

EXPLORING POLITICAL RHETORIC: ANALYSING CONTRADICTIONS, AMBIGUITIES, AND ANOMALIES IN POLITICAL SPEECH BY AMERICAN PRESIDENT JOE BIDEN

Ikram Ullah¹, Muhammad Bilal Ahmad², Nafeesa Sardar³

Abstract

This study investigates how politicians use contradictions, ambiguities, and anomalies in their speeches to persuade and influence people, what values and ideas they hope to promote through these techniques, and why they choose to employ these strategies in various political settings. The data was collected from YouTube, which was a speech delivered by the American president, Joe Biden, at White House Correspondents' Dinner in 2024. This research study used the Davis Contradiction, ambiguity, and anomaly model as a theoretical framework for the study. The analysis focuses on identifying contradictions, ambiguities, and anomalies in the collected data. The findings of the study emphasize the importance of critical thinking in interpreting political discourse and provide a deeper understanding of how language can be used to influence public view. The researcher also found specific instances of strategic language, including contradictions, ambiguities, and anomalies to influence public opinion. These devices were employed by the politician to engage the audience, address issues indirectly, and criticize the opponents.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Semantics, Meaning, Politician Speech, Contradiction, Ambiguities, Anomalies, Communication.

Introduction

All languages have meanings (Ahmad et al., 2022; Nawaz et al., 2020). Now what the linguists need is to understand how words are associated with specific meanings and how their meanings vary with the combination of other words (Amjad et al., 2021; Ramzan et al., 2023). Semantics is the branch of linguistics that tries to seek answers to such questions. Michel Bréal (late 1800s) coined the term *sémantique* to describe the psychology of language. That French word has its origins in Greek: *semantikos* means "significant," and comes from *semainein* "to show, signify, indicate by a sign." "Semantics is derived from 'meaning' or 'to signify'" Rapoport, (1952).

1.1.Semantics

"Semantic is a technical term used to refer to the study of meaning" Palmer, F. R. (1981). According to Löbner (2014), semantics is basically concerned with the meanings of words, phrases, grammatical forms and sentences in language. But it is not just about what the words individually mean, it's also about how they are used in communications. According to Kreidler (2002) Semantics is the systematic study of meaning. In semantics, Linguists try to

¹ Department of English Literature and Linguistics, Riphah International University, Pakistan.
ikramullah.uom888@gmail.com

² Department of English Literature and Linguistics, Riphah International University, Pakistan. mbilalaeg@gmail.com

³ Department of English Literature and Linguistics, Riphah International University, Pakistan.
nafeesazufer@gmail.com

uncover patterns, regularities and principles underlying meaning in language. Semantics is a part of conceptual structure in which linguistic, sensory, and motor information are compatible” Allan (2015).

1.2.Semantic Analysis

“In general linguistics, semantic analysis refers to analyzing the meanings of words, fixed expressions, whole sentences, and utterances in context” Goddard, C., & Schalley, A. C. (2010). Semantic analysis is the process through which we understand the meaning of words, phrases, sentences, or the entire text, discourse or speech within a given context Goddard (2011). It is like identifying what each word and sentence is trying to say, and how they combine to make a larger point.

Contradictions arise when two or more statements, ideas, or conclusions contradict each other, leading to logical incompatibility. Contradictions in academic research usually suggest unresolved arguments or the need to refine theoretical or empirical frameworks (Priest, 2006; Ramzan et al., 2023). Ambiguity is defined as ambiguity or ambiguity in meaning, in which a word, phrase, or situation can be interpreted in various ways. In scholarly work, ambiguities can develop from confusing phrasing or inadequate explanation, making interpretation challenging Sorensen, (2002). Research inconsistencies are claims or observations that challenge dominant paradigms and thus represent anomalies (Ramzan & Alahmadi, 2024). They often lead to other queries or signal the fact that new assumptions are required to explain deviation from what is expected (Bunge, 2011).

Abuse of personal language is a strong influence-persuasion instrument, responsible for creating cultural perceptions (Akram et al., 2020; Ramzan et al., 2023) and mobilizing political engagement (Ramzan & Khan, 2019). In this paper, this literature overview presents recent research data related to political talk, language patterns, and behavior, the role of metaphor, and an analysis of the influence of social media and its results in the reinforcement of polarization.

According to Fairclough (2010), CDA refers to, language constructs and social realities. CDA for power relations and ideological and political ideas, he argues that political speech is a communication medium of power relations. In contrast to analytical approaches that focus on local detail, Fairclough would stress a need to understand the context of the sociopolitical since this would enable the scholars to reveal mechanisms that go into the formation of political narratives, based on already extant divides in politics (Ramzan et al., 2021).

This issue is further developed by Hameleers (2020), who studies the interaction between political polarization and social media. The rapid evolution of technology has brought about profound changes in a way we communicate (Akram et al., 2021, 2022), share information (Abdelrady & Akram, 2022), and form opinions (Ma et al., 2024). Transforming technologies have not only connected people globally (Akram & Abdelrady, 2023; Al-Adwan et al., 2022) but have also given rise to new challenges and opportunities (Akram et al., 2021). This paper shows

how platforms foster further dissemination of extreme opinions and leads to public opinion fragmentation. Hameleers have concluded that the language used by people in the social media not only mirrors the dichotomy, which one can observe in the political rhetoric but also deepens the existing polarization, proving the difficult task of significant othering in the consistencies of the online discourses.

In addition, Heyvaert et al. (2020) pay attention to the role of metaphors in political discourse. It was thought that metaphors are instrumental in defining political problematics and orienting the worldview. In their work, the authors use concepts of metaphorical language to explain how politicians rely on given metaphors to either give an appeal to emotions or set a tone for the conflict on behalf of their ideals. In doing so, this study contributes to the knowledge about rhetorical practices in political communication explaining how language constitutes politics.

Two decades of political discourse scholarship is the subject of the study synthesis conducted by Randour, Perrez, and Reuchamps (2020). It pays much attention to the field trends and the methodological developments that specialize in the process of political rhetoric in response to the given socioeconomic environments. This broad survey positions recent research in a broader historical context to showcase the present role of political discourse in today's society.

Farias and Rudman (2016) also discussed the main obstacles that very practitioners encounter when implementing STS in political contexts. Irit and Greg bring critical dialogical research that deals with language and action, impasses to real change in politically contentious contexts. This research brings a realistic angle to the analysis of political discursive activity by stressing the importance of critical language use in the sphere of social justice.

Last but not least; it will shed some light on the strategic exploitation of aporia, equivocation, and paradox in the speeches made by politicians as the means to bring about a transformative change in the populace. By knowing what those concepts and values are which these rhetorical strategies serve to reinforce, it is possible to grasp further the driving forces that compel politicians to use such tactics. Awareness of these characteristics not only expands the existing knowledge of political talk but also helps the audience to encounter navigated political messages from the leaders actively. We hope that the findings of this research will contribute to the understanding of the part played by language in the construction of politico-ideological discourses in the process of socialization.

Methodology

This research study used the qualitative method. Qualitative research always orders understanding the meaning behind sentences and actions, particularly when analyzing any political speech. It contains interpreting rhetoric, tone, and choices of words to uncover fundamental themes, ideologies, or convincing strategies. This research study likely involves identifying repeated themes, patterns, or conversational strategies within speeches, which are seals of thematic or content analysis.

The researcher used observation or close-reading technique to semantically analyze the data. The data collected for the research from YouTube. It is the 9 minutes speech of the current American President, Joe Biden, at White House correspondents' Dinner (2024). This research study used Davis, (1991) Contradiction, ambiguity and anomaly model as a theoretical frame work for the data analysis. Computer, YouTube transcripts, and a mobile device and dictionary were used as research tools.

Data Analysis

1. Contradiction

In semantics, contradiction occurs when one statement directly contradicts another statement. Here are the contradictions found by the researcher in the speech:

1.1 Donald's attentive nature vs non attentive nature

Statement 1

"Donald was listening"

Statement 2

"Sleepy Don"

Analysis of Contradiction

In the first statement the speaker using phrase 'Donald was listening' suggests that Donald is interested and participating. The second statement is opposed to the first one as 'Sleepy Don' means anything but wakefulness and diligence of Donald. The two statements: 'Donald was listening' and 'Sleepy Don', indicate an absurd contrast in Donald's alertness and attentiveness. In the first phrase, the stress is put on the so/SE: + the alertness of Donald, which means he is not only listening but comprehending something that is being said or in the process of being explained to him. This means that Donald can record and participate, gain interest and responsiveness, which is characteristic of a person who does not exclude anything from his field of vision.

In contrasting contrast, the phrase "Sleepy Don" suggests laziness and disinterest. It implies that Donald is not simply inattentive, but also struggles to stay awake or focused. This depiction undermines the first statement's premise by characterizing him as someone who lacks the energy or motivation to actively listen.

Thus, the two declarations cannot coexist without conflict. The first phrase implies attentiveness, which contradicts the second sentence's image of exhaustion and disinterest. This contradiction illustrates the complexities of human behavior and the diverse levels of participation that people

can exhibit in different circumstances, calling into question the legitimacy of labels we ascribe to others based on their observed moods.

1.2 Negation vs Use of political theatre

Statement

“Folks think what's going on in congress is a political theater, that's not true, if Congress were theater, they'd have thrown out Lauren Bobbert a long time ago”

Analysis of Contradiction

The speaker mentions that the congress is not a political theatre, yet he itself uses the elements of political theatre, including humor, satire and mocking remarks. This creates a contradiction between the message conveyed in the statement that the politics should be taken seriously and the use theatrical techniques to engage audience.

The speaker's claim that "what's going on in Congress is not a political theater" is an intriguing paradox, especially given the rhetorical methods used in the remark. The speaker uses comedy, sarcasm, and mocking to express his argument, accidentally employing features typical of political theater. This juxtaposition indicates a deeper complexity in political discourse, implying that while the purpose may be to increase the seriousness of political engagement, the means used paradoxically contradict that goal.

The speaker's statement about Lauren Boebert is a scathing critique, meaning that if Congress were truly a theater, she would have been dismissed long before. This comment uses theatrical techniques to elicit a reaction, blurring the distinction between serious political discourse and entertainment. The speaker raises questions regarding the nature of political discourse, namely whether serious topics can be properly communicated without resorting to theatrical approaches.

Finally, this contradiction shows the widespread nature of theatricality in politics, where the lines between sincerity and performance frequently blur. The use of humor and satire may engage the audience, but it also risks trivializing the very subjects that the speaker argues should be taken seriously, resulting in a conflict between the message and the medium.

1.3 Not taking side appeal vs taking side criticism

Statement 1

“I'm sincerely not asking of you to take sides but asking to rise up to the seriousness of the moment”

Statement 2

“a defeated former president has made no secret of his attack on our democracy he said he wants to be a dictator on day one and so much more he tells supporters he is their revenge and retribution when in God's name you ever heard of another president say something like that and he promised a bloodbath when he loses again”

Analysis of Contradiction

It is shown in the first statement where the use of ‘Donald was listening’ suggests that Donald was an active participant in the conversation. The second announcement actually negates the first as ‘Sleepy Don’ represents the drowsiness and inattentiveness of Donald. Correspondingly, between “Donald was listening” and “Sleepy Don” there is a clear contraction of Donald’s consciousness and attention. In the first phase, the speaker emphasizes the activity of the brain of Donald, which means that he is attentively listening or receiving any information. It thereby means that where Donald is, he knows and participates, it responds bearing in mind that which infers that it has a full self-involvement in the surrounding environment.

2. Ambiguity

In semantics, ambiguity occurs when a linguistic expression allows for multiple interpretations. There are two types of ambiguity in semantics.

2.1 Lexical Ambiguity

Lexical ambiguity occurs when a single word or phrase allows for multiple interpretations. The following are the lexical ambiguities found in this research:

2.1.1 Bloodbath

Statement

“He promised a bloodbath when he loses again”

Analysis of Ambiguity

In this statement, the word ‘bloodbath’ allows for multiple interpretations. It can be interpreted as that the individual being referred to promised of violence if he loses again or it can also mean that he promised if he loses again, he will bathe in blood.

This is because the statement “He promised a bloodbath when he loses again” cannot be easily understood due to the use of the word “bloodbath.” This work may be interpreted in several ways, and every interpretation has its implications. There is one view that the guy in question has declared that he would bring violence or disruption every time it is followed by a loss and expressed his ability to mobilize fans for some revolution. This reading questions aggressiveness and the role that speech may nurture it has in politics.

On the other hand, the term may refer to an obvious figurative meaning of the word whereby if the speaker lost again, he would 'bathe in blood'. This artwork communicates a suggestive scenario of over powering repression/ outrageous response or a predatory behavior which may mean an abrupt change in behavior or speech. Friendliness of spirits for prologues such as such a concept contributes to the ambivalent importation of a single expression that distorts the audience perception of the speaker's aim and the statement implication in politically intensified environment.

2.1.2 Stormy Weather

Statement

"Donald has had a few tough days lately you might call it stormy weather"

Analysis of Ambiguity

The phrase 'stormy weather' can be interpreted in a variety of ways. It is unclear whether it is referencing the weather or Donald Trump's terrible conditions. The sentence "Donald has had a few tough days lately; you might call it stormy weather" contains a deep layer of ambiguity, especially the phrase "stormy weather." On the one hand, this term could be understood literally, implying inclement weather that could disrupt Donald's activities or public appearances. Such a reading may signal that other causes are influencing his situation, resulting in a visual image of tumultuous skies.

However, the more subtle meaning likely refers to the metaphorical use of "stormy weather" to depict Donald Trump's challenging and tumultuous period. This figurative language expresses the idea of confronting problems, controversies, or public scrutiny, eliciting an emotional response to his current condition. By employing this statement, the speaker may imply that Trump's problems are not just temporary, but rather constitute a critical and potentially destructive stage in his political career. The phrase's dual meaning enriches the discourse by asking listeners to ponder both the literal and metaphorical connotations of the statement.

2.1.3 Stretch

Statement

"I had a great stretch since the State of the Union"

Analysis of Ambiguity

Earlier in this statement the word 'stretch' is vague. In as much as, in this context it is used to mean a duration of time or success it poses a lot of congestion when trying to decipher its actual meaning since it also has a meaning that it is a physical stretch.

The word “stretch” puts the vagueness into the statement, “I had a great stretch since the State of the Union,” depending on whom you are asking. It should be noted that if one looks at the immediate physical context then ‘stretch’ seems to be suggestive of a period of success or a period after the State of the Union speech. However ‘stretch’ can also be interpreted more literally. The word ‘stretch’ can cause a reader to visualize distinct meaning other than what the writer intends.

This makes it rather contradictory for the listeners since one will not know which interpretation of the word the speaker wants to pass. Moreover, one cannot know if the subject is contemplating achievements, the feeling of contentment, or a more of a physiological state. These kinds of vagueness concerning language underscore the pedagogy of ORM and the need for clear and concise language. When it comes to fine, subtle discussions where words matter, it is extremely necessary to pay attention not only to the key message wanted to be delivered, but also to the choice of the words which will be used at the talk and especially it concerns the speeches concerning great events like the State of the Union. This statement illustrates that language can be interpreted in many shades illustrating why and how language should at all times be selected carefully either orally or in writing.

2.2 Structural Ambiguity

Structural ambiguity occurs when a phrase or sentence allows for multiple interpretations due to its structure. The following are the structural ambiguities found in the research:

2.2.1 Marrying Up

Statement

“Look folks on a serious note in addition to marrying up Colin and I have another thing in common”

Analysis of Ambiguity

In the above statement, the word ‘stretch’ is vague. In as much as, in this context it is used to mean a duration of time or success it poses a lot of congestion when trying to decipher its actual meaning since it also has a meaning that it is a physical stretch.

The word “stretch” puts the vagueness into the statement, “I had a great stretch since the State of the Union,” depending on whom you are asking. Although the situational meanings of the term “stretch of” refer to a time of success following a State of the Union speech, it is not impossible to arrive at the literal interpretations as well. The word ‘stretch’ can cause a reader to visualize a distinct meaning other than what the writer intends.

This makes it rather contradictory for the listeners since one will not know which interpretation of the word the speaker wants to pass. Moreover, one cannot know if the subject is

contemplating achievements, the feeling of contentment or a more of a physiological state. These kinds of vagueness concerning language underscore the pedagogy of ORM and need for clear and concise language. When it comes to fine, subtle discussions where words matter, it is extremely necessary to pay attention not only to the key message wanted to be delivered, but also to the choice of the words which will be used at the talk and especially it concerns the speeches concerning great events like the State of the Union. This statement illustrates how language can be interpreted in numerous ways and emphasizes how words chosen whether orally or in writing should be chosen carefully.

2.2.2 It's Dangerous

Statement

“There are some who call you the enemy of the people that's wrong and it's dangerous you literally risk your lives doing your job you do covering everything from natural disasters to pandemics to Wars”

Analysis of Ambiguity

For this very reason, the structure of the statement being work and its ability to contribute to qualitatively new things in life, can be given many interpretations. It is not clear whether it means that the job that journalists are conducting is dangerous as they endanger their lives in conducting the job or it means that the calling of people journalists is dangerous.

Some have tried to label you as the enemy of the people; this is a lie and an extremely risky position to hold. Still, the term is semantically quite ambiguous because of structural complexity. You risk your life doing your job to cover anything from natural disasters to pandemics to conflicts. It can be interpreted in at least two ways.

Second and finally, the work of a journalist is intrinsically dangerous. The speaker focuses on the risks that journalists are exposed to, whenever they cover important events like natural disasters or diseases, wars, etc. This point of view stresses the fearlessness and commitment of journalists; and their important and endangered role.

Or, perhaps, it refers to the fact that referring to journalists as ‘the enemy of the people’ is necessarily damaging. In this regard, the focus shifts from what dangers journalists meet at the workplace to other implications of such categorization. Journalists are enemies degrades the professionalism of their work and may provoke hostility against them, which is dangerous for their lives.

This tells it all: the dilemma of how society interfaces media and the significance of language to affect perception and security.

2.2.3 Was worried about how I do

Statement

“It's been a year since I delivered this speech and my wife Jill was with me tonight was worried how I do”

Analysis of Ambiguity

There the phrase “was worried how I do” raises many questions about the subject’s actions. This can be done in two ways. This can Either mean that he was worried on that night that how will he deliver the speech or his wife was worried about it.

Some of the additional ambiguity comes from the seemingly innocent word “was worried how I do” from the sentence “It’s been a year since I delivered this speech, and my wife Jill was with me tonight; she was worried about how I do”. Conflicts of this type stem from the pronoun “I,” which has many meanings and by itself generates all sorts of concerns as to who might be worried about the speech delivery.

One interpretation is to think that the speaker is speaking specifically of his own concern towards the speech. By saying the following phrase, “Then I was worried how I do”, the speaker is expressing that he had concerns about his behavior during the speech, which implies feeling apprehensive or uncertain in this case. This view concentrates on the normal anxiety that one feels when in a position to make a public speech which underlines the importance of such occasions.

On the other hand, it may mean that his wife, Jill was apprehensive over his performance in bed. This interpretation shifts the focus to Jill’s worry about her husband and portrays her as a wife who is highly worried about how her husband is going to fare in the speech.

To some extent, this type of interpretive duality illustrates the best and the worst of language and its function, while calling attention to the importance of the clear. Consequently, the show presents the fact that minor variations in the wording of experiences can lead to the consideration of various forms of a shared occurrence.

3. Anomaly

In semantics, an anomaly occurs when a phrase, sentence, or a larger unit is illogical. Which is grammatically correct but meaningless. Here are the semantic anomalies found in this study:

1.1 Blasting me for a quote

Statement

“The New York Times issued a statement blasting me for quote actively and effectively avoiding independent journalists”

Analysis of Anomaly

In this statement the phrase 'blasting me for quote' is anomalous. While the word 'blasting' might be used metaphorically but if taken its literal meaning, its incorrect as one cannot be blasted by quote.

In the statement, "The New York Times issued a statement blasting me for quote active and effectively avoiding independent journalists," the term "blasting me for quote" reveals an interesting anomaly. The term "blasting" often refers to a harsh, powerful critique, sometimes implying an aggressive verbal attack. However, the usage of "quote" right after it creates an unusual juxtaposition that can cause confusion.

On one hand, the phrase "blasting" can be interpreted metaphorically, implying that the New York Times harshly criticized the speaker's behavior. In this context, the phrase underlines the severity of the criticism, implying that the magazine is concerned about the speaker's behavior toward independent journalists.

However, if one analyzes the literal sense of "blasting," it indicates an explosive activity that cannot logically exist "for quote." The phrase lacks the coherence required to provide a coherent message, implying that "quote" may be a miscommunication or a misplaced word within the sentence. This anomaly highlights the complexity of language, demonstrating how abuse or misinterpretation can result in misunderstandings. It highlights the value of clarity in communication, particularly when discussing sensitive issues in public discourse.

1.2 Runing against a six-year-old

Statement

"Of course, the 2024 elections is in full swing and yes age is an issue I'm a grown man running against a six-year-old"

Analysis of Anomaly

The anomaly lies in the statement "I'm a grown man running against a six-year-old". Here the meaning of the phrase 'six-year-old' is unclear. It's highly unlikely for a grown adult to be running against a six-year-old in a serious political election. This creates a semantic inconsistency or anomaly because it's not a realistic or coherent situation in the context of political discourse.

The paradox in the statement, "Of course, the 2024 elections are in full swing, and yes, age is an issue; I'm a grown man running against a six-year-old," is primarily in the sentence "I'm a grown man running against a six-year-old." These concerns relate to the identity of the referred 'six-year-old', which the author decision to use by analogy questions profoundly. The most improbable electoral competition between an adult and a six-year-old, would even be unlawful

and practically impossible in a real political context, due to standards of qualification to candidacy.

This leads to semantic contradiction or/and semantic quite simply as putting a grown man together with a toddler raises eyebrows. The term ‘six-year-old could be metaphoric indicating perceived underage, inexperience they claim a contender possesses. Nevertheless, the fact that this metaphor is glossed does not make this clear and thus leads to a rational reading of it which is unhelpful to the gravity of the political discourse.

Therefore, the remark demonstrates the fact of how language can give disparate meanings while addressing the populace thus distancing the focus from more important issues to do with age and elections. It shows that there is always important message which demands to be clear and logically think on the political level, when every message, which may be vague in one way or another, may lead to misunderstanding and turn the listener into the enemy.

1.3 Grandparents are wondering

Statement

“Do you think your Irish grandparents are wondering, my great great grandparents that get here in 1846 and when.... what in the hell's going on”

Analysis of Anomaly

This statement is anomalous. The statement “my great great grandparents that get here in 1846” suggests that the grandparents the speaker referred to got there in 1846. So, saying that they are still wondering about the current events is illogical because they must have died years ago.

In the sentence, "Do you think your Irish grandparents are wondering, my great-great-grandparents that get here in 1846 and when...what in the hell's going on," an oddity occurs from the term "my great-great-grandparents that get here in 1846." This structure indicates that the speaker's forefathers arrived in 1846, implying a direct connection to the speaker's grandparents. However, the use of "great-great-grandparents" establishes a time gap, making the assertion invalid.

The speaker's claim that their great-great-grandparents are still "wondering" about contemporary events is fundamentally contradictory, given their ancestors would have lived long ago and most likely died many years ago. This incongruity demonstrates a misunderstanding of generational timescales and calls into doubt the statement's coherence.

The reference of the ancestors' interest in present issues indicates a continuity of thought that does not logically exist given the huge expanse of time. Such a rhetorical strategy may strive for a dramatic or emotive effect, but it ultimately produces a confusing juxtaposition of past and

present. This anomaly highlights the significance of exact wording in conversations about history and legacy when clarity is required to avoid misinterpretation or absurdity.

Findings

Such analysis shows that there are contradictions in the discourse. Inconsistencies are found in the words made by Donald's ever alert, while he is referred to as 'Sleepy Don', showing a struggle in the depiction of a character that best represents Staler's varying levels of human participation. A claim that Congress is not political theatre gives insistent disregard scenic method contradicting the fact the speaker shall employ humor and satire, highlighting how contentious and theatrical to a large extent politics is.

Some confusion appears when the cartoonist uses a term like "bloodbath", it means both violent and non-violent and the other is "stormy weather" which may mean a physical condition or metaphorically mean Trump's problems. It is this phenomenon may be reinterpreted in terms of social status in the broadest meaning of 'marrying up' or of 'marrying' at all. Besides, the comments referring to journalism address the risks of the occupation along with the dangers originating from recognizing reporters as 'the foes.'

There are some syntactic phenomena in the discourse that are logically meaningless, for instance, a statement of a grown man competing with a six-year-old, which is logically incorrect and brings to question the kind of political talk being conducted. Last of all, phrases such as 'your Irish grandparents wondering,' can be linked to the living relatives while using the reference to great-great grandparents from 1846 shows the chronological distance.

Conclusion

The analysis of the speech reveals the fact that specific aspects which include inverted sentences and unclear pronouns alter the message being conveyed by the speech. The hovering recognizes the complexity of people's actions and politicking and shows how whereas there can be several stories, they can be mutually exclusive. This means while flexibilities in language cut across proactively enabling the expansion of nuances thereby enhancing the furthering of discussion possibilities there is misunderstanding again over the motives of the speaker. In writing about anomalies, it is emphasized that illogical or nonsensical utterances may happen in political discourse, thus, coherence is crucial. All these semantic phenomena show that language is very far from being a simple means of communication and that its manifestations have a direct effect on political processes, thus hinting at a connection between word, meaning, and perception.

References

- Abdelrady, A. H., & Akram, H. (2022). An empirical study of ClassPoint tool application in enhancing EFL students' online learning satisfaction. *Systems*, 10(5), 154. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems10050154>

- Akram, H., Yang, Y., Ahmad, N., & Aslam, S. (2020). Factors Contributing Low English Language Literacy in Rural Primary Schools of Karachi, Pakistan. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(6), 335-346.
- Akram, H., Yingxiu, Y., Al-Adwan, A. S., & Alkhalifah, A. (2021). Technology Integration in Higher Education During COVID-19: An Assessment of Online Teaching Competencies Through Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 736522-736522.
- Akram, H., Aslam, S., Saleem, A., & Parveen, K. (2021). The challenges of online teaching in COVID-19 pandemic: a case study of public universities in Karachi, Pakistan. *Journal of Information Technology Education Research*, 20, 263.
- Akram, H., Abdelrady, A. H., Al-Adwan, A. S., & Ramzan, M. (2022). Teachers' perceptions of technology integration in teaching-learning practices: A systematic review. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 920317.
- Akram, H., & Abdelrady, A. H. (2023). Application of ClassPoint tool in reducing EFL learners' test anxiety: an empirical evidence from Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Computers in Education*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-023-00265-z>
- Ahmad, N., Akram, H., & Ranra, B. (2022). In quest of Language and National Identity: A Case of Urdu language in Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 3(2), 48-66.
- Allan, K. (2015). A history of semantics. In *The Routledge handbook of semantics* (pp. 48-68). Routledge.
- Al-Adwan, A. S., Nofal, M., Akram, H., Albelbisi, N. A., & Al-Okaily, M. (2022). Towards a sustainable adoption of e-learning systems: The role of self-directed learning. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Re-search*, 21, 245-267. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4980>
- Amjad, M., Hussain, R., & Akram, H. (2021). Structural and functional taxonomies of lexical bundles: an overview. *Harf-o-Sukhan*, 5(4), 358-367.
- Bunge, M. (2011). *Anomalies: Their Nature and Function in Science*. In *Philosophy in Crisis: The Need for Reconstruction* (pp. 39-55). Springer.
- Gang, W., Yang, Z., & Xinjiang, W. (2013). Study on post-construction ground settlement caused by shield tunnel construction. *Chinese Journal of Rock Mechanics and Engineering*, 32, 2891-2896.
- Goddard, C. (2011). *Semantic analysis: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Goddard, C., & Schalley, A. C. (2010). Semantic Analysis.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vBtXUXknvtE>

Kreidler, C. (2002). *Introducing English semantics*. Routledge.

Löbner, S. (2014). *Understanding semantics*. Routledge.

Ma, D., Akram, H., & Chen, I. H. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A Cross-Cultural Examination of Students' Behavioral Intentions and Attitudes. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 25(3), 134-157.

Palmer, F. R. (1981). *Semantics*. Cambridge university press.

Priest, G. (2006). *In Contradiction: A Study of the Transconsistent* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Ramzan, M., Azmat, Z., Khan, M. A., & un Nisa, Z. (2023, June). Subject-Verb Agreement Errors in ESL Students' Academic Writing: A Surface Taxonomy Approach. In *Linguistic Forum-A Journal of Linguistics* (Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 16-21).

Ramzan, M., Bibi, R., & Khunsa, N. (2023). Unraveling the Link between Social Media Usage and Academic Achievement among ESL Learners: A Quantitative Analysis. *Global. Educational Studies Review*, VIII, 407-421.

Ramzan, M., Khan, M. A., & Sarwar, M. (2023). Style Shift: A Comparative Cultural Analysis of Pride and Prejudice and Unmarriageable. *University of Chitral Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 7(II), 22-29.

Nawaz, S., Ramzan, M., Khan, M. A., Rehman, W., & Tanoli, Z. A. (2020). A study on Urdu speakers' use of English stress patterns: Phonological variation from native speakers. *Elementary Education Online*, 19(4), 6215-6235.

Ramzan, M., & Alahmadi, A. (2024). The Effect of Syntax Instruction on the Development of Complex Sentences in ESL Writing. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(4), 1-25.

Ramzan, M., Javaid, Z. K., & Fatima, M. (2023). Empowering ESL Students: Harnessing the Potential of Social Media to Enhance Academic Motivation in Higher Education. *Global Digital & Print Media Review*, VI, 224-237.

- Ramzan, M., Khan, M.A., (2019).CDA of Balochistan Newspapers Headlines- A Study of Nawabs' Stereotyped Ideological Constructions. *Annual Research Journal 'Hankén'*, XI, 27-41.
- Ramzan, M. Qureshi, A.B., Samad, A. Sultan, N. (2021) Politics as Rhetoric: A Discourse Analysis of Selected Pakistani Politicians Press Statements. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 9(3) ,1063-1070.
- Rabi, F., Ullah, I., Ibrar, M., & Akbar, S. (2024). Stylistic And Structural Analysis of a Short Story "The Good Country People" Written by Flannery O'Connor. *Remittances Review*, 9(S2 (May 2024)), 235-256.
- Rapoport, A. (1952). What is semantics?. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, 12-24.
- Shen, Z., Hu, H., Zhao, M., Lai, M., & Zaib, K. (2023). The dynamic interplay of phonology and semantics in media and communication: An interdisciplinary exploration. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, 6(2).
- Shen, Z., Xu, Q., Wang, M., & Xue, Y. (2022). Construction of college English teaching effect evaluation model based on big data analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on New Media Development and Modernized Education*.
- Shen, Z., Zhao, M., & Lai, M. (2023). Analysis Of Politeness Based On Naturally Occurring And Authentic Conversations. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 19(3).
- Sorensen, R. A. (2002). *Vagueness and Ambiguity*. In *A Companion to the Philosophy of Language* (eds. Bob Hale & Crispin Wright). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Vocabulary.com. (n.d.). Semantics. In *Vocabulary.com Dictionary*. Retrieved May 05, 2024, from <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/semantics>
- Wang, F., & Shen, Z. (2023). Research of Theme-based Teaching's Effectiveness in English Language Education. *The Educational Review, USA*, 7(7), 962-967.
- Wei, X., Zhou, Y., & Wei, G. (2013). Experimental study on the relationship between earth pressure balance shield tunneling parameters and their influence on ground displacement. *Rock and Soil Mechanics*, 34(1), 73-79.
- Zaib, K., Anwar, M., Asmat, K., & Shakir, R. (2022). A narrative analysis of Edgar Allan Poe's short story the tell-tale heart. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 19(3), 1841-1850.