LEXICAL PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF PATRIOTISM AND SELFLESSNESS IN PRESIDENT GOODLUCK JONATHAN'S SPEECHES

Onyebuchi Valentine Mbanusi
Department of English Language and Literature
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
mbanusivalentine@gmail.com
08030658992

Chinwe Ezeifeka
Department of English Language and Literature
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
cr.ezeifeka@unizik.edu.ng
08035427698

Abstract

The study analyses the lexical pragmatic processes of meaning modulation in the linguistic choices of President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches. Using relevance theory and politeness theory, the study highlights observed usages that range from narrowing, broadening or loose usages and metaphorical extension to convey patriotism and selflessness in the speeches. The study adopted the qualitative method to outline, classify and analyze the lexemes of President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches in order to account for the instances of patriotism and selflessness in the speeches, how the speeches appealed to the face wants of the addressee and how lexical pragmatic process are applied in the interpretation of the inherent implicature in the speeches. It was found that implicature is inherent in all choices and that communicative and cognitive principles of relevance are required to interpret the narrowed and broadened uses of words to understand the ad-hoc concepts that portray numerous instances of patriotism and selflessness in the speeches. The study also found out the inclination of the speeches towards mitigating face wants, and how the patriotic and selfless nature of the president played crucial roles in addressing the challenges that bedeviled the nation. It concluded that different situated meanings can be conveyed by the same word in different

contexts, and that speakers and readers should exploit these lexical pragmatic mechanisms of meaning modulation for meaning interpretation.

Keywords: Lexical Pragmatics, Patriotism, Selflessness, Relevance Theory, Theory of Politeness

Introduction

Language has been a great communicative tool in all facets of life; it has also become a great communicative tool in politics. In fact, there will be no politics without language. Agbogun (2011) observes the usefulness of language in politics and declares that language has evolved to have classifications based on context of use. The context of use has given rise to the existence of political language which is used in dealing with issues within the political terrain. Schaffner (2004) agrees that "in linguistics, political language has been used either to denote the use of language in the context of politics, that is, a specific language use with the purpose of achieving a politically motivated function, or it has been used to denote the political vocabulary; words and phrases that refer to extra-linguistic phenomenon in the domain of politics." This emphasizes the uniqueness and usefulness of language in a context; hence, the curiosity in linguistic researchers to study the use of language in different texts.

It is pertinent to study the language of the ruling class because the language of the ruling class is as prestigious as the ruling class. Beard (2002) submits that "looking at the language of politics as an occupation is important because it helps us to understand how language is used by those who wish to gain power, those who wish to exercise power and those who wish to keep power." Language has been used by politicians to will power; they manipulate language, at any time, to suit their various intents. Therefore, language and politics are inseparable concepts. Taiwo (2009) concludes that the study of language of politics has been carried out within the framework of political rhetoric, linguistic stylistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis.

In politicking, language grants the politician access to the masses' hearts. They gain and lose the supports of the masses with the choice of words they employ while addressing the people. Hence, what the politicians say, how they say it and when they say it are of paramount importance in politicking. This is the reason Opeibi (2009) laments thus: "no matter how good a candidate's manifesto or inaugural speech is; no matter how superior political thoughts and ideologies of political parties may be, these can only be expressed and further translated into social actions for social change and social continuity through the facilities provided by language.

Statement of Problem

President Goodluck Jonathan has been adjudged by many as being weak in taking and standing by his decisions. This, amongst other factors, made people to lose interest in him and politics during his tenure as the president of Nigeria. The manner in which he lost the 2015 presidential election to President Buhari made people to reaffirm their belief that President Goodluck Jonathan is not only weak but also a coward for having lost the election despite being the incumbent president of the country. However, Ezeifeka (2012) believes that political speeches in Nigeria have been viewed with caution, indifference and disbelief due to the aged long history of failed promises and despair which the speeches purport. The politicians always sugarcoat their speeches to persuade people into believing that all their moves are to better the lives of the populace whereas the underlying motives are for them to amass wealth, use power to fight envisaged enemies and become influential figures within and outside the country.

People have subjected President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches to different linguistic analyses. Some linguists have analysed the stylistic features of the speeches, some have toed the part of critical discourse to analyse the moves and turns that have been made and taken in the speeches (Ezeifeka, 2012; Anurudu & Oduola, 2017). Some have used the Speech Act Theory to study the actions the president performed with words in his speeches

(Gunn and Ishaya (2020). Adegbenro (2022) and Ezeifeka (2016) used the Systemic Functional Linguistics to explore the interpersonal relationship that exists between the president and his audience while some have used the Cooperative Principles to account for the implicatures in his speeches, but none has employed the use of the Relevance Theory and the Theory of Politeness to make lexical pragmatic analysis of patriotism and selflessness in President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches. Hence, all the aforementioned problems are what prompted this study in order to fill the academic niches.

This study, therefore, analyses the lexical choices of President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches in the field of lexical pragmatics in order to show that the cognitive effects of the speeches are as the result of the processing efforts of the speaker and that the different faces that are employed by the speaker are meaning embedded in different contexts of use. For effective communication to be achieved in such a situation, there must be synergy in communicative intents to enable the speaker and the listener to know the various communicative roles that are expected of them at each point in the time of communication. The questions this study will address are as follows: What are the lexical pragmatic processes in President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches? How has relevance theory accounted for tnese lexical pragmatic processes? How do the lexical pragmatic processes portray instances of patriotism and selflessness in the speeches? To what extent do the speeches address the challenges of the people?

Conceptual Framework

Lexical Pragmatics

The concern of lexical pragmatics is basically the under-specification between encoded meaning and communicated meaning (Rebollar, 2013: 1). It is a pragmatic phenomenon that is concerned with the fact that pure semantics underspecify lexical items making them to need some enrichment and adjustment at the pragmatic level to arrive at their intended speaker meanings; "processes by which word meanings are pragmatically modulated

in context resulting in communicated (ad hoc) concepts that are different from the concepts encoded by the words used (Hall, 2017: 85-86). Hall refers to the explicitly expressed proposition of the utterance as the "explicature" from where the implicatures are generated. The hallmark of lexical pragmatics is to account for the fact that the concept communicated by the use of a word often differs from the concept encoded. Lexical pragmatics therefore studies how these underspecified conceptual meanings are understood in context as well as the various cognitive processes that aid in their interpretation

Based on the above, scholars of lexical pragmatics:

- Reject the Gricean doctrine of literal meaning (logical form conforms to literal meaning)
- Accept the role of under-specification (logical forms are underspecified with regard to expressed semantic content)

In the next section, three lexical pragmatic processes of meaning modulation that will be applied to this study are explored.

Lexical pragmatic processes of meaning adjustment

A number of lexical pragmatic processes have been identified to account for semantic under-specification of lexical meanings. Wilson (2003) identified the commonest categories of these processes as narrowing, broadening/loose uses, metaphorical extension and neologisms. Broadening or loose uses has two types according to Wilson (2003: 343-344) and Rebollar, (2013: 2-3), namely; approximation and category extension. The following examples were given to illustrate these processes:

Narrowing

This involves pragmatic enrichment of a lexical item where a word is used to convey a more specific sense than the encoded sense, resulting in a restriction of the linguistically-specified denotation (Wilson, 2003: 344). Narrowing highlights a sub-part of the many parts of the linguistically-specified denotation resulting in an ad

hoc concept which suits the emergent context. Note that (+>) means "conversationally implicate". For example:

I need a DRINK +> I need an ALCOHOLIC* drink (not water, juice, coffee, wine, etc)
She has a TEMPERATURE +> She has a HIGH* temperature
They went for CAROLS +> They went for CHRISTMAS* carols
I read CHOMSKY today +> I read a BOOK* on Chomsky

Broadening

Narrowing and broadening are two sides of a coin; whereas the former is interpreted in its restricted sense, the latter extends the meaning of the linguistically encoded concept resulting in an ad hoc concept (Rebollar, 2013:2). Broadening has two types: approximation and category extension. The most common examples given for broadening are as follows:

Approximation:

Nigeria is FLAT +> approximately FLAT* not hilly/mountainous
The earth is FLAT+> approximately FLAT*, not round
My tire is FLAT +> approximately FLAT* not pumped/full of air
The world is ROUND +> approximately ROUND*
The children formed a CIRCLE +> approximately a CIRCLE* not precisely a circle

Different meanings of *red* in the sentences below are also examples of approximation

The apple is RED (RED* on its peel)
The watermelon is RED (RED* inside its flesh)
The pencil is RED (painted RED*/with RED* lead)
The book is RED (RED*on its cover)
The house is RED (RED*on its outside)

Category extension

This involves extending a word with precise meaning to a range of items that clearly fall outside its linguistically-specified denotation, but share some contextually relevant properties with items inside the denotation. Example:

> My visit to the hospital today was a UNIVERSITY of life for me
>
> That is our TABLE (pointing to a flat rock TABLE* during a picnic.
>
> Let's not make our country another BOSNIA`(conflict-prone)

The meaning of the lexicalized concepts extends beyond their denotation to a broader category: referring to having a kind of learning from a hospital visit, a flat rock resembling a table and a situation of constant conflicts respectively. Note that the lexical items with the asterisk (*) represent the ad hoc concepts encoded in the use of the words.

Metaphor

Metaphor as figurative use of language is standardly seen as involving blatant violation of a pragmatic maxim of truthfulness if we follow the Gricean classical pragmatic framework. However, with the relevance-theoretic account to be discussed below, human cognition activates the optimally relevant concept from an ordered array of encyclopedic knowledge form which the hearer is to select the most appropriate interpretation, by following the line of least effort in the mutual adjustment of context, content and cognitive effects. Some scholars like Wilson, 2003, Blutner, 1998 regard metaphor as an aspect of category extension, others like Maruenda Bataller (2004) and Rebollar (2013) regard it as a mutual adjustment process to be taken in its own right.

For example:

He is the sugar in my tea

This utterance violates the maxim of truthfulness, but the participants understand such utterance as ostensive communication

that licenses inference. Literal meanings of the words in the utterance would be inadequate in accounting for such inferences. But by mutually adjusting the meaning of the expression to its context through approximation and extension of the meanings of the words, relevance of the expression can be reached how sugar act as sweetener to tea can be equated to how the addressee adds sweetness to the speaker's life.

These three processes will be analysed in this study to highlight how they are deployed in the speeches under study to show the speaker as patriotic and selfless or otherwise. The relevance of the choice of words will also be determined based on the context in which the speeches were situated.

Empirical Studies

In the quest to contribute to knowledge and to fill the various academic niches, many linguists have carried out different researches in President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches using different theories and principles.

/Abuya (2012) undertakes a pragma-stylistic analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's inaugural speech using Austin's speech acts theory. His aim is to identify the speech acts that are ubiquitous in the inaugural speech and to demonstrate how the acts convey meanings in the situated contexts. It is discovered that in the process of performing an act, another act is also performed but all the acts portray President Goodluck Jonathan as a democratic leader.

Anurudu and Oduola (2017) use critical discourse analysis to analyze the concession speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan and other politicians. The study aims at analyzing the pragmatic, grammatical elements and cohesive devices that are used to interpret the various ideologies in the speeches and it is discovered that politicians concede defeat mainly to save face and not necessarily because they mean well for their various countries.

Furthermore, Adegbenro (2022) carries out a lexico-thematic analysis of selected speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan using the systemic functional grammar. The study explores how

reiteration and repetition are predominantly used in the president speeches to express peace, faith, progress and transparency.

In performing illocutionary acts with words, Gunn and Ishaya (2020) looks at how President Goodluck Jonathan performs directives and commissives with words in his speeches in order to be appealing to the citizens while addressing them. The study attempts to establish an interrelationship between utterances and actions while demonstrating that the president's speeches are intended to generate reactions from the audience. The study concludes that a speaker could utter a speech act about the state of affairs in the context of interaction such as stating, asserting, suggesting, and complaining, thereby eliciting another class of illocutionary act such as expressive that expresses the psychological attitude of the speaker toward the state of affairs presupposed by the earlier utterance.

As regards the style of President Goodluck Jonathan in the presentation of speeches, Bolarinwa (2016) submits in his work that the president employs the use of special linguistic features which differentiate his political language from other politicians' language. Some of the special linguistic features are metaphor, planned repetition, irony, etc. The study declares that style is explored by politicians in an attempt to plead for supports of the masses through language.

Adegbenro (2019) undertakes a stylo-pragmatic examination of deixis in the acceptance speech of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan using Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory. The paper accounts for the prominent roles deictic elements play in bringing about cohesion and coherence in the acceptance speech.

Uduma (2012) studies pragmatic meanings in President Goodluck Jonathan's 50th independence speech and the African political speeches. The study investigates both the semantic and pragmatic meanings of modals in the speeches. It goes ahead to involve the analyses of sociolinguistic, semantic and pragmatic implications of the speeches in order to find out the effects of the speeches on the people. It concludes that this is not an ordinary congratulatory speech to invite the Nigerian to vote the ruling party

as identified in the 46th anniversary independence speech of former Nigerian president, Obasanjo, but a tailored speech intended to remind Nigerians that our future and development as a nation depends on our unity and urge them to forget tribal and religious differences and foster unity among her diverse tribes.

Ashipu and Odey (2016) explores a critical discourse analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's CONFAB speech using the theoretical approaches of M.A.K Halliday and Bloor. The study examines the language of politics as it was used during the inauguration of the National Conference by President Goodluck Jonathan and concludes that the ideology of President Goodluck Jonathan's CONFAB speech is embedded in the Fairclough notion of meaning residing in the text that can be uncovered through the process of deconstruction.

More so, Ezeifeka (2016) in her study, Critical Discourse Analysis of Interpersonal Meaning and Power Relations in Selected Inaugural Political Speeches in Nigeria, discusses interpersonal meaning in two inaugural political speeches of Nigerian past leaders – President Olusegun Obasanjo and Alhaji Shehu Shagari. The focus of the study is on aspects of the mood structure of the clause that emphasizes meaning as exchange of information, goods and services between interactants – the subject, and the speech functions of the clause as propositions or proposals and vocatives. The study concludes that Nigerian politicians should be more committed to the proposals that offer goods and services to their subjects rather than making propositions that serve mainly informative functions.

In addition, Ezeifeka (2012) makes another critical discourse analytical survey into the selected inaugural political speeches in Nigeria to identify instances of self-glorification and derogation of others. The emphasis is on the rhetoric used by Nigerian politicians in projecting themselves and others in their political speeches. The Nigerian politicians present themselves as good leaders that have the good intentions of their followers at heart. By so doing, they present the past administrations as failures that institutionalized the social vices and other problems the people suffer from till date.

From the reviews, it is apparent that some researchers have studied the speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan and other political speeches using different theories but none has carried out a lexical pragmatic analysis of patriotism and selflessness in President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches which is the focus of this study. Therefore, this study is justified as it has academic gaps to fill.

Theoretical Framework

Two theoretical frameworks are considered appropriate for this study. The first is Relevance Theory because human communication is geared towards expectation of optimal relevance in order to draw the expected inferences. The second is the Theory of Politeness owing to the fact that communication between rational participants should adopt face-mitigating acts for maximal interactional achievement. We shall take these theories in turns.

Relevance Theory

Deirdre Wilson and Dan Sperber are widely regarded as the proponents of relevance theory. The theory shoots out from one of Grice's key claims: that an essential feature of most human communication, both verbal and non-verbal, is the expression and recognition of intentions (Grice 1989). To buttress that claim, Grice institutes an inferential model of communication which is an alternative to the classical code model. As code model states, a communicator encodes an intended message into a signal that is decoded by the hearer on the anchor of the evidence provided.

Relevance theory is a core pragmatic theory because it centres on inference. The goal of inference according to Wilson and Sperber (1995) is to explain how a hearer infers the speaker's meaning on the basis of provided evidence. Hence, they assume that the theory is an inferential approach to pragmatics and it is based on a definition of relevance and two principles of relevance – a cognitive principle (that human cognition is geared to the maximization of relevance) and a communicative principle (that utterances create expectations of optimal relevance). Wilson and

Sperber (2002) declare that the relevance-theoretic account is based on another of Grice's central claims: that utterances automatically create expectations which guide the hearer towards the speaker's meaning. Grice (1989) describes the expectations in terms of Cooperative Principle and maxims of Quality (truthfulness), Quantity (informativeness), Relation (relevance) and Manner (clarity) which speakers are expected to observe. Therefore, the interpretation an objective hearer should choose is the one that best satisfies the aforementioned expectations.

The relevance theorists believe in Grice that utterances raise expectations of relevance but are critical of other aspects of Grice's account, including the essence for a Cooperative Principle and maxims, the focus on pragmatic processes which contribute to implicatures rather than to explicit, truth-conditional content, the role of deliberate maxim violation in utterance participation and the treatment of figurative utterances as deviations from a maxim or convention of truthfulness (Wilson and Sperber 2002). Therefore, the focal claim of relevance theory, according to them, is that the expectations of relevance raised by an utterance are definite and predictable enough to direct the hearer towards the speaker's meaning as the goal is to account in cognitively realistic terms what the expectations of relevance amount to, and how they might contribute to a very verifiable account of comprehension.

Wilson and Sperber (1996) submit that relevance not only relate to utterances but also to thoughts, memories and conclusions of inferences. According to them, utterances raise expectations of relevance not because speakers are expected to obey a Cooperative Principle and maxims or some other specifically communicative agreement, but because the search for relevance is a basic feature of human cognition that interlocutors may exploit.

In relevance theory, situational context is of paramount importance in understanding meaning. It defines relevance and also attaches relevance to an input or text. Wilson and Sperber shed light on the importance of situational context with their clarification on when an input or text is relevance. According to them, an input is relevant to an interlocutor when it connects with

the background information he has available to yield conclusions that matter to him: say, by answering a question he had in mind, improving, his knowledge on a certain topic, settling a doubt, confirming a suspicion, or correcting a mistaken impression. Therefore, Wilson and Sperber (1995) sum up that an input is relevant to an individual when its processing in a context of available assumptions yields a 'positive cognitive effect'. Emphatically, relevance theorist believe that what makes an input to be worth picking out from amongst other inputs is not just that it is relevant but that it is more relevant than others. The greater the positive cognitive effects achieved by processing an input, the greater its relevance will be while the greater the processing effort required, the less relevant the input will be. This is the reason linguists believe that relevance is assessed in terms of cognitive effects and processing effort.

So far, it can be deduced that relevance theory is a theory of communication. It dwells solely on intentions. However, Wilson and Sperber (1995) term relevance theory in this context a theory of 'ostensive-inferential communication' that involves the use of 'ostensive stimulus' (stimulus that is designed to attract an audience's attention and focus it on the communicator's meaning) because it involves an extra layer of intentions – informative intention (the intention to inform an audience of something) and communicative intention (the intention to inform the audience of one's informative intention). For understanding to be achieved, the communicative intention must be fulfilled – the audience recognizes the informative intention.

Wilson and Sperber (1995) suggest relevance-theoretic comprehension procedures that are necessary in communication – follow a path of least effort in computing cognitive effects: test interpretive hypotheses (disambiguations, reference resolutions, implicatures, etc) in order of accessibility, and stop when your expectations of relevance are satisfied. Aside the comprehension procedures, there are sub-tasks in the overall comprehension process. Wilson and Sperber (1995) outline them as constructing an appropriate hypothesis about explicit content (explicatures) via

decoding, disambiguation, reference resolution and other pragmatic enrichment processes; constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual assumptions (implicated premises) and constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual implications (implicated conclusions).

Inasmuch as relevance theory has filled many gaps in pragmatics especially in encoding and decoding of messages, it has faced criticisms from the linguists. Linguists believe that relevance in its technicality cannot be measured; hence, it will be very difficult to ascertain what and when a message is relevant enough and the most relevant. Levinson (1989) opines that relevance theory is very 'reductionist' as it is infinitesimal to account for the whole pragmatic phenomena. He pinpoints that the theory cannot take care of implicatures in its entirety because relevance theory is very dependent on situational context. Even the implicatures the theory accounts for, it is incapable of explaining how implicated premises are arrived at through the creative processes.

Theory of Politeness

It is widely believed that Penelope Brown and Steven Levinson are the developers of the theory in 1978 and the theory is socially and culturally based as it is centred on social behaviour. They develop the theory to account for the universal social principles and their effects on repositioning grammar. They try to understand the speaker's and hearer's choice of words in any given context and try to achieve that by relying on the concepts of face and rationality. Solely, Brown and Levinson account for one's socio-linguistic behaviours that are portrayed through a language. However, Robin Lakoff is seen as the originator of the theory of politeness which centres on three principles – do not impose, give the receiver options and make the receiver feel good (Lakoff 1975). She emphasizes that the three principles which can also be called maxims are paramount in the achievement of good interaction. As cited in Kuntsi (2012), the principles are formality (keep aloof), deference (give options) and camaraderie (show sympathy). Therefore, an interlocutor is adjudged to be flouting

maxims if he fails to obey the three maxims. Lakoff's principles are rooted on Grice's conversational maxims which are centred on 'conversational construct (Grice 1975). Lakoff (1975) asserts that the first principle aims at creating a distance between interlocutors while the second principle gives the hearer an opportunity to act as the leader while the third principle makes the speaker and the hearer to feel as a team. Lakoff (1975) defines politeness as a system of interpersonal relations that are designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange. She sees politeness as a form of social behavior that reduces friction between a speaker and listener in personal interaction. It is politeness that governs conversation as there are unique rules that must be followed for a conversation to be successful.

Brown and Levinson (1975) propose that theory of politeness is centred mainly on how to maintain faces during a conversation so as to sustain the conversation. However, the term, face, is discovered by Erving Goffman and he, Goffman (1967) defines face as the positive social value which a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. In adopting the term, Brown and Levinson (1987) define it as a public self-image which is possessed by everyone and is maintained in an interaction. They go ahead to classify face into two categories – positive face and negative face. A positive face is defined as fulfilling of the need to be accepted by others as a member of a group while a negative face is seen as the want of every competent adult member that his action be unimpeded by others (Brown and Levinson 1987). There are some actions (requests, warnings, orders, and suggestions) which when performed by a speaker or a hearer, fail to maintain faces. The actions have an adverse effect on maintaining the communicator's relationship. Brown and Levinson (1987) term the actions face-threatening acts which (Agbalo 2017) simplifies as acts that run contrary to the face wants of the hearers and/or the speaker. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), face-threatening acts can be verbal (connected with words), paraverbal (connected with

speech characteristics and other paralinguistic features), non-verbal (connected with facial expression and gesticulations).

To avoid face-threatening acts that dent other people's face, Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest bald on record strategy, positive and negative politeness strategy and off-record strategy as politeness strategies to employ during conversation. In bald on record, an utterance is meant to be introduced directly by the speaker to avoid ambiguity that may lead to misconstruing of information. Positive politeness strategy expresses gratitude and makes the hearer to feel a sense of belonging and this is achieved by the speaker when he shows signs of agreement and optimism during conversation. Brown and Levinson (1987) purport that negative politeness strategy is a redressive action addressed to the hearer's negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded. By implication, negative politeness strategy reduces the imposition on the hearer and grants him freedom to make his choice arbitrarily; hence, minimizes threats. Off-record strategy is an indirect strategy that depends on implications. It gives the hearer the chance to decipher an implied meaning that is imbedded in an utterance.

Brown and Levinson as quoted in Rahayu (2009) introduce fifteen off-record politeness strategies – giving hints, giving association clues, presupposing, overstating, understating, using the tautologies, using the contradiction, using ironic, using metaphors, using a rhetorical question, using ambiguity, using vague, over-generalizing, displacing the hearer, be incomplete and using ellipsis. However, Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that speakers in different societies and cultures use some strategies in similar circumstances due to the fact that such strategies would afford desired outcome. They believe that the nature of outcome of the various strategies together with the necessary social and cultural circumstances of the situational context – social distance, rank and relative power – are the most domineering factors in people's decision of which strategy to use. Therefore, politeness is culture sensitive and context dependent because what tends to be

polite in a definite culture and context tends to be impolite when juxtaposed in another culture and context.

Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness account for the cultural similarities and differences in polite linguistic usage. They base their analysis on the speeches of a 'Model Person' which Chomsky (1965) tags a native language speaker that possesses the innate ability to speak his language fluently – manipulating the language in every given situation in order to achieve effective communication with utmost competence.

Despite the strength of the theory as one of the most comprehensive cum influential theory in pragmatics, critiques abound. Theoretical critics are of the opinion that Brown and Levinson's claim of the universality of their theory is an exhibition of ambitiousness since they lack extensive work to back up the premise. Antovic (2007) submits that Brown and Levinson follow a generative linguistic approach thereby assuming that the internal linguistic and social capacities of humans from different cultures tend to behave in similar ways under the same circumstances. This assumption, according to Fraser (1990) makes us to believe that it is possible to overcome certain interactive impediments arising from conflicting linguistic backgrounds. Kasper (1990) believes that limiting the affecting variables to the contextual power, distance and rank is a bit over-simplistic. Brown and Levinson maintain that the main intention of a speaker should be to maintain a hearer's face but the general intention of a speaker is to manipulate his speech in order to achieve his key aim – effective communication – as being polite is the expected linguistic norm in every conversation.

Finally, this study adopts relevance theory and theory of politeness in carrying out lexical pragmatic analysis of patriotism and selflessness in President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches because the theories are apt pragmatic theories for the study. The theory of politeness accounts for the social aspects of the president's speeches in justifying linguistic elements as being patriotic and selfless while relevance theory accounts for the inferences in the speeches so as to highlight implied instances of

patriotism and selflessness in the speeches. Therefore, the combination of the duo leads to the actualisation of the purpose of this study.

Research Methodology

To achieve the study's purpose of study and to address the stated problems in this study, qualitative research method has been adopted. The study strictly focuses on the textual representations of President Goodluck Jonathan and Greenhalgh and Taylor (1997) believe that researchers who delve into a qualitative research are in search of an unalloyed truth, and thereby aim to "study things in their natural setting, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people attribute to them, and they use a holistic perspective which preserves the complexities of human behaviour". Therefore, this study is a subjective analysis of data in their natural state which is one of the tenets of the qualitative research progenitors. Also, the study adopts textual method of data presentation and analysis.

For the purpose of this study, three speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan have been selected – President Goodluck Jonathan Inaugural Speech, President Goodluck Jonathan Pre-Election Speech and President Goodluck Jonathan Speech on CONFAB. The three speeches are selected because they are strategic as they are delivered in critical situations – tension, unrest and agitation. The speeches are sourced from the daily papers, YouTube and journals. However, both oral and written documentations of the speeches are accessed in order to gain a full grasp of the contents of the speeches so as to achieve quality analysis.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Data 1

"I have said it before and I will continue to say and live by the fact that my ambition and indeed the ambition of anybody are not worth the blood of any Nigerian."

'Ambition' as used in the context means being the president of Nigeria.

'Blood' as used in the context means life.

'Anybody' as used in the context means co-contestant.

The three lexemes have been used out of their various literal meanings to mean something else as stated above. The president does so to maximize relevance so that the utterance will worth the listener's attention. 'Ambition' which is a very broad term in its literal use has been narrowed to mean one thing – "presidential ambition"; being the president of Nigeria. 'Blood' has been broadened to mean life. It is literally known as the reddish bodily fluid of the human system but has been used to signify life. 'Anybody', an indefinite pronoun has been narrowed to become definite. It signifies the co-contestant of the president. The three lexemes form the integral parts of the whole sentence; they harbor the implied meanings of the sentence which the president intends to convey to his listeners that his quest for to be re-elected as the president of Nigeria is not a do or die affair.

Furthermore, the utterance is a face-saving act; hence, a polite utterance. The president employs negative politeness strategy and off-record politeness strategy to save face. It is believed that he uses negative politeness strategy because he minimizes threat to its barest minimum. With the use of the three lexemes, his listener infers freedom to vote whoever he or she wishes as there will not be any use of an incumbent power from the incumbent president. Also, it is believed that the president uses off-record politeness strategy because his utterance is loaded with implied meanings; it has given the listener the room to decipher the implied meaning potential of the utterance.

The use of narrowing and broadening as lexical pragmatic processes in the above data, portrays the face-saving act by the president on the electorate which has foregrounded the patriotic and selflessness nature of the president which in turn has lessened the burden on the electorate to make their choices without any fear

of face-threat on/from the president. The implication of the utterances shows love for one's nation and the condition of putting one's own interest before the interests of others. It also shows that whoever causes violence during the election will definitely face the wrath of the law. The president shows that he has the interest of the country and her citizens at heart; hence, the violence-free election.

The exhibition of patriotism and selflessness addresses insecurity as part of the challenges of the citizens. Overtime, electoral violence – thuggery, hijacking of ballot boxes – has been a challenge in virtually all the elections but the exhibition of patriotism and selfless by the president through his utterance has reassured the listeners that their security is of paramount importance to the government. It has also addressed apathy due to insecurity because people will be motivated to turn out en mass to exercise their franchise bearing in mind that security of lives and properties is guaranteed.

Data 2

"I will not dictate to you. I will listen to you. It will not be a monologue. I will dialogue with you."

'Dictate' as used in the context means not to order.

'Listen' as used in the context means to consider one's opinion.

'Monologue' as used in the context means not being a military government.

'Dialogue' as used in the context means democracy.

The four lexemes have been used by President Goodluck Jonathan to mean different things outside their literal meanings. He uses the words ostensively to maximize relevance. 'Dictate' which is a polysemous word that means to speak in order for someone to write down and which also means to order, command, or control has been used in the context to mean not to order; hence, it has

been narrowed down by the president to attract the listener's attention in decoding his utterance. 'Listen' literally means to pay attention. In the context that has been situated by the president, 'listen' is used metaphorically to mean to consider one's opinion. 'Monologue' literally means a long speech of an individual but it has been used metaphorically to mean not being a military government. 'Dialogue' literally means a conversation between two persons but has been broadened to mean democracy in the context of use. The four lexemes contain the implied meaning which the president intends to communicate to his listeners. He intends to communicate that his regime will not be an autocratic regime rather it will be a regime that will carry every citizen along.

Furthermore, the utterance is a face-saving act; hence, a polite utterance. The president employs bald on record strategy to avoid any form of ambiguity that may lead to misconstruing of his utterance by his listener. The president also makes use of negative politeness strategy to address his hearer's negative face. By saying 'I will not dictate to you, I will listen to you', he has granted the hearer the freedom of choice, even though he is aware that his action and intention will not be hindered by anyone. The president makes use of off-record strategy to achieve implicature in his utterance. The strategy gives the hearer the hint and an association clue to decipher the implied meaning that is imbedded in the utterance.

The use of narrowing, metaphorical extension, and face-saving act has foregrounded the patriotic and selflessness nature of the president. The implication of the utterance shows love for one's nation and the condition of putting one's own interest before the interests of others. The utterance portrays the president as one who will not use power to suppress the voices of his followers; rather, as one that will ensure that every opinion of the citizen of the country counts at every given time. Therefore, whoever that exhibits such attributes exhibits patriotism and selflessness.

The patriotism and selflessness address the challenges of the citizens. Overtime, the citizens suffer intimidation, extrajudicial killing, and imposition of laws, excessive taxation and other

hardships in the hands of their leaders but the president has assured them that he will always listen and dialogue with them in order to ensure that no one's right is impeded. It has also addressed apathy amongst the citizens of the country. People have lost interest in voting because they believe that leaders are egocentric and not patriotic. The president's utterance has shown that patriotic and selfless leaders, leaders that mean well for their country and put the good interest of others before their own interest still exist.

Data 3

"Follow compatriots, lift your gaze beyond the horizon and you will see a great future we can secure with unity, hard work and collective sacrifice."

'Gaze' as used the expression means anticipation.

'Horizon' as used in the expression means present situation.

'See' as used in the expression means imagine, having a mental picture of something or someone.

'Secure' as used in the expression means achieve.

The four lexemes as have been explained above have been put in use to mean concepts outside the literal meanings. President Goodluck Jonathan employs such a rhetoric use of the lexemes in his utterance to maximize relevance so that his utterance will worth the attention of his listener. 'Gaze' which literally means a steady look at something or someone has been broadened to mean anticipation. 'Horizon' which means a visible line where the sky appears to meet the earth has been put in use metaphorically to mean present situation. 'See' which means to detect someone or something with the eyes has been used approximately in the situated context to mean imagine, having a mental picture of something or someone. 'Secure' which means to safeguard from attack has been used narrowly to mean achieve. The implied

meaning of the utterance in Data 3 can be deciphered from the implied meanings of the four lexemes; hence, the four lexemes are the integral components of the sentence. By implication, the president urges the citizen to see beyond the present hardship to the hope for solace in the bright future of the country.

The president considers the face of his audience in the speech. He does so to save face in order to achieve effective communication and to exhibit his patriotic and selfless nature to the citizens. Therefore, the president's speech is a face-saving act. He uses bald on record strategy to directly introduce his speech in order to avoid ambiguity which will impede effective communication. This is seen in the introduction of the sentence with 'Follow compatriots' which shows directness. The president uses positive politeness Strategy to make the listener to have a sense of belonging. He achieves this by being in agreement with the listener that both of them are from the same country that is momentarily facing certain challenges. Also, the president uses off-record strategy in his utterance because the understanding of the utterance is dependent on implications. He gives the listener the liberty to imply meaning from the utterance. All of these strategies are used by the president to avoid a face-threatening act, he intends to achieve face-saving act.

The use of narrowing, approximation and metaphorical extension to imply meanings in order to maximize relevance, and the use of bald on record strategy, positive politeness strategy, and off-record strategy to save face to achieve effective communication in the utterances of the president all point to the fact that Nigeria's present situation is not conducive but there is great hope in what the future holds for the country. However, the president, through his utterance, has shown attributes of patriotism and selflessness. He urges the citizens not to give up on the country as there is a great chance that everything will fall into place in a no distant time. It is only a patriotic and a selfless leader that will encourage his followers in such a manner and President Goodluck Jonathan has shown to be one.

The act of patriotism and selflessness addresses the challenge faced by the people. The people are bedeviled with terrorism, insurgency, economic strangulation, bribery and corruption. The president's attributes have shown the people that he is working assiduously towards checkmating the unfavorable circumstances in the country towards achieving a more habitable nation that everyone will be proud of.

Conclusion

The paper has undertaken the lexical pragmatic analysis of patriotism and selflessness in President Goodluck Jonathan's speeches. It observes that the president makes good use of the lexical pragmatic processes – narrowing, approximation, category and metaphorical extensions in encoding his speeches. He does so to imply meanings, maximize relevance, and attract the listener's attention. The president also deploys face-saving strategies – bald on record strategy, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy and off-record strategy to save face in order to showcase his patriotic and selfless attributes. Therefore, suffice it to say that President Goodluck Jonathan is a patriotic and selfless leader that leaves no stone unturned in trying to address the numerous challenges of his followers.

References

Abuya, E. J. (2012). A Pragma-stylistic Analysis of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan Inaugural Speech. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), Canadian Centre of Science & Education

Adegbnero, E. J. (2022). A Lexico-Thematic Analysis of Selected Speeches of Former Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan. *Journal of Humanties*, 7(4):119-125, Kampala International University

Adegbenro, E. J. (2022). A Stylo-pragmatic Examination of Deixis in the Acceptance Speech of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan

Agbalo, E. (2017). The Use of Politeness Strategies in the Analysis and Discussion Sections of English Research Articles. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(9):30-42

Agbogun, A. A. (2011). A Linguistic-Stylistic Analysis of Post-Appeal Court Victory Speeches of Selected State Governors in Nigeria. *An Unpublished MA Thesis of department of English,* Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile Ife

Anurudu, S. M. & Odula, T. A. (2017). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Concession Speeches of Goodluck Jonathan, Kayode Fayemi and Mitty Romney. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science,* 22(3):15-26

Ashipu, K.B.C. & Odey, V. C. (2016). A Critical Discourse Analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's CONFAB Speech. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 2(6)

Antoric, M. (2007). Half a Century of Generative Linguistics – What has the Paradigm given to Social Sciences? *Linguistics and Literature,* 5(1):31-46

Beard, A. (2000). Of Style and Stylistics. In A.O. Babajide (Ed). *Studies in English Language*, 123-136, Inc Publisher

Bolarinwa, O.R. (2016). A Stylistic Analysis of Language Politics in the Acceptance Speech of President Goodluck Jonathan. *International Journal for Research in Educational Studies*, 2(12)

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*: New York, Cambridge

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, MIT Press

Ezeifeka, C.R (2012). Critical Discourse Analysis of Interpersonal Meaning and Power Relations in Selected Inaugural Political Speeches in Nigeria. *UNIZIK Journal of Arts and Humanities*

Ezeifeka, C.R. (2016). Critical Discourse Analysis of Self-glorification and Derogation of Others in Selected Inaugural Political Speeches in Nigeria. *International*

Journal of Research in Arts and Social Sciences. 4, 121-149

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on Politness. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 14, 219-236

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Rituals: Essays on Face-to-face Behaviour. (1st Edition),* Garden City

Greenhalgh, T., & Rod, T. (1997). How to Read a Paper: Papers that Go beyond Numbers. *Journal in Qualitative Research*¸3(1), 541-556

Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Grice, P. (1991). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Gunn, M. & Ishaya, T.T. (2020). Speech Acts Analysis of Selected Speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan. *Journal of Language and Literary Studies,* 2(1)

Kasper. G. (1990). Linguistic Politeness: Current Research Issues. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 14(2), 193-218

Kuntsi, P. (2012). Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies Used by Lawyers in the 'Dover Trial': A Case Study. MA Thesis, English Department, University of Eastern Finland, 3(9), 1-69

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place.* New York: Harper & Row

Levinson, S. (1989). A Review of Relevance. *Journal of Linguistics.* 25(2), 455-472

Maruenda Bataller, S. (2004). Lexical pragmatics: Relevance theories and generalized conversational implicatures. *Anglogermanica Online* 47-68

Opeibi, B.O. (2009). *Discourse, Politics and the 1993 Presidential Election Campaigns in Nigeria*, Lagos: Nouvele Communications

Rahayu, I. R.(2009). Politeness Strategies in Giving and Responding to Compliments: A Sociopragmatics Study of Compliments in "the Devil Wears Prada" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Sebalas Maret University

Rebollar, B, E. (Dec. 2013). He has wifi: Lexical pragmatics and the nature of word meaning. (n.p.)

Schaffner, C. (2004). Political Discourse Analysis from the Points of View of Translation Realms. *Journal of Language & Politics,* 3(1), 117-150

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1996). Fodor's Frame Problem and Relevance Theory: A Reply to Chiappe & Kukla. *Behavioural & Brain Sciences,* 19, 530-532

Sperber, D, & Wilson, D. (1995). *Postface to the Second Edition of Relevance: Communication and Cognition.* Oxford: Blackwel

Sperber, D, & Wilson, D. (2002). Pragmatics, Modality and Mind-reading. *Mind & Language,* 17, 3-23

Taiwo, R.(2009). Legitimization and Coercion in Political discourse: A case Study of Olusegun Obasanjo Address to the PDP Elders and Stakeholders Forum. *Journal of Political Discourse Analysis,* 2(2), 192-199

Uduma, E. O. (2012. African Political Speeches and Pragmatic Meanings: A Study of President Goodluck Jonathan's 50th Independence Speech. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 3(33), 65-79

Wilson, D. (2003). Relevance and lexical pragmatics. *Italian Jornal of Linguistics 15(2).* 273-291