The Role of Implicature and Presupposition in Men's and Women's Manipulative Utterances

L. Ye. Sorokina

Lesya Ukrainka Eastern European National University, Lutsk, Ukraine
Corresponding author. E-mail: lina.reeves@mail.ru

Paper received 24.08.2106; Revised 28.08.2016; Accepted for publication 01.09.2016.

Abstract. The article deals with a research of verbal mechanisms of manipulative utterance organization, in particular implicature and presupposition. A characteristic feature of manipulative message is deliberate formation of an implicit content. Special attention is given to the gender aspect of manipulative influence. In our corpus of samples implicit manipulative mechanisms are mostly applied by men in order to make threats or reproaches.

Keywords: *verbal manipulation, manipulative utterance, implicature, presupposition.*

Introduction. Mechanisms of manipulative influence are actively studied in the framework of the political (T. van Dijk, O. S. Issers, Ye. I. Sheygal), media (A. A. Danilova, O. V. Dmytruk, L. M. Kyrychuk), advertising (Ye. Yu. Koltysheva, Ye. A. Terpugova) discourse. Despite numerous linguistic studies on the issue of manipulation, the role of specific speech means in the formation and development of manipulative background of speakers' cooperative and confrontational dialogical interaction have not received adequate attention.

A study of verbal manipulation at the level of the "message" has made it possible to trace the linguistic mechanisms of manipulative utterance formation as a way of arranging information which undergoes distortion. A characteristic feature of the manipulative utterance is an intentional production of implicit content. The verbal mechanism that allows the speaker to disguise the important information, to provide their own judgments in the form of generally accepted knowledge and opinions, to conceal their true intentions works out due to such concepts as "implication" and "presupposition ".

Theoretical background and preliminary analysis. The implicature is a logical operation, connecting two statements with a link, which corresponds to the conjunction "if...then": "If A, then B" where A is the antecedent, whereas B is a consequent that is the relation of implicature" [12, p. 192-193]. Implicit information in a manipulative utterance is more complex than logical implicature. In this regard, there is an obvious need for its analysis from the point of view of pragmatic linguistics that significantly expands the knowledge of this phenomenon. The key to understanding the phenomenon of implicature is H. P. Grice's principle of cooperation [7], which is based on the assumption that the participants of verbal communication in regular circumstances have a common goal which is to achieve understanding. Communicative postulates allow to deduce communicative implicatures out of the direct meaning of the utterance. The implicatures are understood as components of an utterance content which are not included in the structure of a sentence, but deduced out of it by the listener in the course of a speech act [10, p. 8-9]. For the analysis of a verbal manipulation O. Ducrot's point of view is of particular importance (op. cit. at [10]). The latter introduces the opposition "intentionality / unintentionality of implicit content generating", which allows to distinguish two types of implicatures: ***unintentional*** (a speaker does not put an additional hidden meaning in his utterance, a recipient reveals it because of his / her own perception) and ***intentional*** (a sender intentionally imparts a portion of the information between the lines). In many cases, the significance of the implicit information for achieving a perlocutionary effect is so important that we can talk about the manipulation of consciousness – the use of language principles and peculiarities for the purpose of hidden influence on the recipient in the desired for the sender direction [10, p. 8-9]. The speaker imposes the listener a certain view of reality, emotional response or intention, which do not coincide with those the latter could have formed himself / herself [1, 9, 16, 17].

The concept of presupposition has also come into linguistics from logic. The defining feature of the linguistic interpretation of this term is the extension of its content: presuppositional elements are not only semantic (as in logic), but also pragmatic components of the total utterance content. Semantic presuppositions relating to the subject of the situation have their own indicator, which can be a word, syntactical construction or intonation pattern. Pragmatic presuppositions have no language markers of their own. They relate to that part of the utterance content, which, in the opinion of the speaker, is known to the recipient, which is, related to the communicants' knowledge on the situation of communication [15, p. 242].

The concept of implicature is often confused with presupposition. Both concepts are related: first, both of them belong to the field of hidden meanings, and secondly, they are similar in their certain positions in relation to the statements. But in case of implication attention is drawn to the conclusion from the utterance, i.e. what is implied. In case of presupposition the subject of attention is the assumptions, source data, allowing to form a specific utterance. The presupposed matter is that in logical terms is preceded by the statement, and the implied matter is deduced from the already given utterances [19, p. 135-136].

The attraction of implicatures and presuppositions for the manipulator is that they are not subject to denial but function, "bypassing the analytical procedures of the information processing (this process occurs unconsciously); the recipient himself deduce information, without casting doubt upon it" [20, p. 162]. So, **the goal** of our study is the consideration and analysis of the conditions under which such a perception of information is possible.

Results and their discussion. **The implication in the utterances of a manipulative nature**. If the purpose of an implicit message is distortion of information, a speaker provides it in such a way that the recipient himself comes to certain conclusions that will contribute to the effective verbal manipulation. In case of exposing the latter a manipulator can always reject the implicit statement. Consider this example:

(1) **(a)** *'Nothing like this happened when the old man was around.' Pickles tipped back his beer again and flicked a glance at Willa. 'Come on, Pickles.' Uncomfortable, Jim shifted in his creaking chair. 'You can't blame Will for something like this. '* **(b)** *'Just stating fact'* (Roberts, MS, p. 73).

In the utterance (a) a man implies that there is no peace and order at the farm while Will's (a daughter of the deceased owner) management. On the explicit level, he merely notes that nothing like that happened when her father was alive. Another worker speaks aloud the implicit information, but the manipulator emphasizes the explicit side of the statement and in such a way rejects the implicit one (b).

The following example (2) illustrates nonverbal chain of inferences, the ultimate of which is the goal of verbal manipulation. The statements of implicit logical links can be traced on the explicit level (*you're being a pretty girl must be careful – despite the fact that you are working in the FBI*). The implicature can be successfully implemented due to the use of direct vocative (*You're a pretty little girl, Ellie*) and indirect one, which doesn't seem to concern the woman (*Even when they're with the FBI*). Moreover, the recipient has the characteristics of "men's language" that allows to imply the role of the expert and the force in opposition to female weakness. In this case implied information includes the element of threat, after the exposure of which the manipulator refuses it, shifting the focus of attention on the recipient.

(2) *'You're a pretty little girl, Ellie. You know how pretty little girls have to be careful in today's world. Even when they're with the FBI.' 'You don't want to take this any further,' Ellie said, trying to pull away. 'You're threatening a federal agent…' 'Threats? I didn't make any threats, Agent Shurtleff. All the threats came from you'* (Patterson, Gross, L, p.195).

It should be noted that, on the one hand, it is important for the manipulator to be unnoticed on the explicit level of the dialogue, on the other, it is simply necessary for the recipient of a manipulation to realize the implicit information, which is embedded in the subtext. Otherwise, verbal manipulation makes no sense. Let us analyze the following example:

(3) *'Hello, Paige.* **(a)** *Let's let bygones be bygones. What do you say?' Paige shrugged. 'Fine.'* **(b)** *Wasn't that a terrible thing about Ken Mallory?' he asked. 'Yes,' Paige said.Kane was looking at her slyly.* **(c)** *'Can you imagine a doctor deliberately killing a human being? It's horrible, isn't it?' 'Yes.'* **(d)** *'By the way,' he said, 'congratulations. I hear that you're a millionairess.' I can't see...'* **(e)** *I have tickets for the theater tonight, Paige. I thought that the two of us could go'* (Sheldon, NLF, p. 356).

Every utterance a manipulator generates is a certain implicature that at the very end should make the recipient act according to the intent of the former. It should be mentioned that the beginning of a dialogue is like a setting up a basic key [8] of a conversation, i.e. the interlocutors' relations are not the best ones. To improve them Kane uses an idiom (*let's let bygones be bygones*), the meaning of which is "to forget smth bad that someone has done to you and forgive them" [14, p. 204]. The next stage of the MM is the implication of a gruesome murder that was committed by the doctor (b); logical presupposition about doctors who intentionally kill people (c). It seems that all explicit and implicit information does not concern Paige. But the statement (d) implies: you've become rich by killing your patient. The fact is that one of wealthy patients left the entire estate to the doctor, Paige Taylor, then suspicions that she killed him for money emerged. The last utterance (e) proves that the dialogue looks more like implied blackmail.

Bringing a recipient to form necessary implicatures contributes to his inclusion into the manipulator's world, identifying the manipulator's point of view, the maximum evidence of knowledge that is able to convince the former in its necessity. In other words, the implicature is defined as formally unexpressed messages in the text, hypothetical conclusions on the basis of knowledge about real life, than such inferences emerge in a recipient's mind as a result of explication in saying with presuppositional antecedent, that is, information about the situation prior to the creation of a text and the assumption (by means of additive implicit sense), as the given information can be interpreted. This additional sense is the content of the category of implication.

One more interesting example is (4), in which the older sister (Tess) is eager to implement verbal manipulation and thus affect her younger sister's choice (Willa). Tess wants to help Willa with her personal life. She knows how Willa and Ben like each other but neither of them dares to take a crucial step because of their pride. So, knowing how important it is for a younger sister to seem all brave, strong and smart, Tess uses an indirect compliment in the implicature of which "only the brave, strong and intelligent woman can be a match for a man like Ben." This manpulative device works perfectly. You must select not characteristic of women's speech the slang word butt, which in this case emphasizes masculine traits of the main character.

(4) *'I don't know why you're looking at his butt when you've already got a guy,' Willa muttered. 'Because it's a fine butt, and I have excellent eyesight.' Of course, a woman would have to be brave enough, strong enough, and smart enough to match him in power and style.' There, Tess thought, as Willa sulked beside her, challenge issued, Ben. That's the best help I can give you* (Roberts, MS, p. 279).

Presupposition in manipulative utterances. Distorted proposition may be a part of a manipulative utterance content that remains when denying, i.e. is presupposed as in the fragment given below. The information that is brought into the consciousness of the recipient indirectly like a presupposition, is fixed in memory on a common basis with information that is directly stated in a sentence. Moreover, it is clear that "a possibility of recipient's critical, in particular, negative attitude to the implicit statement that is brought with the

help of presupposition should be much lower than to a direct one" [17, p. 427]. So, in the below given passage (5), George seeks to capture the hand and heart of the heiress of a large prosperous company. He deliberately did not call her for a long time, holding a perfect pause in the relationship, and then offers his story. George begins with the apology that immediately melts Alexandra's heart. Statements (a, c, d) contain incorrect semantic presuppositions, but pragmatic presuppositions complete the implicit statement: the man's only thought was to see the girl as soon as possible, in spite of such serious occasion as his dad's heart attack (b). Manipulative statement (c) presupposes the importance of his absence, but the literal presupposition (d) is: "I love my family, but you're more important to me".

(5) **(a)** *'I wanted to call you sooner,' George apologized, 'but I just returned from Athens a few minutes ago.' Alexandra's heart melted. 'You've been in Athens?' 'Yes. Remember the evening we had dinner together? The next morning Steve, my brother, telephoned me* – **(b)** *My father had a heart attack.' 'Oh, George!' She felt so guilty for having thought such terrible things about him. 'How is he?' 'He's going to be all right, thank God.* **(c)** *But I felt as though I was being torn in pieces. He begged me to come back to Greece and take over the family business.' 'Are you going to?' She was holding her breath. 'No.* **(d)** *I know now that my place is here. There isn't one day or one hour that's gone by that I haven't thought about you'* (Sheldon, MG, p. 529–530).

In the example (6) the idea, that is to be brought into the mind of the recipient, is given in the form of presupposition which is disguised as a fundamental truth ("an assertion disguised as a presupposition" [16]). A manipulator has an older brother (Lawrence) who is proud of his deceased father and hates his stepfather Robert. In contrast to the older brother, the younger one (Jamie) gets along well with Robert. This fact makes Lawrence really mad. Therefore he puts the assertion of Jamie's disloyalty to the memory of their father in the presupposition of the manipulative statement. At the same time the older brother shows understanding of such attitude which draws a clear distinction between himself and his treacherous brother. Lawrence's purpose is not to insult Jamie, but an attempt to counteract good relations between his stepfather and brother.

(6) *At first he had tried to pretend he was still not really having anything to do with Robert, and then to persuade Laurence that Robert was really all right, but Laurence fixed him with his cold eyes and said, 'You can be disloyal to our father if you must, Jamie. I find it impossible. Perhaps you'll understand when you're older. Don't worry about it. I know it's difficult for you.' 'That's not fair!' Jamie staunchly said, but Laurence shrugged and told him he was only speaking the truth as he saw it* (Vincenzi, NA, p.181).

A pragmatic presupposition that accompanies the semantic one largely determines the uniqueness of manipulative messages. The distortion of the pragmatic presupposition makes even a statement with a true proposition insincere i.e. it has significant manipulative potential. For example (see a fragment 7), a young lawyer Rudy Baylor is trying to convince Miss Bertie that she should not give all her money to a Reverend Chandler. Appealing to the rational sphere (a), Rudy offers to pay a certain percentage in favor of the Reverend, but it doesn't work. His next step is to formulate the statement on the basis of a semantic presupposition (b) (most priests live a life of luxury, indulge in pleasures, and are the real scammers), which is fully revealed only by a pragmatic presupposition (Reverend Kenneth Chandler leads the same life). The recipient understands the presupposed information, and disagrees outright. Due to the formation of the utterance, the manipulator can easily reject the inset information and change the perspective of conceptualization for his responsibility (c).

(7) *'He's a man of God,' she says emphatically, quickly defending the honor of the Reverend Kenneth Chandler.***(a)***'I know. Fine. But why give him everything, Miss Birdie? Why not twenty-five percent, you know, something reasonable?' 'He has a lot of overhead. And his jet is getting old. He told me all about it.' (...)* **(b)** *My point is this, and I'm sure you know it, but a lot of these guys have fallen hard, Miss Birdie. They've been caught with women other than their wives. They've been caught blowing millions on lavish lifestyles - homes, cars, vacations, fancy suits. A lot of them are crooks.' 'He's not a crook.' 'Didn't say he was.' 'What are you implying?' 'Nothing,' I say, then take a long sip.* **(c)** *I'm here as your lawyer, Miss Birdie, that's all. You asked me to prepare a will for you, and it's my duty to be concerned about everything in the will. I take this responsibility seriously'* (Grisham, R, p. 68–69).

Conclusions. The experimental analysis proves that the use of implicit information with manipulative intent are in most cases implemented by men (cf. men 65%, women 35%), chiefly as an implied threat or reproach.

REFERENCES (TRANSLATED AND TRANSLITERATED)

1. Batsevych F.S. Essays on Linguistic Pragmatics. Lviv: PAIS, 2010. 336 p.
2. Bykova O.N. Verbal Manipulative Behaviour // Theoretical and Applied Aspects of Verbal Influence: Russian Rhetoric Association Messenger. 1(8). Available at: http://library.krasu.ru/ft/ft/articles/ 0070503.pdf
3. Danilova A.A. Word Manipulation in Mass Media. M.: Dobrosvet, KDU Publ., 2009. 234 p.
4. Dijk T. A., van. Discourse and Manipulation // Discourse & Society. Vol.17 (2). P. 359— 383.
5. Dijk T.A.,van. Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power. Available at: http://www.discourses.org/ OldArticles/ /Structures%20of%20discourse%20and%20structures%20of%20power.
6. Dmytruk O.V. Manipulative Strategies in Modern English-speaking Communication (based on printed and Internet issues of 2000—2005): extended abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philology: 10.02.04 "Germanic Languages", Kyiv, 2006. 19 p.
7. Grice H.P. Logic and Conversation // New Writing in Foreign Linguistics. M.: Progress, 1985. P. 217—236.
8. Hoffman I. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life [translated by A.D. Kovalyov]. M.: KANON-Press, 2000. 301 p.
9. Issers O. S. Communicative Strategies and Tactics of the Russian Speech. Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2002. 284 p.
10. Khvorostin D.V. Hidden Components of an Utterance Meaning: Principles of Revealing: extended abstract of the

dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philology: 10.02.19 "Language Theory", Chelyabinsk, 2006. 22 p.
11. Koltysheva Ye.Yu. Manipulative Influence in a Modern Advertising Text: extended abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philology: 10.02.19 "Language Theory", 10.02.04 "Germanic Languages", Yaroslavl, 2008. 24 p.
12. Kondakov N.I. Logical Dictionary. M.: Nauka, 1975. 720p.
13. Kyrychuk L.M. Pragmatic and Cognitive Peculiarities of Stereotypes as Means of Manipulation in Publicistic Discourse // Scientific Messenger of Lesya Ukrainka Eastern European National University. Lutsk: Vezha, 2009. Is. 6. P. 195—199.
14. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2006. 1949 p.
15. Morozova O.I. Lingual Aspects of Lie as a Cognitive and Communicative Formation: thesis for a doctoral degree in philology: 10.02.04 "Germanic Languages", Kharkiv, 2007. 477 p.
16. Plohinova A.S., Lapinskaya I.P. Lingual Manipulation // Language, Communication and Social Environment. Voronezh: VGTU, 2002. Is.2. P. 178—181.
17. Pocheptsov G.G. Selected Works on Linguistics. Kharkiv: V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National Univ. Publ., 2009. 556 p.
18. Sheygal Ye.I. Semiotics of Political Discourse. M.: Gnosis, 2004. 328 p.
19. Susov I.P. Linguistic Pragmatics. Vinnytsa: Nova Knyga, 2009. 271 p.
20. Terpugova Ye.A. Implicit Information as an Influence Device in an Advertising Text // Materials on International Scientific and Methodological Conference "Russian Language: Issues on Theory and Teaching Innovative Methods". Irkutsk: Irkutsk State Pedagogical Univ. Publ., 2001. Is.1. P. 161—166.

ILLUSTRATIONS

21. Grisham J. The Rainmaker. L. : Arrow, 1996. 568 p.
22. Patterson J., Gross A. Lifeguard. N.Y., Boston : Warner Books, 2006. 417 p.
23. Roberts N. Montana Sky. L.: Piatkus Books, 2008. 467 p.
24. Sheldon S. If Tomorrow Comes. L.: Harper Collins Publishers, 2005. 577 p.
25. Sheldon S. Master of the Game. L.: HarperCollins Publishers, 2005. 673 p.
26. Vincenzi P. No Agel. L.: Orion, 2001. 836 p.

Роль импликации и пресуппозиции в манипулятивных высказываниях мужчин и женщин

Л. Е. Сорокина

Аннотация. Статья посвящена исследованию речевых механизмов организации манипулятивного высказывания, в частности импликации и пресуппозиции. Характерной чертой манипулятивного сообщения является преднамеренность создания имплицитного содержания. Определенный интерес представляет гендерный аспект.

***Ключевые слова**: речевая манипуляция, манипулятивное высказывание, импликация, пресуппозиция.*