

ABSTRACT

This study sets out to determine a beneficial theoretical and

Explicit and implicit political communication: relevance theoretic perspective

أ.م.د. أنغام عبد الكاظم الركابي الباحثة هند صباح زغير

جامعة القادسية / كلية التربية

edu-eng.post22.15@qu.edu.iq

practical aspects in relevance theory. Theoretically, this study is hoped to be an productive contribute in providing to be useful posit of the importance of explicatures and implicatures in effective political interactions. Practically, this study could be made as the model for how speech effectiveness can change many political affairs especially in the most vital point in the UK Parliament the House of Commons. By studying relevance theory, people can be careful to determine the choice of words, phrases, clauses and sentences in expressing the ideas or meaning in a given context, because being relevant and intentional is an important thing in deciding whether the utterance used is implicit or explicit. Political actors are assessing their political context in order to provide their hearer with the most suitable utterance, suitable for the hearer and the immediate context. Political messages are of different forms but with common aim, which is to pragmatically take advantage of the other side of the communication to gain the public's acceptance and support. As this study aims to explain how cognitively-pragmatically political communication is processed, through the use of explicatures and different range of implicatures.

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحديد الجوانب النظرية والعملية المفيدة في نظرية الصلة. من الناحية النظرية، من المأمول أن تكون هذه الدراسة مساهمة مثمرة في تقديم موقف مفيد حول أهمية التفسيرات والدلالات في التفاعلات السياسية الفعالة والمؤثرة. من الناحية العملية، يمكن إجراء هذه الدراسة كنموذج لكيفية تأثير فعالية الخطاب على تغيير العديد من الشؤون السياسية خاصة في في برلمان المملكة المتحدة التي تعد الأكثر حدة في مجلس العموم. من خلال دراسة نظرية الصلة، يمكن للناس أن يكونوا حذرين في تحديد اختيار الكلمات والعبارات والعبارات والجمل في التعبير عن الأفكار أو المعنى في سياق معين، لأن كونها ذات صلة ومقصودة أمر مهم في تحديد ما إذا كان الكلام المستخدم ضمناً أم لا وما إذا كان لها تأثير على القدرات الاستيعابية والمعرفية للجمهور. في الحقيقة يقوم الفاعلون السياسيون بتقييم سياقهم السياسي من أجل تزويد المستمعين بالكلام الأكثر صلة، والذي يناسب المستمع والسياق المباشر. وللرسائل السياسية أشكال مختلفة ولكن هدفها مشترك، وهو الاستفادة بشكل عملي من الجانب الآخر من التواصل لكسب قبول الجمهور ودعمه. حيث تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى شرح كيفية معالجة التواصل السياسي معرفياً وعملياً، من خلال استخدام التفسيرات ومجموعة مختلفة من التضمينات..

1. Introduction:

It is possible to define language in such realm as a semantic combinations or formulas that are well-formed. Such definition gives a great significance for 'language' as a tool. Two types of communicative processes which are involved in communicating. Perloff (2018, p.472) defines political communication as "a complex, communicative activity in which language and symbols, employed by leaders, media, citizens, and citizen groups, exert a multitude of effects on individuals and society, as well as on outcomes that bear on the public policy of a nation, state, or community.". Resul Çelik (2021) confirms that communication is crucial to politics. It would be hardly possible to do politics without communication. Social duties are accomplished by using communication, and society is verified

in deploying communication in its widest sense (Özkan, 2004, p.32).

Brian McNair (2003) agrees with the latter definition, as he calls it “purposeful communication about politics”. This definition is so versatile than others, since it includes all types or forms of communication, different users, for different aims. More efforts should be done in building the political image, through using different means of communication whether it is visual or virtual form, materialistic or mentalistic elements and many other aspects of political identity and how it is seen (McNair, 2011, p.3-4).

Accounting to communication through the perspectives of relevance theory is bringing many practical implications to the study of language use. To put things simply, the process of inferring meaning is possibly to be classified into variable sub-tasks in pragmatic accounts. Communication may include special cases such as ambiguity, ambivalences to be discovered, investigated and resolved, elliptical matters for further explanatory interpretations, other than more cases of underdeterminacy of explicit form to be dealt with. In addition to implicated content, metaphoric uses and ironic configurations that the receiver or the audience have to work on, to get certain confusions figured out. According to Allott (2013, p.20) the tractability of the search for interpretation of a certain utterance is offered by the communicative and presumption of optimal relevance. They function as an endorsement portal for the processing of the utterance interpretation, which attribute to the comprehension procedure.

The main processes needed are decoding and inferring to enable the communicators to grasp the intended meaning and go beyond what

is said or what is literally meant. The assumption is explicitly communicated is called “explicature” but when an assumption is implicitly communicated it is called “implicature”. Relevance is a matter of degree and therefore explicatures are also a matter of degree. Carston mentions two main communicated assumptions; ‘explicature’ and ‘implicature’, first, the distinction includes only assumptions that are undergo the communicative intention of the hearer, which might lead to the idea that the proposition considered as an explicature of the utterance that is communicated. A second feature is related to the sources of explicature’s content which are two distinct sources; ‘linguistic expression used’ and ‘context’. According to these sources, the derivation of the explicature is either by ‘pragmatic inference’ or ‘linguistic decoding’ (Carston, 2002, p.116-117). For Carston, explicatures (derived in terms of logical form inferentially) and implicatures (communicated assumptions through the utterance) are communicated through utterances in the propositional forms, both of them derived from the speaker’s intention, and communicative meaning.

Explicatures: Different forms of communication used by the communicators, Actually, verbal communication gives the hearer more stronger and explicit content (which is important grounding for the hearer to exploit the speaker’s meaning through intentions which can go way beyond the linguistic aspect of the linguistic item) to work with. In non-verbal communication that introduces no evidence for the hearer to process. So in this case the speaker needs to support the hearer into spending some efforts in deciphering the speakers meaning. The constructed hypotheses by the hearer are the main aim to meet the

utterances presumptions of relevance (Sperber and Wilson, 2004, p.613-615). Relevance theory proposed a new term to complement Grice's implicatures. Sperber and Wilson's main aim behind this proposal is to indicate that pragmatic inferential processes attribute to both implied and the explicit part of communication. Sperber and Wilson (1986, 1995, p.182) state explicature definition as follows:

An assumption communicated by an utterance U is explicit [hence an 'explicature'] if and only if it is a development of a logical form encoded by U. (Sperber and Wilson 1986, 1995, p.182)

Carston (2002, p.10) put her own development of the term of explicatures "...a propositional form communicated by an utterance which is pragmatically constructed on the basis of the propositional schema or template (logical form) that the utterance encodes; its content is an amalgam of linguistically decoded material and pragmatically inferred material..." In other words, The proposition that is explicitly expressed or communicated, explicature, it is inferred by pragmatic inference capacities of the hearer what the speaker intends to recover the relevant constituent (Sperber, Wilson, 1986).

Pragmatic processes such as 'disambiguation', 'reference assignment' and 'enrichment' are utilized by communicators to develop the encoded content of the utterance (Sperber and Wilson, 2012; 1986, p.184). Encyclopedic knowledge is accessed in order to get the most effective outcome of a particular ambiguous utterance. The hearer checks her/his encyclopedic information chunks through the processing of an utterance until he/she selects a certain interpretation that fits (Yus, 1998, p.324).

In the view of Sperber and Wilson, explicatures can vary in their strength (strong or weak), given in their terms basic and high-level explicatures (Sperber and Wilson, 1986; Carston, 2002). For instance:

“a. Bill: Did your son visit you at the weekend?”

“b. Mary (visibly happy): He did.” (Carston, 2002, p.119)

“a. Mary’s son visited her at the weekend.”

“b. Mary says that her son visited her at the weekend.”

“c. Mary believes that her son visited her at the weekend.”

“d. Mary is happy that her son visited her at the weekend.” (Carston, 2002, p.119).

Explicatures are varying in strength (or degree of explicitness) “The greater the relative contribution of decoding, and the smaller the relative contribution of pragmatic inference, the more explicit an explicature will be (and inversely)” (Sperber and Wilson, 1986/1995, p.182). Mainly, basic explicatures which is simply what proposition is communicated by the utterance but that is not all, proposition expressed embeds different higher-level descriptions, including “(weak) speech-act” and “propositional-attitude descriptions” (Wilson and Sperber, 1993, p.5-6). According to Carston higher-level explicatures are “a particular kind of explicature which involves embedding the propositional form of the utterance or one of its constituent propositional forms under a higher-level description such as a speech-act description, a propositional attitude description or some other comment on the embedded

proposition". Allot (2013, p. 18) defines it as "Higher-level explicatures are embeddings of the basic-level explicature under speech-act descriptors like 'promise that' and 'ask whether', or attitudinal ones such as 'regret that' or 'be pleased that.'" The higher-level explicatures is important or seems very clear to non-literal or non-declarative uses of language and other uses.

Implicatures: Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995, p.182) define implicatures as whatever that is not communicated explicitly. "An assumption communicated by U which is not explicit is implicit [hence an 'implicature']." In this way, implicatures are defined in terms of its relation to explicatures (Haugh, 2002, p.120). sperber and wilson have their own characterization of f implicatures that seems to be different in a reductionist way from Grice's treatment. (Haugh, 2002). Fully determined Implicatures are recovered through the reference to the manifested expectations of the speaker in that way the utterance it optimally relevant (Sperber and Wilson, 1986, p.194). Implicatures (or r-implicature as Huang (2007, p.195)) are retrieved purely inferentially, in order for the hearer to understand the intended meaning of the speaker.

Implicated premises and implicated conclusions are the two types proposed by Sperber and Wilson. Implicated premises are produced by the memory or constructed by assumption schema, and implicated conclusions are retrieved from the explicit level of the utterance and context (Sperber and Wilson, 1986, p.195). Both interpretation must be harmonized with the principle of relevance. In addition, implicatures vary in strength, there is strong and weak implicatures (Clark, 2013, p.217).

The hearer is obliged to supply a these premises and conclusions and attributing the hearer's beliefs to the speaker. As these assumptions are formed through psychological processes, to determine the accessibility of these assumptions, in which can affect their relevance (Sperber and Wilson, 1986, p.200-201).

There are two main sources for implicatures, "contextual assumptions" and "contextual implications" (Sperber and Wilson, 1994, p.105). Relevance theorists, moreover, expect that implicatures can vary in strength. In this picture, an utterance is stated to speak a sturdy implicature if its comprehension crucially depends on the restoration of this particular inference, or an array of weak implicatures, if the speaker does not really intend to communicate some determinate message (Assimakopoulos, 2017).

Moving to Strong and weak implicatures, strongly implicated "It is strongly implicated (or is a strong implicature) if its recovery is essential in order to arrive at an interpretation that satisfies the addressee's expectations of relevance". However its existence is necessary to retrieve the right interpretation (consistent with principle of relevance) the hearer is obliged to deduce it specifically. Whereas weakly implicated proposition "It is weakly implicated if its recovery helps with the construction of such an interpretation, but is not itself essential because the utterance suggests a range of similar possible implicatures, any one of which would do" the implicated premises or conclusion is when the hearer is less sure to derive it because interpretation is given in a wide range of premises and conclusions. (Sperber and Wilson 1986, 2004, p.620). Deirdre Wilson and

Dan Sperber proposed their alternative theory concerning inferential pragmatics which investigates mainly how meaning is inferred between the speaker and the hearer. Instance like:

“Peter: Would you drive a Mercedes?”

“Mary: I wouldn't drive ANY expensive car.” (Sperber and Wilson, 1986, p. 149)

Mary is asserting that Mercedes is an expensive cars. An utterance is comprehended when it is recovers a set of assumptions intended by the speaker explicitly and implicitly conveyed. The goal is to achieve the mutuality of the cognitive environment.

2. Methodology:

The data were analyzed pragmatically depending on one main theory: Sperber and Wilson's (1986, 1995) Relevance Theory. The reason for selecting this theory is that although the theory potentially provides a basic explanation for the results and there is no such study that tackles and issue similar to this one. Additionally, relevance theory gives much deeper understanding of the communicative process. The researchers rely heavily upon explicit and implicit communication used by the political communicators in their interaction to infer relevant interpretations using specific contextual assumptions.

3. Data Analysis:

The following are extracts that are taken from controversial debates in the House of Commons 2022.

Extract 1:

Boris Johnson has said: "That is the objective of the Labour party. It cannot be trusted on Brexit, and it cannot be trusted on the economy."
(UK Parliament, 2022, January 5).

Angela Rayner has said: "Prime Minister, how's it going? Are you okay?"
(UK Parliament, 2022, January 5).

In the above extract, the interlocutors; Angela Rayner (Deputy Leader of the Official Opposition) and Boris Johnson (The Prime Minister of the UK) are debating and starting the New Year by facing the repercussions of COVID and health crisis as regards to the financial and economic affairs in the UK. The extract is taken from a long debate moderated by (Mr. speaker) Lindsay Hoyle in the house of commons (UK parliament). This extract is analyzed in accordance with Sperber and Wilson's theory of relevance.

The prime minster expresses his informative and communicative intention in using an ostensive communication, through, finger pointing along with short utterances to create a communicative environment for the hearers' (primary and secondary audience). With his persuasive utterance trying to convince the audience that Rayner and her party are wrong, using less efforts and by contradictory and combining effects on the hearer's cognitive environment that is automatically triggered. A repetitive syntactic structure uttered by Johnson that is considered as a method to formulate a rhetorical effects. The Prime Minister uses parallelism to reduce the processing efforts needed to comprehend such utterances. No only this, but also to support the stylistic effects produced

by the parallel syntactic structure. The explicature is further enriched by the audience's encyclopedic entries to have a complete prepositional forms:

(a)The Labour Party cannot be trusted on Britain's situation in European Union

(b)and The Labour Party cannot be trusted on the economy

Johnson draws the audience's attention to an accessible schema of contextual assumptions to strongly implicates that:

(a)The Labour Party seeks nothing but their own good

(b)The Labour Party does not care about economic repercussions of Brexit

(c)The Labour Party is not managing governmental issues correctly.

The speaker aims to be optimally relevant for the audience (both primary and secondary audience, by directing his messages parallelism in order to meet the hearers' expectations and to pursue the other side of the house (the Opposition) strongly. The speaker is supporting his linguistic communication with non-linguistic communication to enable his audience to infer strong implicatures alongside other weak implicatures.

(a)Borris Johnson does not agree with them

(b)Borris Johnson has different opinion about what is happening in Britain

These are weakly manifested to the hearers who are required to put

the least effort to identify such assumptions and therefore finding the interpretation that is consistent with principle of relevance. The decisive factor, here, the effect. Since the speaker is after achieving as much effects as possible.

Rayner replies with quiet obvious ironical tone of voice, which is counted as a non-linguistic form of communication. Rayner has said to Johnson, "Prime Minister, how's it going? Are you okay?" the decoded logical form of Rayner's utterance into a description of Johnson's ostensive behavior. Expectation raised by Rayner's utterance will be optimally relevant to Johnson. Expectation raised by recognition of Rayner's ostensive behavior and acceptance of the presumption of relevance it conveys, together with the fact that such an explanation would be most relevant to Johnson at this point. Denial of saying "unfounded" proves Rayner to be wrong. First assumption to occur to Johnson which, together with other appropriate premises, and this is counted as implicit premise of Rayner's utterance which might satisfy expectation, Rayner's utterance will achieve relevance by ironical tone of what is said by Johnson. Rayner asks a rhetorical question and her utterance against his policy of management. First enrichment of the logical form of Rayner's utterance to occur to Johnson which might accepted as an explicature of Rayner's utterance. Rayner is defending her situation by using a regular question ironically. Johnson infers that Rayner seeks to take advantage of Johnson's situation. And Rayner asks a rhetorical question and her utterance against his policy of management plus background knowledge satisfies the expectation of optimal relevance.

The implicit premise:

- Johnson does not care about inflation

The explicit premise:

- Johnson is selfish

Johnson assumes that Rayner's utterance, which is decoded, is optimally relevant to him. Since Rayner does not want to know whether he is ok or not. He assumes that Rayner's utterance will achieve relevance by no answering Rayner's question. The encoded logical form gives a schema of accessible contextual assumption. This could be used as an implicit premise in deriving the expected explanation of Johnson's behavior. The utterance is interpreted on the explicit aspect (via enrichment and reference resolution) conveying the information. In combining the implicit premise and the explicit premise, Johnson reaches to the implicit conclusion and others may also occur. The resulting interpretation satisfies Peter's expectations of relevance. Therefore, explicatures and implicatures (implicit premises and conclusions) are reached by mutual parallel adjustment, with the most accessible hypotheses.

The utterance uttered by the Deputy leader is highly supported by non-linguistic cues. "Prime Minister, how's it going? Are you okay..." By calling in the formal position of Boris Johnson, she seeks his attention, not only him by also the attention of the whole house. To strengthen her situation in her political communication and also to prove more audience's expectations. The explicature assigns reference to "Prime

Minister” and “you” to Boris Johnson, “it” refers to “daily life”.

The rhetorical questions are uttered by Rayner, this is not to honestly ask him about how he is doing or whether he is ok or not. She does not expects him to answer her with the regular question about such questions. But she aims to automatically trigger and manifest a schema of contextual assumptions about how he manages things in the time of his prime ministry, how he is managing the prices around the country. She successfully creates a communicative environment for all the audience that is ironical and full of laughter by the secondary audience (except Johnson). Humorous questions achieve cognitive positive effects by the improvement of hearers’ cognitive environment. The higher-level explicature is:

- (a) The speaker is asking how he is feeling about the prices rising
- (b) The speaker is asking how he is planning to solve these issues

Rayner is communicating/implicating her full refusal of what is happening in UK and blaming Johnson for his decisions:

- (a) The speaker is telling Johnson to fix the problems he caused
- (b) The speaker is telling him that he is The Prime Minister and should act like one

A set of weaker implicatures produced by the speaker’s utterance:

- (a) The Prime Minister is unfit for his position

- (b) The Prime Minister is denying his faults
- (c) The Prime Minister argues regardless of his constant lies
- (d) The Prime Minister knows nothing about the economy

The hearer is capable of deciphering the explicated meaning to reach the intended meaning, through retrieving background knowledge and relevant assumptions about the speaker's utterance. Since the speaker harmonized her utterance and her body language to make the intended meaning accessible together with the hearer's abilities and preferences, minding the fact that the aim is to mutually manifest a particular conceptions about Johnson's management methods and principles.

Given the automatic principle of relevance that enables Johnson to maximize his mental capacities to involve all the possible hypotheses about a particular stimuli whether it is linguistic or non-linguistic which is Rayner's mental representation. The logical form of the Rayner's explicature involves a set of concepts, which give access to encyclopedic entries that assist the procedure of comprehension. The presumption of relevance is decided according to the factor of effort in deciding what hypotheses the hearer holds and what kind of interpretation derived from the ostensive communication. Inferential mental activity is triggered within Jonson's mental representations to recover Rayner's intended meaning which is totally rhetorical with ironical tone of voice. Rayner uses both extralinguistic and paralinguistic types of non-verbal communication, therefore, her message is delivered as argumentative and persuasive message in an interpersonal political

communication. Rayner expresses both informative and cognitive effects to achieve her aim in drawing on interdiscursive and intertextual structures of speech and text to have an effective political communication. In effect, her utterances are achieving presumption of relevance, thus, Johnson is assessing and evaluating her behavior to get what is intended by her ostensive behavior (utterance, tone of voice and body posture). The speaker is achieving cognitive benefit by using different linguistic and non-linguistic in order to draw the attention of the audience (primary audience specifically; Boris Johnson). The decisive factor, here, is the effect. Since Rayner is after achieving as much effects as possible.

Extract 2:

Angela Rayner said: “The Prime Minister promised that wage rises would offset inflation. They have not and they will not. Millions of British workers now face a further pay cut and the Chancellor is handing them a tax hike. [WHAT] will the Prime Minister do to get a grip of this?” (UK Parliament, 2022, January 5).

Boris Johnson has said: “It is great to be here with the right hon. Lady, the shadow Secretary of State for the Future of Work—we know the future job that she has in mind. I wish [I wish, I wish, I wish her well, I wish] her well” (UK Parliament, 2022, January 5).

In the above extract, the interlocutors; Angela Rayner (Deputy Leader of the Official Opposition) and Boris Johnson (The Prime Minister of the UK) are debating and starting the New Year by facing the repercussions of COVID and health crisis as regards to the financial and economic affairs

in the UK. The extract is taken from a long debate moderated by (Mr. Speaker) Lindsay Hoyle in the House of Commons (UK parliament). This extract is analyzed in accordance with Sperber and Wilson's theory of relevance.

Rayner represents Boris's promise, 'The Prime Minister' refers to Boris himself, and she reflects Boris's thought descriptively. Her hearers (primary and secondary audience are capable of infer an interpretation about Boris's thought with Rayner's attitudinal thought towards Boris's utterance. Promising requires the individual to perform the action. The speaker is intending her utterances to prove that Boris is wrong and he needs to state his reasons behind his actions which caused inflations. The speaker is expressing informative intention to indicate her intention towards the audience and the communicative intention in explicating and implicating her intentions at the same time. Her utterance automatically triggers Johnson and she is harmonizing her logical form with the audience's abilities and preferences. The explicit premise is that:

- Johnson's political decisions are the reason behind inflation and prices hike

And the implicit conclusion is that:

- Johnson is failing to get a grip on the living cost and he should fix this inflation crisis

Both premise and conclusions are combined together to result the intended meaning. The hearer is capable of recognizing her intended meaning through detecting the speaker's intentions in improvising her

opinions. The expository question with focal stress point to reinforce her aim in drawing audience's attention '[WHAT] will the Prime Minister do to get a grip of this?' Rayner requires some explanations from Johnson, she gives an intentional utterance to draw the hearers' attention. The communicators are mutually manifesting the notion of argumentative and persuasive messages, to improve the audience's cognitive environment and in combining informative and communicative intentions to have positive cognitive effects (benefits).

Rayner's explicature is encoded via reference assignment:

- (a) Wage rises have not offset inflation.
- (b) And wage rises will not offset inflation
- (c) The Chancellor is handing millions of British workers a tax hike.
- (d) What will the Prime Minister do to get a grip of inflation?

Rayner is implicating that:

- (a) Johnson is mismanaging his authority
- (b) Johnson did not keep his promises
- (c) Johnson is the reason behind British workers' suffering
- (d) Johnson and his Chancellor are involved in the tax hike

All these implicatures are combined in the order of accessibility to automatically and optimally appeal for Johnson himself and the other members of the house. The speaker provides her hearers with the

suitable equipment to comprehend her utterances and therefore to achieve the intended effects. Rayner's informative and argumentative message are added to the background knowledge to navigate the possible hypotheses and the hearer's expectations. The decisive factor, here, is the effect factor since the speaker is giving all her attention to linguistic and non- linguistic cues to change the hearer's cognitive environment.

Since Rayner believes that her utterances are optimally relevant to Jonson, she uses her body language (leaning on towards Boris) to reinforce and strengthen her political communication. She also makes mutually manifest some assumptions about her intentions for the audience (primary and secondary), this way, she is constructing them a unique context to make her utterances easy to comprehend with least effort and much effects produced.

Boris Johnson has said: "It is great to be here with the right hon. Lady, the shadow Secretary of State for the Future of Work—we know the future job that she has in mind. I wish [I wish, I wish, I wish her well, I wish] her well" (Humorous tone of voice, and looking back into his Party.) (HC Deb, 5 January 2022, c11).

Boris replies with quiet obvious humorous tone of voice, which is counted as a non-linguistic form of communication.

Johnson has said to Rayner, 'we know the future job that she has in mind' the decoded logical form of Johnson's utterance into a description of Johnson's ostensive behavior. Expectation raised by recognition of Johnson's ostensive behavior and acceptance of the presumption of

relevance it conveys. Expectation raised by Johnson's utterance will be optimally relevant to Rayner together with the fact that such an explanation would be most relevant to Johnson at this point. In not answering her question and mentioning her desires of new position proves Rayner to be greedy. First assumption to occur to Rayner which, together with other appropriate premises, and this is counted as implicit premise of Johnson's utterance which might satisfy expectation of Johnson's utterance will achieve relevance by ironical tone to what is said by Rayner. Johnson redirects the communication flow against Rayner. First enrichment of the logical form of Johnson's utterance to occur to Rayner which might be accepted as an explicature of Johnson's utterance. Rayner infers that Johnson is defending his situation by using Rayner's desires in humorous tone and Johnson seeks to take advantage of Rayner's situation.

Rayner assumes that Johnson's utterance, decoded, is optimally relevant to her. Johnson changing the flow of the conversation between him and his hearer as a pragmatic strategy to implicate the reason why Rayner is accusing him of such actions. She, on the other side of the house, assumes that Johnson's utterance will accomplish relevance by implicating the nature of Rayner's desires. The encoded logical form provides easy access to the contextual assumption. This could be used as an implicit premise in deriving the expected explanation of John's behavior, as long as the utterance is interpreted on the explicit side (via enrichment and reference resolution) to convey the information in the utterance. Rayner combines the implicit premise and the explicit premise, to arrive at the implicit conclusion, therefore, weaker

implicatures, may also result. The resulting interpretation satisfies Rayner's expectations of relevance. At this point, mutual parallel adjustment functions to relate all what mentioned above with hypotheses considered in order of their accessibility.

Implicit premise:

- Rayner is working for her own personal goal

Explicit premise:

- Rayner is too ambitious

Johnson uses this utterance 'we know the future job that she has in mind. I wish her well' as a persuasive and argumentative message. The explicature takes its presuppositional form through reference assignment, the pronoun 'we' refers to 'conservative party', 'future job' refers to the position of 'Secretary of State', the pronouns 'she' and 'her' refers to 'Rayner', and the pronoun 'I' refers to 'The Prime Minister'. Further enriched as:

- The house of commons knows that Rayner wants to be the Secretary of State
- Johnson wishes Rayner well in her political career

Johnson uses emphatic repetition of the noun phrase 'I wish' four times and 'I wish her well' two times to make his notion clear for the audience since there has been some noise in his side of the house (Conservative Party). Johnson uses both types of communication; linguistic, directing his utterance towards Rayner; non-linguistic, smile

and looking back into his Party. This utterance is strengthened and effective enough to draw Rayners attention to quiet a sensitive point in her political motives. He makes manifest to his hearer to make it as relevant as possible, in implicating that:

- (a) Rayner is seeking her own good
- (b) Rayner does not care about inflation
- (c) Rayner does not care about price or tax hike
- (d) Rayner is attacking The Prime Minister to affect his position
- (e) Rayner's motives are purely political greed

Which implicate the conclusion that:

- Rayner is not honest in her judgments towards Boris and the conservative party.

Rayner is capable of recognizing the speaker's informative and communicative intentions to attack her motives behind her political opinions, the hearer deciphers Johnson's utterance by recognizing the mood of the logical form and the attitudinal presuppositions. Rayner's cognitive environment is improved through the contradictory effects of Johnson's utterance. Johnson expects his primary audience (Rayner) to access the assumption that she is just want a higher position (Secretary of State). He encourages her to derive the intended conclusion. The result of Johnson's utterance is a contradictory effects in humorous utterance that led Rayner to smile thoroughly. The decisive factor is effect, since the speaker is aiming to achieve most effects and show his

audience the Rayner's truth behind her false accusations and behind her constant attacks.

4. Conclusion:

This study digs deep into the explicit and implicit political debates between the political actors, and what this could cause to suggest some changes to the political opinions. This new developed field in linguistics which studied intrinsically the interpretation of an utterance under effect of context. It indicates a highly precise accounts for the contextual factors and how they play a great role in meaning and the interpretation of an utterance. In addition it pays attention to explicit and implicit layers of speech. The researchers shed lights on how political actors use explicit and implicit communication to convey their intentions and to satisfy their aims in accordance with their audience's abilities. The link between the political actors' cognitive abilities (encyclopedic knowledge) and the interpretation is found by relevance theory. The interpretive hypotheses are automatically embedded during stimuli comprehension. The logical forms also function as a derivative tool to two most to most accessible contextual assumptions.

5. References:

1. Allott, N. (2013). Relevance theory. In A. Capone, F. Lo Piparo & M. Carapezza (Eds.), *Perspectives on Linguistic Pragmatics*, Springer. 57–98.
2. Assimakopoulos, Stavros. (2017). Context in relevance theory. In Joanna Blochowiak, Cristina Grisot, Stephanie Durrleman, Christopher Laenzlinger (eds.) *Formal Models in the Study of Language*:

3. *Applications in Interdisciplinary Contexts*. Springer. Pp. 221–242.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48832-5_12.
4. Carston, R. (2002). *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Oxford:Wiley-Blackwell.
5. Çelik, R. (2021). "Political Communication; A Conceptual Evaluation", *International Journal of Disciplines Economics & Administrative Sciences Studies*, 7(33), 713-722.
6. Clark, B. (2013) *Relevance Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Haugh, M. (2002) "The Intuitive Basis of Implicature: Relevance Theoretic Implicitness Versus Gricean Implying". *International Pragmatic Association*. Pp: 117-134. <http://www98.griffith.edu.au/>
8. Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press Inc.
9. McNair B. (2011). *an Introduction to Political Communication*. London ; New York: Routledge.
10. Mysociety. (2022). theyworkforyou. Retrieved from <https://www.theyworkforyou.com/>
11. Perloff, M. Richard. (2018). *The Dynamics Of Political Communication; Media and Politics in a Digital Age*. (2nd Ed). London ; New York: Routledge.
12. Sperber, D. & D.Wilson. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
13. Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1994) *Outline of relevance theory*. *Links & Letters*1, 85-106.
14. Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (2004). *Relevance Theory*. In Horn, L. and Ward, G. (eds) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. (pp.607-632) Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
15. Sperber, D. Wilson D. (2012). *Meaning and Relevance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-
16. UK Parliament. (2022, January 5). Prime Minister's Questions (PMQs) - 5 January 2022. [Video file]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TqITIEVcJiQ>
 17. Wilson, D. (2017). Relevance Theory. In Haung, Y. *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics*, (pp.79-100). Oxford University Press Inc.
 18. Wilson, D. Sperber, D. (1993). Linguistic Form and Relevance. *Lingua*. 90(1-2). Pp.1-25. DOI: 10.1016/0024-3841(93)90058-5.
 19. Yus Ramos, F. (1998). A Decade of Relevance Theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(3). Pp.305-45.