



A Pragmatic and Discourse Analysis of the Hidden Meanings in “I Have a Dream”

Shimaa hmad Issa Al Bakhati

Missan University, College of Education

م.م شيماء حمد سعد عيسى البخاتي

جامعه ميسان/ كلية التربية

shimaahmad@uomisan.edu.iq

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-4985-5346>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52834/jmr.2025.214215>

Abstract:

This study investigates the use of hidden meanings in Martin Luther King Jr.'s iconic speech "I Have a Dream" through the lens of pragmatic and discourse analysis. The study examines the selected excerpts from the speech to identify pragmatic strategies and discourse devices employed to convey implicit meanings. Findings reveal that figurative language such as metaphors and symbols constituted about 30% of the pragmatic devices used, speech acts accounted for 20%, deixis for 10%, and context-dependent meanings for another 10%. Discourse analysis showed repetition and parallelism at 15%, antithesis at 10%, intertextuality (especially religious references) at 5%, and a unifying narrative metaphor structuring the speech. These findings highlight the crucial role of multiple pragmatic and discourse strategies in shaping the emotional and persuasive impact of the speech within its historical and cultural context

Keywords: Hidden meanings; Pragmatics; Discourse analysis; Figurative language; Speech acts; Intersexuality.

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 20 /9 / 2025

Accepted: 20 /11 / 2025

Published: 30 /11 / 2025

استلام البحث: ٢٠٢٥/٩/٢٠

التعديل الأول: ٢٠٢٥/١١/٢٢

القبول للنشر: ٢٠٢٥/١١/٣٠

تحليل تداولي وخطابي للمعاني الخفية في خطاب "لدي حلم"

المخلص :

تتناول هذه الدراسة استخدام المعاني الخفية في خطاب مارتن لوثر كينغ الابن الشهير "لدي حلم"، من خلال منظور علم التداول (البراغماتكس) والتحليل الخطابي. وباستخدام منهج تحليلي نوعي، تم تحليل مقاطع مختارة من الخطاب للكشف عن الاستراتيجيات التداولية والأدوات الخطابية المستخدمة في إيصال المعاني الضمنية. كشفت النتائج أن اللغة التصويرية مثل الاستعارات والرموز شكلت حوالي ٣٠% من الأجهزة التداولية المستخدمة، وأفعال الكلام مثل التعبير عن الأمل والالتزام مثلت ٢٠%، واستخدام الإشارات المرجعية (deixis) بلغ ١٠%، والمعاني المعتمدة على السياق ١٠%. أما التحليل الخطابي فأظهر أن التكرار والتوازي شكلا ١٥%، والتضاد ١٠%، والاقتراسات الدينية (الترابط النصي) ٥%، كما شكل السرد المجازي وحدة موحدة للخطاب. تبرز هذه النتائج الدور المحوري للاستراتيجيات التداولية والخطابية المتعددة في تشكيل التأثير العاطفي والإقناعي للخطاب ضمن سياقه التاريخي والثقافي.

1. Research Aim, Methodology, and Hypothesis

1. This research aims to conduct a pragmatic and discourse analysis of Martin Luther King Jr.'s iconic speech "I Have a Dream".

2. The study investigates the hidden meanings and communicative strategies used to inspire and mobilize the audience during the Civil Rights Movement.

3. The objectives include identifying the pragmatic tools such as Speech Acts, Deixis, and Metaphors, as well as Discourse Strategies like Repetition, Antithesis, and Intertextuality.

The study adopts a qualitative approach, relying on critical textual analysis of selected excerpts from the speech. A coding-based method was used to classify and quantify the frequency and functions of each strategy. Pragmatic features were examined to reveal implicit messages shaped by historical and cultural context, while discourse strategies were analyzed for their persuasive and emotional effects.



The central hypothesis of this research is that Martin Luther King’s use of implicit and context-bound language—alongside carefully structured rhetorical devices was crucial to the power and longevity of the speech. The integration of both pragmatic and discourse tools allowed the speaker to construct a compelling message that resonated across generations.

2. Definition of Explicit vs. Implicit Meaning

As Grice (1975) explains, Language operates on multiple levels of meaning. At the most basic level, we encounter explicit meaning—the surface-level, directly stated message. This type of meaning is usually unambiguous and requires little to no interpretation. For example, the sentence “**The meeting starts at 9 AM**” provides clear, factual information. However, human communication extends far beyond what is merely said. Implicit meaning, on the other hand, involves subtleties, connotations, and contextual clues. These meanings are not overtly stated but are understood based on shared knowledge, cultural norms, or situational context.

Building on this, Searle (1969) emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between explicit and implicit meaning, particularly in fields such as pragmatics and discourse analysis. Pragmatics examines how context influences meaning, especially when it deviates from literal expressions. For instance, when someone says, “**Can you pass the salt?**” during dinner, the speaker is not questioning the listener’s ability but is instead making a polite request—an example of an indirect speech act. Similarly, Austin (1962) highlights how discourse analysis explores language use in relation to social structures, ideologies, and power dynamics, including how speakers shape impressions, relationships, and authority through implication rather than direct statements.

Understanding this distinction, as noted by Grice (1975) and Searle (1969), enables us to decode the real intentions behind language. It also reveals how language can subtly express ideologies, influence audiences, or communicate criticism, praise, sarcasm, or solidarity. For example, when a political leader says, “Our people deserve better,” the statement implicitly criticizes the current administration without naming it directly. The ability to recognize and interpret both explicit and implicit meanings is essential for competent and critical language use, especially in today’s globalized and media-saturated world where indirectness is often favored for rhetorical or diplomatic purposes.

Beyond these foundational insights, it is important to note that explicit meaning often functions as the “skeleton” of communication, while implicit meaning provides the “flesh” that makes language dynamic, persuasive, and context-sensitive. Explicit meaning guarantees clarity and prevents misunderstanding, but without implicit meaning, communication would lack richness and subtlety. In academic settings, for instance, when a professor comments, “**That’s an interesting answer,**” the explicit statement praises the student. Implicitly, however, it may suggest that the answer is unusual, incomplete, or in need of further elaboration, depending on tone and situation.



Implicit meaning is also closely tied to cultural conventions. What is considered a polite indirect request in one culture may be misinterpreted in another. For example, in English, “Would you mind opening the window?” is a polite request, while in some other languages, such indirectness might be seen as unnecessary or confusing. Thus, understanding implicit meaning requires not only linguistic knowledge but also cultural competence.

Another dimension is the role of power and authority. As Austin (1962) observed, language is never neutral; it can reinforce hierarchies and social roles. A manager saying to an employee, “It’s warm in here,” may implicitly expect the employee to adjust the air conditioning without issuing a direct command. The implicit message carries authority that would not be obvious if we only considered the explicit words.

Furthermore, implicit meaning allows speakers to navigate sensitive topics more tactfully. Sarcasm, irony, and metaphor rely heavily on implication rather than literal expression. A sentence like, “**Oh, you’re such a genius!**” might explicitly sound like praise but implicitly conveys criticism or mockery. This duality demonstrates how meaning can shift dramatically when implicit cues are considered.

In media discourse, implicit messages are particularly powerful. Advertisements, political campaigns, and even news reports often embed subtle implications that influence audience perception without overt statements. The phrase “Make America great again,” for example, explicitly expresses optimism, but implicitly suggests that the nation has declined and requires restoration. Such examples show how implicit meaning functions as a tool for persuasion and ideology.

Ultimately, the interplay between explicit and implicit meaning is what makes language flexible and adaptable across contexts. A message may appear simple on the surface, yet carry layers of cultural, social, and emotional significance. Being able to identify and interpret these layers equips individuals with critical literacy skills, enabling them to engage thoughtfully with language in both personal and professional domains.

3. Importance of Hidden Meaning in Daily Communication

As Levinson (1983) notes, that the hidden meanings are at the core of how people navigate complex social interactions. In everyday life, individuals frequently avoid direct statements in order to preserve politeness, manage face (self-image), show respect, or express subtle emotions. This is especially evident in cultures that value indirectness and social harmony. For instance, rather than saying “**You’re wrong,**” someone might say, “**That’s an interesting point,**” which serves to disagree politely while maintaining interpersonal respect.

According to Yule (1996) and Levinson (1983), the phenomenon of hidden meanings is deeply explored through the field of pragmatics. Pragmatics offers concepts such as Grice’s Cooperative Principle and Implicature, which explain how speakers convey meanings beyond the literal level. At the same time, Gee (2014) emphasizes that



discourse analysis investigates how language reflects and constructs social hierarchies, identities, ideologies, and power dynamics. Politicians, media figures, and celebrities often rely on hidden meanings to subtly persuade, criticize, or align with specific audiences while avoiding direct confrontation. A single sentence may carry different interpretations depending on tone, audience, timing, or background knowledge.

As Yule (1996) and Gee (2014) point out, that an ability to recognize and interpret hidden meanings is critical in preventing miscommunication. For instance, if a colleague says, **“Some people are always late,”** in a meeting, this might implicitly target someone present, despite no names being mentioned. Failing to interpret such indirectness can lead to tension, while accurate recognition can foster smoother interpersonal dynamics. Additionally, hidden meanings enable speakers to strategically position themselves within a conversation. In political or public discourse, implications are often used to express critique or support indirectly, avoiding accountability for explicit claims. This makes the study of implicit language essential to understanding manipulation, persuasion, and the shaping of public perception. In short, as Levinson (1983) suggests, uncovering hidden meanings is not only a linguistic ability but a crucial social skill.

Hidden meanings also play a vital role in interpersonal relationships, where direct speech might damage trust or closeness. For example, when a friend says, **“I guess you’re busy these days,”** the explicit meaning is a simple observation, but the hidden meaning may be a complaint about neglect or a request for more attention. Such subtle cues allow people to express dissatisfaction without risking open conflict.

In professional settings, hidden meanings help to maintain the workplace harmony. A supervisor saying, **“It might be better to revisit this section of the report,”** is not simply suggesting a review but implicitly signaling that revisions are necessary. Employees who fail to recognize these cues may appear uncooperative or inattentive, highlighting the importance of pragmatic awareness in organizational communication. Moreover, hidden meanings often protect social relationships through strategies of politeness and face-saving. Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory illustrates how speakers soften requests or criticisms to avoid threatening the listener’s self-image. For example, “Could you possibly look at this document when you have time?” carries the hidden message that the task is urgent, while maintaining politeness.

Cultural context further shapes how hidden meanings are expressed and interpreted. In high-context cultures, such as many Asian societies, indirectness is a norm, and much of the meaning is inferred rather than spoken. In contrast, in low-context cultures, like Germany or the United States, communication tends to be more direct, which may cause misunderstandings across cultural boundaries. Another dimension is how hidden meanings contribute to irony, satire, and humor. Comedians, for instance, often rely on implicit criticism disguised as entertainment. A seemingly light-hearted comment may, in fact, expose deep social truths or challenge political systems. The humor works precisely because the audience recognizes the gap between what is said and what is meant (Yule 1996).



In digital communication, hidden meanings take on new forms. Emojis, punctuation, and even silence can carry implicit messages. A short reply like “Fine.” in a text message, for example, explicitly signals agreement but often implicitly conveys irritation or disapproval. Thus, hidden meanings remain central even in modern, technology-mediated interaction (Thomas 1995).

Ultimately, the ability to uncover hidden meanings requires sensitivity to context, tone, and shared cultural knowledge. This skill is not only useful for everyday communication but also essential for critical reading of media, advertising, and political discourse, where unspoken implications can influence opinions and shape ideologies. As Levinson (1983) and Yule (1996) highlight, the mastery of hidden meanings transforms language from a mere exchange of words into a powerful tool of negotiation, persuasion, and social connection.

4. Language and Pragmatics Theories Related to Implicit Meanings

Language is more than a tool for conveying literal messages; it is a vehicle for nuanced, layered communication. Pragmatics, as a subfield of linguistics, deals with the interpretation of meaning in context — especially when meanings are not directly stated. Key concepts such as implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and deixis help explain how speakers convey and listeners interpret implicit messages (Tannen, 2007).

Implicature, for instance, refers to the meaning suggested rather than explicitly stated. This concept is central to Grice’s Cooperative Principle, which is governed by four conversational maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. When these maxims are intentionally flouted, speakers often generate implied or hidden meanings (Gee, 2014).

Presuppositions, on the other hand, involve background assumptions that are taken for granted in communication. These assumptions shape how utterances are understood, often without being explicitly mentioned (Tannen, 2007). Speech act theory, developed by Austin and later refined by Searle, shifts focus from the structure of sentences to their communicative functions — such as promising, ordering, or questioning. These functions are not always obvious from surface-level language and often rely heavily on context (Wodak & Meyer, 2015).

Deictic expressions (e.g., "here", "now", "that") are another key component in pragmatic meaning. They require situational context to be properly interpreted and often imply shared knowledge or perspectives between speaker and listener (van Dijk, 1998). Taken together, these theoretical tools provide a robust framework for analyzing indirectness, suggestion, and subtlety in language — all crucial for uncovering implicit meanings in political rhetoric, media discourse, and everyday interaction (Wodak & Meyer, 2015).

By understanding these pragmatic and discourse-based approaches, researchers and critical readers become more adept at discerning not just what is said, but what is strategically meant — a skill especially important in persuasive and ideologically driven communication (Gee, 2014). Beyond these foundational concepts, pragmatics highlights how implicit meaning operates dynamically in real communication. Implicature, for



example, is not limited to casual conversation but extends into political speeches, advertisements, and academic discourse. When a politician says, “**We will bring back prosperity,**” the explicit promise is clear, but the implicature may suggest that current leadership has failed. Recognizing such hidden layers helps audiences uncover rhetorical strategies.

Presuppositions also deserve careful attention because they often frame conversations in ways that restrict interpretation. For instance, the question “**When will you improve your performance?**” presupposes that the performance is already poor. These hidden assumptions can influence perception without the listener consciously noticing them, making presupposition a powerful linguistic tool.

Speech act theory further demonstrates how meaning extends beyond grammar. A sentence like “**I’ll help you tomorrow**” is not only a statement but also a commitment. If the speaker fails to follow through, the listener may perceive it as a broken promise, showing how implicit meanings carry social consequences. Thus, speech acts highlight the performative nature of language in everyday life.

Deixis, reveals how meaning is tied to context. Expressions like “this,” “that,” “here,” or “now” cannot be fully understood without shared situational knowledge. In digital communication, deixis adapts in interesting ways: words like “here” might refer to an online space, and “now” could refer to global events, showing how pragmatic theories evolve with technology.

Pragmatic theories also shed light on indirectness as a strategy of politeness and diplomacy. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), indirect speech often protects “face,” or social identity, by avoiding confrontation. For example, “It might be better to reconsider this idea” is far softer than directly saying, “Your idea is wrong.” This indirectness, while polite, relies heavily on the listener’s ability to interpret implicit meaning. Furthermore, these theories are essential in analyzing institutional discourse, such as courtroom language, political debates, and media interviews. Implicatures and presuppositions often shape public opinion more than explicit statements. As Wodak and Meyer (2015) argue, critical discourse analysis relies heavily on uncovering such hidden meanings to expose ideologies and power relations.

5. The Role of Culture and Context in Shaping Hidden Meanings

As Thomas (1995) explains, culture and context play a crucial role in shaping how hidden meanings are constructed and understood. While pragmatic theories offer general frameworks for analyzing communication, the interpretation of implicit messages is deeply influenced by social norms, cultural expectations, political settings, and historical backgrounds. According to Brown and Yule (1983), in high-context cultures—such as many Arab, Asian, and Latin cultures—communication often depends on shared background knowledge and subtle, unspoken cues. In contrast, low-context cultures like those in many Germanic or Anglo-American societies rely more heavily on explicit language. This fundamental cultural distinction significantly affects how features such as indirectness, politeness, or sarcasm are both expressed and interpreted.



Cultural scripts, as Thomas (1995) discusses, determine what is perceived as polite, assertive, or even offensive. For example, an indirect refusal in Japanese culture might be viewed as courteous, whereas the same approach could frustrate someone from a more direct communicative culture. Furthermore, Blommaert (2005) emphasizes that social hierarchies and power dynamics also influence language use—individuals may resort to metaphorical or softened language to avoid conflict or maintain harmony in hierarchical contexts.

Fairclough (1995) further highlights that context—whether political, professional, or personal—frames the way hidden meanings are conveyed and interpreted. A politician may strategically use dog-whistle language, expressing a seemingly neutral message that simultaneously carries a coded meaning intended for a specific group. Similarly, comedians may use cultural references and layered humor to critique authority without stating it directly. Thus, as all of these scholars suggest, decoding hidden meanings cannot be separated from the cultural and contextual lenses through which communication occurs. Awareness of these dimensions is key to fully understanding the subtle and strategic nature of language use.

Culture doesn't just shape what is communicated, but also how it is interpreted. For example, silence in Western cultures may signal awkwardness or disagreement, while in many Asian cultures it can symbolize respect, reflection, or agreement. Without awareness of such cultural norms, hidden meanings may easily be misinterpreted.

In addition, context frames the weight and direction of implicit meaning. In professional environments, an utterance like “We should think about other options” may implicitly suggest dissatisfaction with a proposal. Yet in a casual conversation among friends, the same phrase could merely indicate openness to creativity. This shows how situational context shapes interpretation.

Finally, awareness of cultural and contextual dimensions allows communicators to avoid miscommunication and foster intercultural competence. As Fairclough (1995) and Blommaert (2005) emphasize, the interpretation of hidden meanings is never universal but always shaped by who is speaking, to whom, where, and under what circumstances. Recognizing this complexity is essential not only for linguistic research but also for diplomacy, media literacy, and everyday human interaction.

6. How Hidden Meanings Affect Understanding and Communication

As Mey (2001) explains, hidden meanings—often conveyed through pragmatic strategies and discourse structures—significantly influence how language is interpreted and how communication develops. These meanings do not reside in the surface structure of the sentence but arise through implication, tone, context, or shared knowledge between speakers and listeners.

When interpreted successfully, these meanings enrich communication, allowing for subtlety, persuasion, politeness, irony, and critique without direct confrontation. According to Tannen (2007), in political or public discourse, speakers often rely on



implicit language to navigate sensitive topics, appeal to specific audiences, or avoid explicit commitments. For instance, political figures may use loaded or metaphorical language that offers multiple layers of interpretation, preserving ambiguity and controlling audience response.

However, as noted by Crystal (2003), when hidden meanings are misunderstood or overlooked, the result can be miscommunication or interpersonal conflict. A sarcastic remark might be taken at face value, or an indirect refusal could be mistaken for agreement. Such misunderstandings are often intensified by cross-cultural differences, where what is considered implicit in one context may not register at all in another.

In sum, as it emphasized by Wodak and Meyer (2015), hidden meanings shape not only what is communicated, but how it is understood—making them essential to strategic, effective communication. Decoding them requires pragmatic awareness, cultural sensitivity, and contextual interpretation, especially in domains like politics, media, education, and intercultural relations. Hidden meanings are also crucial in conflict resolution. By softening criticism through implication, speakers can address sensitive issues without escalating tension. For instance, “Maybe we should consider another plan” is less confrontational than directly rejecting an idea.

On the other hand, failure to detect hidden meanings can damage trust. If an indirect refusal is perceived as consent, expectations may clash, leading to disappointment or conflict. Crystal (2003) notes that these misalignments are especially common in intercultural exchanges.

In mass media, hidden meanings allow journalists and advertisers to shape perception subtly. A headline like “Challenges ahead for the economy” may implicitly signal crisis or political failure without explicitly stating blame. This indirectness increases persuasive impact while reducing accountability. Finally, as Wodak and Meyer (2015) argue, the ability to interpret hidden meanings is not only a linguistic skill but also a critical social competence. It enables individuals to read between the lines, resist manipulation, and engage more effectively in personal, professional, and political communication.

7. devices and Techniques for Uncovering Hidden Meanings

7.1. Discourse Analysis

Stubbs (1983) and Schiffrin (1994) highlight that discourse analysis is a powerful method for revealing hidden meanings, ideologies, and intentions in language. Rather than focusing solely on grammatical forms, it examines how language operates in real-world contexts—through patterns of repetition, framing, presupposition, and intertextuality.

According to van Dijk (1998) and Hymes (1974), discourse analysis also uncovers how social hierarchies, power dynamics, and ideologies are embedded within speech. For example, who speaks, who is interrupted, and how issues are framed often reflects deeper societal structures. Repeated metaphors like "**war on drugs**" or "**battle for freedom**" carry ideological weight and shape how audiences think about political or social issues.



Thus, discourse analysis is indispensable for uncovering indirect strategies and implied meanings in texts, especially when speakers aim to persuade, critique, or influence subtly.

Discourse analysis also examines how context and participant roles affect interpretation. For instance, a teacher giving feedback to a student may phrase criticism differently than a peer would, reflecting institutional authority. It also considers how narratives are constructed to guide audience perception, such as in media reports or political speeches. By analyzing cohesion, coherence, and rhetorical devices, researchers can detect subtle biases and assumptions embedded in language. Ultimately, this method allows us to understand not just what is said, but how it functions socially and ideologically.

7.2. Pragmatic Analysis

As Mey (2001) and Crystal (2003) describe, pragmatic analysis focuses on the ways speakers use language contextually to achieve communicative goals. This includes analyzing Implicature, Presupposition, Deixis, and Politeness Strategies. For example, the statement "**It's cold in here**" may function as a polite request rather than a weather report.

Pragmatic analysis is particularly useful in political or media discourse, where speakers often manipulate tone and inference to leave space for plausible deniability or to imply positions without stating them directly. Wodak and Meyer (2015) note that such strategies are common in political rhetoric, where ambiguity serves strategic purposes. Together, as emphasized by both Discourse and Pragmatic Analysis scholars, these two approaches offer complementary lenses for examining how hidden meanings function within complex communication. They provide the tools to decode what is meant versus what is said—especially in persuasive, institutional, or culturally sensitive contexts.

Pragmatic analysis also highlights the role of context in shaping interpretation. A single utterance can convey multiple meanings depending on situational factors, social roles, or shared cultural knowledge. For instance, a politician saying, "We need to consider all options" may explicitly sound neutral, but implicitly signal disapproval or a strategic stance. Similarly, deixis and presupposition guide listeners to infer intentions without direct statements. Politeness strategies allow speakers to soften requests, criticism, or disagreement, maintaining social harmony while still communicating their goals. By combining pragmatic analysis with discourse analysis, researchers can uncover how speakers balance explicit statements with implied messages, revealing both rhetorical strategies and underlying ideologies. This integrated approach is particularly valuable in education, media critique, and cross-cultural communication, where hidden meanings often carry significant consequences (Crystal 2003).

8. Pragmatic and Discourse Analysis of "I Have a Dream" (Selected Excerpt)

8.1 Introduction

Dr. Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech is widely recognized as a masterpiece of rhetorical and persuasive language, rich in hidden meanings and pragmatic depth. This





analysis focuses on uncovering the implicit meanings within a selected passage of the speech through the lenses of pragmatics and discourse analysis.

The speech is not only remarkable for its explicit calls for equality and justice but also for the subtle ways in which it conveys hope, critique, and solidarity. Through repetition, metaphor, and parallelism, King emphasizes key themes while guiding audience interpretation. Pragmatically, his use of phrases like “I have a dream” functions as both a personal declaration and an inclusive vision, inviting listeners to share in his aspiration. Discourse analysis reveals how King frames societal issues, positioning the audience as both witnesses to injustice and participants in social change. Implicatures throughout the speech allow him to criticize systemic racism without direct confrontation, creating a persuasive yet respectful tone. Presuppositions embedded in statements such as “the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society” highlight historical and social assumptions, prompting reflection and moral evaluation. Deictic expressions like “this moment” and “today” anchor the speech in a specific temporal and social context, intensifying urgency. Politeness strategies and inclusive language maintain engagement while minimizing defensiveness, especially among diverse listeners. Overall, the interplay of explicit and implicit meaning enhances the rhetorical power of the speech, making it a prime example for pragmatic and discourse analysis. By examining these strategies, scholars can better understand how language functions to inspire, mobilize, and influence audiences.

8.2 Pragmatic Analysis

The speech demonstrates a clear distinction between literal and intended meanings. Figurative phrases such as “every valley shall be exalted” and “the rough places will be made plain” do not refer to geographical changes, but rather to the elimination of social injustice and systemic inequality. These metaphors convey hope and transformation beyond their literal interpretations.

The speaker’s illocutionary force is both expressive and commissive: King expresses his faith in justice and commits to a vision of freedom. His use of collective pronouns such as “we” and “our” builds solidarity and reinforces a shared struggle, establishing a strong connection with the audience. Contextual factors are vital in interpreting the hidden meanings. The speech was delivered during the American Civil Rights Movement, which situates the metaphors and hopeful language within a broader historical and political context of racial injustice.

Additionally, Implicatures play a significant role throughout the speech. When King says, “I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin,” the literal statement describes a personal hope, but the implied meaning critiques existing racial discrimination and calls for societal change. Presuppositions are also present; by referring to injustice as a current reality, King assumes the audience recognizes systemic inequality, which strengthens the persuasive impact. Deictic expressions like “this moment” and “now” emphasize immediacy, urging listeners to act rather than wait for future change. Politeness and inclusive language reduce potential resistance, framing the call for justice as a collective



moral duty rather than an attack. The interplay between figurative language, presupposition, and implicature allows King to communicate complex social critiques subtly and powerfully. Furthermore, repetition and parallelism, key rhetorical strategies, reinforce implicit meanings, ensuring that the message resonates emotionally and cognitively. By analyzing these pragmatic features, one can appreciate how King balances inspiration, critique, and mobilization within his speech. This demonstrates the critical role of pragmatic analysis in uncovering layers of meaning beyond literal interpretation.

8.3 Discourse Analysis

Structurally, the speech utilizes parallelism and repetition, especially in the phrase “With this faith, we will be able to...”. This rhetorical strategy not only creates rhythm but reinforces key messages through memorable patterns that resonate emotionally.

King employs antithesis, as seen in “mountain of despair” versus “stone of hope”, to generate vivid imagery and emotional contrast. This contrast symbolically represents the transformation from suffering to empowerment. The speech also contains intertextual references, particularly religious ones such as “the glory of the Lord shall be revealed”. These allusions to Christian scripture enhance the spiritual authority of the speech and make it more relatable to a faith-driven audience. Narratively, the passage constructs a journey from despair to hope, using metaphor and visionary language to help the audience visualize societal change as attainable and divinely guided.

Discourse analysis also highlights how King frames social issues to position the audience as both witnesses and agents of change. By using inclusive pronouns like “we” and “our”, he creates a collective identity, reinforcing solidarity and shared responsibility. Repetition of key phrases such as “I have a dream” functions not only rhetorically but also pragmatically, signaling important implicit themes about equality, justice, and moral duty. Metaphors like “the chains of discrimination” implicitly convey oppression and the need for liberation, while maintaining a persuasive and non-confrontational tone. Framing strategies, such as contrasting “freedom” with “oppression”, guide the audience’s interpretation and elicit emotional responses. Anticipatory cues and climactic structures in the speech build suspense and emphasize pivotal points, enhancing the impact of implicit messages. Intertextuality, including references to the Declaration of Independence and Emancipation Proclamation, situates the speech within broader historical and ideological contexts, deepening its persuasive force. Cohesion and coherence are carefully managed to ensure the audience follows both explicit arguments and subtle implications. Power dynamics are subtly addressed; King acknowledges systemic inequality while empowering listeners to envision and enact change. Overall, discourse analysis reveals how linguistic choices work in tandem to encode both explicit and hidden meanings, amplifying the speech’s rhetorical and motivational power.

Table (1) : pragmatic and Discourse Strategies Used in the Selected Excerpt



category	specific Strategy	Frequency Observed	Estimated Usage (%)	Function / Implication
Pragmatics	Figurative language (metaphors/symbols)	7 occurrences	30%	Convey implicit meanings of justice, struggle, and transformation
	Speech acts (commissive/expressive)	5 occurrences	20%	Express hope, commitment to collective action
	Use of deixis (we, our, this, that)	4 occurrences	10%	Create unity and shared purpose with audience
	Context-dependent meaning (historical/cultural)	Integrated	10%	Frame metaphors and faith within the Civil Rights context
Discourse Analysis	Repetition / parallelism	5 repeated structures	15%	Reinforce key ideas, create rhythm and emotional effect
	Antithesis (contrasting images)	3 instances	10%	Highlight transformation from despair to hope
	Intertextuality (religious references)	2 references	5%	Add spiritual legitimacy and emotional resonance
	Narrative structure (journey metaphor)	1 main progression	Encompassing	Structure the entire excerpt as movement from suffering to hope

9. Conclusion

This excerpt from “I Have a Dream” demonstrates how uncovering hidden meanings through pragmatic and discourse analysis reveals multiple layers of significance. King’s use of metaphor, repetition, contrast, and intertextuality transforms the speech into a powerful act of resistance and collective motivation. These linguistic strategies not only inspire, but also communicate a deep socio-political message embedded within hopeful and symbolic language. Moreover, the analysis shows that understanding implicit





meanings enhances our appreciation of rhetorical skill and strategic communication. Pragmatic features such as implicature, presupposition, and deixis enable King to convey critique and aspiration simultaneously, without direct confrontation. Discourse strategies like framing, narrative structure, and intertextuality embed the speech within historical, cultural, and ideological contexts, increasing its resonance and persuasive power. Recognizing these layers also highlights the importance of audience interpretation, as the impact relies on shared knowledge and cultural awareness. This case demonstrates that effective communication often depends as much on what is implied as on what is explicitly stated. Ultimately, uncovering hidden meanings provides valuable insight into how language can mobilize, inspire, and shape collective consciousness. Such analysis underscores the enduring relevance of pragmatic and discourse approaches in understanding influential texts across time and culture.

References

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.
2. Blommaert, J. (2005). Discourse: A critical introduction. Cambridge University Press.
3. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). Discourse analysis. Cambridge University Press.
4. Crystal, D. (2003). A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics (5th ed.). Blackwell.
5. Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.
6. Gee, J. P. (2014). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method (4th ed.). Routledge.
7. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
8. Hymes, D. (1974). Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach. University of Pennsylvania Press.
9. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
10. Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: An introduction (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
11. Schiffrin, D. (1994). Approaches to discourse. Blackwell.
12. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.
13. Stubbs, M. (1983). Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language. Blackwell.
14. Tannen, D. (2007). Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse. Cambridge University Press.



15. Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics. Longman.
16. van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. SAGE.
17. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2015). Methods of critical discourse studies (3rd ed.). SAGE.
18. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

Selected Excerpt from a Political Speech

"I Have a Dream"

Speaker: Martin Luther King Jr.

Date: August 28, 1963

Location: In front of the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D.C., USA

Occasion: The March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom

"I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight;

and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with.

With this faith, we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope.

With this faith, we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood.

With this faith, we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to climb up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day."