Zamfara International Journal of Education (ZIJE)
The Official Journal of the Faculty of Education
Federal University Gusau, Zamfara State, Nigeria
Volume 6, Number 6, October, 2026
pISSN: (Hard Copy): 2814 – 1377
eISSN (Online): 2814 – 1369
www.foefugusau.com.ng
Reviewed Date: 29-09-2026
Publication Date: 07 -10-2026
DOI: **https://doi.org/10.64348/zije.2026627**

Qualitative Study on Semantic Entailment, Implicature and Pre-Supposition among Speakers of English: A Review of Donald Davison's Truth-Conditional Semantics Theory

SAMUEL, Chukwuemeke Eboh
nycnchap2020@gmail.com
08117904648, 07067601711

Department of General Studies, Nation Builders Polytechnic, Asaba, Delta State - Nigeria

Abstract
This paper takes a cursory look at what constitutes entailment in semantics. It discusses the sources of inclusion and attempts to distinguish between entailment and other similar terms, such as implicature and pre-supposition, with which it is sometimes confused. The constant confusion between the implicature, pre-supposition and entailment among speakers of English has prompted the researcher into investigating the three items using the Donald Davison's truth-conditional semantics theory. It was found that differences exist between them. Finally, the importance of entailment to the English speaker was not left out.
Keywords: Semantic Entailment, Implicature, Pre-Supposition, English Speakers

Introduction
In linguistics, entailment is the relation between two sentences or utterances, where the of one, *A* requires the truth of the other *B*. By this we mean that one statement entails another when the second is a logically necessary consequence of the first (Brinton, 2000). For instance**,** Omua lives Benin, entail *Omua Lives in Edo State.* An entailment can be thought of as a relation between a sentence, or a set of sentences (the entailing expressions) and another sentence (the entailed sentence). Truth-Conditional Semantics Theory (Donald Davidson, 1967)

Theoretical Framework
The theoretical frame work for this research is based on the Donald Davidson (1967) Truth-Conditional Semantics Theory, which holds that the meaning of a sentence can be understood by specifying the conditions under which the sentence would be true or false. According to Davidson, knowing the meaning of a sentence is equivalent to knowing what must be the case in the world for that sentence to be true. The theory is based on the idea that a semantic theory for a language should provide a systematic account of the truth conditions of all sentences in that language. Davidson drew inspiration from the work of Alfred Tarski, who developed a formal theory of truth. He argued that understanding meaning involves understanding the truth conditions associated with linguistic expressions. In relation to entailment, Truth-Conditional Semantics explains that one sentence entails another if the truth of the first sentence necessarily guarantees the truth of the second. For example: *John killed the lion*. *The lion died*.
If the first sentence is true, the second sentence must also be true. Therefore, the first sentence entails the second.
We can find countless examples where entailment relations hold between sentences and countless where they do not (Ghierchia and McConnel-Ginney,2000).

The sentence: Ade kissed Shola passionately can be interpreted so that it entails the sentences:
i)Ade kissed Shola
ii) Shola was kissed by Ade
iii) Shola was kissed
iv)Ade touched Shola eith her lips,
But it does not entail:
i) Ade married Shola
ii) Shola kissed Ade
iii) Ade kissed Shola many times
iv) Ade did not kiss Shola.

Zamfara International Journal of Education (ZIJE)
The Official Journal of the Faculty of Education
Federal University Gusau, Zamfara State, Nigeria
Volume 6, Number 6, October, 2026
pISSN: (Hard Copy): 2814 – 1377
eISSN (Online): 2814 – 1369
www.foefugusau.com.ng
Reviewed Date: 29-09-2026
Publication Date: 07 -10-2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64348/zije.2026627

Entailment is a very strong kind of implication; a semantic relation which holds no matter what the facts of the world happens to be. That is, it holds in all possible worlds (Sil International,2004). This is to say that the statement, *Doyin is a spinster, entails Doyin is unmarried*. Since the purpose here is to discuss the relation between the lexemes *spinster* and *unmarried*, we want to say that for any individual, not just *Doyin*, being a spinster entails being unmarried (Palmer, 1994). Let us take a look at the entailment pair: (a) *The anarchist assassinated the king*, and (b) *The king died*. Assuming the same individual is denoted by the king here, there are numbers of ways of describing the relationship. We could say that if somebody tells us A and we believe it, then we know B without being told anymore. Or we could say that it is impossible for somebody to assert A, but deny B; What such definitions try to capture is that entailment is not an inference in the normal sense. We do not have to reason to get from A to B; we just know it instantaneously because of our knowledge of English (Saeed 2003: 93). He further observes that such truth – base definition of entailment might allow us to state the relation more clearly, and would be something like:

A sentence, P, entails another, Q, guarantees the of the of the second, Q, and the falsity of the second Q, guarantees the falsity of the first, P. We can see how this would for our examples below:

STEP 1: *If P, The anarchist assassinated the king***,** *is true*.
Is Q, *the king died* automatically true? Yes.

STEP 11: If Q *the king died*, is false, is P, *The anarchist assassinated the king,* also false? Yes.

STEP 111: Then P, entails Q, If P is false, then we cannot say anything about Q; it can either be true or false.

This is referred to as the truth relations of entailment. When this set of relation hold between P and Q, then P entails Q. Only the truth of the entailing sentence and the falsity of the entailed sentence has consequences for the sentence. When P is false, Q can either be true or false; If all we were told was that, The anarchist did not assassinate the king, we would not know whether the king is dead or alive. When Q is true, P can either be true or false: if we just know that, the king is dead, that does not tell us anything about whether, the anarchist assassinated him or not (Saeed, 2003).

Sometimes, the speaker will necessarily produce a very large number of background entailments, but will indicate how these are to be ordered (SIL international, 2004).

Observe the following examples below:

1) Tunde ate three slices of bread
2) Someone ate three slices of bread
3) Tunde did something to three slices of bread
4) Tunde ate three of something.

On any occasion, in uttering sentence I, the speaker will communicate, by stress, which entailment is assured to be the foreground (or more importantly for interpreting intended meaning) than any other. So, when the utters the following sentences:

1) Tunde ate THREE slices of bread;
2) TUNDE ate three slices of bread;

He/she indicates that the foreground entailment, and hence his/her main assumption in the first sentence is that, Tunde ate a certain number, (THREE), of slices of bread. But in the second sentence, the focus shifts, the main assumption is that someone (TUNDE) ate three slices of bread. The stress in English function to mark the main assumption of the speaker in producing an utterance. Such, it allows the speaker to mark for the listener what the focus of the message is, and what is being assumed.

We have said that an entailment is given to us by linguistic structure: we do not have to check any fact in the world to deduce the entailed sentence from the entailing sentence. The source of entailment may sometimes be lexical. For instance, the relationship of entailment between the sentences; 'The anarchist assassinated the king' and 'the king died', derives from the lexical relationship between the lexemes, assassinated and died. In some sense, the meaning of assassinate contains the meaning of die.

Zamfara International Journal of Education (ZIJE)
The Official Journal of the Faculty of Education
Federal University Gusau, Zamfara State, Nigeria
Volume 6, Number 6, October, 2026
pISSN: (Hard Copy): 2814 – 1377
eISSN (Online): 2814 – 1369
www.foefugusau.com.ng
Reviewed Date: 29-09-2026
Publication Date: 07 -10-2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64348/zije.2026627

Hyponym between lexical items is also a regular source of entailment between sentences (Saeed, 2003). The noun 'dogs' is a hyponym of; animal'. So it follows that*, I bought a dog today*, entails*, I bought animal today.*

Another source of entailment is syntactic is nature. The active and passive versions of the same sentence will entail one another. So, *the cat killed the rat, entails, the rat was killed by the cat.*

Entailment differs from implicature**,** where the truth of *A* suggests the truth of B, but does not require it. For instance**,** *Ada had a baby and got married*; implicate that: *(A) She had a baby before (B) the wedding*. But this is cancellable by adding *…not necessarily in that order*. Again, *I tried to phone john yesterday,* would normally implicate, I did not in fact phone him; but there is nothing odd about continuing, … *and in fact, I succeeded in getting through* (Lyons 1977: 595). Implicature assumes that the speaker actually intends to provide information that is not part of his/her sentence meaning.

Entailment also differs from presupposition where the truth of what one is *presupposing* is taken for granted. Presupposing is what the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance, while entailment is what logically follow from what is asserted in the utterance. Speakers have presuppositions, while sentences (not speaker) have entailments (Shadia, 2010). For instance, *Bayo's brother bought two cars*, presupposes that *Bayo exists and his brother has a lot of money*. All these presuppositions are held by the speaker and all they can be wrong, as we have seen earlier on.

A simple test to differentiate presupposition from entailment is negation: *The Obi of Agbor was assassinated*, and *The Obi of Agbor was not assassinated*, presuppose that there is *an Obi of Agbor*. However, *the Obi was assassinated*, entails, *The Obi of Agbor is dead*. *But The Obi of Agbor was not assassinated,* no longer entails, *The Obi is not dead*; nor that is he alive, as he could have died in another way. Presupposition remains under negation, entailment does not. Negation destroys entailment (Shadia, 2010).

Whatever way we see it, it is easy to show that lexical relations are central to the way speakers and hearers construct meaning. Knowledge of entailment relationships is important, for it is a reflection of the speaker's lexical knowledge. Entailment can be said to follow from the semantic relationships that exist between words or lexical items contained in the sentences, or the utterances of the language, e.g. between assassinated and dead; father and man; and between spinster and unmarried.

Conclusion

In conclusion, to show that the meaning of words in a language is interrelated, the meaning of a word is defined, in part, by its relation with other words in the language. As well as being in relation with other words in the same sentence, a word is in a relationship with other related, but absent words. To take a very simple example, if someone says to you, I saw your father just now, you know, without further information, that the speaker saw a man. This follows from the relationship between the uttered word father and the related, but unspoken word man; representing links in the vocabulary. One could also claim that the word father contains a semantic element man, as part of its meaning.

References

Brinton, L.J. (2000). The Structure of Modern English: A Linguistic Introduction. John Benjamins Publishing Ltd.
Davidson, D. (1967). Truth and meaning. Synthese, 17(3), 304–323. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00485035
Chierchia, G., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2000). Meaning and grammar: An introduction to semantics (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics (Vol. 2). Cambridge University Press.
Palmer, F. R. (1996). Semantics (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
Saeed, J. I. (2003). Semantics (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
Shadia, Y. B. (2010, October 21). Presupposition and entailment. Retrieved from http://www.kau.edu.sa.