

A Pragma-Rhetoric Analysis of Persuasion

JINAN AHMED KHALEEL
Assistant Professor
NAWAL MAHMOOD ABED
M.A. Candidate
College of Education for Women
Baghdad University, Iraq

Abstract:

This research is a pragma-rhetorical analysis of persuasion in one interview with Nelson Mandela in 1991. It aims at identifying instances of persuasion used by Mandela in his interview before the presidential era of his life. Also it is meant to clarify Mandela's persuasive strategies used to affect and persuade his audience. To achieve these aims, Mandela's persuasive language is analyzed by the researchers to examine the extent to which figures of speech are utilized by him. Then, an analysis is performed to investigate the way that Grice's maxims (of quantity, quality, relation, and manner) are flouted by Mandela in using these rhetorical figures to achieve his persuasive goal. The analysis carried out in this paper includes identifying specific tropes: metaphor, pun, overstatement, understatement, and rhetorical question as persuasive devices. This paper is expected to be of benefit to show how persuasion can be created by using different figures of speech. Besides, it will bridge a gap in this field of knowledge by applying a Pragma-Rhetorical analysis through which Mandela's chosen interview will be examined thoroughly.

Key words: Pragmatics, persuasion, rhetoric, pragma-rhetoric, figures of speech.

1. INTRODUCTION

Persuasion is one of the most powerful and most effective human tools within the community. The primary objective of

persuasion is to show how this strategy enables one to change one's thoughts and feelings towards a particular subject. Halmari & Virtanen (2005:3-4) define persuasion as "all linguistic behavior that attempts to either *change* the thinking or behavior of an audience, or to *strengthen* its beliefs, should the audience already agree". Furthermore, understanding more about a persuasion process, they believe, requires learning more about human nature. The process of persuasion includes the contribution of the audiences, interlocutors, and onlookers. The present paper includes a prama-rhetorical analysis of persuasive strategies used in Nelson Mandela's interview (1990) after his release from jail after 27 years of imprisonment.

The reason behind selecting this interview as data to be analyzed can be attributed to two main reasons: first, Nelson Mandela is widely considered one of the most inspiring and iconic figures and leaders of our age. Fletcher (2012:56) affirms that Nelson Mandela actually has an extremely motivation to lead; he would constantly be "the first to volunteer in any difficult situation". As a good leader, Mandela has thoroughly known and understood his people and how to motivate them. Second, According to Kanu (2009: 70) "all interviews contain elements of both information and persuasion". This indicates that the interviewee is trying to persuade his audiences by affecting their attitudes, or behaviors whenever the "information is communicated". The main focus of the present paper is to clarify how persuading and convincing others are the pragmatic goals that a speaker wishes to attain by using different rhetorical strategies.

The researchers intend to investigate how persuasion can be achieved by using certain figures of speech, more specifically, 'Tropes' of metaphor, pun, overstatement, understatement, and rhetorical question. Furthermore, it highlights the fact that persuasion can also be created by flouting Grice's maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner as a consequence of

using these figures of speech. By using different approach, this paper as a pragma-rhetorical research of persuasion is different from other studies such as: *A Rhetorical Analysis of the English Speeches of Queen Rania of Jordan* a thesis written by Ali Amaireh (2013), a discourse analysis study. *A Politeness View of Persuasion in ESL/EFL* (2005) by Dolores and Pastor is an attempt to clarify persuasion from a pragmatic view.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF PRAGMATICS

Levinson (1983:1) points out that the term *Pragmatics* dated back to Carles Moris (1938), who defined pragmatics as "the study of the relation of signs to interpreters". Pragmatics, as Mey (2009:744) states, "is concerned with meaning in the context of language use". Essentially, our communication via language often includes other meanings beyond what we said, i.e. " there is often a gap between speaker meaning and sentence meaning". Pragmatics includes several theories that have a great contribution to the study of language use in communication such as speech act theory, presupposition, politeness, and turn-taking, etc. The term '*implicature*' as indicated by Mey (ibid: 365) is firstly used by the philosopher Paul Grice in his influential article "logic and conversation". According to Grice's approach, "what is implicated" and "what is said" are involved in the speaker's intended meaning. Grice (1975:44-45) distinguishes two types of implicature: 'conventional implicature' and 'conversational implicature'. He states that a 'conventional implicature' is detected by the traditional meaning of the word uttered. In some situations, the conventional meanings of the words uttered will specify the implicated meaning as well as helping to identify what is literally said. He represents a conversational implicature as a particular category which, as he asserts, is mainly associated with specific general properties of conversation such as the cooperative principles (CP) and the conversational maxims. It

gives a candid significance for the possibility to convey another meaning more than what the speaker indeed said i.e. "More than what is literally expressed by the conventional sense of the linguistic expressions uttered". Grice distinguishes four maxims that have to be 'obeyed' by each participant:

1. Maxim of Quantity: make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange). Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
2. Maxim of Quality: do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
3. Maxim of Relation: be relevant.
4. Maxim of Manner: avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly (Grice 1975: 45- 46).

Thomas (1995:64) sheds light on Grice's awareness of many occasions on which people experience a failure to observe and follow the maxims. He also indicates five ways of non-observing these maxims as:

- Flouting a maxim
- Violating a maxim
- Infringing a maxim
- Opting out of a maxim
- Suspending a maxim

There are many reasons for failing to follow the maxims such as people who are unable to speak clearly, or maybe intentionally want to deceive others. He asserts that flouting a maxim is regarded as the most significant type for generating a conversational implicature (an additional meaning). Grice (1975:49:58) and Thomas (1995: 65) indicate that a flouting happens in situations within which a speaker " blatantly fails to observe a maxim"; basically, the speaker's intention is not to

deceive or mislead others, but to stimulate the hearer or hearers to seek for the additional meaning, i.e. generating a conversational implicature that includes a different meaning from the apparent meaning.

3. RHETORIC

Rhetoric original status was in the works of Aristotle, Isocrates, and Plato. Roberts (2004:3-7) shows that Aristotle prefaced his Book 1 by indicating that rhetoric is "the counterpart of dialectic"; he defines rhetoric as "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion". The art of rhetoric deals with the power of recognizing the modes of persuasion on different subjects produced to us. Bivins (2008:131) confirms that a great deal of Aristotle's work was passed to us from one generation to the next. His work on rhetoric which takes into consideration the subject of persuasion is regarded as one of his most significant works. Rhetoric, as referred to by McQuarrie and Phillip (2008:3), is an "ancient discipline that was fundamental to Western thought for over 2,000 years". Presently, rhetoric is thriving once again in accordance to the development of the media which concentrates on the analyses and broad variations of "consumer research" that are involved within different "humanities and social sciences disciplines".

4. PRAGMA-RHETORIC

The relationship between pragmatics and rhetoric is referred to by Archer et al (2012:148-149) as the way language is used to affect others and to change their act towards a certain way. This is implied into a pragmatic view on language.

Persson and Ylikoski (2007:55) mention that according to Bitzer "a work of rhetoric is pragmatic; it comes into existence for the sake of something beyond itself". Rhetoric plays an

important role in producing an action or changing the world. Besides, rhetoric is a means of changing reality by producing a discourse in which the audience is so involved, in this meaning, rhetoric is forever persuasive. Capone et al (2013:537-538) mention that a paper entitled "The marriage of Pragmatics and Rhetoric" was published by M. Dascal and A. Gross in 1999. They refer to "the marriage between Aristotelian rhetoric and Gricean pragmatics". They also consider their reconstruction endeavors to integrate the solidity of "Gricean pragmatics and Aristotelian rhetoric" possible and productive. Following Dascal and Gross after few years, Larrazabal and Korta (2002:1), suggest *Pragma – Rhetoric* as a new perspective, which is: "A pragmatic and rhetorical view in discourse analysis, combining both disciplines in order to explain the intentional phenomena that occur in most communicative uses of language, namely the communicative intention and the intention of persuading".

5. WHAT IS PERSUASION?

Schmidt and Kess (1986: 15) consider persuasion as one kind of perlocutionary act, where perlocutionary speech acts can be defined as those acts which essentially include a specific response on the part of the hearer.

Persuasion is defined by O'Keefe (2002:3-6) as "a successful intentional effort at influencing another's mental state through communication in a circumstance in which the persuadee has some measure of freedom". He adds that an attitude is the central concept to be involved in the definition of a persuasion as mental state that can be seen as "orientations of mind" rather than of body. Walton (2005:160-61) asserts that Stevenson (1944) puts his theory of persuasion which was an attractive development in the intellectual view on the twentieth-century. His work shows the importance of persuasion in disagreements about values; what should be

noted is that, in all argumentation, the concept of persuasion plays an important role. Steinberg (2006:237) describes persuasion as the communication process by which the communicator "succeeds in voluntarily forming, sustaining or changing the attitudes or behavior" of one or a group of listeners, according to the message that the communicator intends to convey. According to Steinberg and other writers, the main goal of a persuasive speaker is to change or influence the listeners' "attitudes, beliefs, values and behavior".

6. FIGURES OF SPEECH

McQuarrie and Mick (1996:424-425) agrees with many rhetoricians who assert that any issue can be stated in different ways according to any specific situation; using rhetorical figures of speech is considered one of these ways. They mention the definition of a rhetorical figure according to (Corbett 1990) as "an artful deviation" from the general arrangement of an expression, i.e. a rhetorical figure is generated when a term deviates from what is expected. They classify figures of speech into two types: Schemes and Tropes. Figures of speech in the schemes category include a deviation from the usual word arrangement, i.e. it involves a change in the typical word order. For example, ellipses, repetition, etc. On the other hand, a figure of speech involved in the Tropes category contains a deviation in the word's or phrase's significance or content, for example, hyperbole, metaphor, etc. For the purpose of the present paper, only tropes will be included in the analysis.

7. TROPES

Tropes are figures of speech which involve messages in order to convey additional meaning which differs from the exact meaning of the literal words. The implied meaning, besides the

literal one, is the perspective of pragmatics which makes certain rhetorical figures of speech credible strategies of rhetorical pragmatics. Tropes are classified into two types: Destabilization tropes and Substitution tropes (McQuarrie and Mick 1996:429).

1- Destabilization Tropes

McQuarrie and Mick (1996:433) state that in these tropes "one means more than is said and relies on the recipient to develop the implications". Two destabilization tropes are included in the current paper: Metaphor and Pun.

- Metaphor

Metaphor, as Arends and Kilcher (2010:176) emphasize, is a rhetorical figure that refers to a term or an expression which can be applied to a subject or notion that it does not exactly indicate, so as to propose a sort of comparison to another subject or notion. It makes the abstract ideas easier to be understood.

- Pun

This figure of speech is considered by Bussmann (1996:968) as a rhetorical strategy of "words play" via the combination of two words which have similar sounds, but their meaning and etymological form are extremely contrastive. The pragmatic view of pun is the ambiguous meaning that results from flouting the maxim of manner (avoid ambiguity), and this activates the involved meanings at the same time.

2- Substitution Tropes

McQuarrie and Mick (1996:433) assert that in the substitution tropes "one says something other than what is meant, and relies on the recipient to make the necessary correction". Three types of substitution tropes are included in the present paper:

- **Overstatement**

Overstatement (also known as Hyperbole) is one of the rhetorical pragmatic strategies that referred to by Leech (1983:145) as "a case where the speaker's description is stronger than is warranted by the state of affairs described".

- **Understatement**

Cruse (2006:186) defines understatement (also called litotes) as a figure of speech that includes utterance of "quantity, intensity, or seriousness of something that is less than what is objectively the case" in order to achieve the rhetorical impression.

- **Rhetorical Question**

Rhetorical questions as defined by Shaffer (2009:167) are those questions which are asked "not for the purpose of eliciting an expressed answer, but rather for their rhetorical effect: an emphasis of the speaker's point". It is used intentionally by the speakers to arouse the hearers' attention towards the message conveyed.

8. DATA ANALYSIS

Wilson and Sperber (2012:17) assert the relationship between using a figure of speech and flouting Grice's maxims. This relationship is essentially very important; since analyzing the data will help in achieving the aims of the present paper. They argue that, in accordance with Grice's view, such explicit flouting of the maxims denotes the intention of the speaker: "the speaker intends the hearer to retrieve an implicature that brings the full interpretation of the utterance", (including the literal meaning in addition to the implied meaning) and relates them as possible to be satisfied with cooperative principles and Grice's maxims. The researchers have followed a specific procedure for the sake of building an organized linguistic

analysis. This procedure encompasses a range of sequential steps namely: selecting one interview that is related to Mandela's pre-presidential era dated to 1990 after his release from jail after 27 years of imprisonment; identifying the turns of both participants. The interviewer will be marked as [1.A], [2.A], [3.A]...etc. and the interviewee Nelson Mandela will be marked as [1. B], [2.B], [3.B]....etc. scanning the instances of figures of speech; extracting the type of figures of speech; finding out which type of Grice's maxims (quality, quantity, relation, and manner) is flouted; itemizing the most frequent figures of speech; and eventually, examining which maxim is most recurrently flouted.

- **The Analysis of Interview**

[4-A] **Koos van der Merwe:** Nelson, you're not going to nationalize the assets of the white people. I have worked for my banks, my mines, my businesses and my farms. You are not going to take it. Stop your violence, stop your nonsense.

[4-B] **NM:** *All I have said to Koos van der Merwe is to say I am happy to know you. I hope that one day we shall have the opportunity to discuss the affairs of our country.*

1- According to our pragma-rhetorical analysis:

A- The figure of speech that Mandela uses in [4-B] is a **substitution trope of understatement**. He intends to lessen the importance of what is said; this strategy is adopted by him as a way of giving a clear picture of his thought and attitude. It is a way of persuading his audience of the importance of being partners in facing all the country's difficulties rather than engaging in a personal dispute. He tries to direct his audience's attention towards

the most important aspect that includes his country's struggle.

- B-** In accordance with Grice's maxims, the maxim of **quantity** is flouted in **[4-B]** by Mandela. This answer was intended by Mandela as a way by which help the audience to retrieve the implied meaning plus the literal one. Mandela gives insufficient information about Koos's accusations about his violence and nonsense and changes the whole subject towards what he believes to be more important (their country's affairs). He flouts the quantity maxim, i.e. he says something "less than what is meant".
- C-** By using a figure of speech of understatement, Mandela in **[4-B]** **flouts the maxim of quality** since he intends to lessen the importance of what Koos van der Merwe had said about the accusations of his violence and nonsense. It is a way of attracting his audiences' attention towards his belief and point of view which emphasizes the importance of his country's affairs and struggle more than defend himself.
- D-** Mandela flouts the **relation maxim**; what he says is irrelevant. He intends not to discuss whatever is said as a way of directing and persuading his audiences towards his attitude which makes him think firstly of his country away from Koos's accusations.
- E-** The **maxim of manner** is also flouted. Mandela comments on Koos van der Merwe's statement, and mentions his pleasure to know Koos by saying *I am happy to know you*, since the latter asked Mandela to stop his *violence* and *nonsense*. The sense of ambiguity is activated as a result of the contradictory statements by both. Mandela's

ability to change the subject matter positively makes him a more confident and convinced character.

[5-A] Gatsha Buthelezi: There's nothing that prevents you even in the United States from picking up the telephone and say hello and talk to me as we were doing ever since you left jail.

[5-B] NM: *For me, to wash our dirty linen in a foreign country ... I am hesitant to do that even though here I have the feeling that I am among comrades in arms.*

2- The pragma-rhetorical analysis of **[5-B]** includes the following:

A- In **[5-B]** the figure of speech that Mandela used is a **destabilization trope of metaphor** when he said '*For me, to wash our dirty linen in a foreign country*'. Mandela, by using this comparison between two different things, intends to stimulate the audience's attention towards understating the idea of talking about a private issue concerning the political affairs of his country in public, namely in a foreign country though he is capable of doing that. The expression '*Washing our dirty linen in a foreign country*' is used metaphorically by Mandela as a way of explaining one idea in the light of the other. The literal meaning refers generally to the process of washing the dirty linen, whereas the implied meaning indicates the way of discussing his country's affairs publically that seems to be untrue. This makes Mandela adheres to his attitude towards the independency of his country in dealing with its affairs.

B- As for Grice's maxims, Mandela flouts the maxim of quantity.

In his answer, Mandela gives insufficient information about what he wants to say. Instead of talking about his country's affairs directly, he intends to make his audiences conclude his attitude as a means of affecting them and achieving his persuasive goal. He uses this image to give a vivid illustration and to emphasize a specific issue.

C- In turn [5-B] Mandela flouts the maxim of quality. What he says is untrue. He intends to make use of metaphor as a persuasive device that attracts his audience's attention and confirms the way he uses to express his point of view. He says something untrue '*Washing our dirty linen in a foreign country*', but it is an appropriate way to generate an implicature which includes the implied meaning of what he says. The implied meaning is shown by explaining one meaning in the light of the other, i.e. discussing his country's private issue in a foreign country by using the image of 'washing dirty linen in a foreign country'.

D- Mandela flouts the maxim of relation.

This sentence is irrelevant, but Mandela tries to make his audience grasp his intended meaning in the light of the other one. Though he says something which does not answer the question directly, he could accomplish his main purpose of persuading his audiences by his attitude. His main purpose of his struggle is his country's freedom rather than this personal accusation.

E- The maxim of manner is flouted by Mandela.

His answer arouses a sense of ambiguity; the maxim of manner is flouted by Mandela as a way of attracting attention and convincing others towards his intended meaning. What he means by giving the image of '**washing**

a dirty linen in a foreign country' is to indicate his unwillingness to discuss his country's private issues publically.

[7. A] Ken Adelman: Those of us who share your struggle for human rights and against apartheid have been somewhat disappointed by the models of human rights that you have held up since being released from jail. You've met over the last six months three times with Yasser Arafat.

[7-B] NM: Yasser Arafat, Colonel Gaddafi, Fidel Castro support our struggle to the hilt.

3- The pragma-rhetorical analysis of **[7-B]** includes:

A- A rhetorical strategy used by Mandela is a destabilization trope of metaphor. He uses the word ***hilt*** as a means of comparing to which extent those leaders are exceedingly supporting the struggle of his country. He uses the word ***hilt*** (which refers to the handle of a sword, dagger, or knife) to show his extraordinary gratitude for those leaders and persuade his audience about the important role those leaders play in his country's struggle. He aims to persuade his audience to respect his attitude instead of talking about the disappointment of his meeting with Yasser Arafat.

B- According to Grice's maxims, Mandela flouts the maxim of quantity. By using metaphor, Mandela attempts to exaggerate his intended meaning to persuade his audiences. He intends to refer to which extent those leaders, including Yasser Arafat, support his country's struggle. Mandela's intention of using metaphor is a way of persuading his audiences of his point of view about clarifying his attitude towards them.

- C- Mandela flouts the maxim of quality** as he conducts a comparison between those leaders' support to the hilt. He gives an interpretation of one thing in the light of the other. What he says about their support to the hilt is literally untrue, since a struggle does not have the hilt. He speaks metaphorically and intends to generate a conversational implicature that includes another meaning beyond the literal one, using this image as a way of convincing others of his attitude.
- D- Mandela flouts the maxim of relation** by using a rhetorical figure of metaphor. Mandela intends to clarify his view by using the image of *hilt* as a means of explaining one thing in the light of another. The literal meaning of this metaphor is irrelevant. Instead of speaking directly, Mandela attempts to persuade his audience by using this image.
- E- Mandela, in using this figure of speech, flouts the maxim of manner.** He does not avoid obscurity and gives a sense of ambiguity with the purpose of creating an additional meaning. It makes his audience think, compare, and conclude his implied meaning of their country's support.

[11-A] **TK:** What I'm saying is that in this country, for example, there has been for many years a close alliance between the Jewish population and the Black population, in the civil rights struggle.... Only today, in fact, his number two man said that the government perceives itself in South Africa as being part of the anti-apartheid struggle.

[11-B] **NM:** *Hah! [Audience laughs]*

One of the problems we are facing in the world today are people who do not look at problems objectively but from

the point of view of their own interests. That makes things difficult, because once a person is not objective; it is extremely difficult to reach an agreement. One of the best examples of this is to think that because Arafat is conducting a struggle against the state of Israel, that we must therefore condemn him. We can't do that. It is just not possible for any organization or individual of integrity to do anything of the sort.

4- The pragma-rhetorical analysis of [11-B] involves:

A- Mandela uses the rhetorical figure of speech of substitution tropes of overstatement. He attempts to concentrate on the role of his objectivity in dealing with his affairs. Additionally, he intends to exaggerate the idea of the difficulties that one faces to achieve his goal. He uses this device as a way of persuading his audience by his view that one of the problems which people face is how they deal with these problems depending on their own interest rather than on thinking objectively to reach an agreement. Accordingly, Mandela exemplifies his point of view by mentioning the impossibility to condemn Yasser Arafat only because he is conducting a struggle against "the state of Israel".

B- As for Grice's maxims, **Mandela flouts the maxim of quantity** since he intends to persuade his audience and generates a conversational implicature by giving more information and details to achieve his persuasive goal. Generally speaking, the way of achieving any goals should be based on objective reason rather than on our own interest, simply because we have certain ideas in our mind. His purpose is to exaggerate and concentrate attention on certain characteristics of reality.

[9. A] TK: Above all, Nelson Mandela stated his positions forcefully. Why are you so insistent upon maintaining sanctions, at a time when it can be argued that the South African government has made more concessions, your release being only one of them, than it has ever made in the past forty years?

[9-B] NM: *I should know better about this matter, Mr. Koppel, than you.*

5- Our pragma-rhetorical analysis of **[9-B]** includes:

A- Mandela uses the rhetorical strategy of substitution tropes of understatement.

Mandela tries to prove that he is conversant with, informed, and knowing more than what is said. He intends to lessen the effect of the situation by using this strategy as a way of affecting and persuading his audience. By this way, Mandela creates a conversational implicature by conveying an additional message beyond what is literally said. It is a way of minifying the effect of the situation.

B- In accordance to Grice's maxims Mandela flouts the maxim of quantity by using this figure of understatement. His statement summarizes his attitude that can be concluded by his audiences. He intends to lessen the importance of what is said by using this figure of speech, i.e. his statement lessens the importance of what is said.

C- Mandela flouts the maxim of quality when he uses this type of figure of speech. What he says is uninformative statement. Mandela in his answer creates a conversational implicature and attempts to attract his audiences' attention to the implied meaning. What he says gives the audience

an impression that he knows more than what the other one knows.

D- Mandela flouts the maxim of relation by using the rhetorical figure of understatement. What he says is irrelevant, he does not give a clear information about what is said. His answer generates a conversational implicature and directs his audience's attention to the implied meaning which include his intention to avoid discussing the interviewer's question.

E- It is noticed that he flouts the maxim of manner. What he says does not avoid obscurity. He answers this question with the intention of arousing his audiences' attention about his point of view that he has a clear picture of whatever happens in his country . Furthermore, he can answer this question directly as a leader who has a deep insight of his country affairs, instead, he gives the indication that he knows more than Mr. Koppel about this matter without giving a details of what he knows. This intention arouses a sense of ambiguity among the audience who concludes this implied meaning of his being unwilling to discuss this matter.

[12-A] TK: If I could intervene with one point. I don't want to leave the impression that this is only going to be a Jewish-Black issue. There are a great many Cuban Americans in this country who will be just as offended by some of the comments you've made about Fidel Castro and Cuba.

[12-B] NM: *No. Mr. Koppel, I don't agree with you. I am saying that it would be a **grave mistake** for us to consider our attitude toward Yasser Arafat on the basis of the interests of the Jewish community. We sympathize with the struggles of the Jewish people and their*

persecution, right down the years. In fact, we have been very much influenced by the lack of racialism amongst the Jewish communities.

Why are you so keen that I should involve myself in the internal affairs of Cuba and Libya?

- 6- A pragma-rhetorical analysis of [12-B] includes:
- A- In [12-B] Mandela uses two kinds of rhetorical figure of speech: Firstly, he used a figure of speech of destabilization tropes of *pun* as he says *I am saying it would be a grave mistake....*here the word *grave* is used by Mandela as a way of persuading his audience to his view . He states that it will be a serious and dangerous mistake to adopt any viewpoint against Yasser Arafat depending on the interests of Jewish community. He intends to clarify his opinion on the Israeli-Palestinian issue as a way to enlighten his refusal of considering any attitude towards Yasser Arafat according to the interest of the Jewish community.
- B- As for Grice's maxims, Mandela flouts the maxim of quantity. By using this figure of speech, he intends to exaggerate the seriousness of considering their attitude toward Yasser Arafat on the basis of the Jewish community interests. It is a way of affecting and persuading his audience of the importance of the objectivity in dealing with a specific issue. The implied meaning that this exaggeration creates includes giving more information than the literal meaning does.
- C- Mandela flouts the maxim of *manner* when he intends to use the figure of speech of *pun* that includes using the same word which have different meanings. Using such figure of speech will arouse a sense of ambiguity, since the

word *grave* has two different and unrelated meanings. It may be mean a serious or important thing, and it may be used to indicate a place of burial for a dead body. Additionally, using **pun** in his speech, Mandela states that despite of his sympathy with the Jewish community, it will be a dangerous mistake to consider his attitude towards Yasser Arafat depending on it. He attempts to make his audiences retrieve the intended meaning behind this expression to achieve his persuasive goal.

- D- Secondly**, saying: *why are you so keen that I should involve myself in the internal affairs of Cuba and Libya?* Here, we notice that Mandela is employing **substitution tropes of the Rhetorical question device**. He just raised this question to prove his point of not interfering himself into the affairs of others although the issue is found worldwide. He means that TK shouldn't be keen on assuming that Mandela may involve himself in the internal affairs of Cuba and Libya.
- E- Regarding to Grice's maxims, Mandela flouts the maxim of quantity**, since using a rhetorical question provides inadequate information. It is less informative than the situation is required. This device is used by Mandela as a means of persuading his audience that he is not going to get himself involved in the affairs of other countries such as Cuba and Libya.
- F- Mandela flouts the maxim of quality**, using this question which is not need to be answered by the hearer gives the indication that what is said is untrue. The intended and the implied meaning of this question indicates that the speaker does not sure of the hearer's attitude. It includes insufficient evidence, but it is intended to persuade the hearers to a specific point of view.

G- The maxim of relation is flouted by Mandela. His intention of using this figure of speech gives his audience the impression that he will never involve himself in other country affairs. He flouts this maxim since he mentions Libya in addition to Cuba in his answer whereas the question is about Cuba only. He tries to clarify his attitude concerning his objectivity in dealing with these countries.

H- Mandela flouts the maxim of manner when he used this figure of speech. This question does not avoid ambiguity and obscurity because what is said makes the audience retrieve the implied meaning intended by Mandela, i.e. That he will never interfere in their internal affairs. He intends not to show his attitude directly; instead he uses this rhetorical question as a device of persuading his audience.

Table (1) Figures of speech and flouting Grice's maxims

No	Turns No	Instances of persuasion	Figures of speech	Flouting Grice's maxims
1-	[4-B]	<i>NM: All I have said to Koos van der Merwe is to say I am happy to know you. I hope that one day we shall have the opportunity to discuss the affairs of our country.</i>	Understatement	Quantity Quality Relation Manner
2-	[5-B]	<i>NM: For me, to wash our dirty linen in a foreign country ...</i>	Metaphor	Quantity Quality Relation Manner
3-	[7-B]	<i>NM: Yasser Arafat, Colonel Gaddafi, Fidel Castro support our struggle to the hilt.</i>	Metaphor	Quantity Quality Relation Manner
4-	[9-B]	<i>NM: I should know better about this matter, Mr. Koppel, than you.</i>	Understatement	Quantity Quality Relation Manner
5-	[11-B]	<i>NM: That makes things difficult, because once a person is not objective, it is extremely difficult to reach an agreement. One of the best examples of this is to think that because Arafat is conducting a struggle against the state of Israel, that we must</i>	Overstatement	Quantity

		<i>therefore condemn him. We can't do that. It is just not possible for any organization or individual of integrity to do anything of the sort.</i>		
6-	[12-B]	First NM: <i>No. Mr. Koppel, I don't agree with you. I am saying that it would be a grave mistake for us to consider our attitude toward Yasser Arafat on the basis of the interests of the Jewish community.</i>	Pun	Quantity Manner
		Second NM: <i>Why are you so keen that I should involve myself in the internal affairs of Cuba and Libya?</i>	Rhetorical question	Quantity Quality Relation Manner

The number of sentences used by Mandela in the first interview are (34), and (8) sentences of which include using figures of speech. This means that the percentage of his figurative language is (23.529%). The following table involves the frequency of each rhetorical figure used by Mandela. It reveals that all the five selected figures are used by Mandela in this interview and metaphor and overstatement are equally used for (2) times more than the other figures.

Table (2) Frequency and percentage of using figures of speech of the first interview.

No	Figures of speech	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Metaphor	2	5.882 %
2.	Pun	1	2.941 %
3.	Overstatement	1	2.941 %
4.	Understatement	2	5.882 %
5.	Rhetorical question	1	2.941 %

The third objective aims at showing which maxim is most flouted by Mandela in his interview. Table (2) shows the frequency of each maxim by using these rhetorical figures. It shows that by using these figures of speech, the maxim of quantity is most flouted by Mandela for (7) times in his first interview than the other maxims.

Table (3) Frequency of flouting Grice's maxims in the first interview

No	Grice's Maxims	Frequency
1.	Quantity	7
2.	Quality	5
3.	Relation	5
4.	Manner	6

9. CONCLUSION

This paper has provided a pragma-rhetorical analysis of Nelson Mandela's interview (1990). The analysis based on clarifying the extent to which specific figures of speech are used by him as a persuasive strategy. It is also based on how flouting Grice's maxims can be created by using these figures of speech. The research has reached the following findings: persuasion can be created by using these tropes; flouting Grice's maxims that results from using each figure of speech can create persuasion in a certain context. The analysis has shown that Mandela intends to use a variety of tropes to influence and persuade the hearers. Metaphor and understatement are the most frequent figures used by Mandela, and the maxim of quantity is the most flouted in using these figures.

REFERENCES

- Archer Dawn, Aijmer Karin, and Wichmann Anne (2012). *Pragmatics: an Advanced Resource Book for Students*. Routledge Applied Linguistics.
- Arends Richard and Kilcher Ann (2010). *Teaching for Student Learning: Becoming an Accomplished Teacher*. Routledge. Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data.
- Bivins, Thomas (2008). *Mixed Media: Moral Distinctions in Advertising, Public Relations, and Journalism*. Taylor &

- Francis e-Library. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-publication Data.
- Bussmann Hadumod (1996). *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. Routledge. Translated and edited by Gregory Trauth and Kerstin Kazzazi.
- Capone Alessandro, Piparo Lo Franco and Carapezza Marco (2013). *Perspectives on Pragmatics and Philosophy*. Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- Cruse Alan (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Fletcher A. Michael (2012). *Leadership Becomes You: Understanding the Psychology of Leadership and You*. Author House. Library of Congress Control Number: 2012904387.
- Grice Paul (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. Reprinted from *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech acts*, Cole et al. "Logic and Conversation", pp.41-58, (1975), with permission from Elsevier.
- Halmari, Helena and Virtanen, Tuija (2005). *Persuasion Across Genres: A Linguistic Approach*. John Benjamins B. V. Library of Congress Cataloging- in-Publication Data.
- Kanu M. Alusine (2009). *Reflections in Communication: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. United States of America. University Press of America, Inc. Library of Congress Control Number: 2008934820.
- Leech N. Geoffrey (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Levinson C. Stephen (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data.
- McQuarrie F. Edward and Phillips J. Barbara (2008). *Go Figure! New Directions in Advertising Rhetoric*. M.E. Sharpe, Inc. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-publication Data.

- McQuarrie, F. Edward and Mick, David (1996). *Figures of Rhetoric in Advertising Language*. The Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 22, No.4 (Mar., 1996), 424-438.
- Mey L. Jacob (2009). *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. 2nd Edition. Denmark: University of Southern Denmark .
- O'Keefe, Daniel J., (2002). *Persuasion: Theory and Research, 2nd edition*. United States of America, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Persson, Johannes and Ylikoski, Petri (2007). *Rethinking Explanation: Boston Studies in The Philosophy of science*. The Netherland, Springer.
- Roberts W. Rhys (2004). *Rhetoric: Aristotle*. Dover Publications, Inc. Mineola, New York. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-publication Data.
- Schmidt, Rosemarie and Kess, F. Joseph (1986). *Television Advertising and Televangelism*. John Benjamins B. V. Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data.
- Shaffer Christina (2009). *SAT: Subject Test Literature*. 4th Edition. Barron's Educational Series, Inc. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Steinberg, Sheila (2006). *Persuasive Communication Skills: Public Speaking*. South Africa. Juta & Co Ltd.
- Thomas Jenny (1995). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Walton, Douglas (2005). *Deceptive Arguments Containing Persuasive Language and Persuasive Definitions, Argumentation 19:159-186*.
- Wilson Deirdre and Sperber Dan (2012). *Meaning and Relevance*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.