

The Concept and Relation between Pragmatics and Politics in English Language

By

Hadeer Jasim Mohammed

Al-Esraa University College, English Department, Baghdad, Iraq

Email: hadeer.jm96@gmail.com

Aljanabi Hiba Ahmed Kareem

Al-Esraa University College, English Department, Baghdad, Iraq

Email: hiba.ahmed@esraa.edu.iq

Ranea Yahya Khudhur

Dijlah university college, English Department, Baghdad, Iraq

Email: ranea20180@gmail.com

Jagdish Joshi

Gujarat University, School of Languages, Linguistics Department, Ahmedabad, India

Email: joshijagdish@gmail.com

Abstract

Language is essential for politics, for producing, disseminating, engaging with, and reacting to political discourse. The pragmatics of political speeches is crucial to the development of effective political communication tactics. Thus, speech is situated at the intersection of rhetoric, linguistics, and politics. In communication, intent is a pragmatic factor that plays a crucial role at the time of the communication process. Speech is of paramount importance to the social and political domains. Through the use of concepts and the relationship between language and politics, the study analyzes the function of language in communication and interpretation of intentions. The study of the relationships between language and the situations in which it is employed is the focus of the subfield of linguistics known as pragmatics. Politicians communicate directly with the public to persuade them to support their plans or beliefs. In this area, certain concepts of pragmatics can be applicable to the analysis of the political speeches demonstrates that political leaders conduct a variety of acts through their speeches. This article discusses the concept of Relation between Pragmatics and Politics, derived from its two basic components throughout linguistic concept. The authors attempt to identify elements or factors that interweave these two apparently separate spheres, by highlighting all the pragmatic concepts that can be included in the analysis of political discourses. In addition to giving an overview of the concept of political speeches and their relationship to the theory of pragmatism through the principle of analyzing the intentions of the politicians.

Keywords: Pragmatics, political speeches, discourse analysis

1. Introduction

Political language involves using ability to coordinate the ideas of several individuals. It is a weapon for controlling society as a whole. Many people heard the speech, and each person's perspective may have an impact on the candidates' success. Political speeches build and sustain social ties, express emotions, and sell ideas. Political speech in pragmatics can be analyzed using the felicity condition, the cooperative principle, conversational implicatures, relevance, politeness, phatic tokens, deixis, and the most popular feature, speech act theory.

Published/ publié in *Res Militaris* (resmilitaris.net), vol.12, n°3, November Issue 2022

The act of speaking accomplished by a single word, according to Speech Act Theory, The speaker's intention and the context in which the word is delivered are frequently determining factors.

In general, pragmatics studies the relationship between signs and their interpretation. The concept of interpretation has evolved historically. Discourse analysis, a branch of pragmatics, is a relatively new concept. It can be understood in various ways, both as a tool and a discipline. Our thoughts and language influence every aspect of our lives. We become "prisoners" of our minds in numerous instances. We have a particular way of thinking, but we speak differently. This issue has been investigated not only by philosophers and psychologists but also by experts in communication sciences.

Language people employ a means of constructing a personal identity. This method of personal branding became an essential step in politics, bringing politicians closer to their constituents. The management of a political brand depends heavily on discourse. Words are potent, and potency resides within them. Everything a person says can be used to their advantage or disadvantage. The issue in this situation is the disparity between what was actually said and what was intended to be said. In this paper, the author investigates the intentions in discourse as a crucial pragmatic component. First, the pronunciation of a sentence determines its meaning, followed by its intended meaning. When discussing pragmatic theory, rationality principles must be mentioned. Due to varying cultural and ethnic backgrounds, rationality is interpreted differently all over the world.

2. Objectives

Additional study has been undertaken to provide clear and comprehensive information about pragmatics and answer various questions. The paper offers an overview of political speeches and politics based on pragmatics, in addition to an overview of significant literature and research in the field of pragmatics. The following are the primary topics covered by this paper:

1. The linguistics definition of pragmatics, and political speeches.
2. An overview of language context in pragmatics.
3. The relationship between pragmatics and political speeches.

3. An Overview of Pragmatics

3.1 Pragmatics

It is concerned with the use of the context-dependent features of meaning that are analytically presented away from in the creation of logical practice. The meaning of a sentence is observed as a task related to the context, comprising time, place, and conceivable world, addicted to a proposition, in which propositions are roles associated with the potential world based on an actuality. The scrutiny of conversations and cultural differences in communication are of special interest. Van Dijk (1977:189) asserts that"... Pragmatics' task is being responsible for successful state of affairs for the utterance - act, besides clarifying aspects that act as part of communication wherein it is both recognized and precluded by alternative negotiator". Pragmatics tackles utterances that are presented in particular occasions, to accomplish intended acts in which interlocutors typically comprising some linguistic aspects.

Pragmatics is a discipline of linguistics that explores how language and context interact. According to this definition, pragmatics arises as an unique and unified field of study primarily concerned with the study of language outside of its context of usage. The political scene is characterized by language that generates and reinforces beliefs about who are allies and who are enemies. Even when scientific language suggests that certain groups are scapegoats rather than enemies, language frequently evokes the belief that certain groups are inherently evil. Numerous victims of discrimination attest to the power of language in specific contexts that evoke a political world in which persecution is justifiable, despite the fact that the same words connote gross injustice for different people in other contexts.

3.2 What Does Pragmatics Include?

The study of the relationship between linguistic forms and their users is known as pragmatics. Along with semantics and syntax, it is one of the three primary subfields of semiotics. Only the pragmatics component of this distinction allows humans to be included in the analysis. . Discussing people's intended meanings, assumptions, intentions or aims, and the type of action they are performing when speaking are all advantages of studying language through pragmatics. These extremely human concepts are exceedingly challenging to analyze consistently and objectively. Two types of pragmatics exist. Sociolinguistics and pragmalinguistics. (Yule 1996: 3-4).

The fact that no two published accounts include the same pragmatics categories in exactly the same order demonstrates the lack of a clear consensus. However, you should be aware of the following:

- A. Speech act theory
- B. Felicity condition
- C. Conversational implicature
- D. The cooperative principle
- E. Conversational maxims
- F. Relevance
- G. Politeness
- H. Phatic tokens
- I. Deixis

All of them, as well as related or peripheral subjects, are covered in this overview, many of them further subdivide into their own subcategories, such as the various types of speech acts that linguists have usefully distinguished.

3.3 Pragmatics in English

Pragmatics is a growing field in contemporary linguistics, which in recent years has attracted the attention of linguistics, philosophers of language, anthropologists, artificial intelligence workers, cognitive scientists, psychologists and semanticists.

Pragmatics is related to linguistics fields, but also to non-linguistic fields. As a modern branch of linguistics, it has its origins in the philosophy of language. The philosopher Charles Morris is credited with popularizing the word pragmatics (1938, *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*).

Charles Morris outlined the general shape of semiotics, the science of signs, understanding for sign a linguistic unit. He distinguished:

- Syntactics, often known as syntax, is the study of the formal relationships between signs.
- Semantics: the study of the relationship of signs to the objects to which they apply.
- Pragmatics (European Continental School) broad perspective
- Pragmatics: the study of the relationship between signals and interpreters

Pragmatics studies the vast array of psychological and sociological aspects involved in sign systems or a language in particular. It should be taken as presenting a functional perspective on every aspect of linguistic behavior. It's related to sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and discourse analysis.

At the intersection of American pragmatism and logical positivism, the study of pragmatics, or at least the term "pragmatics," develops. . After hearing the name of the American philosophical school to which Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey belonged, Charles Morris

invented the term "pragmatism.". Morris' account of how signs function is heavily based on Peirce's semiotic framework to which he adds a trichotomy distinguishing three branches of the study of signs (i.e., semiotics): 1) syntactic, which is concerned with the relationship of sign forms to one another; 2) semantics, which is concerned with the relationship of sign forms to what they stand for (i.e. their designate); and 3) pragmatics, which is to be the study (Morris, 1938).

Morris's approach to semiotics recalls both the then-dominant logical positivist view of language and American pragmatism. According to this theory, natural language and much of the analytic philosophy of the early twentieth century are composed of a number of "systematically erroneous claims" that give rise to philosophical errors and confusions. Clarity was to be attained through the logical examination of natural language claims and, if that failed, through the rational reconstruction of the language in its entirety (Ibid).

3.4 What is Pragmatics in Context?

Before continue, a quick consideration of what is meant by pragmatics in the context of foreign language learning is required. To begin, pragmatics is described by Aitchison, J (2003) as "how speakers use language in ways that cannot be predicted purely by linguistic understanding." (pp. 9). She appears to be referring to the reality that much of what native speakers say or write that is seen as natural, suitable, or native-like by traditional prescriptive grammarians can be ungrammatical. Furthermore, it appears that natural language in usage is regulated by a language emotion rather than grammatical or linguistic understanding. . This is something that Kasper and Rose have also mentioned (2001). Pragmatics, on the other hand, has been defined as "using socially appropriate language in a variety of casual and formal circumstances" (Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, S.) (2003). The emphasis here is on socially acceptable language, and the issue is not with grammatical perfection but with appropriateness and naturalness in a given setting. "Pragmatics is the study of language from the perspective of users, particularly of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter when using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication," according to a more detailed definition used by the JALT special interest group in pragmatics and cited by authors such as Kasper. (David Crystal, 1997, p. 301).

The emphasis is once again on the language employed for social interaction. Nonetheless, this definition raises an issue that I believe is critical: the impact of language choices on social interactions. . How can we teach students when and how to be polite, informal, straightforward, or authoritative? This appears to address a topic that many teachers find incredibly difficult and complex. How do we deliberately teach language learners a myriad of language tactics, nuances, and nuances that native speakers appear to take for granted, utilize successfully without thought, and adapt to a wide range of situations and contexts? M. Childs (2005) adds a valuable definition of pragmatics as "the study of how humans produce and interpret meaning in real-world circumstances." 'Meaning,' in this sense, refers to language as a tool of attaining a number of goals and conveying a wide range of messages, feelings, and emotions, which the user communicates through more than just strings of words." Language users use a wide range of symbols, sounds, expressions, and gestures to transmit true meaning in interpersonal and communicative contexts. Despite their relatively diverse foci and terminology, the previous definitions share a number of characteristics. All of the authors appear interested with pragmatics in terms of language "use" in a real and meaningful context, as well as the choices and decisions made by language users while striving to communicate meaning. The conclusion is that pragmatics and, by extension, pragmatic competence, are concerned with language that conveys genuine meaning and is employed in a range of interpersonal circumstances or contexts. For communication to be truly effective, the language used must be appropriate for the situation. These viewpoints do not appear to describe communication or communicative skill in terms of grammatical rules or other purely linguistic ideas.

3.5 Definitions of Pragmatics

Literature-based definitions of pragmatics emphasize. Its focuses on the importance of context for comprehending spoken language coherently. Leech (1981) defines pragmatics as the study of the element of meaning obtained from how utterances are used and how they connect to their environment of usage. This perspective views pragmatics as a philosophy of dialogue appropriateness. Lawal (2003:150) defines "pragmatics" as "the study of how context effects our understanding of utterances." According to Adegbija (1999:189), pragmatic study of language explores "how language is employed in any particular communicative contexts or situations."

Yule (1996:3) describes the scope of pragmatics as comprising four interdependent facets. The research of speaker meaning, the study of contextual meaning, the study of how more meaning is transmitted than what is stated, and the study of the representation of relative distance. Consequently, pragmatists are concerned with the interlocutors, the context, the unstated or uncommunicated meaning, and its consequences in discourse. Allan (1986) defines pragmatics as the study of interactional meaning in light of this. Pragmatics covers context, speech acts, deixis, conversational principle, politeness, and presupposition, among other notions relevant to the fundamentals and nuances of communicative values, in order to discern interactional meaning.

3.6 Main Concepts in Pragmatics

Pragmatics studies the use of language in context. It gives importance to the users of language and the context in which language is used (Joan Cutting, M^a Victoria Escandell, Geoffrey Leech, Stephen Levinson, Jacob Mey and George Yule).

- A. Key concepts in Pragmatics: language use, meaning, utterance (vs. sentence),
context/situation, interaction/communication, speaker/user/addresser,

reader/listener/addressee, purpose/goal, principles, actions/illocutionary acts, appropriateness.

- B. Basic elements in communication (non-linguistic aspects): addresser, addressee, utterance, meaning, goal, and context.
- C. Related linguistic disciplines: Sociolinguistics, Discourse Analysis, Conversation Analysis, Semantics, Syntax; Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology.
- D. Sentence (a well-formed string of words put together according to the grammatical rules of a language; abstract unit, grammatical unit, structure-semantic meaning, correct or incorrect) vs. utterance (the use of a particular piece of language by a particular speaker on a particular occasion; concrete and realized unit, pragmatic unit, discourse unit, semantic meaning-pragmatic meaning, appropriate or inappropriate, effective or ineffective).
- E. Semantic meaning (linguistic meaning, grammar, what is said, literal meaning) vs. pragmatic meaning (speaker meaning, pragmatics, what is meant or communicated).
- F. Rules (grammar, syntax; correctness, well-formedness) vs. principles (pragmatics; language use, communication, understanding).

3.7 Pragmatic Failure

In general, Ziran and Xinren (2004) that pragmatic failure in cross-cultural communication occurs under the four conditions outlined below.

A. The speaker chooses an unsuitable subject. Generally, diverse cultures hold diverse beliefs, value perspectives, and lifestyles. In intercultural communication, people must distinguish between free and constrained topics.

B. The speaker employs expressions with different connotations in the target language or that deviate from his original intent when producing such utterances. This type of pragmatic error is common in greetings. In addition, the improper use of fixed expressions in the target language contributes to misunderstanding.

C. The speaker's expression of a particular idea does not conform to the conventions of the target language. People with different cultural backgrounds tend to use different expressions and strategies to convey the same information, so they frequently fail pragmatically when speaking a foreign language.

A conversational participant responds inappropriately to a particular question or statement. In a more specific manner, Guan-lian (2004), "Pragmatic failure is committed when the speaker uses grammatically correct sentences but unconsciously violates interpersonal relationship rules, social conventions, or disregards time, space, and addressee."

3.8 Definition of Pragmatics by Expert

Each expert has an opinion regarding the various definitions of pragmatics as described by Yule (1996: 3), who lists the following pragmatics definitions:

- A. a field that investigates the speaker's meaning.

- B. a discipline that examines meaning in relation to context.
- C. field, in addition to the study of uttered meaning, investigates the meaning of the communicated or communicated by the speaker.
- D. a field that examines forms of expression by limiting the social distance between conversation participants.

As it has been argued that pragmatics cannot be separated from context, it must be consistent with the context communicated to speakers.

According to Crystal (1987:120), pragmatics is the study of the factors that govern our language choices in social interactions and their influence on others. In theory, we are able to express our desires. In practice, we adhere to a large number of social rules that constrain our speech (mostly unconsciously). As stated in the definition, pragmatic is concerned with how we choose our correct speech when conversing with others because there are social rules that must be understood. According to a second definition by Mey (1993:42), the term is:

The study of the conditions under which humans utilize language as determined by the social context is known as pragmatics. From the aforementioned restrictions, we can conclude that pragmatics is largely determined by the language's context. In accordance with what was discussed with the interlocutor, everyone must pay attention and be cautious to his speech.

Social contexts and societal contexts are covered in the discussion. Social context is a context that emerges from interactions between community members in a specific social and cultural society. Societal context is a context in which the rank position of community members in social institutions that exist in certain social and cultural communities is the determining factor. According to pragmatics, we must pay attention to who we are speaking with and the context of the conversation when we communicate. According to Tarigan (1985:34), pragmatics is the study of how context influences how a person interprets a sentence. On the basis of the preceding opinion, it is clear that pragmatics refers to the ability to use another person's language in a way that is appropriate and that relates and harmonizes sentences and contexts. Some experts' pragmatics understanding highlights the significance of our speech acts in relation to the context and the people with whom we converse. Pragmatics focuses on how a speaker can express a meaning by understanding social rules, which must be consistent with the context of the conversation.

3.9 Understanding Pragmatics

After reading the definitions of pragmatics provided by a number of experts, Pragmatics, in my opinion, is the study of language relations and spoken and written words that comply to context and social conventions. In addition, the language we use, with whom we use it, in what situations, and in what context, must adhere to the pragmatics-taught rules. Our language and speech are influenced by the social context, which determines how well we speak words that are appropriate for the circumstances and our speech partners. By studying a great deal of pragmatics, we must adapt in order to communicate effectively.

A. Linguistic context (co-text): a word's co-text is the set of words that appear in the same phrase or sentence. The surrounding context has a substantial effect on our judgment of the probable meaning of the term.

B. Physical context (relevant context): The mental representation of what is physically said. It is our comprehension of a great deal of what we read and hear, particularly the environment in which we come across linguistic terms.

There is a number of ways by which we can get to a proper interpretation of what we hear or read.

A. Deixis: a phrase used in linguistics theory (originally Greek) to encompass those qualities of language that directly correspond to the personal, temporal, or geographical characteristics of the circumstance in which an utterance occurs and whose meaning is relative to that situation. now/then here/there I/you possess.\

B. Deictic expressions: These are apparent examples of language that can only be comprehended in light of the speaker's intended meaning (which means pointing via language).

They are classified into:

* Personal Deixis (him/ her / them / those / this...etc.)

* Spatial Deixis (here / there / near that ...etc.)

* Temporal Deixis (now / then / last ...etc.)

C. Reference: means using language to aid in the identification of something, either verbally or in writing. On the other hand, does the reader or listener to build a connection between what is spoken and what must be meant utilize supplementary information.

Each word or expression has its own collection of references. The researchers can also refer to objects when we do not know what they are called. In the same vein as "the blue thing" and "that terrible crap." We can give anything a name even if we do not know what to call it.

D. Anaphora: a grammatical term denoting the process or outcome of a linguistic unit driving its interpretation from previously articulated units or meanings.

E. Anaphoric reference: is one means of distinguishing what is being said from what has previously been said. Yule: a subsequent reference to a previously introduced entity.

F. Presupposition: We create our language communications based on broad assumptions about what our reader or listener already knows. Of course, some of these assumptions are incorrect, but for the most part, they are correct.

G. Speech acts: These are acts like (request, command, or inform) or it is an action performed by a speaker within an utterance.

Types of speech acts:

- Direct speech act: an activity in which the form utilized (e.g. interrogative) directly corresponds to the function performed by a speaker with an utterance

- Indirect speech act: an activity where the form used (for example, interrogative) does not instantly correlate to the function performed by a speaker with an utterance 'Could you bring me the salt?' is a request, not a question

H. Politeness: is defined as showing awareness and consideration of another person's face. In the study of linguistics politeness, the most relevant concept is "face". Your face in pragmatics is your public selfimage.

- Face threatening act: expressing something that undermines another person's self-esteem.
- Face saving act: expressing anything that reduces a potential harm to another's self-esteem A face-saving act that emphasizes a person's positive face will show solidarity and draw attention to a common goal.
- Negative face: is the desire to be self-sufficient and free of imposition.
- Positive face: is the desire to be linked, to belong, to be a part of a group.

4. The Concept of Politics

4.1 Introduction

Politicians need language because "politics is essentially dependent on language, which gives rise to the view that language is an instrument of power" (Nyachae) (2013:1). Political language is concerned with the use of power to arrange people's minds and opinions. It is a tool used to control the entirety of civilization. Each individual's assessment of a speech heard by a wide audience can affect the candidates' success. Political speech can be seen as a technique of developing and maintaining social ties, expressing feelings, and selling ideas, policies, and programs in any community.

Language has clearly been and continues to be a powerful instrument in the hands of political leaders who exploit it to suit their aims. This claim validates the importance of political speech writing and performance. To grasp the meaning of any speech in a more appropriate manner, pragmatics must be applied to explain how language can be used to transmit information that is not immediately proportional to the additive value of the raw linguistic forms used. In terms of pragmatics, this pertains to the Speech Act Theory. The speech act performed by a specific word is frequently determined by the speaker's intention and the context in which it is stated. Language can be constructed in such a way that it aids the accomplishment of its many functions while also accomplishing one's aim and desired result.

4.2 Language of Politics

The relationship between language and politics is derived from the relationship between language and communication. Man is a political entity whose entire life is saturated with politics, and his ability to communicate effectively allows him to do so. Language precedes, accompanies, influences, and controls all political actions (Schaffer, 1996). As per Beard (2000), The significance of studying political language is to comprehend how language is utilized by those who seek, exercise, and maintain power. In politics, language is utilized to create speeches and pronouncements.

Thus, a political career is negotiated, secured, and exercised through the use of language, the product of which is essentially public speaking. "Making speeches is a vital aspect of a politician's work when it comes to introducing policy and persuading the public," Beard (ibid., p. 35) says. Lakoff (1990:7) more effectively shows the inextricable relationship between language and politics. "Language is politics," he claims, "and politics allocates power, and power influences how individuals speak and are interpreted." Furthermore, he emphasizes

that political manipulations rely on language since language originates and interprets power connections. . Thus, language bestows or confers power while also defining the relationship between its users by assigning them unique roles.

Language demonstrates power, and every language user possesses it. user "plays the linguistic power game according to hidden agendas, with the unspoken being considerably more potent than the spoken" (ibid :21). Pragmatics is concerned with elucidating the implicit meaning or "hidden agenda" (Mey,2001:207). Language affords politicians the opportunity to investigate and exploit its verbal expressive resources to satisfy their needs. As a result, language can be seen of as a political vehicle. Throughout this context, Opeibi (2009) observes that language is the vehicle via which the candidate's manifesto, superior political ideals, and other ideas are communicated, and party ideologies are expressed, as well as the instrument by which they are translated into social acts for social continuity and change. Language's importance in persuading, organizing, influencing, and illuminating the masses cannot be emphasized. It brings people closer to their hearts. Because these elements determine the success of a candidate's programs or policies, Akinkurolere's (2011) thesis that the public's support for politicians is dependent on their message and presentation style is true. As a result, both of the political viewpoint and the manner in which it is delivered are critical. . As a result, political discourse has been researched utilizing discourse analysis, stylistics, rhetoric, and pragmatics frameworks. This inquiry makes use of two pragmatics-related items.

4.3 Political Discourse

Some discourse-analytical studies of political speech concentrate on professional politicians' and political institutions' language. (Chilton 2004, page 14) Political discourse is exemplified by its players or authors. In this context, politicians are the combination of individuals who are compensated for their (political) actions and who are either elected or appointed as political leaders. Furthermore, we must also recognize the many recipients of political communication, include the public, people, and citizens Numerous of these organizations and institutions, as well as the groups and individuals who comprise them, are actively engaged in political dialogue. (Van Dijk 1997, p. 13).

The organizing of public life around style-focused service and consumer activities has also had an impact on political representations. Politicians have most likely developed a more individualized language of choice and lifestyle values in order to transmit their political communications with citizens. Simpson and Mayr (2010), pages 42 and 3).

There is more to political discourse than simply stating public propositions. It pertains to politics. It involves performing actions with words. The use of language to influence the political body. Lexical items may be chosen not only established decorum norms, but also because they efficiently emphasize political attitudes and beliefs, shape public opinion, produce political consent, or legitimate political authority. The same might be said for interactional-self presentation and pragmatic speech act control. In other words, while political discourse structures are rarely exclusive, normal and effective political communication may have preferred forms and procedures for effective performance of political acts in political circumstances.

Presidential addresses have been studied from a variety of perspectives as a component of political discourse. Political speech has undeniably been an important field of language study for a very long time, attracting the attention of experts. Because of its fundamental significance in the formation and administration of society, Political speech is a complex human activity that requires careful examination.

4.4 Political Speeches

Ideas and ideologies must be presented through language in political speeches so that the receivers and those who may read or hear portions of the speech in the media agree with them. Expressions and words are deleted or included in a variety of ways to alter meaning. . Furthermore, political speeches are produced by a team of experienced speechwriters who have received training in the use of compelling language. Truthfulness is not required for a good political speech; rather, it may be a matter of presenting reasons. (Bread 2000:18).

Numerous addresses are made to the public prior to elections; these addresses are Pre-election special addresses another name for them., and are typically delivered at rallies and campaigns. A political speech is a text, a method, as well as a product that may be given either vocally or in writing.

The field of study known as "pragmatics" examines how language functions in specific social and communication settings. factoring in the context of the conversation, the message being sent or the speech act being performed, the speakers, their goals, their background knowledge, and the effects of these factors, ; what they have assumed to be true because of the context; what they have inferred due to context; and what is suggested by what is said or left unsaid (Leech 1983:20, Watson and Hill 1993:146, and Thomas 1995:7). The vast majority of politicians do not understand the significance of the gap between words and their intended meanings and consequences. The speech act theory has proven to be an influential and useful framework for analyzing political speeches.

5. Politics of Pragmatics

Considering Pragmatics in connection to politics is rather conflicting. We unavoidably enter the police order when we prescribe and restrict the uses of the body and language. Hence, the police are first and foremost a body that specifies allocations of methods of performing, being, and talking, and ensures that those bodies are allocated by name to a specific place and task. A hierarchy of the visible and the sayable ensures that one activity is visible while another is not. This utterance is seen as discourse, whereas the other is regarded as noise (Ranciere, 1999, p. 29). In this context, how can Pragmatics be used to politics without limiting language use, i.e. without succumbing to the temptation to limit what cannot and should not be totally governed by deterministic rules? Many libertarian theories confront this danger. These ideologies, in an attempt to address social exclusion, flipped hierarchies and simply relocated the center of power. Alternatively, they focused their efforts only on the material side of social behaviors, diminishing the symbolic aspect. These are biased ideas full of metaphors and seemingly affirmative acts that tend to increase the gap between the two groups. Perhaps Pragmatics does not necessitate politics. However, we must remember that humans make history.

Politics is described in this context as "social and physical acts that respond to objective and psychological mediations of cultural forms." ." on the other hand, politics correlates with strategic uses of language within the sphere of its highly performative nature, with the goal of modifying the Subject's mental states or the condition of affairs in reality. To formulate politics according to Pragmatics, the agent, the act, and the context must be explained. It also means establishing a practice capable of locating both the world's material and symbolic dimensions within such dialectics. When we say that individuals are conscious, we do not imply that they base their ideas on historical application or practical absorption into social movements; "the

consciousness could never be distinguished from the conscious being" (MARX and KONDER, 2002, p. 40).

6. Conclusion

Language is a significant tool for gaining access to leaders' political views and ideologies. Pragmatics cannot be studied fully without taking into account discourse analysis, as the two are intricately intertwined. For a long time, Political speeches have aroused the interest of researchers as a key area of language use. This is due to the fact that political discourse is a complex human activity that merits critical examination, particularly given its fundamental role in the structure and management of society. The objective of this study is to investigate the role of language in communication and comprehension of intentions by examining political speeches as pieces of discourse with specific purposes. The Speech Acts serve the most important purpose because a politician's speech is primarily focused with persuading or influencing others of what they are saying.

Hens political discourse requires instantaneous actions, the most essential pragmatic reflections perceived in it are "speaking acts." The words chosen in a speech can have a significant impact on how future events unfold. These are stated promises that cause a drastic shift in perception. Sentences are not formed in isolation, but rather have context-dependent meanings. Any sentence's interpretation is dependent on the understanding of the relationship between context. The intentionality dilemma might be regarded as a mental representation of what must be said against what is actually said. The words chosen have a deliberate structure as well as a logical arrangement. language and non-linguistic elements such as speech acts, socio-political context, and deixis are taken into account, and good explanations of how these aid in meaning interpretation are praised. A number of challenges and impasses encountered in the analysis of language in a significantly de-contextualized form stimulated the investigation of classic pragmatic concerns such as deixis, presupposition, speech acts, implicatures, politeness, and information structure. . The authors wish to summarize the components required to construct a discourse and how political speech is created in connection to context as a conclusion to this study. At the moment, pragmatics and discourse analysis academics only have a hazy grasp.

References

- Aitchison, J. (2003). *Teach Yourself Linguistics* (6th Edition). London: Hodder and Stoughton
- B.O. Opeibi, (2009). *Discourse, politics and the 1993 presidential election campaigns in Nigeria* Lagos: Nouvele Communications Limited
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. and Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching Pragmatics*. Washington DC:US Department of State, Office of English Language Program
- Bread, Adrian (2000). *The Language of Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- C. Schaffner, (1996). 'Editorial: Political speeches and discourse analysis.' *Current Issues in*
- Chilton, P. (2004) *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Clancy B, O'Keeffe A 2015. *Pragmatics*. *The Cambridge Handbook of English Corpus Linguistics*, (2015)
- Cohen, A. D. and Ishihara, N. (2005). *A Web-based Approach to Strategic Learning of Speech Acts*. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. Retrieved October 16th 2011 from www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/requests/tm.htm
- E. E. Adegbija, (1999). 'Titbit on discourse analysis and pragmatics.' E. Adegbija (Ed.)
- G. Leech, (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman Inc.

- G. Yule, (1985). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- G. Yule, (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Guan-lian Q. *Pragmatics in Chinese Culture*. Tsinghua University Press, Beijing, China; 2004.
- J. L. Mey, (1993). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- Jonathan's inaugural Speech.' in *English Language Teaching*. Canadian Center of Science and Education .5 No.(11).
- K. Allan, (1986). *Linguistics meaning*. Vols 1 & 11. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved October 18th 2011 from <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/>
- Konder, L. *A Questão da Ideologia*. SP: Cia das Letras, 2002.
- Marx, K. *A questão judaica*. In.: *Manuscritos econômico-filosóficos*. São Paulo: Martin Claret, 2002.
- Mey, Jacob L. 1993. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Morris, C. 1938. *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*. University of Chicago Press.
- Nyachae, J. (2014). *The Language of politics: A CDA of the 2013 International presidential campaign Discourse*. *Journal of Education and Research*. Vol. 2 January
- R. Lakoff, (1990). *Talking power*. Basic Books
- R.A. Lawal, (2003). "Pragmatics in stylistics: A speech act analysis of Soyinka's 'Telephone Conversation'". In A. Lawal (Ed.) *Stylistics in theory and practice*. Ilorin: Paragon Books.
- Rancier, J 1999 *Disagreement: politics and philosophy* Rose J trans University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis MN
- Rancuere, Jacques. *O Desentendimento: política e filosofia*. SP: Editora 34, 1996
- S. O. Akinkurolere, (2011). 'A speech act analysis of selected political speeches of President Simpson, Paul and Mayr, Andrea (2010). *Language and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and Context*. London: Longman.
- Van Dilk, Teun, A. (1997). "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", in J. Blommaert and C. Bulcaen (eds.), *Political Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Watson, J. R. and Hill A. (1993). *A Dictionary of Communication and Media Studies*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Ziran H, Xinren C. *Contemporary Pragmatics*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, Beijing, China; 2004