What is left unsaid; implicatures in political discourse.

Ardita Dylgjeri, PhD candidate

"Aleksander Xhuvani" University
Email: arditadylgjeri@live.com

Abstract

The participants in a conversation adhere to the cooperative principle and the maxims. However, some things are left unsaid because of the fact that diplomatic discourse or political discourse makes frequent use of 'implicatures', in order to suggest information not explicitly expressed in the text. These inferences are usually based on particular beliefs, opinions and knowledge of some concrete situation. The political implicatures that is, the specific political inferences that participants make in the communicative situation, for instance MPs in a parliamentary debate may make, are based on (their understanding of) this speech and its context.

In this paper, several instances of maxim violation and inplicatures present in political discourse will be analyzed, by paying importance to the way politicians favor them so as to conceal the truth. We will take into consideration Edi Rama`s interview to CNN about the presidential election in USA, as a case study of implicatures use and function.

Keywords*: implicature, cooperative principle, politics, discourse, context.*

Introduction

Language is a weapon and a powerful tool in winning public support especially during current information revolution period. It is also a weapon in the struggle of community against community, worldview against worldview. Language, therefore, is seen as the means for communicating ideas, projects, programs, but not only that. It is also a fighting means, to persuade, to make the other believe or not, to promise, to tell the truth, or to tell lies.

It is apparent that political discourse revolves around being manipulative and hedgy, giving less information about the truth of things. Therefore, it is well enough to say that political language is the tricky and twisted use of language, achieving the politician's goals and interests.

Discourse analysis is generally peaking considered as communication viewed linguistically and linguistics viewed communicatively. Thus, it can be studied as a mixture of these two closely related fields. On the other hand, political discourse can be mostly analyzed as the discourse of political leaders, MPs, presidents, ministers etc. whose main aim is to persuade the people that their political ideas, aims, and propaganda are the best to be listened to and believed in.

A politician actually hides himself behind these skills so as not to attach himself to any kind of commitment. According to Wodak (2007, p. 203) various pragmatic devices such as insinuation, allusions, word play, presuppositions and implicatures can be analyzed in their multiple functions in political discourse where they frequently serve certain goals.

Political Discourse Analysis.

There are definitions of discourse in many linguistics books on the subject now open with a survey of definition. They all fall into the three main categories noted:

1) Anything beyond the sentence,
2) Language use,
3) A broader range of social practice that includes nonlinguistic and nonspecific instances of language.

Schifrin (2011) defines "discourse" as anything "beyond the sentence." Another general definition of discourse is "a connected stretch of language (especially spoken language) usually bigger than a sentence and particularly viewed as interaction between speakers or between writer and reader."

 "Discourse" can refer to a description of all genres in politics or to politicians' discourses, so in politics "discourse" is "a socially constituted set of such genres, associated with a social domain or field (Van Dijk, 1998, p. 196). Political speech is a genre of political discourse and is part of public discourse. According to Van Dijk (2002, p. 225) "political discourse" is not primarily defined by a topic or style, but rather by who speaks to whom, as what, on what occasion and with what goals. In other words, political discourse is especially 'political' because of its functions in the political process. Political actors sometimes communicate in an obscure, semantically dense, vague, oblique, and rather 'cautious' manner. In effect, they communicate indirectly.

A discourse can be analyzed by using pragmatics tools because firstly, both of them use context as the focus of the study. Context is analyzing part of meaning that can be explained by knowledge of the physical and social world, and the socio-psychological factors influencing communication, as well as the knowledge of the time and place in which the words are uttered or written.

The second feature that pragmatics and discourse analysis have in common is that they both look at discourse, or the use of language, and text, or pieces of spoken or written discourse, concentrating on how stretches of language become meaningful and unified for their users. From the relations above, discourse can be applied in analyzing Grice Cooperative Principle theory because both of them using context to interpret meaning in an utterance.

Implicatures and Gricean maxims of conversation.

Perhaps one of the most influential contributions to the analysis of discourse in general and to political discourse in particular, is the one made by Paul Grice (1975). According to his cooperative principle, Grice points out that our talk exchanges are characteristically, to some degree, cooperative efforts. Conversational implicatures are briefly described as propostions or assumptions not encoded,

Grice distinguishes between two types of conversational implicature:

1) Particularized conversational implicature (PCI); to decode this we have to know "special features of the context."

2) Generalized conversational implicature (CGI); no context knowledge is needed to decode this (Grice, 1975, p. 56).

For detailed explanation of the cooperative principle, Grice gives four categories of maxims of conversation or general principles underlying the efficient cooperative use of language and as follows:

(1) Maxim of Quality: seek to say that which you know to be true, and do not say that which you know to be false or for which you lack adequate evidence.

(2) Maxim of Quantity: Make your contribution as informative as required, not more or less informative than required for the purposes of the ongoing discourse.

(3) Maxim of Relevance: Be relevant.

(4) Maxim of manner: Make your contribution clear, and intelligible, brief, orderly and not ambiguous.

Of course, it is known that people do not follow all these normative maxims all of the time, but if the norms weren't norms, there would be no concept

of lying, telling half-truths, evading the issue, being deliberately obscure (Chilton & Schäffner, 2002, p. 12). Politics may be a specific context in which the CP is recognized to be in danger. However, Grice argues that when the maxims are "flouted," the cooperative principle is generally still assumed to be functioning, in such a way that hearers infer some implied meaning. These implied meanings are known as implicatures.

Practical analysis of implicatures in Albanian political discourse.

Political implicatures as defined by Van Dijk (2005, p. 66) are "the specific political inferences that participants in the communicative situation may take on the basis of the speech and its context". The inferences involved are not semantic, but pragmatic or contextual. Moreover, politicians use implicatures, perhaps because they prefer to be implied, completely or incompletely in what is actually said, in their verbal messages and the way they tend to convey them to the audience.

Our practical analysis of implicatures through the violation of conversational maxims will be concerned with the interview given by the Albanian Prime Minister, Edi Rama given to CNN about the presidential election in USA (Rama, 2016).

   a. **CNN:** *You have recently claimed that a successful presidential bid by the Republic hopeful would hurt US relations with his country. Why did you say that and what do you exactly mean?*

Prime Minister Edi Rama: *America is "the shining city upon the hill", and the purposes we are listening from Donald Trump are really frightening and are really undermining what America is in our eyes.*

What is easily noticed in this question-response interaction is the fact that the speaker (the journalist) explicitly and directly asks the other speaker (the Prime Minister) about one of his declarations about the US presidential election results, and he tries to answer by violating the maxim of manner by not being clear, direct, and concise. "The shining city upon the hill" is a metaphor, and Edi Rama, as a politician is in favor of using figurative language as well as many other stylistics devices, which Albanian language offers in abundance. However, metaphors may serve as examples of the violation of the maxim of quality. By making use of metaphors, speakers imply something different from what they mean, or at least try to use verbal strength by exaggeration or understatement.

   b. **CNN:** *You'd be aware of course that diplomatic niceties usually mean that foreign leaders do not comment on elections in other*

> countries. But you obviously decided that this issue is greater that this protocol.

Prime Minister Edi Rama: *I did not comment on the elections. I simply said something that I understand, and I am neither the first nor the only one to say. Other leaders in Europe have expressed the same concerns, because America is far greater and far more important than for itself and in itself. The US is in our eyes a world leader that we follow as a truly inspiring example and this inspiring example is built on values and principles for which America fought and that made America great.*

In this case, the speaker violates the maxims of quality and quantity. At first, he tries to hide the truth, what he had previously done the declaration about the possible "unfortunate" result of presidential elections. Second, he tends to be my ore informative than required, by including even some unnecessary details not asked by the interviewer. Maybe, the actual context and the fact of being under pressure, make him respond this way, arising implicatures.

   c.   *CNN: If Donald Trump does become the nominee, then it becomes a lot trickier, doesn't it, for everyone concerned who has these fears.*

Prime Minister Edi Rama: *God forbid! I believe it would harm a lot America and it would harm a lot the democratic world, since at the end he will have to do at least some of the things that he is saying he will do, and this would be very harmful.*

In his response to the above question, Edi Rama floats the maxims of quality and manner since he chooses to be implicit and generalized. He does that without sticking to the real actual part of the question, which is, "the tricky relationship" between Albania and the United States if Trump was to be elected the future president of USA.

Following the previous answer, the speaker gives some additional information, trying to make it more complete, but in fact, by doing this he loses relevance of the speech. The maxim of relevance requires him to be relevant and coherent with what he has been asked. Instead, he makes use of many other details not directly linked with the question. Thus, he floats another maxim as well, which is that of quantity. Referring to what was previously explained, he adds:

   d.   *And I very much hope that in the meantime he will be able to learn more about the world, learn more about Muslims, learn more about how they are a very proud community of people who, regardless of their religion or their ethnicity, live with the values*

> *that America represents and protect these values, even by sacrificing their own children in wars together with America.*

Findings/ conclusions.

Politicians must persuade the public that their views are valid and common sense. This can partly be achieved by implicature. Implicature allows the audience to make assumption about information that has not actually been presented. It suggests that the audience share the same views as the politician. For that reason, politicians tend to politicize the public by speeches or interviews with dramatic overtones and unrealistic promises, which means that various language forms can influence the intensity of social conflict. Unfortunately, listeners sometimes have to believe or accept what political speakers say since there are no alternative ideas or opinions or they are not knowledgeable enough to dispute speakers' words. Implicatures are one of the most effective tools for politicians to realize their objectives. As resulted from the previous example of Edi Rama`s interview, the violation of conversational maxims directly leads to the use of implicatures, either by concealing the truth, or being non relevant, by giving too many unnecessary details or by just not giving enough needed information, or by expressing yourselves in an unclear or ambiguous way.

Bibliography

Chilton, P. A., & Schäffner, C. (2002). Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of the political discourse. In P. A. Chilton, & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* (pp. 1-41). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Syntax and semantics. (P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan, Eds.) *Logic and conversation 3 , 3*, 41-58.

Rama, E. (2016, April 14). *Interview of Prime Minister Edi Rama for CNN*. Retrieved May 07, 2016, from http://www.kryeministria.al: http://www.kryeministria.al/en/newsroom/news/interview-of-prime-minister-edi-rama-for-cnn

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *"Ideology. A multidisciplinary study.* London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). "Political discourse and political cognition. In P. A. Chilton, & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse 203 (2002).* (pp. 203-238). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2005). War rhetoric of a little ally. Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimatization of the war in Iraq. (M. Krzyzanowski, D. Machin, & R. Wodak, Eds.) *Journal of Language and Politics , 4* (1), 65-91.

Wodak, R. (2007). Pragmatics and critical discourse analysis: A cross-disciplinary inquiry. (M. Dascal, Ed.) *Pragmatics & Cognition , 15* (1), 203-225.