

**particularised Conversational Implicatures in Abbas
Araghchi's NBC News Interview: A Pragmatic
Analysis**

**الاستلزامات الحوارية الخاصة في مقابلة عباس عراقجي مع
قناة NBC News : تحليل تداولي**

Asst. Lect. Maha Kareem Kamil

م.م. مها كريم كامل

Ministry of Education/ Thi-Qar Directorate of Education

وزارة التربية / مديرية التربية في محافظة ذي قار

Mahakareem16@gmail.com

Key words: Implicatures, maxims, Abbas Araghchi, cooperative principle.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاستلزامات ، المبادئ ، عباس عراقجي، مبدأ التعاون.

الملخص

اللغة هي الآلية التي يتواصل بها الناس ويتبادلون أفكارهم وآرائهم. ووفقاً لنظرية مبدأ التعاون (1975) Grice، يتطلب التواصل الفعال الالتزام بقواعد معينة تشمل الكمية والنوعية والعلاقة والأسلوب. إذا لم يلتزم المتحدثون بهذه القواعد، فإنهم يُؤلّدون استلزامات ضمنية. تُقسم الاستلزامات الضمنية عمومًا إلى نوعين: تقليدية وحوارية. على عكس الاستلزامات الحوارية، لا تعتمد الاستلزامات لتقليدية على السياق. تُقسم الاستلزامات الحوارية إلى استلزامات عامة واستلزامات خاصة. تتطلب الاستلزامات الحوارية الخاصة سياقًا يتشارك فيه المتحدثون معرفة مشتركة وبعض الافتراضات. هذه الدراسة وصفية تحليلية، وتبني منهجًا نوعيًا. تركز على الاستلزامات الخاصة لعباس عراقجي، وزير الخارجية الإيراني. تقتصر الدراسة على مقابلاته التلفزيونية مع قناة NBC News حول الصراع بين إيران والولايات المتحدة (2026). تخلص الدراسة إلى أن عباس عراقجي يتجاهل مبدأ الجودة في أغلب الأحيان، يليه مبدأ الكمية، ثم مبدأي الملاءمة والأسلوب. ويكمن تجاهل مبدأ الجودة في توليد استلزامات ضمنية في الحوار، تُستخدم كإجراء استراتيجي لتصوير إيران وإخفاء ضعف قوتها العسكرية. فهو يوجه رسالة إلى العالم مفادها أن إيران ضحية لهذا الصراع، وأن ردها ليس إلا دفاعًا عن النفس.

Abstract

Language is the mechanism by which people can communicate and share their thoughts and ideas. According to Grice's (1975) theory of Cooperative Principle, the effective communication requires adhering to certain maxims including quantity, quality, relation and manner. If speakers fail to observe these maxims, then they generate implicatures. Generally implicatures are divided into two types conventional and conversational. Unlike conversational implicatures, Conventional implicatures are not a context dependent. Conversational implicatures are subdivided into generalised and particularised Implicatures. Particularised conversational implicatures require a context where the participants share a mutual knowledge and some assumptions. This study is descriptive and analytical adopts a qualitative approach. It focuses on particularised implicatures of Abbas Araghchi, the Iranian Foreign affairs Minister. The study is limited

to his televised interview with the NBC News about the conflict between Iran and U S (2026). The study concludes that Abbas Araghchi flouts the maxim of quality most frequently, followed by quantity maxim then relevance and manner maxims. Flouting the quality maxim is to generate conversational implicatures which serve as a strategic procedure to projecting Iran and conceal the vulnerability of its military power. He conveys a message to the world that Iran is a victim of this conflict and their retaliation is just kind of self defence.



Introduction

Language is the mechanism by which people can communicate and exchange information and ideas. The effective communication requires adhering to some principles . According to Grice (1975) human beings communication is governed by a certain cooperative principle and some maxims including quantity, quality, relation and manner. Speakers do not always observe these maxims, they flout them most often . As a result of flouting the maxims, participants generate conversational implicatures which implies meaning beyond the literal meaning of the words. When the participants generate conversational implicatures, they believe that the listener can infer their implied meaning because they have a mutual knowledge and share some assumptions. Thus, speakers not always convey their intended meaning only by the string of words, instead they implicate some additional meaning. Generally, implicatures are divided into conventional and conversational implicatures . Conversational implicatures are subdivided into two types, generalised and particularised. The former depends upon a context and some lexical words, meanwhile, the latter requires a specific features of the context.

The current paper focus is the particularised conversational implicatures of the Iranian Foreign Minister's (Abbas Araghchi) Speech . The collected data is limited to the interview with Araghchi on the NBC News. Abbas Araghchi represents the most influential figure in the latest conflict between US and Iran. He plays an important role as a negotiator concerning Iran nuclear weapons. As a diplomatic figure, he represents a compelling subject to pragmatic analysis. In the political discourse, the politicians try to avoid using direct language for some strategic purposes. The study raises some questions as follow:

1. what is the most frequently flouted maxim by Abbas Araghchi to generate particularised conversational implicatures?

2. What are the pragmatic functions of these particularised conversational implicatures?

The study aims to find the most frequently flouted maxim by Abbas Araghchi to generate conversational implicatures and to identify the pragmatic functions of these implicatures.

The results of the study show that the quality maxim is the most frequently flouted by Araghchi to show partial facts about the war as a strategic factor to express the Iranian strength and to conceal the vulnerability of its military power.

Although there are many pragmatic studies concerning the conversational implicatures in the political discourse, there is no study addressing Abbas Araghchi's speech as he represents a significant political figure during the critical period between America and Iran. Thus, this study is found to bridge this gap.

1. Literature Review

2.1 Grice Cooperative Principles

Effective communication is the basis of human understanding and interaction. Because of the vital role of interaction to exchange information and build social relationships, interlocutors have to adhere to some logical principles which prevent the misinterpretation among them. (Sri et al., 2022, p. 190). Grice tries to differentiate between various types of meaning. He has made a distinction between semantics and pragmatics. According to him, semantics deals with what is said (literal meaning), it is context dependent where the meaning is communicated explicitly. On the contrary, pragmatics is not a truth conditional, the meaning is not context dependent; it can be inferred implicitly. (Sztencel, 2018, p. 110). Pragmatics is the study of the contextual aspects that affect the meaning,



they are independent of the content or the logic form of the words. (Horn& Ward, 2006). So, hearers depend on their abilities to infer the meaning. According to Grice (1975, p.45) people use language to communicate based on some assumptions which guide the conversation. He sets what is called the cooperative principle which can be used among interlocutors to communicate effectively. So, communication is not arbitrary, but it is governed by certain principles. According to him, the cooperative principle is “ make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Grice, 1975, p. 45). He set four categories and each category has certain maxims.

- a. **The maxim of quantity**(it relates to the quantity of the provided information)

The interlocutors have to make their contribution as formative as required (for the current purposes of the exchange). They need to avoid the abundance of information that is not needed to understand what they say.

The contribution has to be informative (no less no more) as it is required in the current purpose of the exchange. Grice assumes that giving much information makes the hearer lose the point of the talk and be confused.

- b. **The Maxim of quality** (Make your contribution one that is true).

This maxim obligates someone to be truthful and do not say what they think it is false without having an adequate evidence.

- c. **The maxim of relevance**

People need to be relevant to the topic of the conversation.

- d. **The maxim of manner**

The speaker has to avoid obscurity and ambiguity of his expression and to be brief and orderly.

Grice (1975) states these categories and their maxims are not efficient lone, but they need to be connected with other maxims (aesthetic, social, or moral). He supposes these maxims are observed by interactants in a particular exchange. Grice provides some examples of everyday life and what is the rationale behind each category. For instance, if someone is assisting someone else who is mending a car and asks the addressee to give him four screws, so he expects that the assistant gives him the exact number of screws no less no more, this is closely related to the quantity maxims. Concerning the category of quality, Grice articulates that if someone is making cake, so the hearer is expected to handle her sugar not salt, or spoon; not a spoon that made of rubber. In accordance with the relevance category, Grice says that each contribution has to be relevant to a topic at a particular stage, he provides the following example, if someone is making cake and she is mixing the ingredients, so it is supposed that the other participant does not handle her a book or oven cloth. With the reflection of manner category, Grice says the partner's contribution must be clear and reasonable. (Grice, 1975, p. 45-47).

The cooperative principle is a way by which the interlocutors can convey and implicate the meaning appropriately without misunderstanding, depending on some contextual factors. If the interlocutors do not observe these maxims, this will lead to a crucial problem of implicating and interpreting the meaning which is hidden beyond the words. So, Grice gives a great value in his theory to implicatures and how to infer the intended meaning.

2.2 Implicatures

The term "implicature" is derived from the verb to *implicate* which means to fold something into something else. So, implicature is an implicit



meaning in the actual use of the language which cannot capture lexically, syntactically or semantically; it depends on some external factors. (Mey,2001, p.45). Horn and Ward(2006) state that the implicatures are components of the speaker's meaning which consists of an aspect the speaker wants to convey and he thinks the hearer has the linguistic principles that enable him to evoke the implied meaning. In accordance with Grice theory of conversational meaning, Implicatures are connected with particular features such as the mutual shared knowledge and knowing; this knowledge is like expectations which enable the speaker and the hearer to make inferences about what is said. (Senft, 2015, p. 33). Levinson (1983, p. 101) assumes that implicatures gives significant facts about linguistic function, they provide some implied meaning; something which is not said. He considers implicatures as kind of meaning inference where the speaker implicates the indirect meaning. Grice generally divides implicatures into conventional and conversational. He subdivides the conversational Implicatures into generalised and particularised. Grice points out that the conventional implicatures depend on some lexical items in the utterance such as *and* and *but*. For instance

She is poor and she is honest.

She is poor but she is honest.

The first utterance, if both of these assertions are true, then it is true. Meanwhile, the second utterance; there is something unexpected by using the word *but*. The hearer can infer the meaning of contract. (Chapman, 2011, p. 71).

Conversational implicatures focus on the way by which we understand an utterance according to what we expect to hear. For instance,

A: What time is it?

B: The bus just went by.

The hearer has to interpret B's response that there is only one car passes a day at an exact time. A has to be aware that B means something which is shared between the two. (Mey, 2001, p. 47).

All types of conversational implicatures are dependent on the context.

2.3 Generalised and Particularised Implicatures

Grice has distinguished between two types of conversational implicatures, generalised conversational implicatures (henceforth GCI) and particularised conversational implicatures (Henceforth PCI). He assumes that conversational implicatures have some properties which are easy to identify. They have five characteristics as follows:

1. All conversational implicatures can be cancelled and defeasable , for example

John ate some of the cookies.

The implicature is that John didn't eat all the cookies.

2. Implicatures are non-detachable, which means that the inferred meaning attached to the utterance, but not to a specific word or a phrase. For instance

John is not a rocket scientist, not an Einstein, not a candidate for the Noble Prize in Physics.

All these assertions implicate that John is not smart or genius.

3. Implicatures are calculable. We can say the relation between observing the maxim and implicature involving utterance is equivalent. For instance "boys will be boys " or (as cited in Yule 1996, p. 35) "business is business", such expressions are called tautologies; they have an additional meaning which can be figured out according to the shared knowledge between the interlocutors. Using such expressions "tautologies" between interlocutors, the speaker is accused of not being cooperative.



4. Implicatures are non-conventional, that implies the inferred meaning cannot be part of dictionary meaning, but the listener implicates it.
5. Implicatures cannot be determined completely by depending on the form of the utterance. There is no link between the utterance and its implicated meaning. (Senft, 2014, p. 37).

GCIIs can be understood and inferred out of a context.(Senft, 2014, p.36). Their meaning is non arbitrary as they do not base on linguistic matters, but rather on some rational capabilities. (Ariel, 2010, p. 6). GCIIs do not depend on some contextual features, for instance:

John went into a house yesterday.

John is meeting a woman.

According to the aforementioned examples, everyone can perceive that John didn't go to his own house and he is not meeting his wife or sister. (Ariel, 2010, p. 83). In other words, GCI does not need any particular background knowledge or drawing inferences to calculate it. Grice posits that this kind of meaning can be conveyed by certain form of words even if the special circumstances are not present. (Grice, 1989, p. 37).

Levinson (2000, p. 132) divides GCIIs into two types, scalar and clausal. The former can be defined as the inferred or implied meaning beyond the words depending on the speaker assumption when he provides less information as he is sure that the addressee ables to draw inferences. For example, if someone said that “ some people have arrived”, the listener would infer that not all the people have arrived. The latter one, concerns the addressee's inference regarding the truth of proposition, he may know if is true or not.

On the other hand, PCIs fit to a particular context in which they occur, for instance if someone said “ I have put the lights” and he didn't mention other action such as locking the door, his utterance would be vague as the

utterance is not expected by the hearer. PCIs are communicated by exploiting the content or flouting the four Gricean's cooperative maxims. (Sztencel, 2018, p. 110). Levinson postulates that particularised conversational implicatures need not only a context, but specific features that surround the context. (Levinson, 1983, p. 126). Lakoff (1989) agrees with Levinson (1983) that PCIs need a specific context or some cultural understanding. For instance, the implicature in this exchange,

A: I am sorry for making you wait for a long time.

B: It's fine, it's just like waiting for one year.

In this exchange, the speaker asks for an apology, the addressee's response has some contrary meaning. Her answer implies that she is angry. (Sri et al., 2022, p.192). The word "fine" literally means someone in a good condition, but in this context, it has an ironic implication. Depending on the context, the other participant can infer the opposite meaning. PCIs can be arisen from deviating the cooperative principles and the contributed meaning will be in different forms, such as ironic, metaphorical, hyperbole as well as the meaning of proverbs. (Sri et al., 2022, p. 192)

Another example, if someone asked "does the wedding goes well?", the addressee might answer "some men got really drunk." So, we can implicate that the wedding didn't go well. The inference can be drawn on the available information in their local context (Nanda et al., 2012, p. 123).

2.4 Flouting the Maxims

According to Grice (1975, p. 49), people may fail to adhere to the maxims in various ways including violation, opting out, by a clash and flouting the maxims. The concern of this paper is flouting the maxims because it is closely related to the particularised conversational implicatures as Levinson (1983), (Thomas, 1995), (Yule, 1996), and Cutting (2002) emphasise that. So, Flouting the maxims can be defined as the speaker's failure to observe the cooperative principle and its maxims. He does not



have an intention to deceive or mislead the hearer, but he wishes that the addressee conceives the additional expressed meaning. (Thomas, 1995, p. 65). Cutting (2002, p. 37) supports Thomas's idea that the speaker does not follow the cooperative principles, but he infers the meaning. Flouting the maxims is a way by which people generate conversational implicatures.

In interaction, some people may not want to be cooperative because they have their own reasons either to be polite or to make jokes. The reasons that make people flout maxims are as follows: the hearer does not have enough knowledge, or he is unconscious. The hearer sometimes seems as he is not interested in a particular topic. Another possible reason may be both the speaker and the hearer do not understand each other, or the hearer is governed by certain rules, or both of the interactants are joking. (Manurung, 2019, p. 155). In political discourse, none of these reasons seems reasonable because politicians always select their political discourse carefully to employ diplomacy and other objectives like being strategic and persuasive.

In accordance with Grice (1975) theory, there are four flouting types.

1. Flouting the quantity maxim

According to Grice (1975), this type of flouting occurs when the speaker gives more or less information than what is required. They fail to tell the exact meaning which the other interlocutor needs. Speakers often never tell the details that is needed because they believe that the addressee understands their intended meaning.

2. Flouting the quality maxim

The maxim of quality can be flouted when the speaker delivers untruthful or partial truthful information without an evidence. Thus, the hearer finds himself tries to draw inferences behind the literal meaning of the words. There are many ways by which the speaker flouts the maxim of quality

such as hyperbole, irony, and banter. (Hamidah, 2022, p. 84). The speaker who fails to adhere to this maxim is accused of being uncooperative .

3. Flouting the relevance maxim

Participants flout this maxim when they make unmatched responses. They often do this to avoid talking about something and that can be done through changing the topic of the exchange. Therefore, the hearer infers that the speaker does not like such topic.

4. Flouting the manner maxim

This type of flouting requires the absence of many factors, such as brevity, clarity and transparency. (Manurung, 2019, p. 156). So, particularised conversational implicatures can be generated through flouting one of these maxims for different reasons. The hearer plays an important role in interpreting what is said to figure out the hidden meaning.

Scholars have given a great attention to the political discourse as it is not only a means of communication, but it represents power, identity and authority. Conversation implicatures provide a way to the politicians to deliver their intended meaning through various ways. (Pepin Hsb et al., 2026, p. 213).

2. Methodology

The current study is descriptive and analytical. It adopts the qualitative approach within framework of pragmatics to analyse the utterances and to unfold the hidden meaning. The study adopts Grice (1975) as a model of the study who emphasises that the meaning can be expressed not only by the literal meaning of the words . It tries to infer the meaning that delivered by using conversational implicatures. The data has been collected from NBC News, television interview featuring the Iranian Foreign Minister (Abbas Araghchi). The researcher has transcribed the data from the



televised interview from NBC News website on Youtube platform. The study consists of questions raised by the interviewer and the interviewee's responses to the questions. The researcher selects only the excerpts that contain particularised conversational implicatures. The total number of the excerpts is 20, but the number of the flouted maxims is (25) because in some excerpts more than one maxim is flouted. The study analyses the utterances where the speaker (Abbas Araghchi) flouts the cooperative principles and providing indirect answers . The main focus is on the particularised conversational implicatures to interpret the implicit meaning.

3. Data Analysis

In this section, the data will be presented which includes the interviewer's questions and their responses by the Iranian Foreign Minister. The excerpts will be analysed according to Grice's (1975) theory of conversational implicatures. The following excerpts are taken from (NBC News, 2026).

Except 1:

The interviewer: Who is in charge in Iran right now?

Araghchi: the system is working very well. We have lost a supreme leader, but according to our constitution, there is now a council which takes charge of his duties. And then the presidents, the cabinets, ministers, everybody is in its position. So the system is working very well and everybody is in charge.

Analysis:

Araghchi flouts many cooperative principles (maxims) to generate particularised conversational implicatures. He flouts the maxim of quantity when he said twice " the system is working very well", he generates PCI when he does not name any one who may be in charge in this time.

Repeating the same phrase implies that the political system is unstable. Another flouting is “ we have lost the supreme leader”, he uses “ lost” instead of “died” or “passed away” to imply that the death is kind of loss. Flouting the maxim of relevance represented by shifting the topic. Instead of naming an individual, he talks about the political system in Iran with out giving any hints about the one who might be the Candidate for the position. This reveals that Abbas selects his responses carefully.

Except 2:

The interviewer: There are reports that Ayatollah Khamenei's son is a frontrunner. Is that true?

Araghchi: Well, actually, I don't know exact information, but there are many rumours around. But we have to wait for the assembly of experts to choose the new supreme leader.

Analysis

In this excerpt, the Foreign Minister flouts the maxim of quality by responding that “ I don’t know”. Araghchi is in a high position, so he is supposed to be informed about everything concerning the process of selecting a new leader. He generates PCI in his response which shows that he avoids revealing the answer to mislead the world into believing that there is no specific candidate yet, or he conceals that because of the critical moment of his country. He flouts the maxim of quantity by claiming “there are many rumours” to convey that there are unverified reports but he does mention anything about them, he does that for diplomatic purposes.

Except 3:



The interviewer: The Pentagon says America is winning decisively do you think they're wrong?

Araghchi: Well, I think you know now six days after the war, it is clear that the U S has failed to achieve its main goal which was a clean rapid victory. They failed to achieve that and now they are trying to justify why they did attack us and they have presented so many different reasons, but none of them worked and now they are talking about plan B ,and I believe that plan B would be even a bigger failure.

Analysis:

The speaker flouts the maxims of quantity and quality because his contribution is more informative than it is required and he justifies America's claim with out any adequate evidence . Instead of answering the question directly he mentions a lot of details about the opponent. He generates PCI that American has failed to achieve what it aimed to emphasising that their claim lacks evidence . He also flouts the maxim of manner when he said “are talking about plan B ,and I believe that plan B would be even a bigger failure.” Plan B is vague and lacks clarity. He generates PCI as plan B cannot understand out of a context. He implies that America's plan A has failed so, they are looking forward applying Plan B which may be ground invasion, negotiation or escalation. In fact, they have never achieved plan A yet.

Except 4:

Interviewer: Your supreme minister, your supreme leader, was killed , your top military leaders were killed , your military installations have been bombed , how can you call that a failure?

Araghchi: Then what they have been achieved, what was their goal? They came here for a regime change perhaps , they came here for a rapid victory. So, they can control everything, but they have failed.

Analysis:

Here, Araghchi violates the maxim of relevance because the interviewer challenges him to prove that America has failed. He generates PCI by shifting the talk about the defeat to present that America's goal is to change the regime, but they failed to do that. He implicates that the victory is not about killing the leaders, but by achieving the strategic objectives that the enemy aspires to.

Except 5:

The interviewer: Can Iran win this war?

Araghchi: There there is no winner in this war. Our win is to be able to resist against their illegal goals. What we have done so far, they failed to achieved their goals. We have been able to resist against the powerful army in the world.

Analysis:

Araghchi fails to adhere to the maxim of reverence when he avoids answering the question with *yes* or *no* to redefine the concept of victory. He generates PCI to imply that the winner who does not surrender no matter how strong and capable the opponent may be. So, Iran's resistance represents its win.

Except 6:



The interviewer: Why are you attacking your Muslim neighbours during the holy month of Ramadan?

Araghchi: We have not attacked our neighbours. We have not attacked Muslim countries. We have attacked Americans' targets and Americans' bases, Americans' installations, which are unfortunately located in the soils of our neighbours.

The Analysis:

The speaker disregards the maxim of quality by saying twice “we have not attacked” and then directly he said “we have attacked”. He uses PCI to convey that Iran has attacked the region not because Iran has animosity towards these countries, but because they host enemy bases and headquarters. Araghchi flouts the maxim of manner either when he ignores the question regarding the time “during Ramadan” to generate PCI which conveys that Iran defends itself whenever and wherever it is required.

Except 7:

The interviewer: Minister, NATO said they shot down an Iranian missile, which Turkey says was in its airspace. Are you creating new enemies every single day?

Araghchi: Our military has denied firing any missile to either Turkey or Azerbaijan.

Analysis:

Araghchi doesn't observe the maxim of relevance when he shifts the attention into another dimension. Instead of responding to the question concerning the creation of new enemies, he generates PCI to convey that

this is a diplomatic issue and he has no attention to discuss it publicly. He merely states that his forces denied launching any missiles towards these countries.

Except 8:

The interviewer: Is Iran's goal here to attack these other countries so they try to pressure the United States to stop bombing Iran?

Araghchi: No, This is not our goal. You know, our war is with the US. US is attacking us on a daily basis, on an hourly basis. And we are defending ourselves. How we can defend ourselves when we cannot reach the American soil? What we can, you know, attack to our American bases, which are around us in the region, and they are scattered all around the region.

Analysis:

The speaker flouts the maxim of quality when he says “we are defending ourselves”, he generates PCI that Iran attacks these countries, but he justifies these actions as self-defense because America’s territory is very far away and inaccessible, so they cannot stand doing nothing, instead they target affiliated locations and bases. So he reframes attacking the region as self-defence due to geopolitical reasons.

Except 9:

Interviewer: Minister, you paint a very dire picture of what the situation looks like in Iran. Government buildings bombed, even sports stadiums bombed out, police stations bombed. How much longer can Iran hold on?



Araghchi: We are the victim of the act of aggression. And what we are doing is self-defence , and we have every right to defend ourselves. And at the same time, we have been able to hit targets in Israel and American bases.

Analysis:

The respondent's answer reveals that he fails to adhere to the maxim of quality because he mentioned earlier how the opponent attacked many civilians sectors, but when the host asks him about the dire picture of destruction in Iran, he doesn't answer. The response gives rise to the PCI that we are not the one who has paved the way for this war, we are just victims of it, and our duty here is not to surrender. He implicates that in spite of all the destruction, Iran still hits in the battlefield effectively.

Except 10:

The interviewer: This is not an equal battle right now. Would you agree to that?

Araghchi: Well, look at the damages inside Israel as well. They have badly hit by us. Of course, they are in control of their media, so they do not publish the footages of the damages. But this is a war. But we have received damages, but we are the one who defend our dignity, and our dignity is important than anything else.

Analysis:

Araghchi does not adhere to the maxim of quality as he does not answer the question by *yes* or *no*, but he redirects the discussion about Iran's triumph in battlefield. He implicates that the other side infrastructure destruction cannot be ignored, but they restricted their media, therefore, the

Iranian opponent seems as the one who is the winner of this war. Similarly, he flouts the maxim of quality when he asserts that “ we defend our dignity”, he implies that whatever the number of people who have been killed, we resist. No war without victims, they were the price for our territorial dignity and sovereignty.

Except 11:

The interviewer: Minister, to be clear, I want to make sure I understand you here. Right now, you're saying Iran does not want a ceasefire.

Araghchi: we are not asking for a ceasefire. we don't see any reason why we should negotiate with theUS. When we negotiated with them twice, and every time they attacked us in the middle of negotiations.

Analysis:

Araghchi flouts the maxim of quality when he says “ we are not asking for a ceasefire” to trigger PCI that Iran welcomes the diplomatic solution, but it does not ask for that directly. He implicates that US is not trustworthy. US has failed to commit to the deal concerning ceasefire and they cannot trust them anymore. This can be perceived as a call to the international community to choose a mediator for negotiations because they never ask that by themselves.

Except 12:

The interviewer: If this war continues, will Iran try to close the Strait of Hormuz?



Araghchi: But they have not closed it. It is the ships and tankers who do not try to pass through to cross the Strait, because they are concerned about being hit by either side. So we have no intention to close it right now.

Analysis:

The respondent fails to observe the quality maxims by asserting that “ we have no attention to close it right now” to trigger PCI which reveals that Iran has an intention to close it in the future as a strategic target. He also states that we have not closed it at the moment, but at the same time he said the Strait is empty because shipping is not safe in the region.

Except 13:

The interviewer: Minister, is Iran's nuclear facilities secure right now? Is Iran's nuclear stock, stock load right now, is that secure as well?

Araghchi: Well, our stockpile is under the rubbles. We didn't, we have not touched them after the last June war.

Analysis:

The speaker violates the maxim of quality when he states that “our stockpile under rubbles” . His answer generates PCI that Iran’s nuclear programme either has been damaged and its material cannot be accessed right now or it just is safe under the ground. He does not give any details about how much the damage is, if the stocks are secure or not, only the experts can prove that. The maxim of quality requires an adequate evidence, but he does not show any truthful information or evidence about the condition of the stockpiles of nuclear.

Except 14:



The interviewer: Are you afraid of a US. invasion in your country?

Araghchi: No, we are waiting for them.

Analysis:

The speaker fails to observe the quality maxim because his contribution is very precise and does not give a full answer to the question. He generates PCI that Iran is ready for ground invasion because they have prepared for that very well. The consequences of the invasion will be a catastrophe for the US not for Iran. The word *waiting* implies readiness. His contribution implies the meaning of irony because the word “*welcome*” is used to refer welcoming someone or receiving them very kindly, but which country waits troops on its soil.

Except 15:

The interviewer: Are your allies, Russia and China helping you?

Araghchi: Well, they are supporting us politically and otherwise.

Analysis:

The respondent flouts the maxim of quantity by using the word “*otherwise*”. He implies PCI that Iran’s allies support it in various ways, militarily , politically. He does not states that publicly because he prevents his country’s allies from some diplomatic issues.

Except 16:

The interviewer: Are they supporting you militarily?



Araghchi: Well, military cooperation between Iran and Russia is not a secret. You know, we have worked with each other in the past, and that has continued. They had always held us.

Analysis:

Araghchi fails to adhere to the maxim of quality because he does not answer yes or no, but his answer was indirect, particularly his saying “that has continued”, and “they had always helped us”. This triggers PCI which implies that Russia and China do help Iran, but he does not want to draw them into an international confrontation.

Except 17:

The interviewer: Why are you closing off information for the Iranian population while this crisis is unfolding?

Araghchi: Well, this is not the case. Almost all Iranians have access to social networks. And in some cases, for security reasons, we have cut access to internet. Please do not forget that we are in the middle of a war, a very extensive war, and war has its own rules and procedures.

Analysis:

The speaker does not adhere to the maxim of quality by saying that “all Iranians have access to network” and the same time, he contradicts himself that “we have cut access to internet”. This generates PCI that the Iranian government has cut the internet, particularly when he justifies that as this action is a kind of war procedures. He implicates the government has the right to cut the internet in extensive situations. It puts the nation interest and security over accessing the internet.

Except 18:

The interviewer: Do you fear for your own life?

Araghchi: Well, everybody may fear for his life in the time of war. But I am doing my job. I am doing my duty. And I would be honored if my blood is shed for the sake of my country.

Analysis:

The respondent's answer seems to violate the quantity maxim because he does not answer the question directly by *yes* or *no*, but shifts to say this fear all Iranians share it. He generates PCI to implies that the answer is “*yes*” he has some fear, but he is in a safe and secure place especially when he said “there is no fear”. He turns to speak about patriotism and that his martyrdom will be for the sake of the nation. This implicates that he wants to inspire the Iranian people and to emphasise that their defence is a sacred one. So, he reframes the danger as a cost of the patriotism.

Except 19:

The interviewer: Can you confirm is former President Mahmoud Ahmadi Najad still alive?

Araghchi: Well, to be honest with you, I don't have any exact information. I heard some rumours 3-4 days ago that he might have been, hit by missiles. But I don't have any exact information.

Analysis:

The speaker does not adhere to the quality maxim because he states twice that “I do not have any exact information”. He is one of the top figures in



Iran, it is supposed to be he has every detail. He generates PCI that he has exclusive information about Ahmi Najad, but he does not want to admit it publicly.

Except 20:

The interviewer: Do you have a message for American people?

Araghchi: For American people, this is unnecessary war, they drag to by those who want Israel first and America last.

Analysis:

Araghchi flouts the maxim of quality because he said “by those who want...”, he does not name any one, but Americans and the world know what he wants to implicate . His response gives rise to PCI which implies that the war is not for American interest, but they are dragged by Israeli Lobby to achieve what Netanyahu’s government wants.

4. Finding and Discussion

This section will introduce the findings concerning pragmatic analysis of particularized conversational implicatures which are drawn from the Iranian Foreign Minister (Abbas Araghchi). The number of the flouted maxims is (25) out of (20) excerpts. The study adopts Grice's (1975) cooperative principles and how the particularised conversational implicatures are generated through flouting these maxims.

Table (1) the frequency and percentage of the maxims flouting

The Maxim	Frequency	Percentage
Quality maxim	14	56%
Quantity maxim	5	20%
Relevance maxim	4	16%
Manner maxim	2	8%
Total	25	100%

Table (1) shows that the quality maxim is the most frequently flouted maxim by Araghchi recording (14) out of (25) flouted maxims, accounting for (56%) . This indicates that Araghchi reveals partial facts or information for some strategic and diplomatic objectives. The second maxim that flouted by Araghchi is quantity maxim occurring (5) out of (25) flouted maxims, representing (20%) that implies the Minister's contribution is less informative, particularly to sensitive question that requires an elaborated answer. Araghchi flouts the maxim of relevance in (4) instances, occurring in (16). This shows that Araghchi shifts the topic of discussion if the answer may expose Iran to international confrontation. The maxim of manner is flouted (2) out of (25), representing (8 %). Araghchi often uses vague language which bears more than one interpretation and that is very common in political discourse.

5. Conclusion

The current paper investigates the particularised conversational implicatures in the televised interview with the Iranian Foreign Affairs Minister (Abbas Araghchi). The study is limited to particularised conversational implicatures in the interview on the NBC News regarding the conflict between Iran and U S (2026). The study is based on Grice 's (1975) theory of cooperative principle and its maxims. According to him, PCIs are raised as a result of flouting the maxims of the cooperative principle. The current study analyses(20) excerpts, some excerpts have more than one flouted maxim, so the total number of the flouted maxim is (25). The results reveal that Araghchi flouts the quality maxim most frequently, occurring (56%) as it serves some diplomatic advantages to project Iran power and conceal its military vulnerability. He gives the conflict morality and makes it sacred. The second flouted maxim is quantity, representing (20%) when Araghchi intentionally flouts this maxim either being too or



less informative about sensitive questions. He selects his words carefully which bear more than one interpretation. The relevance maxim flouting record is (16) where Araghchi shifts the attention of discussion to some other subjects to avoid answering controversial uestions.Finally, the manner maxim is flouted in (8%), when the Minister uses certain vague words which have different implied meaning.

References

1. Allott, N. (2010). *Key terms in pragmatics*. Continuum.
2. Amelia, N. R., Hsb, P. A. Y., & Khasanov, U. A. (2026). *Unveiling hidden meanings: Implicature in Donald Trump's 2017 UN General Assembly address*.
3. Ariel, M. (2010). *Defining pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Chapman, S. (2011). *Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
6. 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.
7. Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.
8. Hamidah, N., Arifin, M. B., & Ariani, S. (2022). *Analysis of flouting of conversational maxims by characters in The Help movie*. Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya, 6(1), 80–93.
9. Horn, L. R., & Ward, G. (Eds.). (2006). *The handbook of pragmatics*. Blackwell Publishing.
10. Lakoff, R. T. (1989). The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua*, 8(2–3), 101–129.
11. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
12. Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. MIT Press.
13. Manurung, L. W. (2019). *Flouting maxims in Hitam Putih talk show (Pengabaian maksim dalam talk show Hitam Putih)*. HKBP Nommensen University.
14. Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publish
15. Nanda, S., Sukyadi, D., & Sudarsono, M. I. (2012). *Conversational Implicature of the Presenters in Take Me Out Indonesia*. Indonesian

- Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1(2), 120–138.
<https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v1i2.89>
16. NBC News. (2026, March 6). *Full exclusive interview: Iranian Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi speaks to NBC News* [Video]. NBC News. <https://www.nbcnews.com/video/full-iranian-foreign-minister-abbas-araghchi-exclusive-interview-258784325520>
 17. Sztencel, M. (2018). *Semantics, pragmatics and meaning revisited: The case of conditionals*. Springer International Publishing.
 18. Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman.
 19. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
 20. Yulianti, S., Arafah, B., Rofikah, U., Idris, A. M. S., Samsur, N., & Arafah, A. N. B. (2022). Conversational implicatures on Saturday Night Live talk show. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 189–197. <https://doi.org/10.17507/JLTR.1301.22>