Maria Leyva- Hernandez
LING 412: Final Term Paper
Dr. Sandra Disner
December 12, 2024

Language is the foundation to communication, not only shaping interpersonal interactions but also the heart of law and public discourse. This is most evident in the landmark U.S. Supreme Court case New York Times v. Sullivan (1964), which redefined the legal boundaries of defamation (Oyez, n.d.). At the center of the case was a paid advertisement published in The New York Times which criticized police actions in Alabama during the civil rights movement (The New York Times, 1960). While the ad did not name anyone, L.B. Sullivan, the Montgomery city commissioner, argued that its language defamed him by implying misconduct. The Court's ruling established the "actual malice" standard for defamation cases involving public officials, emphasizing the importance of intent and recklessness in assessing defamatory statements (*New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 1964). Despite its significance, *New York Times v. Sullivan* highlights the complexities of language in legal contexts, where seemingly clear terms such as "actual malice" are fraught with ambiguity. For legal practitioners and linguists alike, the case underscores the need to analyze the literal content of statements and their implied meanings, contextual framing, and pragmatic functions. Researchers like Roger Shuy, a pioneer in forensic linguistics, emphasize that defamation is inherently a linguistic act, requiring tools such as speech act theory, discourse analysis, and the study of implied meanings—pragmatics—to uncover intent and interpret the impact of language (Shuy, 1993). Similarly, another renowned linguist in this field is Edward Finegan. His work on linguistic precision and pragmatics reveals how ambiguity in language can lead to conflicting interpretations in the courtroom (Finegan, 2010). This paper will analyze *New York Times v. Sullivan* through the lens of linguistic analysis, focusing on speech acts, grammatical ambiguity, and discourse framing. By applying linguistic principles to the ad's language, the paper explores how the advertisement's rhetorical choices contributed to the legal dispute and shaped the Court's interpretation of "actual malice" (*New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 1964). Furthermore, it considers the broader implications of linguistic ambiguity for defamation law and public communication, arguing that

precise and ethical communication is essential for navigating the intersection of language, law, and reputation.

Speech act theory, first introduced by J.L. Austin and later expanded by John Searle, provides a powerful framework for analyzing how language performs actions beyond merely conveying information. According to this theory, speech acts can be classified into **locutionary acts**: the literal content of the statement; **illocutionary acts**: the speaker's intent; and **perlocutionary acts**: the effect on the listener (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). For example, in the statement "Police ringed the campus," the illocutionary act implies condemnation of police behavior. The intent appears to be a critique of law enforcement's oppressive tactics against students. Moreover, the content of the statement is particularly significant because it centers on whether a statement constitutes an accusation or merely an opinion. Defamation, as Shuy notes, aligns closely with the illocutionary act of accusing. For a statement to function as an accusation, it must imply responsibility for a harmful or blameworthy act (Shuy, 1993). In legal disputes, the challenge is often determining whether the speaker intended to accuse or merely to express an opinion, especially when dealing with the press. The distinction is critical because opinions are protected under the First Amendment, while accusations that are knowingly false or reckless may constitute defamation (*New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 1964). Shuy emphasizes that indirect speech acts—where a speaker implies more than they explicitly state—are particularly ambiguous in defamation cases, as they often leave room for multiple interpretations (Shuy, 1993). For instance, general terms like "they" and "police," which do not explicitly name Sullivan but could be interpreted as implicating him due to his high-profile role as police commissioner. This raises the question of whether the ad performed the illocutionary act of accusing Sullivan or merely criticized a broader system of oppression. The perlocutionary act is portrayed as Sullivan's reaction to the statements in the ad. His perception of the pronouns are shaped by his environment. It is important to note that language is more than a collection of isolated statements; it works within a broader framework of discourse that shapes meaning and perception. Which is why pragmatics is essential to this analysis.

Discourse framing is another important theory that refers to the way information is structured and presented to influence interpretation, while pragmatics focuses on how meaning arises from context and implied intent. In this case, these elements are central to understanding whether language fulfills the legal requirements of harm and intent. The ad begins with a dramatic appeal to address the systemic oppression faced by civil rights activists, framing its content as an urgent call for justice. “Heed Their Rising Voices” and references to a “wave of terror” set a tone of moral urgency, positioning the ad as an advocacy piece rather than an objective report. This framing, while rhetorically effective, may have contributed to Sullivan’s interpretation of the language as defamatory, particularly in its portrayal of law enforcement actions. Especially statements like “ringed the campus” and “padlocked the dining hall to starve [students] into submission.” These phrases, while evocative, lack precision and specificity. The illocutionary force could be interpreted as an accusation of deliberate oppression, but it could also be seen as a rhetorical device to emphasize the urgency of the civil rights struggle (Lewis, 1991). While inflammatory, these statements did not meet the standard of “actual malice” because there was not enough evidence that the authors knowingly published falsehoods or acted with reckless disregard for the truth (*New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 1964). Additionally, one of the key statements in the ad reads, “They have arrested [Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.] seven times.” While this claim was factually inaccurate, one can begin to ask: Was the intent to accuse the Montgomery police, and by extension Sullivan, of misconduct? Or was it a rhetorical exaggeration meant to highlight systemic oppression? If the statement was intended as an accusation, it would align with the illocutionary act of assigning blame, suggesting that the police—and by association Sullivan, as the commissioner—acted unlawfully or unjustly. Such an interpretation could support Sullivan's claim that the advertisement defamed him by implicating his leadership in the alleged mistreatment of civil rights activists. This reading relies on a direct connection between the statement’s content and the perception of deliberate harm caused by those in power. On the other hand, if the statement is understood as rhetorical exaggeration, its primary function shifts. Rather than being a direct factual claim, it becomes a device to amplify the urgency of systemic injustice, aimed at rallying support for the civil rights movement. In this case, the statement’s illocutionary force is not to

accuse but to persuade and evoke empathy. Roger Shuy's work on rhetorical devices in legal contexts supports this interpretation, emphasizing that inaccuracies in advocacy texts often reflect passionate expression rather than malicious intent (Shuy, 1993). In fact, the idea that the purported defamation has to be proven to have that intent through its language is a new and emerging approach to defamation cases (Rathert, et al., 2018). This ambiguity illustrates a broader challenge in defamation law: how to differentiate between harmful falsehoods and impassioned speech. Under the "actual malice" standard established in *Sullivan*, public officials must prove that false statements were made knowingly or with reckless disregard for the truth. The statement about King's arrests raises the question of whether the authors of the advertisement acted recklessly by failing to verify the claim or whether they reasonably believed it to be true in the context of their advocacy. While falsity does not fully apply for a linguistics analysis, it is important to note in order to dissect the *New York Times's* intent. Moreover, the socio-political context of the advertisement adds another layer to this interpretation. The civil rights movement relied heavily on moral appeals and dramatic language to draw attention to systemic oppression, often operating under the constraints of urgency and limited resources. In such a context, minor inaccuracies may not have been viewed by the authors as undermining the ad's overarching message. Frankly, the violence and retaliation was not surprising to read by this point. This perspective aligns with the Supreme Court's ruling, which recognized that robust public discourse—especially on matters of public concern—requires a degree of protection for rhetorical expression, even when it contains errors. Ultimately, the interpretation of this statement reflects the dual function of language in the advertisement: as a tool for advocacy and as a potential source of defamation.

Grice's Maxims of Conversation of quality, quantity, relation, and manner, provide a framework for analyzing how implied meanings arise from language use. The Maxim of Quality emphasizes truthfulness, requiring that statements not assert information known to be false or lacking sufficient evidence. The inaccuracy in stating "[Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.] has been arrested seven times" flouts this maxim. While factually incorrect, the statement's rhetorical nature complicates its interpretation.

Shuy's insight that inaccuracies in persuasive texts often reflect hyperbole rather than malicious intent underscores this complexity. In persuasive contexts, such as advocacy advertisements, slight exaggerations may function more as emotional appeals than deliberate efforts to deceive. However, the ad's lack of factual precision leaves room for legal challenges, especially under defamation laws requiring proof of reckless disregard for the truth. This tension between persuasive intent and factual accuracy demonstrates how breaches of the Maxim of Quality can be viewed through different interpretive lenses depending on context. The Maxim of Quantity calls for providing just enough information—not too much, nor too little. In the advertisement, the vague references to systemic oppression, such as generalized statements about law enforcement, create a gap between what is said and what is needed to fully understand the situation. For example, mentioning police actions without specifying the events or naming responsible individuals forces readers to infer connections. While this brevity may be a deliberate stylistic choice to maintain broad focus, it also reduces the opportunity to verify claims, potentially leading to misunderstandings or misinterpretations. This lack of detail shifts the burden of interpretation to the audience, heightening the risk of perceived harm, as evidenced in Sullivan's reaction to the ad.

The Maxim of Manner stresses the importance of clarity, orderliness, and the avoidance of ambiguity in communication. In the advertisement, however, ambiguity is present, often employed as a rhetorical device to generalize criticism and maintain a wide appeal. Terms like "police" and "they" are deliberately broad, serving to implicate systemic issues rather than pinpoint specific individuals or events. While this vagueness may enhance the emotional resonance of the message, it also invites multiple interpretations, particularly for readers with differing perspectives or stakes in the narrative. For L.B. Sullivan, the ambiguity of terms such as "police" and "they" likely contributed to his perception that the advertisement targeted him personally. This type of ambiguity is particularly significant in defamation cases, as it allows readers to draw their own inferences about culpability, which may differ dramatically depending on their familiarity with the context or their personal biases.

Ambiguity also arises in the ad's descriptions of events, such as the claim that police "padlocked the dining hall to starve [students] into submission." While evocative, this statement lacks clarity and specificity, leaving readers to fill in interpretive gaps about what exactly transpired. Such phrasing, while rhetorically powerful, blurs the line between literal fact and figurative language, creating space for competing interpretations. For some readers, the statement may suggest deliberate cruelty by law enforcement, while others may view it as an exaggerated critique aimed at drawing attention to systemic oppression. Ambiguous phrasing often operates on the level of implicature, where the meaning conveyed is not explicitly stated but is inferred by the audience. As mentioned before this leads to significant challenges in legal contexts, as courts must determine whether the implied meaning constitutes defamation, even when the explicit content does not. However, the ambiguity inherent in the advertisement's language played a pivotal role in Sullivan's perception of defamation and the subsequent legal dispute.

Ambiguity, while legally defensible in this case, underscores a broader challenge in public communication: balancing rhetorical effectiveness with clarity. The deliberate use of broad terms and emotionally charged language in the advertisement allowed it to resonate with a wide audience and amplify its call to action. Yet, this same vagueness increased the likelihood of misinterpretation and legal vulnerability. This duality illustrates the power of ambiguity as both a communicative tool and a potential liability, particularly in contexts where reputational harm and legal accountability intersect. In public communication, ambiguity can be both a strength and a weakness. On the one hand, it enables broader, more flexible interpretations that can engage diverse audiences. On the other hand, it leaves room for unintended readings that may escalate into disputes. Understanding how ambiguity operates in language, particularly through its alignment with the Maxim of Manner, is crucial for communicators who seek to balance persuasive impact with ethical and legal responsibility.

This linguistic analysis of *New York Times v. Sullivan* underscores the crucial role of language in shaping both legal outcomes and public perception. By examining the advertisement through Speech Act theory

and Grice's Maxims of Conversation, it becomes evident that breaches of truthfulness, clarity, and specificity of the parties involved in the ad were central to the tensions in the case. These linguistic features, while enhancing the ad's rhetorical effectiveness, also opened the door to multiple interpretations, leading to the defamation claims brought by Sullivan. The Supreme Court's recognition of the advertisement as protected speech reflects the inherent difficulty of balancing free expression with the protection of reputations in a democratic society. This analysis demonstrates the dual power of language as both a tool for advocacy and a source of potential harm, particularly in emotionally charged and contextually complex communication. This paper also emphasizes the role of linguistic analysis in defamation cases; something that is often overlooked.

Looking ahead, the insights gained from this analysis highlight the importance of linguistic precision in both legal and public contexts. As discourse increasingly moves to digital platforms, where messages are more fragmented and audience interpretations more diverse, the potential for misinterpretation and reputational harm only grows. Communicators—whether journalists, public figures, or advocacy groups—must be mindful of the implications of their language use, striving for clarity while maintaining rhetorical impact. Further research could explore how contemporary defamation cases grapple with the challenges posed by online discourse, where ambiguity, hyperbole, and anonymity intersect. By applying the principles of linguistic analysis to evolving forms of communication, we can better navigate the complexities of free speech and accountability in the modern era.

Bibliography

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.

Finegan, E. (2010). *Language in the law*. Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, A. (1991). *Make no law: The Sullivan case and the First Amendment*. Random House.

Oyez. (n.d.). *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*. Retrieved from https://www.oyez.org/cases/1963/39

Rathert, M., Visconti, J., & Visconti, J. (2018). Handbook of Communication in the Legal Sphere (J. Visconti, Ed.; 1st ed.). De Gruyter Mouton,. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614514664

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Shuy, R. (1993). *Language crimes: The use and abuse of language evidence in the courtroom*. Blackwell.

Shuy, R. (2010). *The language of defamation cases*. Oxford University Press.

The New York Times. (1960, March 29). *Heed Their Rising Voices* [Advertisement]. *The New York Times*, p. 25. Retrieved from https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1960/03/29/p/25?zoom=15