* Try to generalize the base case
  + Don’t rely on the listener being the 0 level
  + Maybe change the listener class
* Write the draft for the abstract now
* Find the papers on blind implicature
  + Judith Degen
  + Qing
* What does it mean for RSA to derive a blind implicature?
* Imagine the two sequences are uttered in the same row:
  + What would happen in the basic model?
    - Every student passed the test – would put all of our mass on all
* Do some lit review on blind implicatures
  + Why are they important?
  + What is the actual reason they have been brought into debate
    - Likely because implicatures are not always global
  + Danny fox tries to do the pragmatics in the syntax
  + Are these blind implicatures really a phenomenon
  + What is supposed to be weird about a blind implicature?
* People will look for a way to interpret this that allows the implicature
  + But the computer won’t
  + But why do we do this? Why do we look for a set that is some but not all?
  + Can we derive that in the RSA?
    - Can we create a situation that we then look to keep the implicature
* Blind implicatures are important because they show an issue with i-predicates
  + John is sometimes tall
  + Some Italians come from a warm country
  + The algorithm the computes this implicature must be robust
* The oddness of blind implicatures (according to Hawkins) is due to the fact that the implicature does not match with the common knowledge
  + Heim 1991
* “Within the Gricean theory, scalar implicatures are triggered by a violation of the maxim of Quantity. Being a pragmatic maxim, Quantity compares an utterance to its alternatives with respect to their informativeness. But because of common knowledge, utterances of (17a) and (17b) convey exactly the same information. Thus no violation of Gricean Quantity can arise by uttering (17a) instead of (17b).”
  + Issue with Hawkins’ explanation
* Within the Gricean theory, scalar implicatures are pragmatic inferences. Hence, they have a weak status: they are optional, cancellable, and suspendable. Thus, it is not at all clear why the mismatching implicature is kept in place and an utterance of (17a) deemed odd, rather than the implicature cancelled or suspended or never computed, and thus the utterance rescued.
  + Another issue with Hawkins’ explanation
* Heim’s explanation for the oddness
  + Maximize Presupposition. A sentence u sounds odd if there exists an alternative sentence w which conveys the same information as u but triggers stronger presuppositions than u.
* Further issues with Hawkins’ explanation:
  + If implicatures are computed by a pragmatic engine, how can this engine be blind to common knowledge so as to distinguish between alternatives that are equivalent given common knowledge?
  + If implicatures are computed by a pragmatic engine, how can this engine be robust enough to mandatorily force the mismatching implicature in place?
* The pragmatic theory of implicatures has recently been challenged for independent reasons and an alternative grammatical derivation of scalar implicatures has been suggested in works such as Chierchia (2004), Fox(2007), Chierchia (2006a), and Chierchia et al. (to appear), among others
  + Scalar implicatures are derived through a purely grammatical algorithm, to be conceived of as a grammaticalization of the standard Gricean reasoning. Thus, grammar pairs each sentence with both a plain meaning and a strengthened meaning , namely the plain meaning enriched with its scalar implicatures.
* Hawkins reasoning can be defended if we assume that implicatures are derived in a grammatical fashion
* Explore how prior world knowledge enters into pragmatic utterance interpretation, and when this world knowledge is defeasible
* A defining feature of Bayesian reasoning is that prior beliefs affect inferences that will be drawn. Bayesian models of language interpretation, accordingly, predict that prior beliefs about the world should affect the listener’s interpretation of an utterance
* Introduces a world in which the listener can revise her beliefs about the domain under discussion
  + Introduce a lifted variable corresponding to the choice of state prior
    - The prior depends on a ‘wonkiness’ variable w which determines if it is the usual prior for this domain or a more generic back-off prior that we take to be uniform
  + If a given utterance cannot be explained by the usual prior because it is unlikely under any plausible world state s, the pragmatic listener infers that the world is wonky and backs off to the uniform prior
  + The wonkiness prior and speaker optimality are fit to optimize mean squared error
* Conclusion: listeners revise their assumptions about relevant priors as part of the computation of speaker meaning