A Pragmalinguistic Study of Threat and Warning in English and Arabic

دراسة تداولية لغوية للتهديد والتحذير في اللغة الإنكليزية و العربية

جامعة بغداد / كلية التربية ـ ابن رشد/ قسم اللغة الانجليزية

Wisam Ali Khadim, MA Candidate   وسام علي كاظم

wisamalialshawi@yahoo.com

Asst. Prof. Omran Moosa Mahood (Ph.D.)   ا.م.د عمران موسى ماهود

Abstract

This research project deals with the aspects of threats and warnings as speech acts or as verbal actions performed by speakers. Threat is one speech act defined as the act of declaration of hostile determination to be inflicted in retribution for or conditionally upon some course, whereas warning is the act of intimation or notice of something as about to happen. Obviously, there is a close relation and inherent tensions between them. How can speakers assume that the intended illocutionary force will be recognized by the hearer? A speech act of threatening, especially a conditional one, overlaps with warning. For example:

"I am going to kill you if you don't return my car."

In this paper, we present two bodies of research focusing on two different kinds of speech acts in Arabic and English.   In performing threats, as it is hypothesized, the most agentive participant is the speaker but in warnings it is the hearer. It is concluded that in both languages, warning is the negative of advice and threat is the negative of promise.

الخلاصـــه

مشروع البحث هذا يَتعاملُ مع سماتَ التهديداتِ والتحذيراتِ كأفعال الخطابية او كأعمال شفوية أدّتْ مِن قِبل المتكلمين. التهديد هو عمل خطابي مُعَرَّف كفعل إعلانِ التصميم العدائي الّذي سَيُوقَعُ في العقوبةِ ل أو بشكل مشروط على مَسَار مَا، بينما التحذير فعلُ تنويهٍ أو مُلاحظةِ الشيءِ على وشك الحَدَوث. من الواضح، هنالك علاقة وثيقة وتوَتّرات متأصّلة بينهم. كَيْفَ يَفترض المتكلمون بأنّ القوةَ الخطابية المقصودة سَتَكُونُ معروفة مِن قِبل السامعِ؟ العمل الخطابي التَهديدي، خصوصاً الشرطي، يتداخل مع التحذير. على سبيل المثال:

"سَأَقْتلُك إذا لم تُرجعُ سيارتَي."

في هذه القِرْطَاس ، نُقدّمُ إثنان مِنْ مَجْامُيعَ البحثِ نُركّزُ على نوعين مختلفينِ مِنْ الأعمال الخطابية في اللغة العربية وإنجليزية. في إداء التهديداتِ، كما هو مُفتَرَضُ، المشتركِ الأكثر تاثير وفاعلية هو المتكلّمُ لكن في التحذيراتِ هو السامعُ. يُستَنتجُ بأنّ في في كلتا اللغتين، التحذير هو الصورة السلبية للنصيحةِ والتهديدِ هو الصورة السلبية للوعدِ.

Key Words

Threat: التهديد, Warning: التحذير, Directives: الافعال التوجيهية , Commissives: التَّكْلِيفية Prophetic, Verses: الايات التوراتية, Biblical, Pragmalinguistics: علم اللغة التداولي, الافعال Hadith: الحديث النبوي, Locutionary acts: الافعال القولية, Illocutionary acts: الافعال الخطابية Request-performatives: الانشاء غير الطلبي, Non-request-performatives: الاثرالكلامي, Performative meaning: معنى الاداء اللغوي, Perlocutionary act: مُؤْذٍ :Malefactive, الانشاءُ الطّلبي مُهْلِك، Benefactive: نافع, Indirect, Non-literal and Implicit Speech Acts: الأعمال الخطابية Al-musnad ilaihi , شَرْوط موفقة ملاءمة :Felicity Conditions, الضمنية وغير الحرفية والغير مباشرة and al-musnad: المسند و المسند اليه.

1.   Pragmalinguistics

The term 'pragmatics' is firstly used in Morris' (1938) general theory of signs (a semiotic model), where pragmatics refers to the relationship of the sign to the sign user. الخليفة (2007: 225) who is a Classical Arabic scholar, like others, assumes that rhetoric including the speech act theory of Arabic has been introduced first by the interpreters of the Glorious Qur'an and the Prophetic Hadith that require a great centre of attention on the rhetoric aspects of language which help them to work out the intended meaning. In short, pragmatics is (1) the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener, (2) the analysis of what people mean and (3) the study of circumstances, contextual meaning (how more is communicated than what is said). Pragmatics investigates the relationship between linguistic forms and their uses (purpose, goal, intention); use of language for interaction (the interpersonal function) (السكاكي, 1981: 35; Bussmann, 1996: 927; Yule, 1996:3; حسان, 2004b: 347; المخزومي , 2005: 242).

Pragmatics can hardly be considered an independent field of study (as is the case for phonology); it is related to many approaches (without clear-cut boundaries). Leech and Thomas divide Pragmatics into two areas: pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics (Verschueren, 1999: 496; Rose and Kasper, 2001: 2). Pragmalinguistics is pragmatically oriented studies in text linguistics, used to refer to the linguistic end of pragmatics where structural study is followed (Wales, 1989: 368). Leech (1983: 11) shows that pragmalinguistics is a branch of general pragmatics associated with syntax and semantics, whereas sociopragmatics is related to sociology, a communication-oriented sub-discipline.

The major division in treatments of linguistic meaning is between semantics and pragmatics. Unfortunately, there are no fully agreed definitions of the two fields. A very rough working distinction is that semantics is concerned with the stable meaning resources of language-as-a-system and pragmatics with the use of that system for communicating, on particular occasions and in particular contexts. But that characterization leaves a number of disagreements unresolved. So, issues like deixis are controversial for being whether a pragmatic or semantic phenomenon. If used to place utterances in contexts, deictic expressions are part of

pragmatics; if used as factors establishing truth conditions of sentences, they are semantic (Bussmann, 1996: 877).

The central topics of Pragmalinguistics are those aspects of meaning which are dependent on context. Two are of particular importance. The first type goes under the name of conversational implicature, which refers to meanings which a speaker intends to convey, but does not explicitly express. The second type of context-dependent meaning concerns expressions which designate different things, places, or times in the world, in different contexts: this table, over there, last night (Bussmann, 1996: 877).

Speech act theory systematically classifies types of speech acts and the ways in which they can be performed. Speakers can perform actions while making utterances, and the actions performed via utterances are called speech acts (e.g., threat, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, request). The speaker normally expects that his communicative intention will be recognized by the hearer. An action performed by producing an utterance consists of three related acts, namely, the so-called (1) locutionary acts (الافعال القولية): basic act of utterance, producing a meaningful linguistic expression; actual forms of words used by the speaker and their semantic meaning (Austin, 1962: 92-95; ابن قيم الجوزية، 1977:34), (2) illocutionary acts الافعال الخطابية: what the speaker is doing by uttering those words, (3) perlocutionary act الاثرالكلامي is the intended effect of the action (also called perlocutionary effect) and it is defined by the hearer's reaction (الجرجاني, 1961: 314; Austin, 1962: 101-116). The forms of "in" and "by" distinguish the illocutionary, "In saying something he may threaten you", from the perlocutionary act "By saying it he may intimidate you."

Speech acts are often interpreted narrowly as just the illocutionary force of an utterance (the function/communicative force of the utterance). It is the performative meaning and can be a statement, offer, commanding, promising, threatening, thanking, etc. The same locutionary act can count as different illocutionary forces (Cruse, 2006: 42):

a.)   I'll see you later
b.)   I predict that a.)   Prediction
c.)   I promise you that a.)   Promise
d.)   I warn you that a.)   Threat

Depending on dimensions referred to as felicity conditions, Searle (1979: 12-7; 1998: 58) has set up the following classes, assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations. In Arabic, utterances are classified as request-performatives (الانشاءُ الطّلبي) and non-request-performatives (الانشاء غير الطلبي) (السكاكي, 1980: 441-7).

2.   Indirect, Non-literal and Implicit Speech Acts

In the course of performing speech acts, people ordinarily communicate with each other. The content of communication may be identical, or almost identical, with the content intended to be communicated, as when a stranger asks, "What is your name?" However, the meaning of the linguistic means used (if ever there are linguistic means, for at least some so-called "speech acts" can be performed non-verbally) may also be different from the content intended to be communicated. An approach to distinguishing types of speech acts can be made on the basis of directness. A fairly simple distinction between three general types of speech acts is provided by three basic sentence types. There is an easily recognized relationship between the three structural forms (declarative, interrogative, and imperative) and the three general communicative functions (statement, question and command / request) (Levinson, 1983: 264; Huddleston, 1988: 129).

Whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, there is a direct speech act. Perlocutions are characteristic aims of one or more illocution, but are not themselves illocutions. Nevertheless, a speech act can be performed by virtue of the performance of another one, e.g:

2.   قل للذين اوتوا الكتاب و الأميين أأسلمتم؟

The question whether you have become Muslims is normally taken as a request that you do so. This is an example of so-called *indirect speech acts*. Whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, there is an indirect speech act. Thus, a question used to elicit information is a direct speech act, but a question used to make a wish is an indirect speech act (Yule, 1988: 133; الأوسي, 1988: 200-206):

3.   فهل من شفعاء يشفعوا لنا؟(الأعراف: 53)

A type of speech act can have a characteristic aim without each speech act of that type being issued with that aim. Speakers sometimes make assertions without aiming to produce belief in anyone, even

themselves. Indirect speech acts are the paradigmatic examples that are often used by speakers when the direct forms may appear aggressive (Searle, 1979: 60; Gordon and Lakoff, 1975: 87; Leech, 1980:87; السيد, 1982: 133; لاشين, 1985: 247; الحموي, 1987: 488). With nonliterality, we do not mean what our words mean but something else instead, so the intended illocutionary act is not just predicted from the word meanings being used (Kreidler, 1998: 177; James, 1983: 128)

When performative utterances are explicit, which are usually in the present tense and there are immediate participants like the first person. Those features are indexical, reflecting features of the immediate context. The particular verbs used in performative utterances tend to be verbs of speaking, or "metapragmatic verbs," that draw attention to a particular relation between the utterance or speech form and context. While some theoreticians might describe explicit performative utterances as rare occurrences, they argue that there are performative aspects to nearly all words, sentences, and phrases, as in threats (القزويني, UD: 301; الحلبي, 1980: 140-141; السكاكي , 1981: 17; الرازي, 1985: 135-136; الجوهري, 1987: 2477; Cruse, 2006: 42; Hudson, 2000: 319).

3.   The Nature of Threats and Warnings in English

A. Threats are intentional speech acts since they express what the speaker intends and can be performed by the speaker alone, 'I', or by the speaker as a member of a group 'we' (Adams, 1985: 46). Van Dijk and Kintcsh (1983: 84) define speech act of threat loosely by saying that threats "are said to be appropriate if a number of contextual conditions are satisfied. These conditions pertain to the wants, beliefs, and intentions of the speaker and to a limited number of social relations between speaker and hearer such as rank and familiarity." Consequently, threats can be inferred from the text and context. Collins (1987:123), Pearsal (1998:1930), Searle (1969: 58; 1972: 142) and Hornby (2000:1408) define threat as the expression of a hostile intention toward somebody to do something that will cause harm, trouble, or inconvenience to him unless that person does what is demanded. A threat to a person is the danger that something unlikable might happen to him. A threat is also the cause of this danger (Nelson, 1966:530).

According to Austin (1962:131; 150-160), Searle (1979b: 356), Bach and Harnish (1979: 42-55) and Hamblin (1987:34), threats are commissive utterances that are prospective and assuming an obligation that indicates

some future action authoritatively committed or entrusted to speaker to do in some specified capacity. There must be some hearer, whether the utterance shows it or not, since S must be making a commitment to somebody. Commissive predicates can be classified as response to directive either with positive response (agree, consent) or negative response (refuse, decline). There is another class of commissive predicates that is characteristically Self-motivated (not a response to directive). This type is either benefactive (offer, volunteer) or malefactive as in threatening speech acts performed by malefactor (a wrongdoer, especially a criminal) who is called so because of performing malefic action having a harmful or evil effect or influence (Kreidler, 1998: 194).

Threat illocutionary act is capable of polysemy in that it is both assertive, statement describing someone's behaviour in trying to harm you, and commisive regardless of the syntactic construction. If someone threatens to do something unpleasant to you, or if he threatens you, he may say or imply that he will do something unpleasant to you, especially if you do not do what they want (Leech 1983: 205-208):

4. He said army officers have threatened to destroy the town...

5. If you threaten me or use any force, I shall inform the police.

Threatening action or decision bears dangerous or threatening consequences (Blackledge, 2005: 68). The negative consequences of threat can comprehensibly be either mental or physical or both simultaneously, as in the sanction conditions available in the speech act of the bank robber who threatens the bank teller, commanding her to hand over money. The robber's "Hands Up!," exclaimed while pointing a handgun, shows a power claim and that the imperative is to be understood in the sense of a factual expression of will, whereby one person's will is simply imposed on the will of another (mental punishment). In this case, the reservoir of potential sanctions contingently linked with the imperative provides the speaker with certainty that the addressee has good reasons to conform. Audiences feel the weight of a promise being made only when they understand, with legal clarity, the positive consequences assured by it. The most important thing is that there is mostly restraint on behaviour in that threat requires an action implied in a clause that may contain a model, e.g. 'should', with 'you' as an actor (Halliday, 1973: 86-7; Kaufer, et al., 2004: 148). A hearer

understands a threat (for example, in the imperative form as in, I (hereby) direct you to stop smoking.) if he knows:

(a) The conditions under which an addressee can bring about the desired state (not smoking) and

(b) The conditions under which S has good reasons to expect that H will feel constrained to yield to the will of S (the threat of penalties for violating safety regulations). Only by knowing both components (a) and (b) does the hearer know what conditions have to be met if a hearer is to be able to respond affirmatively, as in imperative. In knowing these conditions, he knows what makes the utterance acceptable. Thus, this utterance is normatively an authorized imperatives. It presupposes recognized norms (the safety regulations for international air travel) and an institutional framework authorizing those holding certain positions (e.g., flight attendants) under certain conditions (e.g., preparing to land) to direct a certain class of persons (the passengers) to stop smoking by appealing to certain regulations (Habermas and Cooke, 1998: 226, Searle, 1969:25).

B. Warnings are 'speech acts that try to get another to do something' (Mullany, 2007: 82). This means that they are directive, as Searle classified them, in that speaker tries to get the hearer to perform some act or refrain from performing an act prospectively; one cannot tell other people to do something in the past. So, they have the pronoun you as actor, whether that word is actually present in the utterance or not. The uttering of warning words counts as a change of state from non-information of bad future event to the effect that action is not in hearer's best interests (Searle, 1969: 67; 1979: 12-7; Kreidler, 1998: 192):

5. Don't (any of you) miss this opportunity to save.

Searle states that warning tends to be more like advice than like command in it are used more to urge the hearer to avoid than to force him to avoid something not in his best interests; it is the negative of advice (Searle, 1979: 28). According to Bach and Harnish (1979: 44-55), a subcategory of directives is that of advisories, and a subcategory of advisories is that of warnings having the function of giving advice, usually with the implication that the advice given need not be followed.

Warning illocutionary act is a single compound speech act in that it is both directive and assertive; it is polysemous. It is directive if you warn someone against dangerous action, i.e., you advise them not to do it so that

they can avoid possible danger or punishment (directing to do something), and assertive when it commits hearer to the truth of a proposition in the world (informing warningly about something happening if…) (Leech, 1983: 205-208):

6. They warned that food was expensive.

7. They warned us to take enough money.

Warnings are uttered to let people know S's assumption about a possible danger, problem, or other unpleasant thing that might happen to someone in the future, so that hearer can make a decision to avoid such consequences or be cautious about them (perlocutionary act) (Austin, 1962:131; De Green, 1970: 313). So, warnings are psychologically specific stimuli which alert the user.

Warning is shown as an intentional reduction of risk of personal damage via avoiding certain patterns of behaviour and allowing certain other patterns. Thus, it means that it is advantageous. The question now is whether it is beneficial for the hearer or speaker. The answer is that Warning belongs to non-impositive directives, while threat is impositive). In the latter the utterance is beneficial for speaker, while in the former, the utterance is beneficial for hearer (advisory) (Haverkate, 1979: 31-32; Doris and Purswell, 1987: 443; Vanderveken, 1994:183), as in:

8. Avoid jumping like that, you may break your leg.

4. The Manifestation of Threats and Warnings on Pragmalinguistic Levels in English

This section is dictated to specify the distinctive features that distinguish threat and warning speech acts. Since the current studying is a pragmalinguistic study, how theoreticians tackle these two acts should be investigated on four levels: lexical, structural, semantic (linguistic levels) and pragmatic.

Lexically, Austin (1962: 31-2) maintains that one can use sentences like 'I warn ...' to perform explicit performative acts of the very sort named by the verb; threat can be expressed by the lexical verbs 'threaten' (Leech and Svartvik, 1994:171; Kaufer, et al. 2004:122), as in:

9. I warn you that Rottweiler has been starved for three days and is peevish.

10. The manager has threatened that they will lose their jobs.

Warning can also be expressed by the words which occur in some constructions such as alarm and beware. The example below, by using the

word 'promise', can be used to mean a threat rather than a promise (Quirk et al, 1985: 139; Griffiths, 2006: 150), as in:

11. Beware of the snake.

12. I promise to make you regret this.

They are not only to be realized by lexical verbs. Warning can also be realized by using (1) secondary auxiliaries (Leech, 1983: 181; Wierzbicka, 1987: 177; Halliday, 1973: 87; Quirk et al. 1973: 167), and (2) lexical perceptive verbs which have a connotation of warning. This certainly makes sense in the context of situations, e.g., 'see, look out, watch out' (Schmidtke-Bode, 2009: 191). Stubbs (1988:156) states that the verb 'threaten' renders the stretch of language infelicitous "I threaten you …" and only marginally acceptable as a response to an implicit threat, as in:

13. A: I'll punish you if you don't behave yourself.

   B: Don't threaten me.

Structurally, a different approach to distinguishing threat and warning speech acts can be made on the basis of structure. A fairly simple structural distinction is made according to sentence forms. The simple affirmative active declarative structure is used to manifest threat and warning. It is uttered to tell us something regarded as a threatening or warning fact (Searle, 1975: 64-7; Allan, 1986: 206; Ernst, 2004: 84; Burt, 2004: 111), as in:

14. This nation is peaceful, but fierce when stirred to anger.

15. I warn you that there is a bull in the field.

A type of sentences indicates them hypothetically is "if-then" structure, 'subordinate if-clause and matrix declarative clause'. (Searle, 1969: 67; Halliday, 1973: 87; 97; Wunderlich, 1979:279; Hamblin, 1987:34; Ishihara and Cohen, 2010: 66):

16. If you do not give Y money, I will tell the police that... (Threat)

17. If you put the baby down, she'll scream. (Warning)

Threat and warning can be indicated by a structure signalling imperative directive, 'and/or' and a declarative sequence. Unlike threat, the source of consequence in warning is not the speaker, ultimatums express speaker's desire that the hearer should carry out the act, so as to avoid the consequences of not doing so (Fraser, 1997: 179; Leech and Svartrik, 1975: 159; Davies, 1986: 204; Thomas, 1995: 104; Halliday, 1973: 87). This is

why Sadock (1974: 144) indicates that threat is the negative functional form of promise, as in:

18. Keep the dog calm or you'll be punished (Threat)

19. Close the window or you'll get a cold. (Warning)

They are also realized by interrogative structures: the speaker either asks hearer to provide a response or invites him to obey in performing a certain act, and thus speaker's seeking hearer's compliance is an imposition on him (Lyons, 1977: 338; Allan, 1986: 207; Cruse, 2000: 339). By doing the latter, speaker actuates hearer's mental state towards the disadvantageous consequences to indicate a threat. Interrogative warning is not used as a structural form eliciting information, but used imperatively by speakers; as a means of warningly getting people to act (Searle, 1975: 64-7; Sadock, 1974: 143-44; Mullany, 2007: 83; Kreidler, 1998: 177, 179; Cotterill and Ife, 2001: 8-7; Kaufer, et al. 2004: 122).

20. Do I hear anyone laughing?

21. Do you challenge me?

The imperative is a structural form used to realize threat and warning (Griffiths, 2006: 170; Davies, 1986:73; Kreidler, 1998: 178), as in:

22. Don't anybody move. (Threat)

23. Don't move, there's a snake by your foot! (Warning)

Threats and warnings can also be realized by embedded non-factual structure (different from factual declarative structure), used with or without *should*, and with the so-called 'sausive verbs' that imply intentions to bring about some change in future where the hearer is directed to do what is desired. (Jespersen, 1954: 270-72; Hornby, 1968: 207; Quirk et al. 1985: 1180-3; Kreidler, 1998: 191; Griffiths, 2006: 16; 119-20), as in:

24. If he behaves badly he should go to bed without any supper. (Threat)

25. We suggest you (should) pay more attention to what you're doing. (Warning)

The already mentioned syntactic structures are not enough to give a full realization of threat and warning since there are arguments like 'you' that may not be realized on the syntactic level, as in:

26. She threatens to be more censorious in future.

Consequently, what is looked-for is to realize the unspecified arguments of threat by means of a semantic structure: Halliday (1973:75) and Kreidler (1998:258) indicate that 'threat' is a semantic phenomenon having a

structure composed of a transitive futuristic modalized action clause with verb as a process, 'I' as a source or actor and 'you' as a goal, with an optional conditional dependent clause. Threat can also be realized as with 'you' as an actor when there is an action imposed on him. Threat has a commissive predicate having a threatening verb that expresses the commitment of the subject to the performance *of an action* to addressee (Kreidler, 1998: 194, 298-300). Warning has a directive predicate indicates that speaker tries to get the hearer to perform some act or refrain from performing an act. So, a directive utterance must have the pronoun *you* as actor, whether that word is actually present in the utterance or not. The point wanted to be reached is the actor in warning is the hearer (Perkins, 1983: 17; Kreidler, 1998: 192; 298- 300). More explicitly, they are represented by the combinations of causation of intimidation plus location, by the notions of 'source' and 'goal' (Kreidler, 1998: 272), e.g., 'I warn you there is a hornet in your left ear, it will cause you to panic, scream and scratch wildly at your ear' (Hurford and Heasley, 1983:243).

Pragmatically, threat and warning are speech acts playing an instrumental role in contexts, and derive their illocutionary meaning from other speech acts in other contexts of employment. Therefore, what follows is proposed to deal with the functional realization and classification of threat that is based on the functions of other speech acts. Threat and warning can be realized by prohibition which may show a causal or conditional relation so as to establish something as the cause of something else or the condition for not doing it (Halliday, 1973: 88; Haverkate, 1979: 31-32; Allan, 1986: 205; Thomas, 1995:104), as in:

27. Do not listen to my advice. ("اسمعني والا"-Listen to me or else)
28. Don't lean out of the train window. (Warning)

Statement can be used to realize threat and warning, indicating speaker's belief about the world and they are direct means to a goal where threatening or warning illocutionary force will be combined with the propositional structure (Cruse, 2000: 337; Trosborg, 1995: 192; Thomas, 1995), as in:

29. This ain't no affair of yours, boy! McClosky says threateningly.
30. Rottweiler has been starved for three days and is peevish.
31. I think that the next exam will be so difficult.

Threat can be realized by command. Some command speech acts direct hearer to comply in doing certain action, while others suggest to hearer to do a certain action. The former is used to indicate threat, e.g., 'come in!' can be a direction that must be complied with when uttered by an angry mother to her child. With its peremptory mode of achievement, the hearer has no option of refusal to comply, so it is said to be obeyed or disobeyed; if disobey hearer will be punished. Warning can also be realized by command (Lyons, 1977: 748; Allan, 1986: 226; Kreidler, 1998: 191; Gruyter, 2007: 215), as in:

32. Stay away from the stove.

Threat can be manifested by a promise by committing the speaker to do something bad to the addressee with the intention of intimidating him, and this speech act is called in Arabic 'وعد تهكمي' (sarcastic promise) (Verschueren, 1999: 24; Griffiths, 2006: 150), as in:

33. I promise I'll shoot you if you come any closer.

Threat and warning can be realized by advice (Trosborg, 1995:188-89; Hinkle, 1997: 5; Kaufer, et al., 2004:148):

34. I advise you to shut your mouth. (Threat)

35. I would strongly advise against it... (Warning)

The last kind of threat is realized by warning: when breaking the norms, threat which has the surface appearance of a warning is put forward in the form of an indirect speech act that is overtly a warning, but covertly a threat, as in:

36. So be warned, don't do it

This utterance is uttered by Amy, upper-middle manager (chair), who is threatening departmental managers, who let her down in filling out absence rotas correctly, by giving a warning about forfeits which they have to perform if they fill out absence rotas incorrectly (Mullany, 2007: 86, 107-8; Gramley and Ptzold, 1992: 214).

5.   Felicity Conditions of Threats and Warnings in English

These are conditions that must be satisfied for a speech act to be properly performed (also known as 'happiness conditions'). They can be grouped under four headings: propositional conditions, preparatory conditions, sincerity conditions, and essential conditions. For a threat:

1. Propositional conditions indicate that the content of the utterance must be about a future event where the speaker performs the action that is in his interest.

2. Preparatory conditions denote an appropriate setting for the act, including the speaker's intentions and qualifications. The issuer of a threat must have authority over the addressee, and the act must be both possible and not already carried out. If the preparatory conditions are not satisfied, the speech act has not been validly performed (it is said to have 'misfired').

3. Sincerity conditions require the speaker to be sincere: someone who threatens to do something must genuinely intend to do it; someone congratulating someone must feel pleasure at that person's good luck or success, and so on. An insincere speech act has nonetheless been performed, but the speaker is guilty of an 'abuse'.

4. Essential conditions define the essential nature of the speech act. For instance, if someone makes a threat, speakers must intend their utterance to count as putting them under an obligation to carry out what is threatened. If the essential conditions for a particular speech act are not met, then merely producing the right form of utterance does not result in the speech act being performed. (Notice that this is different from sincerity: someone telling a lie intends their statement to be taken as the truth.) (Palmer, 165: 1981; Fraser, 1998:163; Searle, 1969: 66; 1972: 147-154; Bussmann, 1996: 106-7; Kreidler, 1998: 194), and for warning:

1. Warning is to be uttered only in the context of an (elliptical) sentence (or larger stretch of discourse), where the utterance predicates some future act of hearer (Propositional content).

2. Warning is to be uttered only if the hearer would prefer speaker's doing act to his not doing the act, and speaker believes hearer would prefer speaker's doing the act to his not doing the act (Preparatory).

3. Warning is to be uttered only if it is not obvious to both speaker and hearer that speaker will do the act in the normal course of events (Preparatory).

4. Warning is to be uttered only if speaker intends the hearer to do the act (Sincerity).

5. The utterance of warning counts as an undertaking to the effect that event is not in hearer's best interest (Essential) (Searle, 1969:60-6; 1972:

147-154; Palmer, 165:1981; Levinson, 1983: 240; Bussmann, 1996: 106-7; Kreidler, 1998: 194; Noveck and Sperber: 2004:52).

6. The Nature of Threats and Warnings in Arabic

Since doing disadvantage action, committed by creatures, yields damage, Allah sets this right with a painful punishment. Allah has promised to govern the world rightly "سيقضى بين عباده بالحق" by giving the paradise for good-makers and the fire for wrong-makers. Linguistically speaking, rhetoricians indicate that threat is a declaration of intent that is to commit oneself to doing something to someone with the perlocutionary intention of intimidating the hearer and with the presupposition that it is bad for him. So, threat is intended to cause harm to the addressee via an unwanted act. (ابن منظور, 1955: 463; الرازى, 1981: 728). Religiously speaking, penalties are specified for Man making mischief on earth. Thus, punishment is a basic notion of the Divine Justice in the Hereafter, and thus they need to be stated linguistically (الغزالي, 1904:145; البصري and others, UD: 49). Some of these punishments are linguistically indicated by the act of threat. The act of threatening is considered as a means of improvement to mischief-makers, preventing them from committing such errors to avoid punishment (الصدر, 1970: 91). Thus, threats put into words the intention to perform an act unfavourable to the hearer, resulting in intimidating him by subsequent dispraise humiliation and punishment (الطوسي, 1979: 79-81,178; عرفة, 1984: 74-5). Thus, if the addressee is intimidated by physical punishment, the speaker is performing a physical threat, as in torture; if H is intimidated by mental humiliation, speaker is using a mental threat that affects the psychological state of the hearer, obliging him to do or to avoid doing something is without any physical punishment (السنهوري, 1952: 338; بهنسي, 1988: 245) look attentively at the verse:
27)
"لاَ يَغُرَّنَّكَ تَقَلُّبُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُواْ فِي الْبِلاَدِ مَنَاعٌ قَلِيلٌ ثُمَّ مَأْوَاهُمْ جَهَنَّمُ وَبِئْسَ الْمِهَادُ" (آل عمران: 197, 196).

"Let it is not deceive you that those who disbelieve go to and fro in the cities fearlessly." (Shaker, 2009: 113)

Allah said that you should not be deceived by the happiness and the bodily or the materialistical pleasure of the unbelievers since they last for a short time. Unhappiness and agony for the soul and the body are treated in

the glorious Qur'an as types of punishments as they are performed on the nations went before.

"Warn" is systematically ambiguous between an assertive and a directive use. In the assertive use, I can warn that X where the proposition is future to the time of utterance as in the case of a prediction (propositional content condition) but where there is the additional presumption both that it somehow bodes badly for the hearer and that there is still some possibility of avoiding the misfortune (with appropriate action on the hearer's part) which brings us to the systematic presence of the directive. Thus, to warn the hearer that X is to assert X with the directive purpose of suggesting that he do something about it. So, one might say "I warn you that this part of town   is   dangerous   at   night" (الجرجاني, 1982: 115-120; السامرائي, 2007:160-1).

What is meant by warning is carefulness which in turn means safeguard 'تحرز'; it means frightening, scaring التخويفand alarming the addressee so as to alert him to any hazardous characteristic of an action when they are properly designed and presented and to motivate and instruct the addressee so that necessary and appropriate precautions can be taken to avoid the bad consequences (الفراهيدي, 1982: 312; الجوهري, 1984: 626; ابن منظور, 2005: 175-176).

Warning is preparedness 'التأهب' and readiness الاستعداد (الزَّبيدي, 1976 : 564 - 566). This means that warnings are specific stimuli which alert a listener to the presence of some danger, thereby triggering the processing of additional information regarding the nature, probability, and magnitude of the danger. Generally speaking, warning is typically intended for the addressee. But occasionally it is wished for the speaker himself, but its connotation is essentially heading for the receiver. Further it is said that it is possible to direct the warning to the absent person (السامرائي, 2007-170).

7. Threat and Warning Manifestation on Pragmalinguistic Levels in Arabic

This section will sketch out a number of lexical, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features which can denote threat and warning in Arabic. Lexically, commissive verbs in Arabic are called 'أفعال الوعود أو (العهود)' (acts of covenants). They are similar to those in English since these verbs have an illocutionary point as part of their meaning. These verbs in Arabic include the verb "يهدد" (threaten) or "يتوعد" (threaten) or the noun 'وعيد -

threat'. These words are used in Arabic to commit the speaker to doing something to some threatening future act (السنهوري, 1952: 339; سلطان, 1962: 187). Warning can be realized by the lexical forms warn (حذّرْ), caution (حذّرْ), advise (يَنْصحُ), alarm (إنذار) used to convey the explicitness of their warnings (الرازي, UD: 653-4). They are not only to be realized by lexical verbs, but they also can be realized by using secondary auxiliaries (س) and (سوف) (ألمخزومي, 1964: 158-160; المطلبى, 1981: 72; الرفاعى, 1983: 362-4).

28)

"وَيُنذِرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا اتَّخَذَ اللَّهُ وَلَدًا" (الكهف: 4)

"And warn those who say: Allah has taken a son" (Shaker, 2009: 348)

29)

"وَأَصْحَابُ الْأَيْكَةِ وَقَوْمُ تُبَّع كُلٌّ كَذَّبَ الرُّسُلَ فَحَقَّ وَعِيدِ" (ق : 14)

"And the dwellers of the grove and the people Tuba; all rejected the messengers, so My threat came to pass" (Skaker, 2009: 596).

A different approach to distinguishing types of speech acts, in Arabic, can be made on the basis of structure. On the whole, Arabic declarative sentences are used to provide information to the hearer in a direct speech act, but they can also be used to achieve warning and threatening illocutionary forces by using an indirect speech act (حسن, 1966: 15-20), as in:

30)

"وَعَدَ الله الْمُنَافِقِينَ وَالْمُنَافِقَاتِ وَالْكُفَّارَ نَارَ جَهَنَّمَ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا هِيَ حَسْبُهُمْ وَلَعَنَهُمُ اللَّهُ وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ مُقِيمٌ" (التوبة : 68)

"Allah has promised the hypocritical men and hypocritical women and the unbelievers the fire of hell to abide therein; it is enough for them; and Allah has cursed them and they shall have lasting punishment." (Shaker, 2009: 246)

31)

"...أَنَّمَا أَمْوَالُكُمْ وَأَوْلَادُكُمْ فِتْنَةٌ..." (الأنفال: 28)

Threat and warning can also be realized by conditional sentences. Any sentence stating limitation is called a conditional sentence, and so it is composed of two parts, protasis (جملة فعل الشرط)   and apodosis (جملة جواب الشرط) (ابن هشام, 1988: 365; السامرائى, 1990: 430-510), e.g.

32)

"...فَإِن قَاتَلُوكُمْ فَاقْتُلُوهُمْ كَذَلِكَ جَزَاء الْكَافِرِينَ"(البقرة, 191: 30) (Threat)

"…but if they do fight you, then slay them; such is the recompense of the unbelievers." (Shaker, 2009: 61)

33)

"وَإِذَا رَأَيْتَهُمْ "تُعْجِبُكَ أَجْسَامُهُمْ وَإِن يَقُولُوا تَسْمَعْ لِقَوْلِهِمْ كَأَنَّهُمْ خُشُبٌ مُّسَنَّدَةٌ يَحْسَبُونَ كُلَّ صَيْحَةٍ عَلَيْهِمْ هُمُ الْعَدُوُّ فَاحْذَرْهُمْ قَاتَلَهُمُ اللَّهُ أَنَّى يُؤْفَكُونَ" (المنافقون: 4)

"And when you see them, their persons will please you, and if they speak, You will listen to their speech; (they are) as if they were big pieces of wood clad with garments; they think every cry to be against them. They are the enemy, therefore beware of them; may Allah destroy them, whence they are turned back?" (Shaker, 2009: 640)

       Threat and warning are not only to be realized with active declarative sentences, but also with passive forms. The subject of a threat realized by a passive voice syntactic structure (na'ib al-fa'il) can also be a noun phrase or a pronoun (محراث واخرون, 2007:97) as in:

34)

     "حَتَّى إِذَا رَأَوْا مَا يُوعَدُونَ فَسَيَعْلَمُونَ مَنْ أَضْعَفُ نَاصِراً وَأَقَلُّ عَدَداً"   (الجن:24) (Threat)

"Until when they see what they are threatened with, then will they know who is weaker in helpers and fewer in numbers" (Skaker, 2009: 663)

35)

"فَكَذَّبُوهُ فَنَجَّيْنَاهُ وَمَن مَّعَهُ فِي الْفُلْكِ وَجَعَلْنَاهُمْ خَلَائِفَ وَأَغْرَقْنَا الَّذِينَ كَذَّبُوا بِآيَاتِنَا فَانظُرْ كَيْفَ كَانَ عَاقِبَةُ الْمُنذَرِينَ" (يونس:73)

"But they rejected him, so We delivered him and those with him in the ark, and We made them rulers and drowned those who rejected Our communications; see then what was the end of the (people) *warned*. (Shaker, 2009: 265)

       Threat and warning can be realized by interrogative sentences. Some interrogative sentences like "Are you sure?" expect assertive answers, others like "Do you invite me too?" and "Do you accept?" expect directive or commissive answers, and so on for the other illocutionary points (الجبوري, 1989: 554-555). Thus there is no specific illocutionary force of answering, e.g.

36)

الم تر ما فعلت بسمير؟

Haven't you seen what I have done to Samir?

37)

"أَلَمْ تَرَ كَيْفَ فَعَلَ رَبُّكَ بِعَادٍ" (الفجر:6)

"Have ou not considered how lord dealt with Ad"(Shaker, 2009: 691)

38)

Did I not warn you about that before? – الم انبهك على ذلك من قبل؟

        Another structural form used to realize threat and warning is the imperative form 'الأمر'. Its forms are the imperative verb (فعل الأمر) and that verb which is associated with 'لام الأمر'. The imperative comes out to express pragmatic meanings like threat since it comes out from a higher status to a lower one, meaning the request of doing an action with an imposition (الجرجاني, 1982: 335-336; السيوطي, 1988: 75; عرفة, 1984: 14; هارون, 1979: 101, 116-119), as in:

49)

"خالف القانون وسوف تسجن"

"Break the law and you will be jailed." (Threat)

50)

"وَكُلَّ شَيْءٍ أَحْصَيْنَاهُ كِتَاباً- فَذُوقُوا فَلَن نَّزِيدَكُمْ إِلَّا عَذَاباً" (النبأ: 29, 30)

"And we have recorded everything in a book, so tastel for We will not add to you any aught but chastisement" (Shaker, 2009: 676).

Allah threatens the polytheists with a harsh punishment and He does not command them to enjoy but He threatens them indirectly by such an order.

51)

"فَلْيَحْذَرِ الَّذِينَ يُخَالِفُونَ عَنْ أَمْرِهِ أَن تُصِيبَهُمْ فِتْنَةٌ أَوْ يُصِيبَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ" (النور: 63)

(warning)

"Therefore let those beware who go against his orders lest a trial afflict them or there befall then a painful chastisement" (Shaker, 2009: 419)

        Semantically, in Arabic, the predicate of threats is a three-place predicate, composed of the threatener, the threatened, and the means of threat. It also implies the desired behaviour from threat (المعيني, 1985:63). This can be held up by the fact that 'warn' and 'threat' are transitive verbs of the pattern 'faala', حذر, هدد, توعد , where the action is shifted from the speaker to hearer and this means that 'the action of the verb is considered to 'pass over' from the subject to the object. Consider the following example taken from Abdul-Raof (2006: 119), which can be said to an employee who is ambivalent to his wrong actions which seriously violate his contract:

52)

اذا كررت نفس الخطأء ثانية فسوف افصلك من العمل

If you repeat the same mistake again, I shall sack you.

In English, a claim was revised which is that the subject of any utterance must not express a participant less agentive than another participant. It was revised to arrive at the point that the actor in warning is the hearer. One may ask whether the same hypothesis is found in Arabic. السامرائي (2007: 70) states that the hearer is the agent since a warning verb is used by the speaker to get the hearer to perform some act or refrain from performing an act. So, complying with the speaker's beneficial wants requires agenthood represented by hearer to fulfill the order. Thus, warning is a 'three-place predicate' composed of three arguments; warner, warned person and the action warned against-theme. Consider the following example taken from Abdul-Raof (2006 106):
53)

سيغلق المصرف حسابك اذا لم تدفع الفاتورات

The bank will close your account if you do not pay the bills.

Pragmatically, depending on the function of language stretches, threat and warning can be realized by command. Most actual directive forces have a special mode of achievement of their illocutionary point in that generally it is clear that the hearer either has or does not have the option of refusal. (الهاشمي, 1960:44-6; الأوسي, 1988: 200-206; البروسوي, الزمخشري; 319 :1999, البخاري; 1998:30, السيوطي; 1998:318, الزحيلي; 1990:176; 2002: 132):
54)

"واتبعوا احسن ما انزل اليكم من ربكم من قبل ان يأتيكم العذاب بغتة وأنتم لا تشعرون"
(الزمر: 55) (Warning)

"And follow the best that has been revealed to you from your lord before there comes to you the punishment all of a sudden while you do not even perceive" (Shaker, 2009: 539)

الزمخشري (2002:132) points out that using the request in the declarative form is assurance for the request to be fulfilled and makes the addressee respond quickly, as in:
55)

ألقِيَا فِي جَهَنَّمَ كُلَّ كَفَّارٍ عَنِيدٍ ـ مَّنَّاعٍ لِّلْخَيْرِ مُعْتَدٍ مُّرِيبٍ} (ق :24, 25)
"Do cast into hell every ungrateful, rebellious one, forbidder of good, exceeder of limits, doubter." (Shaker, 2009: 597)

The interrogative form which functions indirectly as a request (commanding) rather than questioning can realize threat and warning religiously (هارون, 1979: 15; الأسنوي, 1982:245), as in:

"أَفَرَأَيْتَ مَنِ اتَّخَذَ إِلَهَهُ هَوَاهُ وَأَضَلَّهُ اللَّهُ عَلَى عِلْمٍ وَخَتَمَ عَلَى سَمْعِهِ وَقَلْبِهِ وَجَعَلَ عَلَى بَصَرِهِ غِشَاوَةً فَمَن يَهْدِيهِ مِن بَعْدِ اللَّهِ أَفَلَا تَذَكَّرُونَ" ـ الجاثية ـ الآية ـ 23

"Have you then considered him who takes his low desires for his god, and Allah has made him err having knowledge and has set a seal upon his err and his heart and put a covering upon his eye. Who can then guide him after Allah? Will you not then be mindful? (Shaker, 2009: 576)

'أَفَرَأَيْت' is used to ask them to tell him wether worshiping a stone that he desires is better than worshiping. Allah, so be careful Allal will not give guidance to those who do so. أَفَلا تَذَكَّرُونَ is used to warn them by saying that they must take this as a lesson, and to direct them to repent and worship no one but Allah (الجلالين, UD: 662).

Rhetorically speaking, the proposition of statements, whose content can be either true or false, consists of two units: al-musnad ilaihi and al-musnad. Statements are pragmatically used to provide either known or unknown information to the hearer. Statements can be used to indicate several pragmatic functions, other than informing the receiver about the content of the constative statement. But instead, the speaker intends to express another intention that can be predicted by pragmatic means in the situational context. Thus, they may be used to express impotence, to plea for mercy, to advise someone, to express a threat or warning (الشيخ, 1986:71-73, 147), as in:

56)

"وَقَدْ مَكَرَ الَّذِينَ مِن قَبْلِهِمْ فَلِلَّهِ الْمَكْرُ جَمِيعًا يَعْلَمُ مَا تَكْسِبُ كُلُّ نَفْسٍ وَسَيَعْلَمُ الْكُفَّارُ لِمَنْ عُقْبَى الدَّارِ"
(الرعد: 42)

"And those before them did indeed make plans, but all planning is Allah's; He knows what every soul earns, and the unbelievers shall come to know for whom is the (better) issue of the abode." (Skaker, 2009: 305) (Threat)

57)

"ذلك المجرم يهدد بالقتل"

"That criminal threatens to kill."

الجبوري (1989: 522) mentions that the imperative comes out to a metaphorical function of stating instead of the original function which is

commanding, the function of stating in turn indicates the illocutionary force of threat as follows:

58)

"فَلْيَضْحَكُواْ قَلِيلاً وَلْيَبْكُواْ كَثِيرًا... "(التوبة : 82)

"Therefore they shall laugh little and weep much as a recompense for what they earned" (Skaker, 2009: 248)

The imperative forms (فَلْيَضْحَكُوا قَليلاً ولْيَبكوا كَثيرا) so let them laugh a little and (they will) cry much function ironically or metaphorically as stating to threaten them implicitly that they will laugh a little and weep much in the Hereafter.

59)

"... إِنَّ النَّاسَ قَدْ جَمَعُواْ لَكُمْ فَاخْشَوْهُمْ..."   (آل عمران:17) (Warning)

"Surely men have gathered against you, therefore fear them"

The next type of threat and warning are realized by dispraise (الذم) : Dispraise has two distinct assertive uses, one implying value judgment and the other not. In the other use, to criticize is to make an assertion about someone or something that highlights his faults. So there is a propositional content condition to the effect that the state of affairs represented is bad, and a sincerity condition to the effect that the speaker disapproves of that state of affairs (القزويني: UD,51), as in:

60)

"بِئْسَمَا اشْتَرَوْاْ بِهِ أَنفُسَهُمْ أَن يَكْفُرُواْ بِمَا أَنَزَلَ اللّهُ بَغْياً أَن يُنَزِّلُ اللّهُ مِن فَضْلِهِ عَلَى مَن يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ فَبَآؤُواْ بِغَضَبٍ عَلَى غَضَبٍ وَلِلْكَافِرِينَ عَذَابٌ مُّهِينٌ" (البقرة: 90)

"Evil is that for which they have sold their souls-- that they should deny what Allah has revealed, out of envy that Allah should send down His grace on whomsoever of His servants He pleases; so they have made themselves deserving of wrath upon wrath, and there is a disgraceful punishment for the unbelievers" (Shaker, 2009: 44)

In this verse, the dispraise is stated on their disbelief to imply a threat that disbelieving will bring about wrath and punishments (الجلالين, UD, 19).

61)

"... بِئْسَ مَثَلُ الْقَوْمِ الَّذِينَ كَذَّبُوا بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَاللَّهُ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ" (الجمعة : 5)

"evil is the likeness if the people who reject the communications of Allah; and Allah does not guide the unjust people" (Shaker, 2009: 638)

One of the most important types of pragmatic threat and warning is that which is realized by Prohibition 'النهي': Prohibition functions a directive

request for not doing an action. It may show a causal or conditional relation so as to establish something as the cause of something else or the condition for not doing it. The prohibition mode of discourse requires the negation particle (لا– no) prohibition (لا) which occurs before the verb, as in (لا– Do not sit down) and it differs from negation (لا) which occurs before the noun and can express threatening significations (الآمدي, 1967: 174; سيبويه, أبن 88 :1984; السكاكي, 1981: 524; الجرجاني, 1982: 101; عرفة, 1984: 88; 253-254:1966; الصابوني, 1985: 35-36; عاشور, 1984:187).

62)

"انت لا تحترم والديك ولا تهتم بمستقبلك"

"You neither respect your parents nor care about your future."

This speech act carries an implicit threat that the addressee has to respect his parents and take care of his future.

63)

"Do not listen to my advice." لا تسمع نصيحتي

This is an implicit threat which means (اسمعني والا-Listen to me or else).

63)

"وَلاَ تَرْكَنُواْ إِلَى الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُواْ فَتَمَسَّكُمُ النَّارُ" (هود: 113)

"And do not incline to those who are unjust, lest the fire touch you" (Shaker, 2009: 283)

Another example refers to a quotation taken from various sources like Abdul-Raof's book (2006: 265) that indicates semantic exaggeration that:

64)

"لا تستهينوا بهذه المادة الدراسية، متى اضع العمامة تعرفوني"

"Do not take this module lightly. You will know me when I put on my turban."

The conversationalist has used the quotation (متى اضع العمامة تعرفوني – you will know me when I put on my turban) which is a famous threatening expression said by the notorious ruler al-Hajjaj. Thus, the speaker has employed implicit threat through this quotation.

65)

" وَلَا تَجْعَلُوا مَعَ اللَّهِ إِلَهًا آخَرَ إِنِّي لَكُم مِّنْهُ نَذِيرٌ مُّبِينٌ" (الذاريات : 51)

"And do not set up withAllah another god; surely I am a plain warner to you from him" (Shaker, 2009: 602)

The last and the most important type of threat is that type which is realized by warning: Very often, an indirect threat, which has the surface appearance of a warning; the argument is put forward in the form of an indirect speech act that is overtly a warning, but covertly a threat.

In the following case, the speech event is Allah's addressing to disobedient people. He is putting forward a proposal for them to be submissive, and in his speech, he is arguing that his proposal would be a good thing for them.

66)

"أَمْ أَمِنتُم مَّن فِي السَّمَاء أَن يُرْسِلَ عَلَيْكُمْ حَاصِبًا فَسَتَعْلَمُونَ كَيْفَ نَذِيرِ" (الملك: 17)

"Or are you secure of those in the heaven that he should not send down upon you a punishment? Then shall you know how was my warning (Shaker, 2009: 649).

The speech act of threatening in this ayah is rhetorically realized by warning and structurally expressed by an interrogative sentence. In case they challenge and disobey Allah (Almighty), Allah threatens that all people will not be protected from His torment. He (Almighty) threatens them by sending against them rigorous wind or sandstorms as a curse or punishment (الصابوني، 1985:419; الزمخشري، 2006: 568).

Finally, warning can be realized by elliptical expressions when the utterances are spoken due to an immediate reaction, and this is why they are elliptical. The pragmatic function of these elliptical sentences is to warn and raise the alarm of an imminent danger, as in:

67) ! حريق – Fire!

68) ! السيارة – The car!

These are elliptical speech acts whose al-musnad ilaihi (هذا/هذه – this) is ellipted. The non-elliptical original word order is (هذا حريق – this is fire!), (هذه السيارة – this car (is coming towards us)). This pragmatic function is used when, for instance, 'fire' is seen, when a 'car' is approaching person on foot (Abdul-Raof, 2006: 134).

8. Felicity Conditions of Threats and Warnings in Arabic

Sentences can go wrong in a number of ways: words might be mispronounced, the marks on letters might be misplaced or we might make an irregular verb regular even though we don't normally do so. Speech acts can go wrong, too, by being situationally inappropriate, and we say in such cases that the speech act in question is infelicitous - has gone wrong. Then,

associated with each speech act is a set of felicity conditions that must be satisfied if that speech act is to be correctly (including honestly) performed, especially in religious situations. Consider this order:

"أَلْقِيَا فِي جَهَنَّمَ كُلَّ كَفَّارٍ عَنِيدٍ - مَّنَّاعٍ لِّلْخَيْرِ مُعْتَدٍ مُّرِيبٍ" (ق: 24، 25)

"Do cast into hell every ungrateful, rebellious one, forbidder of good, exceeder of limits, doubter" (Shaker, 2009: 597)

What felicity conditions have to exist for this Verse to be a threat?

1. Language users should have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal threat which must be denoted syntactically, semantically, and pragmatically.

2. The speaker is willing and able to carry out the futuristic threat against a particular hearer who must present; the speaker must be in a position of authority over the hearer.

3. The hearer believes that the speaker has the ability to carry out the threat, and that speaker intends his utterance to cause a sense of intimidation to the hearer, if the desired behaviour is not fulfilled, via the specification of physical, mental means of punishments. Thus, speaker wants the hearer is obligated to perform or to be refrained from performing an action

4. The hearer does not want the threat to be carried out. The main difference between a threat and a promise is that the hearer doesn't want the action to be carried out (threat) or that he DOES (promise.)

Since, the speaker is Allah and the hearers are His creatures, then the felicity conditions exist for the utterance to be a threat. But what if the speaker was a roommate (one of his creatures), and express the same content? He no longer has the ability to carry out the threat and the hearer likely doesn't believe she can carry it out. The felicity conditions no longer exist - thus, no threat (فتيان، 1985: 40; بهنسي، 1988:243; المعيني، 1985: 142).

To realize a warning speech act the following conditions are required:

1. An agent connects with an action the intention and purposes (intended effects) of evoking awareness of danger in somebody; the intention to warn, irrespective of whether they are achieved or not.

2. An actual overt behaviour an agent used to perform the communicative action. Depending on this criterion, a rhetorical question is

a question since it occurs in interrogative form, but a warning since it is intended as a warning.

3. A person actually being warned, i.e. becoming aware of danger connected with his course of action. The actually achieved effects interpreted by a receiver of the act of communication or the agent himself can give the effects of a certain type of behaviour (these effects need not be identical with the intended effects) (الفراهيدي, 1982: 312; المكودي, 2002: 230; الزَّبيدي, 1976 : 564 - 566)

9. CONCLUSION

We have dialled in detail with threat and warning in Arabic and English languages. This is necessary not only because of the interest the various cases present in themselves but also because a thorough knowledge of these possibilities helps one to understand the lexical, structural, semantic and pragmatic structure of threat and warning at the present stage of their development.

In both languages, threats and warnings are indirectness. It is pointed out that warning and threat do not share similar preparatory, sincerity, and essential conditions. For example, they are pragmatically different due to felicity conditions and components of illocutionary, and thus as forces they are completely different.

The most common and prominent feature that these two speech acts enjoy is that of beneficiality. That is, the successful execution of warning acts will render it beneficial to the hearer first, and to the whole society next. Unlike frequent warnings, the beneficiality of threats occurring in everyday conversations is mostly assigned only for the speaker.

One may believe that threatening and warning are universally understood as a commitment to do something. But one must believe also that in threat the commitment is speaker-directed while in warning it is a hearer-directed commitment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

English References

Abdul-Raof, H. (2006) *Arabic Rhetic: A pragmatic analysis*. London: Routledge.

Adams, J. (1985) *Pragmatics and Fiction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Allan, K. (1986) *Linguistic Meaning*. New York: Routledge.

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

Bach, K. and R. Harnish. (1979) *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Blackledge, A. (2005) *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

Bussmann, H. (1996) *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Chastain, K. (1988) *Developing Second Language Skills: Theory and Practice*, 3rd ed. New York: Hart court Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Cotterill, J. and Ife, A. (2001) *Language across Boundaries*. London: TJ International Ltd

Cruse, A. (2006) *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Cruse, D. (2000) *Meaning in Language*. Oxford: OUP.

Davies, E. (1986) *The English Imperative*. London: Croom Helm.

De Green, K. B. (1970) *System Psychology*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Doris, A. L. and Purswell, J. L. (1987) *Human Factors in the Design of Effective Product Warning*. Ann Arbor: Fuller Publications.

Ernst, (2004) *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. Cambridge: CUP.

Fraser, B. (1997) "Pragmatic Markers", Pragmatics, 2, 6, 167-90.

Fraser, B. (1998) "Threatening revisited", Forensic Linguistics, 2, 5, 159-73.

Gordon, D. and Lakoff, G. (1975) *Conversational Postulates*. New York: Academic Press.

Gramley, S. and Patzold, K. M. (1992) *A Survey of Modern English*. London: Routledge.

Griffiths, P. (2006) *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gruyter, M. (2008) *Constructional Approaches to English Grammar*. New York: Co. KG, Berlin.

Habermas, J. and Cooke, M. (1998) *On the Pragmatics of Communication*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1973) *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hamblin, C. L. (1987) *Imperatives*. London: Basil Black-Well Ltd.

Haverkate, W.H. (1979) *Impositive Sentences in Spanish: Theory and Description in Linguistic Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Hinkle, E. (1997) *The Appropriateness of Advice*. London: Routledge.

Hornby, A. S. (2000) *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, 6ᵗʰ ed. Oxford: OUP.

Huddleston, R. (1988) *English Grammar: An Outline*. Cambridge: CUP.

Hudson, G. (2000) *Essential Introductory Linguistics*. Michigan: Blackwell Publishers INC.

Hughes, J. (1984) "Group Speech Acts", Linguistics and Philosophy, 7, 4, 379-95.

Hurford, J. and Heasley, B. (1983) *Semantics*. London: CUP.

Ishihara N. and Cohen A. D. (2010) *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics Where Language and Culture Meet*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

James, C. (1983) *Contrastive Analysis*. London: Longman Group Limited.

Jespersen, O. (1954) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. London: Bradford and Pickens Drayton House.

Kaufer, et al. (2004) *The Power of Words*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Kreidler, Charles, W. (1998) *Introducing English Semantics*. London, Routledge.

Leech, G. (1974) *Semantics*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

———— (1980) *Explorations in Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John BenJamins B.V.

———— (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics London*: Longman Group Ltd.

Leech, G. and Svartric, J. (1975) *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London: Longman.

Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.

Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics*. Cambridge: CUP.

Mullany, L. (2007) *Gendered Discourse in the Professional Workplace*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.

Nelson, T. (1966) *The Highroads Dictionary*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons LtD.

Noveck, I. A. and Sperber, D. (2004) *Experimental Pragmatics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.

Palmer, F. R. (1981) *Semantics*. Cambridge: CUP.

Pearsal, J. (1998) *The New Oxford Dictionary of English*. Oxford: OUP.

Perkins, M. R. (1983) *Modal Expressions in English*. London: Frances Pinter.

Quirk, R., et al. (1973) *A University Grammar of English*. London: Longman Group Limited.

————— (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Rose, R. K. & Kasper, G. (2001) *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.

Sadock, J.M. (1974) *Towards a Linguistic Theory of Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.

Schmidtke-Bode, K. (2009) *A Typology of Purpose Clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Searle, J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: CUP.

————— (1972). *What is a Speech Acts?*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Book.

————— (1975) *Indirect Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

————— (1979) *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: CUP.

————— (1998) *Mind, Language and Society*. Cambridge: CUP.

Solomon, K.A. (1995) *Warnings*. Santa Monica: Rand.

Stubbs, M. (1988) *Discourse Analysis' the Socio Linguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. London: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Trosborg, A. (1995) *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Cruyter.

Van Dijk, T. and Kintsch, W. (1983) *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press Inc.

Vanderveken, D. (1994) *Principles of Speech Act Theory*. London: Routledge.

Verschueren, J. (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.

Wales, K. (1989) *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London: Longman

Wierzbicka, A. (1987) *English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary*. Australia: Academic Press.

Wunderlich, D. (1979) *Foundation of Linguistics*. London: CUP.

Yule, G. (1988) *The Study of Language*. London: CUP.

————— (1996) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: OUP.

Arabic References

ابن قيم الجوزية، شمس الدين. (1977) *إعلام الموقعين عن رب العالمين*. بيروت: دار الفكر.

أبن منظور، أبي الفضل بن بكر. (1955) *لسان العرب*. بيروت: دار صادر للطباعة والنشر.

ـــــــــــــ (2005) *لسان العرب*. بيروت: دار الكتب العلمية.

أبن هشام، الانصاري. (1988) *شرح شذور الذهب في معرفة كلام العرب*. بيروت: دار الجيل.

الأسنوي، جمال الدين عبد الرحيم. (1982) *نهاية السؤال في شرح منهاج الأصول*. القاهرة: المطبعة السلفيةالآمدي، سيف الدين أبي الحسن. (1967) *الإحكام في أصول الأحكام*. القاهرة: دار الاتحاد العربي

الأوسي، ألدكتور قيس إسماعيل. (1988) *أساليب ألطلب عند النحويين والبلاغيين*. بغداد: ألمكتبه الوطنية.

البخاري، أبي الطيب صديق بن حسن بن علي ألحسين ألقنوجي. (1999) *فتح البيان في مقاصد القرآن*. بيروت: دار الكتب العلمية.

البروسوي، ألشيخ إسماعيل حقي. (1990) *تنوير ألأذهان من تفسير روح البيان*. بغداد: ألدار الوطنية.

البصري، الحسن، الرسي، القاسم أبن أحمد؛ عبد الجبار؛ المرتضى، الشريف. (بلا تاريخ) *رسائل العدل والتوحيد*، ج1. بيروت: دار الهلال.

بهنسي، احمد فتحي. (1988) *المسؤولية الجنائية في الفقه الاسلامي*. القاهرة: دار الشروق.

الجبوري، أحمد حمد محسن. (1989) *أساليب المجاز في القرآن الكريم*. بغداد: كلية الآداب.

الجرجاني، عبد القاهر. (1961) *دلائل الإعجاز*. القاهرة: مكتبة القاهرة.

الجرجاني، محمد بن علي بن محمد. (1982) *الإشارات والتنبيهات في علم البلاغة*. القاهرة: دار النهضة.

الجوهري، إسماعيل بن حماد. (1987) *الصحاح تاج اللغة وصحاح العربية*. بيروت: دار العلم للملايين.

حسان، تمام. (2004) *أللغة العربية معناها ومبناها*. ألقاهرة: عالم الكتب.

حسن، عباس. (1966) *النحو الوافي* ج1،ج4. القاهرة: دار المعارف.

الحلبي، شهاب الدين محمود. (1980) *حسن التوسل إلى صناعة الترسل*. العراق: دار الرشيد للنشر.

الحموي، تقي الدين أبو بكر. (1987) *خزانة الأدب وغاية الارب*. بيروت: دار مكتبة الهلال.

الخليفة، هشام عبد الله إبراهيم. (2007) *نظرية الفعل الكلامي بين علم اللغة الحديث والمباحث اللغوية في التراث العربي والإسلامي*. بيروت: مكتبة لبنان.

الرازي، فخر الدين. (1985) *نهاية الإيجاز في دراية الإعجاز*. عمان: دار الفكر.

الرازي، محمد بن أبي بكر بن عبد القادر. (1981) *مختار الصحاح*. بيروت: دار الكتاب العربي.

ـــــــــــــ (بلا تاريخ) *مختار الصحاح*. كويت: دار الرسالة.

الرفاعي، أسامة طه. (1983) *شرح كافية ابن الحاجب*، ج1. بغداد: مطبعة وزارة الأوقاف والشؤون الدينية.

الزَّبيدي، السيد محمد مرتضى الحسيني. (1976) *تـاج العروس من جواهر القاموس*. مصر: المطبعة الخيرية.

الزحيلي، الأستاذ الدكتور وهبه. (1998) *التفسير المنير في العقيده والشريعة والمنهج*. دمشق: دار الفكر المعاصر.

الزمخشري، أبي القاسم جار الله محمود بن عمر. (2002) *الكشاف عن حقائق غوامض التنزيل وعيون الأقاويل في وجه التأويل*. بيروت: دار المعرفة للطباعة.

السامرائي، فاضل صالح. (1990) *معاني النحو*. الموصل: دار الحكمة.

السكاكي، يوسف بن ابي بكر محمد بن علي. (1980) *مفتاح العلوم*. بغداد: دار الرسالة.

ـــــــــ (1981) *مفتاح العلوم*. مصر: مطبعة دار الرسالة.

سلطان، انور. (1962) *النظرية العامة للالتزام: مصادر الالتزام*. القاهرة: دار المعارف.

السنهوري، عبد الرزاق احمد. (1952) *الوسيط في شرح القانون المدني: نظرية الالتزام بوجه عام* ج1. بيروت: دار إحياء التراث العربي.

سيبويه، عمر بن عثمان (1966) *الكتاب*. القاهرة: دار النهضة.

السيد، شفيع. (1982) *التفسير البياني: رؤيه بلاغيه نقديه*. كلية العلوم: جامعة القاهرة.

السيوطي، جلال الدين. (1998) *همع الهوامع في شرح جمع الجوامع*. بيروت: دار الكتب العلمية.

الشيخ، عبد الواحد حسن. (1986) *دراسات في البلاغة عند ضياء الدين بن الأثير*. مصر: الإسكندرية.

الصابوني، محمد علي. (1985) *صفوة التفاسير*. بيروت: دار القرآن الكريم.

الصدر، اسماعيل. (1970). *التشريع الجنائي ألا سلامي في المذاهب الخمسة مقارنا بالقانون الوضعي*، ج1. النجف: مطبعة النعمان.

الطوسي، محمد ابن الحسن. (1979) *الاقتصاد فيما يتعلق بالاعتقاد*. النجف الاشرف: جمعية منتدى الشعر.

عرفة، عبد العزيز عبد المعطي. (1984) *من بلاغة النظم العربي: دراسة تحليلية لمسائل علم المعاني*، ج1 ، ج2. بيروت: عالم الكتب.

الغزالي، أبو حامد. (1904) *المستصفئ في علم الأصول*. بولاق: المطبعة الأميرية.

فتيان، فريد. (1985) *التعبير عن الإرادة في الفقه ألا سلامي والفقه المدني*. بغداد: معهد البحوث والدراسات العربية.

الفراهيدي، أبي عبد الرحمن الخليل بن أحمد. (1982) *كتـــاب العين*. وزارة الثقافة والإعلام: دار الرشيد.

القزويني، الخطيب (بلا تاريخ) *الايضاح في علوم البلاغة: المعاني والبيان البديع*. بغداد: مكتبة المثنى.

لاشين، عبد الفتاح. (1985) *البيان في ضوء أساليب القران*. القاهرة: دار المعارف.

محراث واخرون. (2007) *دروس في الغة العربية*. النجف الاشرف: دار الضياء.

المحلي، جلال الدين و السبرطي، جلال الدين. (بلا تاريخ) *تفسير الامامين الجليلين*. مكتبة المثنى: بيروت.

المخزومي، مهدي. (1964) *في النحو العربي: نقد وتوجيه*. بيروت: منشورات المكتبة العصرية.

ـــــــــ (2005) *في النحو العربي: نقد وتوجيه*. بغداد: دار الرشيد للنشر.

المطلبي، مالك يوسف. (1981) *في التركيب اللغوي للشعر العراقي المعاصر*. بغداد: دار الرشيد للنشر.

المعيني، محمد سعود. (1985) *الاكراه واثره في التصرفات الشرعية: بحث مقارن بين الفقه الاسلامي والقانون الوضعي*. الموصل: مطبعة الزهراء الحديثة.

المكودي، أبي زيد عبد الرحمن بن علي بن صالح. (2002) *شرح المكودي على الألفية في علمي الصرف والنحو*. بيروت: دار الكتب العلمية.

هارون، عبد السلام محمد. (1979) *الاساليب الانشائية في النحو العربي*. مصر: مكتبة الخانجي.

الهاشمي، احمد. (1960) *جواهر البلاغة في المعاني والبيان والبديع*. القاهرة: مطبعة السعادة.