror the speaker's communicative intent, which reasons the implication effects.

Hedges have a large effect in pragmatics, and they may be incredible manner to communicate. Hedges are divided into categories: In the field of pragmatics, approximators and shields are used. In a communicative setting, approximators can modify people's perceptions of debate topics and the unique which means of discourse structure. Approximators, in different words, can alternate the real cost of discourse, or make a certain degree of changes relying at the facts, or offer a selected variety of version to the unique discourse . Adaptors (**phrases that make sure modifications to the unique meanings of discourse**) and rounders (**phrases that make certain**

modifications to the unique meanings of discourse) are subclasses of approximators (are the ones phrases that offer certain range of of variation).

Shields do now no longer adjust the content material or actual cost of conversation; instead, they serve to transmit speakers' reservations or misgivings approximately the discourse, in addition to reveal speakers' perspectives not directly on the way to mood the tone. Shields are break up into subcategories as approximators: plausibility shields and attribution shields (Tang ,2013 :155) . Gribanova & Gaidukova (2019 :88) mention another taxonomy of hedge by Salager- Meyer (1995) as follows :

Table (1) *Classifications of Hedges*

1.shields	<i>[Can ,could , may ,might , would , to appear , to seem , probably , to suggest]</i>
2.Approximators of Degree , quantity ,frequency ,& time	<i>[Approximately , roughly , about , often , occasionally]</i>
3.Hedging Expressing personal doubt & direct involvement	<i>[I believe , to our knowledge , It is our view that ..]</i>
4.Emotionally charged intensifiers	<i>[Extremely difficult/interesting , of particular importance , unexpectedly]</i>
5.Compound hedges	<i>[Could be suggested , would seem likely ,would see somewhat]</i>

3-Hedges Strategies

There are six strategies used to view hedging:

1- [Epistemic modality]

e.g. (" The war maylast for two weeks ")

2-[Likelihood modalities]

e.g.("It is probably the beginning of a comprehensive war that transfer us from bad to worse") .

3-[Sender-Receiver Solidarity (we)]

e.g.(" we know that Iraq has no mass destructive weapons").

4-[Hypothetical Devices]

(" If we fight Iraq for its short illegal occupation of Kuwait, then why do not we fight others for their long illegal occupation of our lands").

5-[Questions]:

e.g. (" When this nation will wake up"?).

6-[Impersonal attribution]

e.g. ("According to the reports , the Iraqi president still endangers the neighboring countries") (Abeer et al , 2011:187).

The lexical hedges such as : 'may' , ' probably 'believe', 'perhaps', 'some' and 'think' characterized by a lack of commitment as an attempt by senders who are in no way seeking to defend themselves in opposition to any possible criticism.

4-Language Used in Hedging

Before we cross into the hedging language, there may be an issue that needs to be addressed: what is the hedging language?

Hedging language is regularly called cautious or ambiguous language. As a noun, a hedge refers to a cautious, ambiguous, or evasive statement. If hedge is used as a verb, it refers to refusing to reply a question, make a clear, direct remark, or commit to a certain action or conclusion [Internet resources, 2]. Hedging terms and phrases are matters that individuals write or say to soften , easy or smooth their words, in addition to restrict or qualify assertions and declarations.

People who are already used to hedging in news reports wherein journalists use the word 'allegedly' — partially due to the fact that remarks they make are not constantly powerful, and in part as it gives a protection for them if challenged with the report's content, shielding them from criticism and probable legal action (Ibid).

- 1- **[Introductory verbs]** : e.g. {seem , tend , look like ,appear to , think , believe , doubt , be sure , indicate ,suggest} .
- 2- **[Certain lexical verbs]** : e.g.{ believe , assume , suggest }.
- 3- **[Modal verbs]** : e.g. {will , must , would , may , might , could} .
- 4- **[Adverbs of frequency]** : e.g. {often , sometimes , usually} .
- 5- **[Modal adverbs]** : e.g. {certainly , definitely , clearly , probably , possibly , perhaps , conceivably} .
- 6- **[Modal adjectives]** : e.g. {certain , definite , clear , probable , possible }.
- 7- **[Modal nouns]** : e.g.{ assumption , possibility , probability }.
- 8- **[That- clauses]** : e.g.{ It could be the case that }
{It might be suggested that}
{there is very hope that}
- 9- **[To-clause + adjectives]** : e.g. {It may be possible to obtain}
{It is important to develop}
{It is useful to study}
- 10- **[If-clause]** : e.g. _if true , “our study contradict the math that men make better mangers than women” [Internet resources3] .

5- Data Analysis

The following tables show the hedging language of Obama and Trump's speeches , the number of occurrence of each type and the percentages can be extracted by calculating the total number of categories and dividing it over the number of each type multiplied by 100 :

Obama's Hedging

<i>Category</i>	<i>Hedging</i>	<i>Times of Occurrence</i>	<i>Percentages</i>
1-Introductory Verbs	-("To make sure that ") -("Current allies like Russia") -("That Nations like Pskestine & India") -("Let's fight to make sure ")	4	20%
2-Certain Lexical Verbs	0	0	0%
3-Modal Verbs	-("that we could begin") -("Those who would slaughter") -("I would willingly") -(" would be better off") -("Iraq will require a U.S.") -("without strong international support will only fan ") -("we may have occasion") -("we will not travel") -("nor should we allow") -("who would march ") -("who would prove ")	11	55%
4-Adverbs of Frequency	0	0	0%
5-Model Adverbs	0	0	0%
6-Modal Adjectives	0	0	0%
7- Modal Nouns	0	0	0%
8-That –clause	-("a shutting down of the financial network that supper terrorism") -("let's fight to make sure that the U.N.") -("the countless' wars that rage across the globe") -("an energy policy that does not simply serve we need to fight") -("the civil war was ... that we could begin")	4	20%
9- To –clause	-("Let's fight to wean ourselves off")	1	5%
10- If –clause	0	0	0%

Trump's Hedging

Category	Hedging	Times of Occurrence	Percentages
1-Introductory Verbs	-("we believe that no nation should have a disproportionate share of burden")	1	1.31%
2-Certain Lexical Verbs	-("we believe that no nation should have a disproportionate share of burden")	1	1.31%
3-Modal Verbs	-("they will emerge from these hardships") -("we will be spending") -("our military will soon be the strongest") -("diverse nations could corporate") -("we must begin") -(" I will always put America first ") -("your countries will always & shall always put your countries first ") -("the united states will forever be a great") -("we can no longer be taken advantage") -(" I will defend America ") -("we will slide down ") -("we must fulfill our sovereign duties") -(" we must protect our nation") -("we must reject threats") -("we must work together") -("evil will triumph") -("some nations would not only trade") -("such a regime but would arm") -("we will have no choice") -("this will not be necessary") -("we must do much") -("Iran's government must stop supporting") -("the day will come") -("all reasonable nations must work together") -("we will stop radical Islamic terrorism") -("we must deny the terrorists")	47	61%

	<p>-("we must derive them") -("our security interests will dictate the length") -("united nation must reform") -("it could actually accomplish") -("we believe that no nation should have to bear...") -("the world must take a greater role") -("we will not lift") -("I would like to thank readers") -("this trade must be fair & it must be reciprocal") -("America will pursue") -("it will depend ") -("we must never forget ") -("if we will not build") -("we must solve our problems") -("we will be vulnerable") -("we would we were ") -("we would give our lives") -("our answer will be a renewal ") -("we will fight together")</p>		
4-Adverbs of Frequency	0	0	1.31%
5-Model Adverbs	0	0	1.31%
6-Modal Adjectives	0	0	1.31%
7- Modal Nouns	0	0	1.31%
8-That-clause	<p>-("it was built on the vision that diverse nation") -("the Marshall Plan was built on the noble idea that the whole world is safer") -("it is an internal credit to the American character that even after we") -("it is an outrage that some nations would not only trade") -("it was based on the vision that...") -("it is time for North Korea to realize that ...") -("it is time to the entire world ..that Iran's government end ") -("citizens of other nations that they have.") -("the entire world</p>	10	13.15%

	<i>understands that the good people."</i> <i>-(."to the united nations that some governments with")...</i>		
9- To -clause	<i>-(("it is a profound honor to understand</i> <i>-(it is forced to defend itself")</i> <i>-(("it is time for North Korea to realize")</i> <i>-(("it is time for all nations to work together")</i> <i>-(("it is far past time for the nations of the world to confront")</i> <i>-(("it is time for the entire world to join us.".)</i> <i>-(("it is time for the regime to free all Americans")</i> <i>-(("it was greatly honored to address the readers ...")</i> <i>-(("it is time to expose .".)</i>	8	10.52%
10- If-clause	<i>-(("if we desire to lift up our citizen")</i> <i>-(("if we aspire to the approval of history")</i> <i>-(("if the righteous many do not confront the wicked few")</i> <i>-(("if it is forced to defined itself or it allies")</i> <i>-(("if its provides cover for the eventual construction of a nuclear program ")</i> <i>-(("if it is to be an effective partner")</i> <i>-(("if it could actually accomplish all its stated goals")</i> <i>-(("if we are to embrace the opportunities of the future")</i> <i>-(("if we will not build strong families ")</i>	9	11.84%

6-Conclusions

Hedging are nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives that belong to diverse speech portions. Hedging's cause and meanings are derived no longer most effective structurally, however additionally contextual .

It is found that all the words may not be categorized as hedges, in particular in the event that they offer no pragmatic cause. It can be inferred that hedging, as an operational function of political speech, enables politicians to commit themselves to the wards that they declare with a purpose to gain acceptability and reduce threats to their management position. It is a phrase that has to do with syntax and pragmatics. It has an effect on the conduct of the addressee and his comprehension of the communication process.

The findings confirmed that hedge is perceived inside the community via ways of means of collaborating in conversations; this act may be advanced by developing the community by adding new vocabularies to the language in order to enrich the hedge language.

In addition to the aforementioned, the employment of hedging words and phrases is a deliberate choice or planned preference with a purpose, no longer a dependency in ones' conduct thorough out his/her life. As a result, the use of hedging is elective rather than mandatory, and the individual utilizes it as needed to soften what he or she says.

7-References

- Abeer ,T. Q. Saidat , Rafayah , E.M. , Hussein .A., Sadat , & Ahmed M. (2011). *Hedging In Political Jordin Discourse* . Al-Hussein Bin Talal University , Ma'an Jordin.
- Adul Majeed , R.K. (2010). *Analysis of Grammatical Forms & Semantic Functions of Hedging in Political Discourse* . American Presidential Debates. Vol.21 (3).
- Bashir , I. , Yunus , K. Al-jarrah . T.M. International Journal of Linguistics, Vol.8 , No.7 ; 2018 issue 1923-869x. E. issue 1923-8703. Published by Canadian Center of Science & Education . Modal Verbs Hedging : *The Uses & Functions of " Will" & " Shall"*.
- Bloomer, M . & Bloomer , T . (2007). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Do Thi Kim Cuc. (2013). *A Study of the Linguistic Features of Hedging Devices in Lectures in English*. University of Danang.
- Fraser, B. (2010). *Hedging in Political Discourse*. The 2007– Bush (the press-conference) .
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- Griбанова ,T . I & Gaidukova , T.M. (2019). *Hedging to Different Types of Discourse* .Journal : Training , Language , & Culture. Vol.3. Issue 2

- Lafi , A. W. (2011). Conventional Indirectness , Questions , & Hedge as Negative Politeness Strategies. College of Arts , University of Basrah.
- Livytska , I. (2019). The Use of Hedging in Research Articles on Applied Linguistics. Ukrainian State: Pedagogical University Ukraine . Journal of language and cultural Education , 7(1) issue 1339-4584.
- Lakoff G. (1972). Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts, Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 1972, – 183- 228. Reprinted in: Journal of Philosophical Logic, 1973 .
- Price , E , F, et al .(1982) . On Hedging in Physician Discourse In Linguistics and Professions. J. di Pietro (ed) Newjersey : Ablex
- Tang , J . (2013). Pragmatics Functions of Hedges & Politeness Principles. School of Foreign languages , Shandong Jiaotong University. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English literature . Vol.2 .No. 4 ; July 2013.
- <https://allthingslinguistics.com/> [1].
- <https://www.bing.com/search?q=Hedging+language+is+known+as+cautious+language> [2]
- www.Uefap.com/Writing & www-di-inf-puc-rio.bra-endler/student/hedging-Handout.Pdf [3].
- -Obama's Speech Against The Iraqi War. January 20 v , 2009
- <https://www.npr-org/templates/story/story.php?StoryId=99591469>.
- Full text :Trump's 2017 U.N. speech transcript .
- [scodis . com/ for-students / glossary hedging hedges/](http://scodis.com/for-students/glossary/hedging-hedges/).