



Investigating Implicature in Trump's Political Speeches

Kareem Ali Ramadhan

Presidency of Al – Mustansiriyah University

kareemali313@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

Abstract

This study deals with a non-spoken device that aids to construct conversation namely “Implicature” and its effect on people. The study pragmatically investigates the use of English in political speeches of the American President Donald Trump. The problem is that styles of discourses, such as political speech containing implicatures as their model characteristic, require from the audience much more cognitive backgrounds than other styles. Working out political implicatures, specifically in electoral propaganda, involves highly contextual and encyclopedic knowledge from the audience. Politicians predominantly employ many linguistic strategies and rhetorical tools in their political speech for mobilizing their political actions and getting the public opinions much affected. Accordingly, the study aims at identifying implicatures used in political speech. It examine to highlight the pragmatic analysis of political speech to find answers to questions like “how do politicians utilize these implicatures in political speech specially in electoral propaganda and how frequent they are in such kind of speech?”. It is hypothesized that (1) conventional implicature, as the name suggests, is ascribed, by convention, to certain expressions regardless of context. (2) The president violates Grice's maxims due to the position requirements that he has. The procedures followed is to survey Grice's model and theory to present a theoretical background regarding the English language and politics and the interrelation between them, also to develop an analytical framework for the pragmatic analysis of the selected political speeches and analyzing them in terms of conventional and conversational implicatures, and to extract conclusions based on the results of the study analysis.

KEY WORDS: pragmatics, implication, political speech, conventional & conversational implicature

التحقيق في التضمين في خطابات ترامب السياسية

كريم علي رمضان

رئاسة الجامعة المستنصرية

المستخلص

تتناول هذه الدراسة أداة غير منظوقة تساعد على بناء محادثة وهي "التضمين أو الإضمار" وتأثيرها على الناس. تبحث الدراسة بشكل عملي في استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية في الخطب السياسية للرئيس الأمريكي دونالد ترامب. تكمن المشكلة في أن أنماط الخطابات، مثال على ذلك الخطاب السياسي الذي يحتوي على إشارات ضمنية كخاصية نموذجية لها، تتطلب من الجمهور خلفيات معرفية أكثر بكثير من الأنماط الأخرى. إن العمل على التضمينات أو الإضمارات السياسية، وتحديدًا في الدعاية الانتخابية، ينطوي على معرفة سياقية وموسوعية عالية من الجمهور (المستمعين). وبذلك الصدد يستخدم السياسيون



في الغالب العديد من الاستراتيجيات اللغوية والأدوات الخطابية في خطابهم السياسي لتعبئة أعمالهم السياسية والتأثير على الرأي العام بشكل كبير. وعليه ، تهدف الدراسة إلى التعرف على الدلالات المستخدمة في الخطاب السياسي. كما إنه يساعد في تسليط الضوء على التحليل البراغمتي للخطاب السياسي للعثور على إجابات لأسئلة أهمها "كيف يستخدم السياسيون هذه التداعيات في الخطاب السياسي وخاصة في الدعاية الانتخابية ومدى تكرارها في مثل هذا النوع من الكلام؟". من المفترض أن (1) المعنى الضمني التقليدي ، كما يوحي الاسم ، يُنسب ، من خلال الاصطلاح ، إلى تعبيرات معينة بغض النظر عن السياق. (2) ينتهك الرئيس قواعد Grice بسبب متطلبات المنصب التي لديه. إن الإجراءات المتبعة في البحث هي باستخدام نموذج ونظرية الفيلسوف اللغوي البريطاني Grice لتقديم خلفية نظرية فيما يتعلق باللغة الإنجليزية والسياسة والعلاقة المتبادلة بينهما ، وكذلك لتطوير إطار تحليلي للتحليل البراغمتي للخطابات السياسية المختارة وتحليلها من منظور تقليدي و دلالات المحادثة ، واستخلاص النتائج بناءً على نتائج تحليل الدراسة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: البراغمتية، التضمين، الخطاب السياسي، التضمين التقليدي والمحدثي

1. Introduction

Language is based on three elements, namely sound, form, and meaning. The element that deals with sound is phonology, the one that discusses form is morphology and syntax, and the third one studying about meaning is semantics and pragmatics. The communication is determined by all these elements. The communication could successfully be created when information is transmitted. However, the receptor (the hearer) has to perceive the meaning beyond the speaker's message appropriately. Pragmatics is defined by Yule (1996) as a part of linguistics that deals with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker or writer and interpreted by a listener or reader. Pragmatics encompasses many types, including speech act theory, implicature, talk in interaction and other approaches to language behavior in philosophy, sociology, linguistics and anthropology, (Mey, 1993). According to Brown & Yule (1983), the cooperative principle was developed by philosopher H. P. Grice to guide or steer speakers and listeners to produce and comprehend particular interpretations of what has been said unless the utterance has a different objective or intention. The sub-principles of the cooperative principle are termed to as maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. A sentence in a conversation might or might not have more than one meaning. One must be aware of the utterance circumstances in order to be able to determine the meaning of the sentences. The speaker might deliberately violate a maxim or more for the purpose of raising implications (Grice, 1975). Beside other categories, Grice distinguished between two main categories of implicature: Conversational implicature is implications derived on the conversational principles and assumptions, relying on more than linguistic meaning words in an utterance. In true circumstance, the speakers use different ways to express their intention. Additionally, conventional implicature is the one based on the conventional meaning of the words occurring in an utterance. Conventional implicatures do not rely on the special context, but deal with the specific word



such as but, yet, therefore, however and even. Grice (1975) believes that a maxim may be flouted on purpose by the speaker with the intention to create implicature. The researcher here is motivated to study implicature as a result of his observations of the phenomenon of implicature in daily life, so, examining conversational and conventional implicatures is what the researcher is most interested in doing here. The researcher here chooses political speeches due to its being as a conflict of authority by having some political, economic, and social ideas into practicality. Two presidential discourses are selected by the former American President Donald Trump that would be analyzed through a model of implicature conducted by Grice. The key problems of the study are firstly to determine what the types of implicature in the targeted speeches are?, secondly how can implicatures be used?, are the maxims violated by the speaker? If so, why?. Based on the formulation of the problem, the research objective will lay out as: to investigate, explore and analyze the types of implicatures in the targeted political speeches. The significance of the study lies in the expectation of providing an extra reference or information in the pragmatic approach to Grice's maxims and implicature.

2. Review of Related Literature:

Pragmatics and the study of implicature, in particular, have always been beneficial to the study of political discourse, (Sanatifar, 2015). Chilton and Schäffner (2002) refer to the implications of Gricean maxims and implicature in political discourse analysis. Politicians appeal to implicatures and are plain uncooperative, e.g. lying, evading, wriggling, etc., because they can easily be disavowed. Wilson (1990) considers political talk as hinging on the relation between what is explicit and what is implied. Thus, implicature is a distinctive characteristic of political discourse that is normally utilized intentionally by politicians particularly in political speech.

Working out political implicatures, in many cases, demands a wider range of contextual and encyclopedic knowledge from the audience (van Dijk, 2002). Wilson (1990) holds that pragmatics is the study of implicative relations and then outlines three types of implicative relations in political discourse, namely: secondary meaning, implicature and presupposition and he believes that politicians can make use of implicative relation for the sake of directing a hearer's interpretation and doing the best to make people believe in certain things. Chilton (2003) comments, "implicatures are crucial to political speech because they let the politician convey messages implicitly without assuming responsibility for what they have implied." In one word, according to Chilton (2003), implicatures involve exploiting listeners, implicit mental frames and in such a way that directs them to infer information that was not explicitly mentioned, and adopt a specific set of values suggested by the speaker. In a quantitative-qualitative relevance-theoretic analysis, Rut-Kluz (2009) has



extracted distinctive properties of political speech among them implicature. Rut-Kluz (2009) confirms, there are fewer implicatures used in political speech. Working within a relevance - theoretic framework, she concludes that relevance theory together with its devices has enabled conducting a detailed analysis of the political speech of the type available in the political programs she has studied. Van Dijk (2005) investigated certain properties of the speeches among them political implicatures, as pragmatic inferences that are precisely based on political context, as well as the general and particular political knowledge of the participants in any political interaction.

2.1. Grice's Theory of Implicature:

Paul Grice, the English philosopher who is considered to be "the father of pragmatics", was fascinated by how the hearer gets from the expressed meaning to the implied meaning. That is, his aim is to explain how the hearer gets from what is said to what is meant, (Thomas, 1995:56). Grice's (1975) is the approach according to which the concept of implicature is to be analyzed. According to him, implicatures can be seen in two modes: once through presumptions as for rational communicative behavior or through some linguistic traditions. The implicature of (1) below is a clear example of the first type, a "conversational" implicature, and the implicature of (2) is an explicit example of the second type, a "conventional" implicature (see Moeschler, for further details): (1) That wall sounds red to me. Implicature: There is some uncertainty over whether the wall is "red" or "not". (2) Suzi is a housemaid but she is very clever. Implicature: there is a contrast of certain type between being a housemaid and being very clever. So, Grice's inference is that "Implicature indicates either (a) the act of meaning or implying one thing by saying something else, or (b) the object of that act. Thus, implicatures can be determined by sentence meaning or by conversational context, and can be conventional or unconventional."

A combination of phenomena which Grice studied as implicatures could then be dealt by plentiful as contribution of pragmatic enrichment to the propositions cleared up. But Grice's maxim of implicatures would be a decisive advance, both for its theoretical integration of distinctly diverse sorts of utterance content and for the attentiveness it drew to pragmatic deduction and the labor division between linguistic semantics and pragmatics in theorizing over oral communication.

2.2. Conventional Implicature:

in some cases the conventional meaning of the words used will determine what is implicated,
besides helping to determine what is said. If I say (smugly), He is an Englishman; he is,



therefore, brave, I have certainly committed myself, by virtue of the meaning of my words, to its being the case that his being brave is a consequence of (follows from) his being an Englishman” (Grice 1975: 44).

Grice states, “In some cases, the conventional meaning of the words used will determine what is implicated, besides helping to determine what is said. If I say (smugly), he is an Englishman; he is, therefore, brave, I have certainly committed myself, by virtue of the meaning of my words, to its being the case that his being brave is a consequence of (follows from) his being an Englishman” (1975). So, it can be stated that conventional implicatures are those which have a stable association with particular linguistic expressions, such as the element of surprise associated with yet in “Haven’t you finished yet?” (Speaker does not actually say he or she is surprised), (Cruse, 2006). Yule (1996: 45) states that in all the conversational implicatures, conventional implicatures are not based on the Cooperative Principle or the maxims. They do not have to occur in conversation, and they do not depend on special contexts for their interpretation. Unlike lexical presuppositions, conventional implicatures are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used.

Grice (ibid) brings in the notion of the conventional implicature for an instant to address the conventional elements of meaning that are nevertheless non truth-conditional. The conjunction “therefore” is Grice’s example according to his analysis “indicates” but not “entails” that the second conjunct “follow from” the first. Other examples that Grice presumed are “but, even, and yet.” The characteristics of conventional implicatures are thought to be that they are non-cancellable, irrelevant to truth-condition, and detachable which means to depend on certain linguistic form of what is said. (Karttunen and Peters 1979) gives an example of a lexeme that explicitly proves the distinction between what is said and what is conventionally implicated which is *even*. The example is as follows:

1- Even Zaki likes Linda.

“Even” for them does not play any role in the truth conditions of the sentence. Simply put, (1) is true if (2) is true, and false otherwise:

2- Zaki likes Linda.

This does not mean that “even” plays no role in the meaning of (1). According to Karttunen and Peters, (1) conveys the information given in (3):

(3) a. Other people besides Zaki like Linda.

b. Of the people under consideration, Zaki is the least likely to like Linda.



For Karttunen and Peters, (2) corresponds to what is said, or to the truth-conditional meaning of (1), whilst the clauses in (3) are conventional implicatures:

“They cannot be attributed to general conversational principles in conjunction with the peculiarities common to certain contexts of utterance: they simply arise from the presence of the word even” (Karttunen and Peters 1979: 12). Here again the test for a conventional implicature is the “but” test, which leads to a contradiction when “but” introduces the negation of one of the conventional implicatures.

(4) * Even Bill likes Mary, but no one else does.

Before introducing the core concept of Grice’s approach to utterance interpretation, conversational implicatures, I would like to start with the initial topic of Logic and Conversation; that is, with logical connectives.

On the other hand, Potts (2007) introduces a more restrictive description of conventional implicatures who explicitly disagrees with the characterization of many of the classic examples of conventional implicatures (but, therefore, even, still, again, and possibly too), suggesting that what they contribute and belong in a new category of “additional entailments”

Let’s give some classic conventional implicatures, suggested by “Potts (ibid).

(1) Even: Even Jim knows it’s immoral.

Entails: Jim knows it’s immoral.

Conventionally implicates: Jim is the least likely to know that it’s unethical.

(2) But: John is hungry but he won’t stay for supper.

Entails: John is hungry. John won’t stay for supper.

Conventionally implicates: We might expect that if John is hungry, he will stay for supper.

(3) Joshua didn’t manage to start the car.

Entailment: Joshua didn’t start the car.

Conventionally implicates: Some effort is required to start the car.

Joshua needed some effort to start the car.

Grice’s (ibid) original discussion of conventional implicatures is entwined with informal assertions about the semantics of therefore. Since the utility of such



examples has often been questioned, it can be extracted a more abstract set of properties:

- a. Conventional implicatures are part of the conventional (lexical) meaning of words.
- b. Conventional implicatures are commitments, and thus give rise to entailments.
- c. The speaker of the utterance makes commitments by virtue of the meaning of the words he selects.
- d. Conventional implicatures are logically and compositionally independent of what is “said in the favored sense.”

2.3. Conversational Implicature:

Grice (1975) assumed that, a maxim might on purpose be flouted by the speaker with the intention to make up conversational implicature. It is noted that a conversational implicature is the information that is not spoken but is understood in tying one utterance meaningfully to a previous utterance. For instance, a speaker replies to the question “Where is John?” with the following utterance:

“He’s either in the cafeteria or in his office.”

In this case, the maxim of quantity and the maxim of quality are in conflict. A cooperative speaker does not want to be ambiguous but also does not want to give false information by giving a specific answer in spite of his uncertainty. By flouting the maxim of quantity, the speaker invokes the maxim of quality, leading to the implicature that the speaker does not have the evidence to give a specific location where he believes John is, (Nick, 2010). To put it in another way, Grice contrasted a conversational implicature with a conventional implicature, by which he meant one that is part of the meaning of the sentence used.

- (a) Jill is German and therefore mean.
- (b) Jill is German and mean.
- (c) Jill's being mean follows from her being German.

Speakers who use (2a) with its literal German meaning implicate (2c). They imply, but do not say, that Jill's being mean follows from her being German. (2a) cannot be used literally with its conventional meaning without implicating (2c). In this state, (2a) contrasts markedly with (2b), this would rarely if ever be used to implicate (2c). The meaning of “therefore” generates the implicature of (2a).



It is suggested by Grice that in conversation information is conveyed by people beyond that what it is said and that this additional meaning is predicted and inferred.

Since Grice's first work and his proposal, conversational implicatures became one of the substantial research areas in pragmatics.

Grice adds conversational implicature is also referred to as "implication"; this takes place when a speaker says something requiring explanation, said in an indirect way of saying something.

For instance, a father says to his son who is about to go to the west coast:

"You would prefer put sunscreen on before you leave."

We understand from this that: "the weather is sunny and hot out there, so you may get sunburned".

A couple of flat mates are now getting ready to go to a concert; one asks his mate:

"Are you gonna be much longer?"

The other replies:

"You could mix yourself another drink".

The implied meaning, in the question mentioned above, could be: "It is time to go - we are gonna be late - what is taking you so long?"

The implied meaning in the answer could be: "I do not know, probably - I shall be ready soon; you may have some time for another drink."

These are indirect exchanges in conversation, where the original data or query is being "encoded"; we, by doing this, imply something (that means we do not overtly mention it). Exchanges like this depend on situation, context, and inferences to be understandable.

2.4. Review of Previous Studies

Three previous studies are discussed in this sub-section in order to examine to what extent these studies are relevant to the current study.

2.4.1. Conversational Implicatures (and How to Spot Them) (2013) :

An article written by Michael Blome-Tillmann in McGill University. Michael here discusses the concept of conversational implicatures, examines some key issues which lie at the heart of the recent debate, and accounts for tests that



allow readers to reliably recognize the semantic entailments and conventional implicatures as well as conversational implicatures.

2.4.2. How to Treat Implicatures in the Translation of Political Speech: A Relevance-theory Perspective (2013):

A study discussed by Saleh Sanatifar. In this research Sanatifar tries to investigate, through an audience-based survey, how a translator reduces effort and makes the translation more related to the target audience. His research reveals that “explication” of implicatures decreases, to a certain degree, the cognitive effort of the target readers, hence relevance reinforcing.

2.4.3. On Translation of Implicatures in Croskery’s English Translations of Morādi Kermāni’s Stories for Children (2021):

This study is carried out by two researchers; Mohammad Saleh Sanatifar & Mona Na’eem Cha’bi. It aims at investigating how implicatures are treated in the English translations of Persian texts. They claim that their study deals with pragmatic aspects of English translations of famous children’s stories spoken in Persian language to consider if English translators have achieved any pragmatic equivalence.

2.5. Features of Political Speech (Discourse):

Politics is a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. In this process, language plays a crucial role, for every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. This paper analyzes implicatures of political speech namely by the former American President Donald Trump. Discourse is a broad term with various definitions which “integrates a whole palette of meanings” (Titscher et al., 2000, p.42), covering a large area from linguistics, through sociology, philosophy and other disciplines. According to Fairclough (1989), the term refers to “the whole process of interaction of which a text is just a part”, (Fairclough, 1989, p.24). According to Schaffner (1996), political discourse, as a sub-category of discourse in general, can be based on two criteria: functional and thematic. Political discourse is a result of politics and it is historically and culturally determined. It fulfills different functions due to different political activities. It is thematic because its topics are primarily related to politics such as political activities, political ideas and political relations. Power is a complex and an abstract idea and has a significant influence on our lives. It is the “ability of its holders to exact compliance or obedience of other individuals to their will” (The New Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thoughts, 1999, p.678). It is a common knowledge that politics is concerned with power: the power to make decisions, to control resources, to control other people's behavior and often to control their values. According to Jones and Peccei (2004), politicians throughout ages have



achieved success thanks to their “skillful use of rhetoric”, by which they aim to persuade their audience of the validity of their views, delicate and careful use of elegant and persuasive language. The main purpose of politicians is to persuade their audience of the validity of their political claims. Political influence flows from the employment of resources that shape the beliefs and behaviors of others, (Edelman, 1977: 123).

2.6. Political Discourse and Pragmatics:

When we deal with political discourse, particularly, and with discourse, generally, the pragmatic aspect of language is always present as a key element to explore and concentrate on the study of sign systems or codes in terms of user relations. Listeners, readers, or analysts of any given text are after the kind of language used, i.e., the coherent semantic and syntactic choice made in terms of the interactive principles of individuals, groups, and classes. The task of political discourse is to relate the fine grain of linguistic behavior to what we understand by politics or political behavior, (Van Dijk, 1997:211).

3. Research Methodology:

This section identifies the data source and data collection for the analysis. It also describes the data and shows the model adopted for the data analysis.

3.1. Data Source: The source of the data is taken from two web cites which are (<https://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/full-transcript-donald-trump-nomination-acceptance-speech-at-rnc-225974>) and (<https://www.politico.com/story/2017/01/full-text-donald-trump-inauguration-speech-transcript-233907>) in which there are the videos of Trump’s speeches and the entire scripts of the speeches.

3.2. Data Collection: Two speeches by the former American President Donald Trump are taken for the analysis. One was speechified in 07/21/2016, just before his winning the US presidency, whereas the second is the inaugural speech, i.e. his first speech just after his winning the presidency.

3.3. Data Description:

Two textual samples of each speech will be analyzed using the pragmatic concept Implicature; a concept that investigates the pragmatic contexts as a distinctive feature of political speech which is normally utilized intentionally by politicians.

3.4. The Adopted Model: In the analysis of the English data, the researcher has adopted Grice's (1975) model of analysis. Grice's theory of conversation will deal only with the dimension and the notion of implicature. The analysis will cover only (16) examples extracted from two speeches of Trump. The analysis



will be adapted by two types of implicature. Despite the fact that the following texts deal with one-side communication (one person speaking to a group of people), one can recognize certain implicatures of certain political considerations that have their role in affecting the tone and language Trump is using in addressing the current issues and concerns of the country. This can be detected in the examples below.

4. Data Analysis:

4.1. Analysis of Conventional Implicature:

In addition to what has been mentioned above, conventional implicatures are supposed by Grice (a) not to be part of the semantic contents of the utterances with which they are associated; that is, not part of what is said by those utterances, but (b) nevertheless determined by linguistic conventions governing those utterances. In linguistics and philosophy, it is common to assume that specific words, such as 'and', 'but', and 'even' do something besides contribute to what is said in utterance of sentences containing them.

The First Speech:

Text (1)

*"I have visited the laid-off factory workers, **and** the communities crushed by our horrible and unfair trade deals. These are the forgotten men and women of our country..." (p. 1)*

What is implicated in this structure is what is said. Conventionally, "and" implicates the notions "in addition" or "plus". The linguistic lexical items added to each other are of equal status, for the speaker and the linguist as well.

Therefore, "the laid-off factory workers" and "the communities crushed" stand for the same status of threat according to the speaker.

Text (2)

*"Not only have our citizens endured domestic disaster, **but** they have lived through one international humiliation after another..." (p. 2)*

The implicature is that the information the speaker mentioned before "but" is, to some extent, contrasted with what he is saying after "but".

Text (3)

*"In 2009, pre-Hillary, ISIS was not **even** on the map..." (p. 3)*

By the use of "even", the implicature in that what he says is contrary to expectations and goes beyond what one might think.

Text (4)

*"You have so much to contribute to our politics, **yet** our laws prevent you from speaking your minds from your own pulpits..." (p. 6)*

In this statement, and concerning "yet", Trump communicates by implicature that the situation he is stating is going to be changed, or it will even be the opposite at later.

Text (5)

*"Decades of record immigration have produced lower wages **and** higher unemployment for our citizens, especially for African-American and Latino workers. We are going to have an immigration system that works, **but** one that works for the American people..." (p. 5)*

In English texts, conventional implicatures are implicated by utilizing "and" and "but", each one with a particular inference. In our text here, the contrast between the notion that the thought was not the speaker's own and that he had taken the presence of it from various performances. So the presence of "but" affects the truth condition. Consequently, the inference of "and" implicates the notion of 'in addition to', so there are two notions of "producing lower wages" and the notion of "higher unemployment for our citizens."

The Second Speech:

Text (1)

*"We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country **and** restore its promise for all of our people..." (P. 9)*

"And" here indicates a type of sequence in the text above; one should extract "rebuilding our country" and then "we" would be able to 'restore the US's promise for all of people'.

Text (2)

*"Washington flourished – **but** the people did not share in its wealth ..." (P. 11)*

The contrast between the economic situation in the US capital; "Washington flourished" and "the people did not share..." is clear here by the word "but." Implicatures that are transported by convention are inherent in words; they are part of the corresponding linguistic expressions.

Text (3)

*"That whether we are black **or** brown **or** white, we all bleed the same*



red blood of patriots..." (p. 11)

These single linguistic items are plain, yet they convey a good deal about how speakers depict the items, entities or concepts, they join them with. The conjunctions “ors” above are used to join two (or more) nouns. They can also join clauses together.

Text (4)

*"The factories shuttered and left our shores, with not **even** a thought about the millions and millions of American workers that were left behind ..." (p. 10)*

In this text, concerning the lexical item “even” , the implicature that what Trump states is contrary to anticipations and goes beyond what one might think.

Text (5)

*"Your voice, your hopes, **and** your dreams, will define our American destiny..." (p. 12)*

Just like in the first speech mentioned above, “and” denotes a sort of series in this our text; it is used here to connect words of the same part of speech that are to be taken jointly. One could determine the notion of “hopes” and then there would be the ability to reach the next goal ”dreams” so that by both of which the American destiny can be defined later.

4.2. Analysis of Conversational Implicature:

Conversational implicatures can also be termed “political” implicatures according to the framework theory of context that is composed of political identities, roles, purposes, actions, and ideologies that are crucially political in the statements of this type of implicature found in the texts.

The First Speech:

Text (1)

"The budget is no better. President Obama has doubled our national debt to more than \$19 trillion, and growing..." (p. 1)

The speaker (the President Trump) clearly exploits the maxim of manner (avoid obscurity) and conveys a conversational implicature. He specifies 'President Obama' but not the rest of his government. Trump, furthermore, follows the quantity maxim by being clear and avoiding obscurity for the situation requires when he states the exact number “\$19 trillion” as a national debt. Following these maxims, the implicatures here are intended to impart to the audience the fact that Obama himself has doubled national debt and these implicatures used also show such items as one of the disadvantages of Obama's government.



Text (2)

*"We must work with all of our allies who share our goal of destroying ISIS
and stamping out Islamic terror..." (p. 4)*

The speaker here must have a reason which happens to be a conversational implicature. The speaker uses the pronoun "we" assuming himself and being implicated as a representative of the American people and also appears to convey a conversational implicature that "we" and the countries allied to the USA are sharing the same goal; namely "destroying ISIS". They are all united according to at least one purpose.

Text (3)

*"My opponent has called for a radical 550% increase in Syrian refugees on top
of existing massive refugee..." (p. 5)*

By using the lexical item "My opponent", the speaker tries not to express the meaning explicitly where the listener has to unfold or develop the meaning of utterance on the base of the linguistic input and knowledge of world also based on the violation of the maxim or flouting of the cooperative principle "be clear". Consequently, this implicature is the interpreted meaning of utterance based on the violation or flouting of the maxim of relevance.

The Second Speech:

Text (1)

*"The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans. For
many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American
industry..." (p. 10)*

The speaker here follows the maxims of relevance (be relevant) and of manner (be clear) by attempting to remind the audience that he took the presidential oath "the oath of office" and depicts it as an oath of allegiance.

It is obvious here that he wants to convey a conversational implicature and wishes his audience to figure out the intended meaning on their own.

Text (2)

*"There should be no fear – we are protected, and we will always be protected.
We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law
enforcement..." (p. 11)*

Saying "we are protected..." , the speaker here clearly flouts the maxim of quality. He does not intend to mislead his audience but wants them to look for



the conversational implicature, that is, the meaning of the utterance is not directly stated in the words uttered. Therefore, when the speaker intentionally fails to observe a maxim the purpose may be to effectively communicate a message. It is implicated that Trump and his newly winning government themselves will be the protector of the US people.

Text (3)

"So to all Americans, in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, and from ocean to ocean, hear these words: You will never be ignored again... " (p. 12)

The speaker in this final paragraph of his speech tries to show that all people living in every city whether small or large "from mountain to mountain..." throughout the United States, are his supporters and followers and they say and do what he says and does. The speaker here appears to violate the maxim of quantity which requires the speaker to give the right amount of information when s/he speaks. In addition, the maxim of quantity requires speakers to make their contribution as informative as is required, but not more informative than is required. They should respect the established, or assumed, common ground by providing the information that recipients need.

5. Findings and Discussion:

5.1. Primary Findings:

Based on the results of data analysis conducted on the implicature, certain points of significance have arisen. The most important findings are:

1. In examples (1-10) in both speeches, the conventional implicatures inherent in the meaning of words ascribe convention to certain expressions regardless of context. In these examples, the speaker does not assert but implicates indirectly some feature or either addition or contrast. This verifies hypothesis (2) of the study.
2. In both speeches in general, and in the (6) selected examples of conversational implicature, flouting the maxims of "quantity" and "quality" is predominantly created blatantly when the speaker prefers to give more or less information than is required or when he says something which lacks adequate evidence.

5.2. Secondary Findings:

Throughout the analysis of the two political speeches delivered by Donald Trump, it sounds that flouting, and violating the maxims of "quality", "quantity", and "relevance" have occurred while as to the maxim of "manner" it has not. Of the ways of not observing a maxim mentioned by Grice (1975),



flouting is the most important case, as the speaker does not intend to mislead the audience, but wants them to look for the conversational implicature, i.e., the meaning of the utterance is not directly mentioned in the actual words uttered.

It has been shown the fact that throughout the analysis of the selected (16) political examples of both types of implicature indicate that implicature is a significant part in revealing the basic and intended message of the president Donald Trump to his addressees.

6. Conclusions:

The topic of the current study has been the application of a pragmatic model to political language to find out how the relationship between the signs and their users function in that kind of discourse, in other words, the relationship between political texts and the set of pragmatic principles that satisfy generic intuitive principle of speech interaction in general.

Implicature is an example of the more general concept that expressions and utterances only make sense against specific background assumptions. This technical term covers a variety of non-explicit meanings, some of which are “conventional”, i.e., attached conventionally to specified forms of expressions. The speaker / writer's choice implicates “not the higher values”. The lexical items “and, but, yet, even, and or”, and some other conjunctions, adjective and adverbs are considered distinctive feature in English political texts.

7. Pedagogical Implication:

The study could be valuable for those specialized in language, and in pragmatics, in particular, as well as students of English language as it seeks to mark the pragmatic features that prevail in a specific topic. It is also of interest to those concerned with political affairs especially political discourse analysis.

REFERENCES

- Chilton, Paul A. and Schäffner, C. (2002). Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse.
- Chilton, P. (2003). Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice. London: Routledge.
- Cruse, A. (2006). A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.



- Edelman, M. J. (1977). Political language: words that succeed and policies that fail. New York: Academic Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and Power. London: Longman.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Syntax and Semantics. Morgan. New York: Academic Press.
- Jones, J. and Peccei, J. S. (2004) 'Language and politics', in Thomas, L.(ed), Language, society, and power. New York: Routledge.
- Mey, Jacob L. (1993). Pragmatics: An Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nick, R. (2010). Introducing Semantics. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rut-Kluz, D. (2009). A relevance-theoretic framework for discourse analysis.
- Sanatifar, M. S. (2015). Lost in Political Translation: (Mis)translation of an intertextual Reference and Its Political Consequences: The Case of Iran.
- Schaffner, C. (1996). Editorial: Political Speeches and Discourse Analysis. In: Current Issues in Language and Society, Vol.3.
- Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. London: Longman.
- Titscher et al. (2000) Methods of text and discourse analysis. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A (2002). Political discourse and political cognition. Paul A. Chilton and Christina Schäffner (eds).
- _____ (2005). War rhetoric of a little ally: Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimatization of the war in Iraq.
- Wilson, J. (1990). Politically speaking. Cambridge: Blackwell.



- Yule, G.(1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIXES

Below are the websites from which the researcher has taken the targeted speeches

1. The first Speech
<https://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/full-transcript-donald-trump-nomination-acceptance-speech-at-rnc-225974>
2. The second Speech
<https://www.politico.com/story/2017/01/full-text-donald-trump-inauguration-speech-transcript-233907>