

**THE DOXA AND THE IMPLICATION  
AS PRAGMATIC ELEMENTS IN THE  
ARGUMENTATIVE ANALYSES**



**Pragmatics**

**Keywords:** Pragmatics, argument, implication, political, speech.

**Nertila Zani**

**Part – time lecturer  
'Aleksander Xhuvani ' University, Elbasan, Albania**

**Abstract**

In this work we are going to discuss about the pragmatic elements which help in the argumentative process. We are going to notice the argumentative interaction which is based on the doxa, also focusing on the way arguments flow. In this work we are going to reflect the theories and concepts in a study, thus providing our opinion about them. We are going to stop on some essential aspects of the lexical elements on the role of the implication and its forms which appear in the discourse. The implication strengthens even more the argumentative strength, thus distinguishing and classifying it according to two criteria. First, according to its semantic versus its pragmatic nature, and secondly according to its discursive function. The implication may transmit beliefs and opinions which deal with uncontestable premises but, even the ironic implication plays a vital role in conveying the message. The acquisition of these elements in the Albanian language will be noticed in the politics discourse, concretizing it with examples from various politicians' speeches in different periods of time. The aim of this work is not only the approach among linguistic pragmatics and its elements, but even how these elements influence in the argumentative speech and how they are obtained in the Albanian language.

**W**e are going to begin by explaining the concept of doxa by different authors. This concept originates from Greek (δόξα) which according to Bally's dictionary means opinion, idea, judgment and in a broader meaning it marks even reputation. But we will give other meanings to this concept, which again refer to its origin from Greek which are show, look similar, look like, etc. (Bally 1901: 1012)

Rhetoric as the art of obedience, emphasizes even the importance of doxa or the common opinion in verbal communication (Ruth Amossy 2012). According to her, Perelman convincingly supports that the argumentative discourse is built on common points, on ratified premises from the auditor. This often occurs in political discourses, mainly in matters which have a common interest or problem for a particular auditor. If we refer to the discourses of our politics, different sides embrace matters which have a broad auditor supporting them. The lecturer in front of the auditor relies on a matter where he is sure he shares the same opinions and ideas with the auditor and requires its approval. This is achieved in those spaces where common beliefs and opinions aim to choose a discussion or to consolidate a perspective. Recognizing the auditor and its expectations makes the lecturer's job to embrace a matter which applies to the majority easier. This preliminary recognition would lead towards a strong bases argumentative discourse.

In the rhetorical perspective, as a bases of the argumentative discourse, doxa appears in various verbal forms. What rhetoric called *topoi*, nowadays is studied by the various disciplines which address to verbal configurations of common knowledge, of the pragmatic *topoi* integrated in the stereotype, in the altered acknowledgements. (Ruth Amossy 2012: 112).

Therefore, the notion of doxa or common opinions will be considered as a summary of the social discourses, where it includes the whole social – political life.

Before we present some forms that doxa brings in the discourse, Ruth Amossy brings us some preliminary remarks over what the notion of doxa imposes. Now it is known that in antiquity doxa contradicted the episteme (recognition, science), authentic recognition, as it happens nowadays where the public opinion stands in the frame of scientific knowledge.

Illustration example

***The Albanian religious tolerance, an example of humanism***

*“I am honored for the visit in Israel. We have a history to be proud of the Jewish salvation. And no Jewish was given to the Germans. This role was played by the Muslim families. During these 25 years we have reconnected relationships which were naturally broken by dictatorship.” Rama from Israel: 23 December 2015 interview in I24 NEWS Israel.* For this work we have selected some successive statements from the interview given by Edi Rama in one of the TV channels in Israel.

When we talk about religious tolerance in our country, it is a common opinion of all social – political parties.

These statements are a knowledge which is conveyed by emphasizing what we call religious tolerance or religious coexistence for our people. Politics and media have played an important role in conveying this message. In this case, doxa is exactly the religious tolerance. This common opinion helps the explanation and argumentation of this case, making it more plausible for the auditor.

According to the extracted statements, they are based even in the historical facts far more than in unfounded opinions.

With these statements Edi Rama conveys a direct appreciation for his country and for the Muslim families who played an important role about this fact which happened at a particular historic period of time. With this statement, in an implicit way, Edi Rama shows how religious tolerance is built. The Muslim families hosted and guarded the Jewish, who belong to another religion. This statement reinforces this widely spread opinion, not just in a particular area and context, but even out of it. Here we can talk about doxa elements without the need of building a social ideology or coherence.

What should be said is that these statements belong to a particular period of time, and not every reader or listener has the encyclopedic knowledge to understand the doxa elements within the context.

When Edi Rama, in this case the speaker, talks about the salvation of the Jewish by the Nazis, we know he refers to the Second World War. Just one target group may not have information about this historical fact.

Knowing a doxa which gains the form of a dedicated ideology and which may cause conflicts, therefore there arises the need of an argumentative analyzes in the discourse. In our case, what causes a debate from another group is exactly the last statement.

*“In these 25 years we have reconnected relationships which were naturally broken by dictatorship.”*

The speaker has tried to make the word *naturally* as plausible as possible from the party that contradicts it.

Apart from the doxa elements, we will treat even the implicit/implication or the hidden message in this work. Precisely in these statements we will notice and analyze the implicit messages that the speaker has tried to convey.

Since antiquity, the implicit has been an important part, mainly in fables, fairy tales, examples and various stories. The implicit is widely used even in political speeches as it gives more power to the used arguments.

The implicit strongly contributes in argumentation up to that scale that it engages the listener or the reader to decode the message and to understand all the elements that are missing in the text.

According to Ruth Amossy (2012) the implicit is provided with a great argumentative power. This occurs not simply because it enables the activity of decoding which leads towards a collaboration with the discourse, but even because Oswald Ducrot has perfectly shown that some values and positions have a greater impact on the auditor when said in an implicit way rather than when a message is directly transmitted. All of this lies in the ability of the speaker to convey a meaningful message, not directly, but indirectly, in what we call a hidden message.

Another reason to use the implicit comes from the fact that it sometimes allows the speaker to say some things and to be capable of seeming he hasn't said them (Ducrot 1972: 5). The general problem of the implicit that Ducrot notices is knowing how to say some things, without being responsible of what you are saying. (Ducro 1972: 12).

The doxa and the implicit are always, but not necessarily joined together.

*“I am honored to visit Israel. We have a story to be proud of, for the Jewish salvation. And no Jewish was given to the German. This role was played by the Muslim families. In these 25 years we have reconnected relationships which were naturally broken by the dictatorship.”*

Let's take the extract again to notice how in these statements, a lot of implicitly said messages have been transmitted.

A history dating back to a particular period of history, the Second World War and the Nazi conquerors, is hidden in all these statements. In the first two statements we have a direct information, which reflects how the Albanian have saved and hosted the Jewish from the Nazis.

*This role was played by Muslim families.*

Only in this statement the speaker has shown how old the religious tolerance has been in the Albanian families. In all this speech, the speaker emphasizes this statement to show and convey the values that these families have had.

Even in the other statements the speaker continues to convey a series of messages.

*“In these 25 years we have reconnected relationships which were naturally broken by the dictatorship.”*

If in the statement ‘*This role was played by the Muslim families*’ the speaker refers to the period 1943 – 1945, in the second statement he passes onto a longer period of 55 years just with an only statement.

The speaker does not leave this period unstated, but he summarizes it with the word *dictatorship* which means exactly the so called communist regime.

For someone who receives the message and has the right encyclopedic knowledge, it is easy to understand and decode many stories within it.

The speaker surpasses and labels periods by clearly showing that religious tolerance and humanism belong to two periods with a separation of time in between which are exactly before and during the Second World War and regaining these values after the fall of the communist regime.

Let’s see another case of implicit, but in which irony is hidden.

Talking about irony in itself, you should see it from its very beginnings which date back to antiquity. Irony is not a property of the statement, but a companion. There cannot be irony in a statement without a speaker and a certain communication situation. Irony is a figure by means of which we require the opposite of what we say to be understood: thus the words which are used to build irony are not literally understood. (Dumarsais 1967: 199).

Irony reflects an event which deliberately seems to be contradictory to what is expected and expressed, being at the same time entertaining, just like its result.

Below we have the headline of a newspaper.

***Sleep at daytime, smoke at night. (Telegraf newspaper, 1 July 2015)***

*It refers to the Kurum company, which operated in Elbasan for 23 years, but the activity of the Turkish company was blocked on 10 April 2015, whereas it still continues to*

*produce, paying the bosses on the power. 'Kurum', 'SLEEP' at daytime, blocked by the state, works at night with the state's blessing.*

This may be an antithetical<sup>5</sup> kind of irony, which explains the confrontation between two states or situations. The descriptive characterization finds the area of discourse towards the problematic characterization. The perception is directed towards the actor to make up the narration from the avoidance of relocating predecessor images.

Philip Hamon (1996) states that we encounter irony everywhere, in conversations, in portraits mostly in satirical newspapers, referring to popular characters but above all, their frequent speeches.

The ironic speaker, at the moment he uses irony, considers two opposing structures which are the said and the plausible. Thus the speaker says something, but something else is believed. With the said we would understand the spoken or written speech. Whereas with the believed or the understood, we would understand the decoding from the receiver.

## References

1. Anatole Bailly, 1901 *Abrégé du Dictionnaire Grec Français*, Paris, Hachette.
2. Ducrot Oësvald, 1972, *Dire et ne pas dire*. Principes de semantique linguistique, Paris, Hermann.
3. Dumarsais-Fontanier. 1967: *Les tropes*. Tome I. Genève : Slatkine Reprints.
4. Gazeta Telegraf 1 qershor 2015.
5. Ruth Amossy, 2012, *L'Argumentation dans le discours*, 2012 Armand Colin Paris
6. Philippe Hamon, 1996, *L'ironie littéraire: essai sur les formes de l'écriture oblique*, Hachettesupérieur.

---

<sup>5</sup> Opposing two concepts or ideas to strengthen the expression.