УДК 82–92:81’42.303
Пефтієва О.Ф.
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри теорії та практики перекладу

IMPLICATURE, INSINUATION, AND PRESUPPOSITION IN CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Critical discourse analysis is meant to get acquainted students with the analysis of socio-political written text taking into account the larger real-world context with all of its complexity. It is meant for the professionals from various spheres such as linguistics proper, forensic linguistics, journalistics, history, to name but a few. Critical discourse analysis is a democratic approach which takes an ethical stance on social issues with the aim of improving society. It gives the odds to the reader to be in possession of theoretical knowledge of the discipline and a practical technique to perceive hidden messages by realizing the implied information in mass media publications; correlate discourse and society, including social cognition, politics, and culture; and last but not least, critical discourse analysis contributes into the improvement of writing skills.

One of the important details of Critical discourse analysis is to recognize presupposition, insinuation, implicature in mass media publications. The term *implicature* is taken from the philosopher H.P. Grice, who developed the theory of the cooperative principle. The term 'conversational implicature' has a synonymic term 'gap sentence link'. A brief review of what these terms mean is given below.

Implicature is the action of implying a meaning beyond the literal sense of what is explicitly stated. It is a vital pragmatic element in the process of communication which bridges the gap between what is literally said and what is intentionally meant. Analysis of implicature has proved its importance to discourse analysis since it caters for what is said and what is understood in the process of communication. Implicature employs the whole situation and it uses all the circumstances surrounding the utterance in order to really conceive the intended meaning of the produ cer of the utterance.

Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward (2006) suppose that in pragmatics, conversational implicature is an indirect or implicit speech act: what is meant by a speaker's utterance that is not part of what is explicitly said. The term is also known simply as implicature. "What a speaker intends to communicate is characteristically far richer than what she directly expresses; linguistic meaning radically underdetermines the message conveyed and understood," says L. Horn.

Michael Blome-Tillmann (2013) thinks that in everyday conversations we often convey information that goes above and beyond what we strictly speaking say: exaggeration and irony are obvious examples. H.P. Grice introduced the technical notion of a conversational implicature in systematizing the phenomenon of meaning one thing by saying something else. In introducing the notion, Grice drew a line between what is said, which he understood as being closely related to the conventional meaning of the words uttered, and what is conversationally implicated, which can be inferred from the fact that an utterance has been made in context. Since Grice's seminal work, conversational implicatures have become one of the major research areas in pragmatics [].

Richard Nordquist says that a conversational implicature is an interpretive procedure that operates to figure out what is going on. Assume a husband and wife are getting ready to go out for the evening: *Husband: How much longer will you be?   Wife: Mix yourself a drink.*

To interpret the utterance of wife, husband must go through a series of inferences based on principles that he knows the other speaker is using. The conventional response to the husband's question would be a direct answer where the wife indicated some time frame in which she would be ready. This would be a conventional implicature with a literal answer to a literal question. But the husband assumes that she heard his question, that she believes that he was genuinely asking how long she would be, and that she is capable of indicating when she would be ready. The wife...chooses not to extend the topic by ignoring the relevancy maxim. The husband then searches for a plausible interpretation of her utterance and concludes that what she is *doing* is telling him that she is not going to offer a particular time, or doesn't know, but she will be long enough yet for him to have a drink. She may also be saying, 'Relax, I'll be ready in plenty of time'.

Thus, conversational implicatures are implied by the speaker in making an utterance; they are part of the content of the utterance, but do not contribute to explicit utterance content; and they are not encoded by the linguistic meaning of what has been uttered.

Insinuations. As for the term *insinuation*, the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary gives the following definition „an unpleasant hint or suggestion of something bad". The origin of the term dates back to early sixteenth century and emerges from Latin verb *insinuare*, from *in-* 'in' + *sinuare* 'to curve' [SOED]. But in critical discourse analysis it is understood as a sly, subtle, ambiguous statement which is difficult to challenge. Insinuation endows a speech with a degree of tension and ambivalence. Synonymic term for insinuation is innuendo which is an oblique remark or hint, typically a suggestive or disparaging one. So a person may convey a message to the intended audience by means of an explicit or implicit statement, from which the audience is able to work out the intended message. Communication, i.e. the sharing of information, ideas, and thoughts, is a vital part of life for all of us and especially for mass media became a sophisticated tool, capable of persuading and influencing large numbers of people.

Innuendo is an allusive or oblique remark or hint, typically a suggestive or disparaging one she's always making sly innuendoes [mass noun] a constant torrent of innuendo, gossip, lies, and half-truths Origin: mid 16th

cent. (as an adverb in the sense 'that is to say, to wit', used in legal documents to introduce an explanation): Latin, 'by nodding at, by pointing to', ablative gerund of innuere, from in- 'towards' + nuere 'to nod'. The noun dates from the late 17th cent

Innuendo is a subtle or indirect observation about a person or thing, usually of a salacious, critical, or disparaging nature, it is also called *insinuation*.

In "An Account of Innuendo," Bruce Fraser defines the term as "an implied message in the form of an allegation whose content constitutes some sort of unwanted ascription towards the target of the comment" (*Perspectives on Semantics, Pragmatics, and Discourse*, 2001).

Douglas Walton (1999) offers variant how to detect innuendo, one has to 'read between the lines' of the written or spoken discourse in a given case and draw out by implicature conclusions that are meant to be inferred by a reader or audience. This is done by reconstructing the argument as a contribution to a conversation, a conventionalized type of dialogue, in which the speaker and hearer (or reader) are supposedly engaged. In such a context, speaker and hearer may be presumed to share common knowledge and expectations and cooperatively to take part in the conversation at its different stages, by taking turns making kinds of moves called 'speech acts,' for example, questioning and replying, asking for clarification or justification of an assertion.

The interesting detail about insinuation or innuendo is that the context and the corresponding use of language are always extremely particular. The interaction between language and context produces a set of unique characteristics.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy defines **presupposition** as the phenomenon whereby speakers mark linguistically the information that is presupposed or taken for granted, rather than being part of the main propositional content of a speech act.

Presuppositions. Sudo Yasutada (2020) considers presupposition as a type of inference associated with utterances. Presuppositional inferences are distinguished from other kinds of inferences, in which they generally convey backgrounded, uncontroversial information with respect to the context of utterance.

Typically, the presuppositional inferences of an utterance are already known to be true and accepted by the conversational participants, or, at least, the speaker assumes so when the utterance is made. One caveat here is that presuppositional inferences may convey new information in some cases, although they are arguably exceptions rather than the rule. This exceptional behavior of presupposition is generally termed "accommodation" and has been treated as an important topic in the pragmatics of presupposition. Notice that in the pragmatic sense of the term, presuppositions include all sorts of assumptions that the speaker makes in uttering a sentence.

For example, an utterance of "John forgot to call Mary" typically has a presuppositional inference that John was supposed to call Mary. It is intuitively clear that this is not the main point the speaker wants to make by the utterance. Rather, the content is that John didn't call Mary (despite the fact that he was supposed to).

In the above example, for example, it is also a presupposition of the utterance that the hearer or hearers understand English. Along with this pragmatic sense of the term, it is common in the literature to speak of presuppositions as part of the conventional semantic properties of sentences. To explicitly distinguish between these two uses of the term, the former is often called "pragmatic presupposition" and the latter is called "semantic presupposition." Pragmatic and semantic presuppositions are closely related, in that an utterance of a sentence that has a semantic presupposition is associated with a pragmatic presupposition about the semantic presupposition, while a pragmatic presupposition does not necessarily stem from a semantic presupposition. For example, all sentences of the form "Subject forgot to VP" give rise to a pragmatic presupposition "Subject was supposed to or required to VP." It is reasonable to assume that this pragmatic presupposition is due to the use of the word "forgot," and the analysis of "forgot" as having a certain semantic presupposition as part of its meaning. On the other hand, the pragmatic presupposition that the hearers understand English is not attributable to the semantics of expressions used in this sentence.

To sum up the abovementioned information about presupposition, it should be mentioned that to presuppose something means to take it for granted in a way that contrasts with asserting it.

In conclusion it is necessary to highlight that in spite of the vicinity of terms meaning, they are essential part of Critical Discourse analysis.

Literature

1. Blome-Tillmann, M. (2013) Conversational Implicatures (and How to Spot Them). McGill University. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263487971_Conversational_Implicatures_and_How_to_Spot_Them

2. Horn, L. & Ward, G. (2006) The Handbook for Pragmatics. Blackwell Publishing. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229078380_The_Handbook_of_Pragmatics

3. Walton, Douglas (1999). *The New Dialectic*. University of Windsor. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/241299602_The_New_Dialectic_A_Method_of_Evaluating_an_Argument_Used_for_Some_Purpose_in_a_Given_Case

4. Sudo, Y. (2020) Presupposition. Available at https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199772810/obo-9780199772810-0197.xml

5. SOED Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Fifth edition. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2002. Print

6. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Available at https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/presupposition/