Legal Entity of Public Law - Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

Faculty of Humanitarian Sciences

Doctoral Program in Linguistics

Annotation to Dissertation on

Bela Churchelauri

The pragmatic and sociolinguistic peculiarities of threat expression in verbal and nonverbal

communication

(Based on materials in English and Georgian)

by

Bela Churchelauri

(Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for PhD Degree of Philological Science

Scientific Adviser: Professor Irine Goshkheteliani)

Batumi

2020

Introduction

In today's reality, it's quite common to hear the most extreme forms of aggression – statements containing threat, and it is probably difficult to find a person who has not become an object of threat at least once in a life. The need to study the language of threat as one of the forms of a speech act and a form of communication is caused by the interest that has arisen in various fields, for instance, Sociology (Tedeschi, 1983), Theory of Power / Management, (Kellermann, 1996), Theory of Speech Acts (Salgueiro, 2010), The Art of Negotiation (Shapiro & Bies, 1994; Galinsky, 2004), Workplace Violence (Jenkins, 1998; Elliott et al., 1994), Political Linguistics (Bratton, 2005; Sechser, 2010). However, the topic of the present work is not only an analysis of the concept of threat. The paper discusses some of the key issues that have many cross-points with the phenomenon of threat expression; these are as follow: communication, speech acts, sociolinguistic peculiarities of threat, explicit and implicit forms of expressing threat, linguistic markers of stance, politeness theory, the concept of a face, politeness strategies, as well as, face threatening and face saving acts.

It is noteworthy that the semantic nature of language is closely related to the extralinguistic world and is one of the main tools of reflecting reality, therefore, a proper analysis of linguistic phenomena would lead to a correct explanation of real life situations. With a proper linguistic analysis of threat, the danger posed by this threat can be avoided. This is why scientists, practitioners, and ordinary people unanimously acknowledge the importance of a proper threat analysis.

In the present work, we will try to describe the linguistic nature of threat, to define and to identify the linguistic units peculiar to the threat discourse, and to demonstrate ways to assess the threat by analyzing the linguistic units characteristic to this type of discourse.

The relevance of the topic is due to the fact that interest in the threat phenomenon is growing every day. Against this background, both English and Georgian linguistics contain very few theoretical materials for studying the discourse of threat and the semantic function of threat stance.

Threat is a speech act realized in the communication process; That is why the topic of the threat language is directly related to the sphere of communication and speech acts. Both

communication and speech acts are characterized by a wide range of usage. In practice, they are used by people working in any field, although their scientific and theoretical foundations are not known to everyone.

Considering the fact that language is not an abstract phenomenon and it exists and functions in the society, it is important to study it from sociolinguistic point of view. Communication and speech represent an important aspect of human relations, the analysis of theoretical information about them will allow us to answer questions that arise in any area of human activity regarding communication and speech. Consequently, the sociolinguistic factor also plays an important role in the study of the threat, since it is both a linguistic and a social phenomenon.

The need for a thorough study of the nature of threat is also stipulated by the fact that in this way it will become possible to determine the credibility of the threat and predict the likely consequences of its realization. To do this, you need to find out how the threat is expressed, whether it is explicit or implicit, and what position markers affect the credibility of its execution.

Since threat is a violent speech act that threatens a member of society, it is important to take into account linguistic issues directly related to it, such as politeness and the concept of face. It is in these issues that face threatening acts, as well as politeness strategies that serve to prevent this threat and are intended for face saving are described in detail.

The goals of the work is the structuring and analysis of theoretical material on communication and speech acts; the theoretical review of the concept of threat and the description of sociolinguistics as one of the latest scientific disciplines; the description of explicit and implicit forms of threat expression; the definition of linguistic stance markers; the definition of the concept of a face and politeness theory both in Georgian and English languages; the formulation of concepts of politeness strategies and face threatening and face saving acts. Based on the goals, **the objectives of the paper** are as follow:

- define the phenomenon of communication and classify its types according to their functional purpose and role-technical perspective, as well as to identify similarities and differences based on this classification;

- analyze theoretical material on speech acts of various authors;

- identify linguistic peculiarities specific to threat concept and determine similarities and differences in English and Georgian on the basis of a comparative analysis;

- define sociolinguistic concepts and their role in the study of the threat phenomenon;

- analyze explicit and implicit forms of threat expression;

- define the concept of a stance and determine similarities and differences between stance markers in Georgian and English;

- discuss the views of various authors on the theory of politeness and the concept of face, and consider practical examples confirming the correctness of these views;

- present politeness strategies and face-threating and face-saving acts in a form of a system and characterize the threat phenomenon according to this system.

The scientific novelty of the paper lies in the fact that some researchers (e.g., Salgueiro, 2010; Muschalik, 2018) consider only certain aspects while studying the topic, and therefore, the problems of the threat phenomenon are less studied in linguistics both in the field of interpersonal communication and in terms of the theory of speech acts, as well as pragmatics. That is why the given work presents all the theoretical foundations that will help us in the future to accurately explain the role of the threat in interpersonal communication, to understand how it is presented in the theory of speech acts, to determine the pragmatic peculiarities of threat expression, and the role they play in assessing its credibility.

The study focuses on threat language examples in English and Georgian; in particular, the paper presents a linguistic analysis of threat-containing statements made by Georgian and foreign politicians. The total number of analyzed examples is 160, among which 80 examples are in Georgian and 80 examples are in English.

The theoretical basis of the thesis is a theoretical review of dissertations, monographs or scientific articles of Georgian and foreign linguists on threat concept. On their basis there has been conducted the analysis of the pragmatic and sociolinguistic aspects of the threat language.

The theoretical basis of the work is represented by the following works: Linguistics (Gamkrelidze et al., 2008; Nebieridze, 1991; Saussure, 2002; Chikobava, 1983; Biber, 2006;

Biber et al., 1999; Conrad et al., 2000; Duranti, 1997; Lyons, 1977), Speech Acts and Theory of Politeness (Tevzadze, 2012; Levidze, 2011; Merabishvili, 2011; Austin, 1962; Brown, et al., 1987; Goffman, 1967; Grice, 1991; Searle, 1975; 1969; Yule, 1996; Walton, 2014; Watts et al., 2005;), Communicative Linguistics (Lebanidze, 1998; 2004;), Sociolinguistics (Ladaria, 2002; Habermas, 1984; Wardhaugh, 2006;), Psycholinguistics (Mindadze, 2009;), Communication (Liparishvili, 2009; Surguladze et al., 2003; Makharadze et al., 2010; Luhmann, 2007; Makharoblidze, 2016;), Language of Threat (Appiah et al., 2015; Bourdieu, 1991; Davis, 1997; Fraser, 1998; Gales et al., 2010; Gales, 2015; Geiwitz, 1967; Glukhov et al., 2015; Jenkins, 1998; Kellermann, 1996; Kent, 1967; Lakoff et al., 1987; Meloy et al., 2012; Milburn et al., 1981; Muschalik, 2018; Napier et al., 2003; Salgueiro, 2010; Scanlon, 2008; Sechser, 2010; Shapiro et al., 2004; Shuy, 1993; Storey, 1995; Tedeschi et al., 1994; Yeboaba, 2012;)

Research methodology: descriptive, functional-semantic and comparative analysis methods have been used to solve the objectives and tasks.

Theoretical and practical value of the work is represented by the conclusions drawn from our study. The results of the study can be used in discourse analysis, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic studies, lectures on psychology and neuropsychology. This work will also be useful to undergraduates and doctoral students when working on qualification works.

The structure of the dissertation. The dissertation consists of an introduction and three chapters. Each chapter is divided into paragraphs and subparagraphs. The work also includes a conclusion, a bibliography, a list of internet sources and a list of examples analyzed in the study.

Chapter I discusses threat as a form of communication and its sociolinguistic features; it also presents threat from the viewpoint of the speech acts theory and gives the classification of threat language according to the level of hazard indicator and content loading.

Chapter II deals with the verbal forms of threat and pragmatic peculiarities of its expression, including an overview of the theory of politeness and the concept of face, as well as the classification of lexical and grammatical units that characterize verbal threat.

Chapter III presents a comparative description of threat-containing statements in the language of Georgian and foreign politicians, based on the classifications presented in the theoretical material.

General conclusions summarize the theoretical generalization of the study.

Chapter I. Threat as a form of communication and its sociolinguistic peculiarities.

Communication is the fundamental foundation of human and social life. The concept of communication is explained individually in each area. According to T. Gamkrelidze, "Communication (lat. Commūnīcatio - "Communication"; "Exchange"; "Message") is essentially a social phenomenon and basically involves the exchange of *messages* in human society" (გამყრელიძე et al., 2008 :46).

Niklas Luhmann, a German sociologist, speaks of the enormous role of the communication form changes in the process of social evolution. (Luhmann, 2007: 8) In his opinion, this fact is not surprising, because "eventually, the social system consists of communication processes. ... communication unites society into a single whole. "(Ibid.).

Scientists believe that the process of social communication consists of many stages and they can be sorted hierarchically (Surguladze et al., 2003: 5). These levels are presented schematically in the book of Revaz Surguladze and Eldar Iberi "Mass Communication" (see Chart No. 1).

Chart 1. Communication levels presented in downscaling order

Source: (Surguladze et al., 2003 :5)

Based on the above chart, one of the most important points is interpersonal communication, since each person almost constantly uses this stage of communication in his/her daily live, and there is the highest chance to commit an act of threat on this stage.

The process of communication with different interlocutors occurs in the form of various communication models (Mindadze, 2009; Liparishvili, 2009;). Regardless of the differences, in any communication model there are always key elements of communication: a sender, an information and a recipient.

Communication can be **verbal** and **non-verbal** (=sign or kinetic language and body language). As the Georgian linguist Givi Nebieridze notes, "not only the sound language has a communication function, but also writing (graphic language), gestures, etc. do" (ნებიერიძე, 1991 :9).

Both verbal and nonverbal communication play an important role in the socialization process of a person and they both represent elements of a mutually complementary function.

The object of our research, the threat phenomenon, is realized in the two forms of communication - written and verbal. That is why the knowledge of such details about them will help us to more fully and comprehensively explain the role of threat, as a form of communication and speech act, in the process of socialization.

The speech act is a kind of social interaction, which through words expresses specific verbal intention such as request, offer, denial, compliment, promise, etc. (Yule, 1996 :47).

Depending on various circumstances referring to the utterance, the goal of the speaker can be achieved or not, that is, communication can be either successful or unsuccessful.

According to definition of John Austin (Austin, 1962 :14), a successful speech act requires:

- the existence of an acceptable and understandable circumstances for participants of a speech act (for example, the appropriate environment);
- equal involvement of participants in the process of speech act perception (how correctly and appropriately the information was transmitted and understood);
- have the appropriate authority to make a statement.

The theory of speech acts identifies three interrelated aspects of the analysis of a speech act (Yule, 1996 :48). The first one, which represents the basis of expression, is a *locutionary act* (Latin *locution* - utterance) – a process including several stages. These stages

are presented differently in the works of different linguists. For example, according to the English linguist John Lyons (Lyons, 1977 :730-731), a locutionary act consists of three stages:

1. Drafting an utterance (by creating symbols while writing and sounds while speaking).

2. Creating sentences in accordance with the rules of syntax peculiar to the grammar of the given language.

3. Contextualization, that is, inserting an expression into the appropriate context and forming it the way that makes it understandable.

Formation of an expression is preceded by a function of previously formed expression in the mind. It represents the second dimension of the speech act, which is called the *illocutionary act* (Yule, 1996 :48). The illocutionary act is fulfilled for a specific communicative purpose and is considered from a non-linguistic point of view. This goal is also called the *illocutionary force* of utterance (Yule, 1996 :48).

In order to identify the illocutionary force (IFID – Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (Yule, 1996 :49)), that is, to clarify the interlocutor's goal, the attention is paid to those verbs in the utterance that directly relate to the illocutionary act. For instance: *გიბრძანებ (*I order you), *გთხოვ (I beg you), გეკითხები (I ask you)*, etc. J. L. Austin calls such verbs **performatives**, and sentences - **performative sentences** (Austin, 1962 :6). According to him, such expressions make it clear that a speaker (of course, taking into account the relevant circumstances) does not just describe his own action, but also fulfills it. Austin (1962 :4-5) proposes to distinguish between **constatives** and **performatives**.

An example of a constative utterance is the following sentence: "The sun rises from the east", and an example of a performative statement is a judge's statement: "The convict is sentenced to 2 years of imprisonment". As a comparison of these two sentences shows, the difference between constatives and performatives is really significant. "Constatives describe the development of an action, while performatives describe the fulfillment of a specific action" (Bichashvili, 2006 :26).

An utterance itself always has an aim, and therefore, logically, it is intended to reach this aim, i.e. to achieve the result. A speech act, examined from the point of view of its real consequences, is a *perlocutionary act* (Tevzadze, 2012 :62).

The perlocutionary act is directed at the addressee, in particular the influence of the expression on him. Highlighting the aforementioned act, J. Austin once again clarifies the problem of intersubjectivity of a speech act, in which both participants of the communication are considered as subjects with equal rights.

The same concept - **perlocutionary effect** is found in J. Yule's works. According to him, the perlocutionary effect can be discussed only if the goal of the speaker is achieved and the listener performs the intended action (Yule, 1996 :49).

Having studied and analyzed all of the above, A. Duranti raises the question whether there is a limit to all those actions that can be carried out by a linguistic action (Duranti, 1997 :222). Researchers have different views on this issue. For example, L. Wittgenstein believes that this cannot be determined once and forever (Wittgenstein, 1958 :11), because language is a changing and developing organism, to which new elements are constantly penetrating, and old ones get forgotten. However, J.L. Austin has a different opinion on this subject and believes that this potentially limitless phenomenon can be divided into certain typological groups. Based on this, he presents five main types of illocutionary act: Verdictives, Exercitives, Commisives, Behabitives, Expositives (Austin, 1962 :150).

A similar classification was suggested by J. Searle (Searle, 1975 :354). According to him, there are five main groups of cases of actualization in terms of language utterances:

1. <u>**Assertives,**</u> which J. Yule calls **representatives** and notes that this is a world represented in the imagination of the interlocutor

    e.g.: Chomsky didn't write about peanuts. (Yule, 1996 :53)

2. <u>**Directives**</u> imply a speech act when the speaker tries to force the listener in various ways to take certain actions.

    e.g.: Don't touch that! (Yule, 1996 :54)

3. <u>**Expressives**</u> show the interlocutor's attitude to the previous act or reflect the psychological state of an interlocutor.

e.g.: Congratulations! (Yule, 1996 :53)

4. **Commissives** in which the speaker undertakes obligation to act in accordance with the sentence expressed by the speech act.

e.g.: We will not do that. (Yule, 1996 :54)

5. **Declaratives,** the proposition of which includes a statement, such as the recognition of a person guilty or the declaration of a marriage statement by the authority. An important role is played here by the institutional role of an interlocutor, i.e., to what extent a person is authorized to make such a statement.

e.g.: Referee: You're out! (Yule, 1996 :53)

Based on the analysis of the above theoretical information, we can conclude that threats can to some extent belong to two types of speech act: directives and commissives. Threat implies exerting pressure on the listener and creating an environment that is undesirable for him, just like a speech act of directives might imply the statements of a type when a speaker tries to force a listener to take some action.

e.g.: Georgi Margvelashvili (former president of Georgia) to Giorgi Targamadze: "Have a rest or I'll make you rest!" (Internet source №1)

The speech act of commissives is a direct threat when a speaker agrees to act in accordance with the statement.

e.g.: Soso Mandzhavidze to Aleko Elisashvili: "Your show off will end soon ... You will answer me for your stupidities!" (Internet source №2)

Threat basically can be defined as a socially constructed act with a linguistic power - between two parties - person who threatens and one who is threatened, which leads to inevitable fatal destruction. In particular, according to P. Bourdieu, the act of threat is a series of long-lasting, social relations that give the individual the basis for performing the threat (Bourdieu 1991 :8).

With the exception of T. Gales (2010), no comprehensive studies on the topic of threat has been conducted. Some researchers (e.g., Salgueiro, 2010; Muschalik, 2018) considered only certain aspects of threat, and almost no one has studied threat issue from its interpersonal communication point of view.

Threat, as one of the form of a violent act, is characteristic of any society. Therefore, it is impossible to explain and understand threat as a social phenomenon without considering the social context.

According to B. Fraser's theory (Fraser 1998 :161), threat is a deliberate speech act that takes the form of a notification and is designed to convey the desired information.

During researches psychologists have stated that the causes of threat can be very different: getting rid of anger, instilling fear, trying to get the desired result, attracting attention, self-preservation instinct (Milburn & Watman, 1981; Fraser, 1998).

Many scientists have discussed the existence of various types of threat. However, one of the most comprehensive and accurate categorizations can be found in T. Gales' research (2010 :272). There are presented the following three main categories of threat:

Direct threat: when the type of action, time, place and identity of the victim are specified (although, the existence of all the components listed here is not necessary; at least two of them are considered sufficient);

e.g. a) „*Stop interfering with us. I would be happy to hang you. If it were up to me, I would hang you all. "* -*Philippines president Rodrigo Duterte (Internet source №3).*

b) Irma Inashvili to Gigla Agulashvili: Don't hope you'll sit still and watch us calm! You will have to bear the responsibility for your deeds just like Misha Giorgadze! I'm telling you, the time will come and you will have to answer, do you understand me?! (Internet source №4)

Conditional threat: threat arising from the actions of the listener;

e.g. a) "*If a new HealthCare Bill is not approved quickly, BAILOUTS for Insurance Companies and BAILOUTS for Members of Congress will end very soon!" (Internet source №5)*

b) Islamic state caliphate threatens Georgia: If we lose three, you will lose 1000 (Internet source №6)

Veiled / indirect threat: neither the type of action, nor the time, place, the identity of the victim is indicated; at the same time, the addressee is required to / not to perform any action in order to avoid an undesirable result.

e.g. a) Politician Kirby Delauter: "Your rights stop where mine start." (Internet source №7)

b) Rezo Amashukeli: "I won't let anybody make my homeland miserable!" (Internet source №8)

In addition to the above terms, which represent the three main threat groups, there are other points that can be found in various research papers. However, it should be noted that a contextual difference is either nonexistent or negligible. For illustrations, see **Table 1** for a comparison of terms.

<div align="right">

Table 1

</div>

Types of threat according to T. Gales	Types of threat according to various authors
Veiled	Implied (Meloy et al., 2008)
Conditional	Contingent (Geiwitz, 1967)
	Incentive (Scanlon, 2008)
	Manipulative (in Beller et al., 2005)
Direct	Noncontingent (Geiwitz, 1967)
	Nonincentive (Scanlon, 2008)

In addition to identifying threat types, an important factor is also determining threat levels. According to the recommendations of the FBI, there are three levels of threat (*Threat Assessment Procedures Manual, 2017 :7):*

- **low-level threat,** that poses minimal risk to the victim and public safety; it is vague and indirect; information is incompatible, contradictory and / or inconclusive, or lacks details; besides, based on the content of the threat, it is clear that the person, who is threatening, will not actually fulfill the intention or is not capable of doing it.

- **medium-level threat** can be carried out, although, it sounds less realistic; it contains much more details and is expressed in a more direct form than a low-level threat; the wording of the text contains some hints about how the person, who threatens, intends to fulfill his plan; general information about time and place is provided, although, the details of the action are still unclear; nothing is said about any preparatory actions; the

statement contains phrases that will convince the addressee that these are not just words and the intention is serious (for example: "I'm serious!" "I really mean it!").

- **high-level threat** is direct, concrete and compelling; high level of imminent and serious danger can be felt; it suggests that detail steps have been taken to implement the plan (purchase or acquisition of weapon); It almost always requires involving law enforcement.

It should be noted that there is no exact and scientifically proven method for identifying threat levels, and sometimes it is possible to observe the transition between levels *(Threat Assessment Procedures Manual, 2017 :8)*. However, there are two key elements that can help determine the level of threat.

The first one is the ***specificity of content*** (ibid). Any threat analysis should primarily be based on its content. Let's consider the following two examples:

e.g. a) *"I am not afraid of an arrest but I won't go down alone, it's time some politicians are exposed." Nana Appiah Mensah tweeted. (Internet source №9).*

b) *"My name is Carmine," ... "I don't know why you're f***ing with Mr. Trump but if you keep f***ing with Mr. Trump, we know where you live and we're going to your house for your wife and kids." (Internet source №10).*

The first case is a vague and ambiguous statement, and in the second example the addressee of the threat and the location of the alleged violence are precisely indicated. The more specific the threat content, the higher the severity of the impending danger is.

The second factor, determining the level of threat, is ***plausibility of content*** (ibid). For example, in the two statements below, the first one is less convincing and, therefore, not dangerous, while the latter contains specific information and requires an adequate response.

e.g.: a) *"As some day it may happen that a victim must be found" (Gales, 2010 :251).*

b) *"Toyota Motor said will build a new plant in Baja, Mexico, to build Corolla cars for U.S. NO WAY! Build plant in U.S. or pay big border tax (Internet source №11)*

In order to assess the actual outcome of the threat, in addition to the above, it is necessary to take into account many other factors: the speaker's attitude, context, gender, culture, etc. For example, what is acceptable for the culture of one country can be offensive to

another; the likelihood that one man will fulfill his threat against another man is greater than if the same threat would come from a woman.

Since the threat is one of the forms of communication, and communication is an integral part of human social interaction, as well as the fact that sociolinguistics studies the influence of social factors on the language, we should pay more attention to the study of all sociolinguistic variables that are related to the phenomenon of threat language. According to Ronald Wardhaugh (2006 :143), "A linguistic variable is a linguistic element that has identifiable variations." For example, the same author quotes the following English words: *"singing"* and *"fishing",* which are sometimes pronounced as "*singin" and "fishin".* The last sounds *(ng)* of these words are linguistic variables, which in this case are presented in two variants: [ŋ] – *'singing'; 'fishing',* and [n] – *singin'; 'fishin'.* If these options are interconnected with various social characteristics, such as age, gender, social status, etc., then the linguistic variable becomes a sociolinguistic variable (Ladaria, 2002 :61).

Verbal threats, like any other form of communication and / or speech act, are influenced by sociolinguistic variables such as age, gender, social status. Such variables cannot be ignored, because they convey additional information, and allow us to create a complete, general image.

Chapter II. Forms of threat and pragmatic peculiarities of its expression.

Interest in the issue of politeness in scientific or unscientific fields is growing day by day. In linguistics, the concept of "politeness" is interpreted in different ways; for example, J. Yule (1996 :60) considers politeness as a generally and universally accepted concept, rooted in any culture. He explains that politeness means courteous and cultural behavior and is equivalent to polite social behavior.

Despite the abundance of definitions of the concept of politeness (Lakoff, 1975; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Watts, 1989), the content still remains the same: while communicating, members of the community use politeness to avoid conflict situations and preserve the desired social image.

To distinguish between everyday politeness and linguistic politeness, the scientists Watts, Ide, and Ehlich (Watts et al., 2005 :3) propose the terms "*first-order politeness*" and "*second-order politeness*".

The "first-order politeness" is a social term, and its examples are: apologies if you accidentally stepped on somebody's foot, or expressing gratitude in public places for the services received, etc. The "second-order politeness", represents a linguistic term and considers all possible situations that a person may fall into at any other time and space, and, therefore, determine a specific language strategy that will allow him/her to successfully complete the task assigned to him - to conduct a successful, conflict-free communication acceptable for every member of the communication, and to do this, use the appropriate verbal and non-verbal opportunity.

The theory of politeness, founded by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson in the late 1970s, relates to the **concept of face**, as well as such terms as *face want*, *positive and negative face*, *positive and negative politeness*, *politeness strategies* and *face threatening (FTA) and face saving (FSA) acts*.

In linguistic studies, the notion of 'face' as a linguistic term for the first time appears in Goffman's (Goffman, 1967 :5) works, where he points out that positive social values are directly related to the face we wish to maintain in the process of social interactions.

Based on the Goffman's definition of the concept of "face", P. Brown and S. Levinson have developed a politeness theory and introduced the terms "*positive face*" and "*negative face*" (Brown et al., 1987 :62), which can be defined according to the type of a person's *face want*. The *"face want"* is a desire to present ourselves in a way that is acceptable to us in society.

A *negative face* means a person's desire to be independent and to be able to act freely. A *positive face* implies a person's desire to be connected with others, to feel like a member of a group and to realize that at least one person shares his desires (Yule, 1996 :62; Brown et al., 1987 :62).

Considering the above mentioned, Brown and Levinson offer two types of politeness: *positive and negative politeness* (Brown et al., 1987 :70). The goal of positive politeness is to show the close connection between the participants of the communication.

e.g.: *1. How about letting me use your pen?* (Yule, 1996 :64).

While negative politeness is an action aimed at preserving the negative face of a listener.

e.g.: *1. Could you lend me a pen? (Yule,1996 :64).*

According to P. Brown and S. Levinson's definition, negative politeness is the main way of expressing respect, while positive politeness, on the contrary, is based on positive, close and friendly behavior (Brown et al., 1987 :129).

Based on this definition, P. Brown and S. Levinson conclude that the culture of Western countries, including English, is mainly characterized by the frequent use of negative politeness strategies. (Brown et al., 1987 :129-130).

In contrast, considering the nature of Georgians, prone to direct and unceremonious interrelations, which are an integral part of our culture, we can safely say that the use of positive politeness strategies prevails in the Georgian language.

According to the theory of speech acts, a threat is traditionally classified as a speech act of the group of commissives. Through it, a person expresses an intention for future actions, which is unfavorable and undesirable for the recipient. As far as threat can be considered a criminal and punishable act, it is often expressed in disguised form. This way, addressers refrain from adding more expressiveness to their own statement and let addressees decode the information themselves so that the senders of the threatening messages, if necessary, might be able to refute the charges against them.

The threat is effective only if its target can recognize it and perceive the impending danger, otherwise, there will be an unsuccessful speech act. Consequently, the expression of the threat should be as effective as possible, even if not direct, but identifying.

When discussing the phenomenon of threat, it is impossible to avoid such an important issue as the concept of stance. According to D. Biber (Biber et al.., 1999 :966), a particular stance, personal feelings, thoughts, and the attitude of a speaker or writer to a person or a question, as a rule, can be expressed using lexical and grammatical forms, which

the person chooses.

According to D. Biber (Biber et al., 1999 :966), "Stance meaning can be expressed in many ways, including *grammatical devices*, *word choice* and *paralinguistic devices*." We can discuss each of them from threat expression point of view providing practical examples.

The paralinguistic way of expressing stance includes the tembre, pitch and duration of speech; the extralinguistic devices involve facial expressions, gestures and body language, used to express feelings, an author's attitude to the recipient and / or the problem being discussed. Extralinguistic elements also include symbols expressing emotions, acronyms, highlighting, upper-case print, multiple punctuation, italics, and more. There are two other ways to mark stance - lexical and grammatical (Biber et al., 1999 :968).

According to V. Shakhovsky (Shakhovsky, 2009 :91), vocabulary expressing emotions can be divided into three groups: 1) vocabulary that **names** or denotes emotions; 2) vocabulary that **describes** emotions; 3) vocabulary that **expresses** emotions.

Vocabulary units of the first group denote emotional states and can be called logical-objective ones. The vocabulary describing emotions can be a verb, a noun, an adjective, etc.

The second group includes a lexical description of emotional expressions, when there are nominated the parts of body (eyes, lips, face) that express emotions, and there is given a lexical designation of emotion.

The vocabulary of the third group is emotional and serves to express emotions (Shakhovsky, 2009 :91-100).

In accordance with the above classification, we can create a table of vocabulary, expressing the threat:

The first group mainly consists of nouns nominating action.

The second group is represented by adjectives and adverbs that describe the action or characterize the state of interlocutor.

The third group contains verbs and expresses the intention that the interlocutor is going to fulfill. According to Austin's classification, this group is a list of performative verbs.

In addition to the above, the Georgian language is characterized by usage of a variety of phraseological and idiomatic units expressing the threat, which are widespread in both

literary and everyday speech. Of particular note is the fact that in such phraseological units the use of words denoting parts of the body, that is, somatic idioms, predominates, what can be considered as a high probability that the verbal threat will be developed into physical aggression. For, as Dr. Dennis Davis notes, violence generally begins with thoughts which is transformed first into linguistic expressions and then into physical activities (Davis, 1997 :13).

Table 2. Phraseologisms expressing a threat in the Georgian language

somatic idioms	colloquialisms	Colors	other (fire, hell)
• ლაყუჩებს /ყურებს აგახევ! (I'll tear your ears off!) • ტყავს გაგაძრობ! (I'll skin you alive!) • თმით გითრევ! (I'll drag you pulling your hair!) • სიმწრით წვერ-ულვაშს გაგლეჯინებ! (I'll make you tear your beard off!) • ცხვირიდან ძმარს გადენ! (I'll make vinegar run from your nose.) • ცხვირ - პირიდან სისხლს განათხევინებ! (I'll make your nose bleed!) • ფეხებით შეგდგები! (I'll walk all over you!) • ზურგზე ბოლდვირს ვადენ! (I'll make his back smoke!)	• „სპასობნია!" (He is capable of doing that!) • შეეშვი, ნუ „ტისკავ"! (Leave him alone, don't scold him!) (Toradze, 2016 :53) • მისაღები მიიღება,... ეტყვი რომ „შაკალი" ხარ! (The deserved will be received… You will say that you are a jackal!) (ibid) • ვინც „ტრუპს"	• შავ დღეს დაგაყრი! (I'll give you a black day!) • ცემაში დაგალურჯებ! (I'll beat you up until you turn blue!)	• ნაცარტუტად გაქცევ! (I'll turn you into dust!) • გაგაცამტვერებ! (I'll turn you into dust!) • ცხოვრებას ჯოჯოხეთად გიქცევ! (I'll make your life hell!) • გაჩენის დღეს /დაბადებას გაწყევლინებ! (I'll make you curse your birthday!) • "ისეთი შემოგილაწუ

• წიხლქვეშ დაგიდებ! (I'll go over you!) • დაგშლი Marchვ მამრავლებად! (I'll break you into smallest pieces!) • სახსრებში გადაგხსნი! (I'll open your joints!)	აიკიდებს, იმას მე გამოვუღებ „ფარშს"! (One who kills someone will be gutted by me!) (ibid)		ნო, ორი კაცი პარადად მოგეჩვენოს!" (I'll hit you so hard that you'll see a parade instead of two men!)
			Examples from internet sources №12 – 19

English, like Georgian, is characterized by an abundant use of phraseological units. This also applies to the language of threats, although it should be noted that, in contrast to Georgian, English colloquialisms are characterized by much more frequent use of profanity. The names of body parts in statements containing threat, in comparison with other elements, are most often found in English phraseological units. It should also be noted that the colors expressing threat in phraseological units are the same in both languages, - black and blue.

Table 3. Threat phraseologisms in English

Body parts	Colloquials /Slang	Colors	Other
• skin someone alive (=to punish someone severely) *e.g. "If that kid damages my car again, I'll skin him alive!"* • eat someone alive (=defeat or beat someone	• take it outside (=to fight. Also *take this outside*). • *e.g. Do you want to take it outside?* • get medieval (=to torture terribly, in the medieval style) • *e.g. I'm going to get medieval on his a**!*	• to beat somebody black and blue (=skin that is black and blue has bruises on it as a result of being	• tear a strip off someone (=reprimand someone severely for doing something wrong) • *e.g. "The teacher tore a strip off Charlie for not doing his*

comprehensively) • e.g. *"You bring out the worst in me, I'll eat you alive."* • bite someone's head off (=criticize someone strongly; be hursh on someone) *e.g. "I'll bite your head off, if you come too close to the stage."* • cut/ rip one's heart out (=destroy or seriously damage) • e.g. *"I'm going to cut your (expletive) liberal bleeding heart out."*	• [make (one) dust (one's) back off](#) (=to physically attack someone) • e.g. *"Keep talking s**t and I'm going to make you dust your back off."* • [open a can of whoop-ass](#) (=to beat someone up) • e.g. *"If he screws with me again, I'm gonna open a can of whoop-ass on him."* •	hit) • e.g. *If you do that again, I'll beat you black and blue.* • Black eye (=if you have a black eye, you have a dark area around your eye because you have been hit) • e.g. *They put my name down, gave me a black eye.*	*homework."* • Go Nuclear (=Use an extreme measure) • e.g. *If they try to dump more goods in our market, we'll go nuclear on them and totally shut down the trade negotiations.* • [ball up](#) (=to beat someone until they enter the fetal position (their body forming a tight ball) • e.g. *If that guy keeps looking at me he's gonna get balled up.*
			Examples from internet sources №20-26

It should also be noted that the lexical meaning of most phraseological units, used in both languages, include threat directly related to physical violence, and only a small part expresses violence of non-physical character.

"Grammatical stance devices include two distinct linguistic components, one

presenting the stance and the other presenting a proposition that is framed by that stance" (Biber et al., 1999 :969). For example, in the expression - "I hope that you will take care of this matter immediately" - the stance is expressed by a combination of a main verb - *hope* and an additional subordinate sentence *you will take care of this matter immediately*, and the expression is created by the encouraging mood of the speaker.

In the English language the grammatical markers of stance can be classified in the following main categories: adverbs, pronouns, modals and semi-modals, nouns, phrases with prepositions and adverbs that define the stance (Biber *et al.*, 1999 :969). From the above listed grammatical categories most frequently in threat language occur modal verbs, complement clauses and adverbs (Biber et al., 1999 :969-975).

Modal and semi-modal verbs in English are divided into three semantic categories: those expressing probability, likelihood and necessity.

Probability modal verbs are among the most commonly used modal verbs, expressing threat (Gales 2015 :1-25).

There are three main semantic classes of verbs that mark the stance of the author in the text (Biber et al., 1999 :854):

1) epistemic, which, in turn, consists of several subgroups; among them, the most interesting for us are adverbs that express certainty, limitation and likelihood;

2) expressing attitude;

3) denoting style.

According to T. Gales, threat language is characterized by a frequent use of adverbs expressing certainty (Gales 2015 :1-25), what is also confirmed by an analysis of our examples. In particular, adverbs conveying certainty - *never / never ever* and *really*, represent 65% of the entire category. Among the other three categories, the adverb expressing probability – *probably* - is most often used, and among the adverbs denoting an attitude, *seriously* - is the most commonly used adverb. As for the adverbs denoting the style, the analyzed examples contain adverbial phrases more frequently than individual adverbs - *in harshest way; in the strongest of terms.*

The analysis of examples of Georgian-language threats has given us quite a different

picture. Here, adverbs expressing the attitude (*seriously, directly*) take the first place with an indicator of 40% of the occurrence, followed by adverbs of style *(simply, quietly, clearly, easily)* and adverbs of certainty (*never, really, definitely, necessarily*); both of these categories occupy equal 25% respectively. As for restrictive adverbs *(no way, no more)*, they account for only 10%, and adverbs expressing probability are not used at all by Georgian politicians when expressing threat.

Grammatical markers of stance are also carriers of certain linguistic functions. Most of them are presented in the same form, both in Georgian and English, and therefore, there is functional consistency. The table below is a good example of this (See Table 4).

Table 4

Similar grammatical markers of threat language in English and Georgian	Linguistic function	Examples
1. Conditional sentences	1. conditionality	I'll do A if you do B.
2. Modality	2. Demonstration of the intention	I must destroy her!
3. Second person personal pronouns	3. Pointing out of the object	I will have you no matter what!
4. Adverbs	4. Showing seriousness of the decision.	I'm really honestly being serious.
5. Negative constructions	5. Overcoming the barriers, negation.	You never know where I will show up.
6. Rhetorical questions	6. Indicating aggression and personal intervention	Do we not deserve better?
7. Imperatives	7. Command	Do it as I said!
8. Future tense	8. Stating the fixed time for the action	You'll be punished for that!

It should be noted, however, that there can be found a lot of differences along with similarities. For instance, in the Georgian language, the threat is not characterized by the

frequent use of second-person pronouns, since the Georgian language belongs to the group of synthetic languages, and the addressee is indicated in the verb form with a suffix; for example: "გაგანეზ იცოდდე!" (You know, you will regret it!) = letter - გ - is the prefix used to represent second person singular object of the sentence and there is no need to mention second person pronoun - „შენ"= *you*. In English, on the other hand, not a single sentence can be made up without mentioning the object of threat, since all categories of person and number are not fully represented in English verb. Therefore, the sentence with the same content have the following form in English: **You** *will be sorry for this!*

Most phrases, containing threat in the Georgian language, are used in active voice, for example, გავგანადგურეზ! (I will destroy you!), while in English, phrases containing threat to a large extent take the form of passive voice, for example, e.g. *You*__*'ll be destroyed*__*!*

Chapter III. Typological classification of threats and verbal presentation in English and Georgian.

Chapter III of the paper, based on the analyzed examples, presents a typological classification of language statements, containing threat in terms of form / type and level of threat in the Georgian and English languages. It also deals with the verbal expression of threat in both languages.

when analyzing the examples, we came across one interesting fact; it turned out that in Georgian and English, any conditional threats contain elements that are characteristic of a direct threat (exact time and / or place of action, pinpointing of the victim, action due to which the victim is punished, etc.). Therefore, in our case, the category of **conditional** threat according to T. Gales' classification is replaced by the category of **direct-conditional** threat. It should also be noted that not all direct threats are conditional, while all conditional threats, as we can see from the analyzed examples, are direct.

The research has shown that the speech of Georgian politicians is characterized by the use of a high dose of direct threat - 71.5%; it is followed by a direct-conditional threat - 15%, from which an indirect threat lags behind only by 1.25% and its rate is 13.75%. A completely different picture emerges in the English language, where almost half (46.25%) of the

statements of politicians, containing a threat, are direct conditional threats; the second place belongs to a direct threat - 32.5%, and an indirect threat is in the third place - 21.25% .

Direct threat in both research languages are performed using commands.

The use of performative verbs in direct threat is characteristic of both languages, for example: „გეუბნებით, გაფრთხილებთ...“; "Promise, tell ...". The construction - the first-person pronoun + performative verb - forms an expressive-performative statement (Austin, 1962 :6), where the performative verb emphasizes the seriousness of the speaker's intention and at the same time convinces the addressee of the threat that the statement is likely to be executed.

e.g. a) Far-right Britain First leader threatens politicians & journalists with 'day of reckoning': "<u>I can promise</u> you, from the very depths of my being, you will all meet your miserable ends at the hands of the British First movement. Every last one of you" (Internet source №27).

b) Rezo Amashukeli threatens Tengiz Gogotishvili: "I warn that stray dog of the NATO office to act a bit cleverer, otherwise I will not shoot myself! But he will have to answer in due time" (Internet source №28).

To express direct threat in English, we mainly use Future Simple and the grammatical construction "to be going to";

e.g. a) Trump speaks out after bomb threat saying:" <u>We will spare no resources or expense in this effort</u>" (Internet source №29).

b) President Donald Trump: "When they don't allow free speech, <u>we're going to do a very big number</u>" (Internet source №30).

Direct threat in the Georgian language is mainly expressed by the verbs in the grammatical category equivalent to the simple future tense in English

e.g. Nugzar Tsiklauri to the opposition faction "Unity for Justice": "Wait for the Georgian people to judge you in October" (№31).

Examples of direct threat have shown that in both languages grammatical stance markers of time, verb and syntactic order are presented in different doses, but in the same form.

In English, expressions containing indirect threat have two different forms of expression:

The first form can be called the "position of an offended author", where the author of the threat expresses dissatisfaction with the current situation and announces his / her future decision.

e.g. "I am not afraid of an arrest but **I won't go down alone, it's time some politicians are exposed. Biting the same hands that fed them.**" Nana Appiah Mensah tweeted (Internet source №9).

The statements of this type are characterized by the use of the first-person pronouns, since the situation is presented from the perspective of the speaker.

In the second form of indirect threat, only the addressee of the threat is mentioned, and the statement is formulated as advice, or there is a highlight on a situation that causes the speaker's irritation.

e.g. a) Sarah Palin: **They'd better be on their toes.** Cheaters will not win (Internet source №32).

b) D. Trump: "**The EU has taken advantage of the U.S. on trade for many years. It will soon stop!**" (Internet source №33).

In Georgian, indirect threat is characterized by the use of exclamation sentences in the form of an appeal to the second and the third persons.

e.g. Zuka Papuashvili: "Ministry of Culture, theater directors, art directors, directors - we all know everything! Wake up to reality before you still have time! I warn you!" (Internet source №34).

Among 11 grammatical categories of rows that exist in the Georgian literary language and are divided into three series, the vast majority of verbs expressing an indirect threat belong to series I. There are rare cases when threat is expressed with the verbs in the form of series III.

e.g.: a) Irma Inashvili to Guguli Magradze: "Such an ignore usually **ends very badly**" (Series I, Present tense) (Internet source №35).

Rezo Amashukeli: "They won't kill everyone, one day these **people will raise their**

heads" (Series I, Future tense) (Internet source №36).

Indirect threat represents one of the most complex types of threats in terms of assessment and identification, since speech, containing such threat, is usually characterized by ambiguity, and the execution of the threat does not depend on other conditions being met. Indirect threats often have a tone of warning or discontent, and in most cases the element of the threat is left to the discretion of the recipient (Napier et al., 2003 :18).

Conditional, or in our case, **direct-conditional threat** is an act of speech that can be used as a mean of controlling the behavior of other people.

As the analysis of examples has shown, main linguistic characteristic of direct-conditional threat for both languages is the same grammatical marker. This is a conditional sentence, which is expressed in the form of the future tense in the Georgian language, while in English the condition is presented in the present tense, and the result is in the future

e.g. a) Irma Inashvili to Tina Khidasheli: "If this government does not punish you, another government will come, we will come and take you to jail, since you are the ones to be blamed in falsification of elections in and many other perpetrations" (Internet source №35).

b) Donald Trump: "<u>_If for any reason Mexico stops apprehending and bringing the illegals back_</u>_ to where they came from, _<u>_the U.S. will be forced to Tariff at 25% all cars made in Mexico_</u>_ and shipped over the Border to us (Internet source №37)._

The expression of a condition in threat is not always represented by a conditional sentence. In rare cases it can be represented by a time clause or an exclamatory sentence, which sometimes sounds like a warning, although, the context clearly shows that we are dealing with a threat. In such sentences, the conjunction "or" is used in the English language, and a conjunction "თორემ" (or, otherwise) is used in the Georgian one.

e.g. a) Aleko Elisashvili: "Stop this process! Do not shake this country, or else I will show you the true shake, do not make hundreds of thousands of people speak up!" (Internet source №38).

_b) Donald Trump: "Bernie Sanders is lying when he says his disruptors aren't told to go to my events. Be careful Bernie, _<u>_or_</u>_ my supporters will go to yours!" (Internet source_

№39).

Direct-conditional threat can be considered as one of the most dangerous types of threats, since along with all the elements characteristic to direct threat, it additionally contains a condition, which, if not fulfilled can lead to an undesirable result for the addressee of the threat; this result is specifically formulated and identified, providing further deeper cogency of the credibility of the threat.

After convincing that the threat is real, it is necessary to determine how the threat can be realized.

Over the past two decades, significant advances in threat assessment have led to the creation of the Association of Threat Assessment Professionals (ATAP) in 1992 and the Journal of Threat Assessment (ATAP), which was first published in 2001. According to the assessment, depending on the degree of probability of the implementation, the threat can be divided into three categories: threats of high, medium and low level.

Both Georgian and English-language threats are used at all three levels, however, an interesting fact has been revealed in the analysis of the examples of the politicians' speech. It turned out that politicians refrain from using statements containing low-level threats, and in fact, they do not use this type of threat.

High-level threats in the speech of foreign politicians make up 65% of the total, while high-level threats of Georgian politicians make up only about 27.5%, which is almost 2.5 times lower than threats in the English language

e.g. a) "If a new HealthCare Bill is not approved quickly, BAILOUTS for Insurance Companies and BAILOUTS for Members of Congress will end very soon!" Trump tweeted (Internet source №5).

b) Nika Gvaramia threatens Tsulukiani and the Judges: "I will follow all of them till the end, Judge Urtmelidze, as well as Minister Tsulukiani and all three of these judges; I will follow them till the last breath and I will institute criminal proceedings against them! You will end your career in prison!" (Internet source №40).

Georgian political threat is characterized by frequent use of medium-level threat; it is about 72.5%. As for the English language, there are only 35% of medium-level threats

e.g. a) Al Gore: "Nice global economy you got there. Be a shame if we had to destroy it" (Internet source №41).

b) Grisha Oniani, a candidate for mayor of Gori municipality Rezo Kakhniashvili: "You may take it as a threat, but I tell you, you are going to be in a huge trouble" (Internet source №42).

After presenting two way typological classification of the threat language used by politicians (in terms of the form of the threat statement (direct, direct-conditional and indirect) and the level of risk content in the threat (high, medium and low)), we decided to compile another cross-classification for each language.

The cross-classification shows the correlation of three different types of threats with the probability of their implementation.

The analysis of the cross-classification has shown the following:

in the Georgian language:

1. the vast majority of direct threats, in particular about 77% are medium-level threats, and the remaining 23% are high-level threats.

2. about 63% of direct-conditional threats are high-level threats, and the remaining 37% are medium-level threats.

3. only 9% of indirect threats belong to high-level threats, and 91% to medium-level threats.

in the English language:

1. Percentages of direct threats are distributed as follows: high-level threats - about 58%, and low-level threats - 42%.

2. the threat of the greatest risk in the English language is direct-conditional threat with an indicator of 92%; the remaining 8% of direct-conditional threats are medium-level.

3. the indirect threat can be considered as one of the least dangerous threats, since in both languages the level of its assessment is mainly average, and only a small part of them belong to a high-level threat. In English, this ratio is as follows: about 83% are medium-level threats and 17% are high-level threats.

As we have already mentioned, phraseological units expressing threat mostly

include the names of body parts, the so-called somatic idioms. Despite the various linguistic-cultural and ethno-socio-cultural peculiarities existing between the English and Georgian languages, the presence of somatic idioms in statements containing threat is recorded in both languages. However, such statements are much more common in the speech of Georgian politicians than in the one of foreign politicians (see Table 5).

Table 5. Somatic idioms in the speech of politicians

Georgian examples	English examples
• ყელიდან ამოგანთხევინებთ! (I'll make you throw it up all from your throats!) • ეგ ღიმილი შეგაყინებათ სახეზე! (That smile will freeze on your face!) • მაგ ღიმილს შეგაყინავ სახეზე! (I'll make that smile freeze on your face!) • მაგ რქებს მოგამტვრევ / ეგ რქები მოგტყდება! (I'll break those horns off your head!) • მოგახევ მაგ თავს! (I'll tear your head off!) • შუბლს გაგიხვრიტავ (I'll make a hole in your forehead!) • თქვენს სისხლს დავლევ! (I'll drink your blood!) • დაგიხვრიტავთ ფეხებს! (I'll shoot you in your legs!) • დაგათლით მაგ გასიებულ თეძოებს! (I'll cut off your fatty hips!) • დაგინგრევთ მაგ თავ-ყბას! (I'll smash your head!) • უნდა დაგილეწოთ თავ-ყბა ყველას თქვენ! (I'll smash your head and jaws!)	• I'm going to stomp all over your face with golf spikes • snatch a knot in their a**
Examples from internet sources № 35, 43-50	

The analysis of the examples has shown that, despite the fact that the sole purpose of using threatening statements is to put an addressee in an undesirable position, the means and methods of expressing it, as well as the form and style, are different and in some cases

completely inexplicable. That is why the study of the threat issue occupies a very important place in many scientific fields, both in modern reality and in the future perspective.

General Conclusions.

Thus, on the basis of the analyzed material, we can conclude the following theoretical generalizations:

In modern reality, when the extreme form of aggression - threat language is characterized by an unusually frequent use, there is a growing interest in studying the threat phenomenon in various fields of science.

From a linguistic point of view, threat is a socially constructed act of linguistic power between those who threaten and those who are threatened, which leads to an expected fatal destruction.

Threat is a social, not an individual, phenomenon that is realized in everyday communication. An act of threat can be implemented at all stages of communication, except for intrapersonal communication. However, the most active stage, where the threat is most likely to occur, is an interpersonal communication.

The act of threat can be implemented both in verbal and non-verbal form, both orally and in writing.

Threat is an act of communication, which in some cases mainly involves issuing directives.

According to the classification of Searle's theory of speech acts, threats are classified as a speech act of comissives; however, the analysis of examples has shown that threat can relate not only to one, but to two groups of speech acts - directives and commissives. This conclusion follows from the fact that threat, on the one hand, as a speech act of directives, forces a listener to take any action, and on the other hand, threat as a speech act of commissives, expresses the speaker's obligation to act in according to his / her own statement.

Threat as a social phenomenon cannot be explained and understood without taking into account the social context and sociolinguistic variables (social class, age, gender,

ethnicity), directly involved in the threat process. These variables provide additional information, and their existence allows to fully understand the ongoing process. In the analyzed threats the main attention is paid to the sociolinguistic status variable, and there are discussed the peculiarities of the language of threat of Georgian and foreign politicians.

The study of the threat phenomenon is closely connected with the concept of stance, which involves the expression of feelings, assessments or views of the interlocutors, using lexico-grammatical and paralinguistic devices. In accordance with the analyzed examples, politicians' threats are often characterized by paralinguistic features such as tone, pitch and length of voice, facial expression, gestures and other expressions of body language. Printing sources also include bold font, italics and upper-case print.

In threatening language, vocabulary expressing a stance is represented by three main groups: vocabulary that names, describes and expresses. Threat language in both analyzed languages is characterized by the following linguistic features: offensive and degrading language (racist, gender), profanity, vocabulary expressing a desire to offend.

The analysis of the examples has shown that both Georgian and English-language threats are characterized by an abundance of the use of phraseological units. In such expressions, somatic idioms are most often used in both languages. There can also be found colloquialisms and idioms. Unlike Georgian, English colloquialisms are characterized by much more frequent use of profanity. It should also be noted that basically the colors (black and blue), that appear in phraseological units expressing the threat, are the same for both languages.

Grammatical markers of stance are carriers of a certain linguistic function, and when used in English and Georgian, there can be found both similarities and differences. The following general grammatical markers can be distinguished both in Georgian and English-language threats: conditional sentences, modality, use of second-person pronouns to point out the desired object, adverbs to show seriousness of intentions, negative constructions, rhetorical questions, imperative sentences, future tense. Regarding the differences, we can note the fact that most of the phrases containing threat in the Georgian language are formed in active voice, while the English language mainly uses passive voice.

The analysis of the examples found was carried out in two main areas of work - by types of threats and levels of threats.

A typological analysis of examples of threatening statements by Georgian and foreign politicians, has shown that Georgian politicians most often use direct threats (71.5%); the second place in frequency of use is occupied by the direct-conditional threat (15%), and the indirect threat is the least frequently used type (1.25%). Different picture emerges in the English language, where almost half (46.25%) of the statements of politicians, expressing the threat, are direct-conditional; they are followed by direct threats (32.5%); indirect threats take the third place (21.25%).

Depending on the degree of danger, politicians are tend to use high and medium-level threat language. Georgian politicians use high-level threats with a much lower frequency (27.5%) than medium-level threats (72.5%). The opposite picture is presented in the case of English-language threats: the frequency of high-level threats is higher (65%) than medium-level threats (35%). It should also be noted that low-level threats have not been found neither in the statements of Georgian politicians nor in foreign ones.

As the analysis of examples has shown, the style, the form and the methods of expressing a threat may vary, but the goal - to intimidate and put the addressee in an undesired position - remains unchanged.

References:

Georgian

1. Amirejibi R., *Concept and Metaphoric Thinking,* TSU (Tbilisi State University) Scientific works, Vol. 9. Tbilisi State University Publishing, Tbilisi, 2005;

2. Bichashvili M., *Political Theory and Practice of Analysis,* Social Science Centre Publishing, Tbilisi, 2006;

3. Chiqobava A., *General Linguistics,* vol. 2, General issues, Tbilisi State University Publishing, Tbilisi, 1983;

4.   Gamkrelidze T., Kiknadze Z., Shaduri I., Shengelia N., *Course of Theoretical Linguistics,* (2nd edition) Tbilisi State University Publishing, Tbilisi, 2008;

5.   Ladaria N., *Sociolinguistics,* Science Publishing, Tbilisi, 2002;

6.   Lebanidze G., *Anthropocentrism and Communicative Linguistics,* Language and Culture Publishing, Tbilisi, 1998;

7.   Lebanidze G., *Communicative Linguistics,* Language and Culture Publishing, Tbilisi, 2004;

8.   Levidze M., *Face Threatening Acts and Answers to them in the Georgian Language: Intergender Perspective,* Humanitarian research journal "Kadmos" №3, Ilia State University Publishing, Tbilisi, 2011;

9.   Liparishvili G., *Effective Communication, Effective Presentation, Discussion Techniques,* Additional material for lecturing course, Ilia State University Publishing, Tbilisi, 2009;

10. Luhmann N., (Translated by D. Dumbadze), *Society Communication System Changes and Mass Media,* Arkhe Publishing, Tbilisi, 2007;

11. Makharadze T., Sumbadze N., *Interpersonal Communication,* National Assessment and Examinations Center (NAEC) Publishing, Tbilisi, 2010;

12. Makharoblidze T., *Communication,* Ilia State University, http://eprints.iliauni.edu.ge/3063/1/Communico.doc , Retrieved: April 12, 2016;

13. Merabishvili T., *Speech Act Theory in Modern Linguistics,* Journal "Intercultural Communications" №15, Tbilisi, 2011;

14. Mindadze I., *Psycholinguistics,* Arte Publishing, Tbilisi, 2009;

15. Nebieridze G., *Introduction to Linguistics,* Education Publishing, Tbilisi, 1991;

16. Petriashvili I., Reading Material for Lecturing Course, *Intercultural Education – Pedagogical Approaches,* Tbilisi State University Publishing, Tbilisi, 2015;

17. Saussure F. D., *Course in General Linguistics*, Diogene Publishing, Tbilisi, 2002;

18. Surguladze R., Iberi E., *Mass Communication,* Language and Culture Publishing, Tbilisi, 2003;

19. Tevzadze M., *Modern Linguistic Movements: Pragmatics and Speech Act Theory,* Lecturing Course Papers, 2012;

20. Toradze T., *Toradzes from Vera,* Georgian Prose Publishing, Tbilisi, 2016;

English

1. Appiah A. R. and Bosiwah L., *Pragmatic Study of Verbal Threats Among the Fantes: A Case of Apewosika.* International Journal of Applied Linguistics and Translation. 2015.

2. Austin J. L., *How to do things with words.* Oxford University Press, Great Britain. 1962;

3. Biber D., *University Language* - A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia. 2006.

4. Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan E., *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.* Pearson Education Limited, England. 1999;

5. Bourdieu P., *Language and Symbolic Power*, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK. 1991;

6. Brown P. and Levinson C. S. *Politeness: some universals in language usage. (Studies in interactional sociolinguistics; 4).* Great Britain, Cambridge University Press. 1987;

7. Conrad S. and Biber D., Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (Eds.) *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2000;

8. Davis D. A., *Threats pending fuses burning: Managing workplace violence.* Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing. 1997;

9. Duranti A., *Linguistic Antropology,* Published in the United States by Cambridge University Press, New York. 1997;

10. Fraser B., *Threatening revisited. Forensic Linguistics.* 5(2), 159-173. University of Birmingham Press, UK. 1998;

11. The School Board of Broward County, Florida: Freedman, A. M., Rubert, N., Bartleman, R., Brinkworth, H. P., Good, P., Korn, D. P., Levinson, L. R., Murray, A., Dr. Osgood, R. *Threat Assessment Procedures Manual.* 2017;

12. Gales T. and Chand V., A corpus-based approach to word frequency and syntactic categories: Untangling their relationship within sound change. Paper at 2010 Linguistic Society of America (LSA) Annual Meeting, Baltimore, MD. 2010;

13. Gales T., *Threatening Stances Language and Law / Linguagem e Direito*, Vol. 2(2), p. 1-25. 2015;

14. Geiwitz P. J., *The Effects of Threats on Prisoner's Dilemma. Behavioral Science, 12.* 1967;

15. Goffman E., *INTERACTION RITUAL: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour.* Made and printed Offset Litho in Great Britain by Cox &Wyman Ltd, London, Fakenham and Reading.1967;

16. Grice H. P., *Studies in the Way of Words.* London, England; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1991;

17. Glukhov G. V., and Anatolyevna, I. M. (2015) *Efficiency of Threats in Interpersonal Communication*; Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education.

18. Habermas J., *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. 1. – Reason and the rationalization of society (translated by Thomas McCarthy). Boston: Beacon Press. 1984;

19. Jenkins E., Violence in the workplace scope of the problem and risk factors. In C.W. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Violence in the Workplace: Preventing, Assessing, and Managing Threats at Work*. Rockville, MD: Government Institutes. 1998;

20. Kellermann P. F., Interpersonal Conflict Management In Group Psychotherapy: An Integrative Perspective. Group Analysis Vol. 29, (pp. 257-275), SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi.1996;

21. Kent G., *The effects of threats.* Ohio State University Press, The USA. 1967;

22. Lakoff G. and Kovecses Z., *The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1987;

23. Lyons J., *Semantics* (Vol. 2), Cambridge University Press, Great Britain. 1977;

24. Martin J. R. and White P. R., *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English.* Antony Rowe Ltd Chippenham and Eastbourne, Great Britain. 2005;

25. Meloy J., Reid., Hoffmann J., Guldimann A. and James D., *The Role of Warning Behaviors in Threat Assessment*: An Exploration and Suggested Typology. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law; Behav. Sci. Law 30.* 2012;

26. Milburn T. W. and Watman K. H., *On the nature of threat: A psychological analysis.* NY: Praeger Publishers, New York. 1981;

27. Muschalik J., *Threatening in English:* A mixed method approach. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia. 2018;

28. Napier M. and Mardigian S., Threatening messages: The essence of analyzing communicated threats. *Public Venue Security*, September/October, 16–19. 2003;

29. Riyadh Tariq Kadhim Al-Ameedi, Promise and Threat in English and Arabic Religious Texts: A pragmatic Study.2012;

30. Salgueiro B. A., *Promises, Threats and Foundations of Speech Act Theory*. International Pragmatics Association. 2010;

31. Scanlon T. M., *Moral Dimensions: PERMISSIBILITY, MEANING, BLAME.* Belknap Press of Harvard University Press Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England. 2008;

32. Searle J. R., *A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts.* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis. Retrieved from the University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy, http://hdl.handle.net/11299/185220. 1975;

33. Searle J. R., *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* University Printing House, Great Britain, Cambridge. 1969;

34. Sechser T. S., "Goliath's Curse: Coercive Threats and Asymmetric Power." *International Organization*, 2010;

35. Shapiro D. L. and Kulik C. T., *The Handbook of Negotiation and Culture*. Stanford Business Books An imprint of Stanford University Press Stanford, California. 2004;

36. Shuy R., *Language crimes: The use and abuse of langauge evidence in the courtroom.* (First edition 1993, reprinted 1996) Basil Blackwell. Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA. 1993;

37. Staton J., (ed.) *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*. Norwood: Ablex. 1982;

38. Storey K., *The language of threats*. Forensic Linguistics 2(1). 1995;

39. Tedeschi J. T., and Felson, R. B., *Violence, Aggression and Coercive Actions*. Washington: American Psychological Association. 1994;

40. Wardhaugh R., *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (Fifth Edition); Blackwell Publishing. 2006;

41. Yeboaba A. A., *Verbal Warnings among the Fantes:* (Unpublished BA Honors graduate's thesis, May, 2012, University of Cape Coast). 2012;

42. Yule G., *Pragmatics.* Great Britain, Oxford University Press. 1996;

43. Walton D., *Speech Acts and Indirect Threats in Ad Baculum Arguments:* A Reply to Budzynska and Witek *Argumentation*, 28 (3), 2014; http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/crrarpub/14

44. Watts R. J., Ide, S., Ehlich, K., *Politeness in language:* studies in its history, theory, and practice / with a new introduction by Richard J. Watts; 2nd rev. and expanded ed., Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague) is a Division of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin. 2005;

45. Wittgenstein L., *Philosophical investigations* by Ludwig Wittgenstein (Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe). Basil Blackwell Ltd., Great Britain. 1958;

Russian

1. Shakhovski V. I., *Categorization of emotions in lexica-semantic system of the language,* Moscow, 2009;

Internet Sources

1. https://bit.ly/2Zllqfa (Published: 18.10.2013; Retrieved: November 11, 2017)

2. https://bit.ly/34XEtgO (Published: 9.06.2016; Retrieved: November 11, 2017)

3. https://bit.ly/2SsB0V0 (Published: 24.03.2017; Retrieved: March 2, 2018)

4. https://bit.ly/35SVysN (Published: 25.11.2016; Retrieved: February 1, 2019)

5.   https://bit.ly/2TrPZyR (Published: 29.07.2017; Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

6.   https://bit.ly/368ktJG (Published: 23.11.2015; Retrieved: February 17, 2018)

7.   https://bit.ly/2rqxmzN (Published: 07.01.2015; Retrieved: March 2, 2018)

8.   https://bit.ly/2Mr9ljy (Published: 13.02.2015; Retrieved: November 9, 2017

9.   https://bit.ly/2tLBPhi (Published: 14.01.2019; Retrieved: February 1, 2019)

10.   https://bit.ly/34VEnX9 (Published: 1.05.2017; Retrieved: December 12, 2017)

11.   https://cnb.cx/2Zl4vcQ (Published: 26.11.2018; Retrieved: May 13, 2019)

12.   https://bit.ly/2QgvPVz (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

13.   https://bit.ly/2MqS1em (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

14.   https://bit.ly/2Qw2pTB (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

15.   https://bit.ly/2MrWIEU (Published: 28.12.2016; Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

16.   https://bit.ly/34WSknN (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

17.   https://bit.ly/37cOlon (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

18.   https://bit.ly/2ZmttZi (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

19.   https://bit.ly/34XJu94 (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

20.   https://bayareane.ws/2tQHMcY (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

21.   https://bit.ly/3968ZZn (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

22.   https://bit.ly/39c4nAV (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

23.   https://bit.ly/2ZnQ9bt (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

24.   https://bit.ly/2PU5NbI (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

25. https://bit.ly/34StS6L (Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

26. https://bit.ly/2MqvDC4 (Retrieved: September 21, 2019)

27. https://bit.ly/2PYRX85 (Published: 18.01.2017; Retrieved: February 17, 2018)

28. https://bit.ly/35YX5i2 (Published: 4.03.2019; Retrieved: April 12, 2019)

29. https://bit.ly/2smbG8p (Published: 24.10.2018; Retrieved: April 12, 2019)

30. https://bit.ly/2rrg6uh (Published: 12.03.2019; Retrieved: April 12, 2019)

31. https://bit.ly/2t0b2xy (Published: 19.06.2012; Retrieved: October 22, 2018)

32. https://bit.ly/2MppOEM (Published: 20.10.2016; Retrieved: April 12, 2019)

33. https://nyti.ms/2FzG0j9 (Published: 9.04.2019; Retrieved: April 12, 2019)

34. https://bit.ly/3795sYA (Published: 11.04.2017; Retrieved: February 17, 2018)

35. https://bit.ly/3984bTn (Published: 17.11.2015; Retrieved: February 17, 2018)

36. https://bit.ly/2PVxwsr (Published: 29.07.2011; Retrieved: February 17, 2019)

37. https://cnn.it/2RnwJzQ (Published: 5.04.2019; Retrieved: April 5, 2019)

38. https://bit.ly/2ESDROZ (Published: 6.11.2015; Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

39. https://bit.ly/368nwS8 (Published: 6.11.2016; Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

40. https://bit.ly/398xBR8 (Published: 31.05.2016; Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

41. https://bit.ly/2QlQ2sP (Published: 27.09.2013; Retrieved: April 6, 2018)

42. https://bit.ly/2SqkLb9 (Published: 12.10.2017; Retrieved: February 17, 2018)

43. https://bit.ly/2Qm5x3Y (Published: 4.07.2017; Retrieved: 1 February, 2019)

44. https://bit.ly/2MswhyF (Published: 24.05.2017; Retrieved: February 17, 2018)

45. https://bit.ly/2ZmzncZ (Published: 12.06.2017; Retrieved: February 17, 2018)

46. https://bit.ly/377IVuX (Published: 12.11.2018; Retrieved: May 13, 2019)

47. https://bit.ly/39bUmUs (Published: 2.12.2018; Retrieved: May 13, 2019)

48. https://bit.ly/2PW96Py (Published: 24.10.2014; Retrieved: May 13, 2019)

49. https://aol.it/2Zv7JdW (Published: 12.10.2018; Retrieved: February 5, 2019)

50. https://twitter.com/kylegriffin1/status/890295376611344385?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ct wcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E890329703822872576&ref_url=https%3A%2F% 2Fwww.bustle.com%2Fp%2F11-times-male-politicians-threatened-female-colleagues-with-violence-2979816 (Published: 26.07.2017; Retrieved: May 13, 2019)