DIFFERENCES OF ENTAILMENTS, PRESUPPOSITIONS AND IMPLICATURES

Ismatillaeva Mokhinur Sayfiddin qizi
2nd Year Master Student of Bukhara State University
Foreign Languages Faculty.
Moxinur.ismatillayeva98@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

The article includes the informative content concerning one of the issues of the pragmatics-distinction between implicatures and entailments. Pragmatics as well as its object are being thoroughly studied because of their importance. The aim of this paper is to define certain distinguishing characteristics of entailments, presuppositions, and implicatures. The aim is to investigate the essence and role of these various forms of inferencing in a conversational setting. Various kinds of samples are given in order to show differences and clarify the borders of notions.

Keywords : implicature, entailments, explicature, conversational implicature, conventional implicature, conversational maxims, presupposition.

INTRODUCTION:

Communication between humans play a great role in their daily life as well as educational process. While talking with each other people not always speak everything explicitly sometimes we face situations where we should understand the the implied message from the spoken utterance or written passage. Implicitness arises from a variety of factors in a conversational relationship. Any of the most important inference forming processes involved in the process are entailments, presuppositions and implicatures.

Implicatures are inferences about the universe that a listener makes based on conclusions about the speaker's supposed motives. The assumption of conversational cooperativeness, as defined by Grice in the Maxims, is the source of many implicatures. Since they may be canceled, implicatures vary from presuppositions and entailments. Presuppositions can be used in a variety of utterance forms (questions, orders, claims, performatives), but entailments can only be used in statement utterances.

MAIN PART:

According to www.lexico.com "Explicature is the part of the interpretation of an utterance that is explicitly expressed, as opposed to what is implicit", whereas www.macmillandictionary.com defines implicature as something that can be concluded from something someone says not directly. From the above given definitions we can conclude that these two concepts are somehow opposing each other.

• There's milk in the fridge.

(b) There's milk of sufficient quantity/quality for adding to coffee in the fridge.

In the following example, the sentence uttered is given in (a) and a likely explicature of the utterance (dependent on context, of course) is given in (b).

Implicatures differ from explicatures in that the latter refers to a process for communicating content by a sentence. This indicates that explicatures freely show the essence they are attempting to convey, making them relatively simple to comprehend. The implicature, on the other hand, is the same as the deduced material, which is based on previous assumptions. This can make analyzing implicatures challenging, since they are based

on a series of prior observations made by the addressee regarding the sender's purpose in the transmission of ideas. Because of this, both the sender and the addressee would have a similar understanding of the world.

1. Sally: What's the weather going to be like today?
   Harold: You should bring your umbrella.

OBSERVATION:

Sally is likely to conclude that Harold means to inform her that it is likely to rain. Conversational implicatures typically have a number of interesting properties, including calculability, cancelability, nondetachability, and indeterminacy.

The www.dictionary.cambridge.org determine entailment as the relation between two statements when for one to be true, the other must also be true. The notion of entailment is related to the concept of presupposition and implicature. Levinson defines semantic entailment as follows: A semantically entails B (written A 11- B) if every situation that makes A true, makes B true (or: in all worlds in which A is true, B is true). (Levinson, 1983:174)

(a) This house belongs to John.
(b) John owns this house.

The sentences (a) and (b) in above mutually entail each other, since these sentences have the same sets of entailments, they may be said to paraphrase one another. The meaning of a sentence determines implication, not the context in which it is used. If one collection of items is used in another, this is known as entailment.Determiners can be used in entailments as well.

Presupposition is something that is assumed in advance or taken for granted according to the www.dictionary.com .

Presumptive evidence is often unfamiliar, and it is possible that this is common knowledge between speaker and hearer. To put it another way, presupposition is a common way of conveying new knowledge.

If entailments are an important semantic relationship, presuppositions are a standard pragmatic relationship. The concept of presupposition arose from a philosophical question about the existence of'reference' and'referring expressions.' However, it was quickly discovered that presuppositions come in a variety of forms and come from a variety of lexical and syntactic origins. Presupposition causes are the linguistic objects that generate assumptions.

John realized that he was in debt.
Presupposition: John was in fact in debt.

CONCLUSION:

In the arrangement and development of conversational interaction, entailment, presuppositions, and implicatures play an essential role.

Presuppositions account for the background expectations and common experience (world view) against which conversational utterances make sense; and implicatures account for the additional non-literal yet contextually important implied component of interpretation in a dialogue. These inferencing processes work together to help interlocutors achieve their conversational targets more efficiently.Understanding and being able to differenciate the concepts can enhance the comprehension of the utterance or text.

REFERENCES:

1) Birner, B. J. (2013). Introduction to Pragmatics. Singapore: Blackwell Publishing.
2) Grice, Paul 1981. Presupposition and Conversational Implicature. In Radical Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.
3) Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pracrmatics Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

4) Romoli, J. The presuppositions of soft triggers are obligatory scalar implicatures. Journal of Semantics.

5) Stalnaker, R. C. (1973). Presuppositions. Journal of philosophical logic 2: 447–457.

6) Thomason, Richmond 1990. Accommodation, Meaning and Implicature: Interdisciplinary foundations for pragmatics. In Philip Cohen, Jerry Morgan & Martha E. Pollack (eds.), Intentions in Communication. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

7) Yule, George. (1996). The study of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.