

If speaker S says that p, then S conversationally implicates that q if:

1. S is presumed to be observing the CP
2. To make S's saying that p consistent with (1), one must assume S believes that q
3. S thinks (and expects the hearer to think that S thinks) that the hearer is competent to figure out that (2)

Example:

A: "How is Tom getting on in his job?"

B: "Oh, very well, I think; he likes his colleagues, and he hasn't been to prison yet."

Implicatum: Tom is the sort of person likely to yield to the temptation provided by his occupation

Maxim: Relevance appears to be infringed. But one must assume that it is not being infringed, so the odd second conjunct must be somehow relevant. The implicatum proposed explains how it is relevant.

Particularised vs generalised conversational implicatures

For some types of sentences, an implicature has become almost a cliché. We can speak of a 'generalised conversational implicature'. These are sentences that normally (i.e. in the absence of special circumstances) carry an implicature. A hearer using a sentence of such types on an occasion can exploit an audience's awareness of this general usage of the sentence, making it quite obvious to hear what the speaker means with their utterance.

Following the characterisation of the sentence meaning of utterance types, we can say for generalised conversational implicature that (timelessly) the sentence "x' implies that q' is equivalent (roughly) to a statement or disjunction of statements about what people, vaguely construed, imply conversationally by uttering tokens of 'x' on particular occasions.

Such generalised conversational implicatures do perhaps not require a hearer to work out the presence of the implicature, as long as they are aware of the normal use of the sentence. However, it is still the case that to make S's saying that p consistent with S's observing CP, we must assume that *S implicates more than what the sentence S uses means*.

Conventional implicature

It is possible for the implicature to become more than a cliché. An implicature is *conventional* if and only if the implicature can no longer be separated from the conventional meaning of the sentence. This inseparability can be detected through the following test. Sometimes we are able to *cancel* an implicature by adding a clarification to the sentence (for this idea see Grice 1961).

- i. "Tim's handwriting is exceptional." (Particular conversational implicature)
"Tim's handwriting is exceptional, though I'm not implying that he's not a good student as well." (Cancelled)
- ii. "My head literally exploded." (Generalised conversational implicature)
"My head literally exploded, though of course I mean that figuratively." (Cancelled)
- iii. "She is English; she is, therefore, brave." (Conventional implicature)
"She is English; she is, therefore, brave—though I don't mean she's brave because she's English." (??)

This allows us to construct a clear theory of implicature:

- I. If and only if an utterance means more than what is said with the utterance, an additional meaning is implied or implicated: the sentence has an implicature
 - A. This implicature is conversational if and only if understanding what the utterance means requires a hearer to assume that the speaker implicates more than what the sentence S uses means
 1. This conversational implicature is generalised if and only if the implicature has become part of its normal usage, i.e. it has become cliché
 - B. The implicature in (I) is conventional if and only if one cannot cancel out the implicature by adding a clarification of the sentence's meaning