

The dynamic turn I

Patrick D. Elliott & Danny Fox

September 13, 2020

24.954: Pragmatics in Linguistic Theory

1 Recap: Stalnakerian pragmatics

1.1 Trivalence

A sentential meaning is a function $p : W \mapsto \{1, 0, \#\}$. Here's a simple example:

$$(1) \quad \llbracket \text{Sarah's corgi is sleepy} \rrbracket = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{Sarah has a corgi \& Sarah's corgi is sleepy} \\ 0 & \text{Sarah has a corgi \& Sarah's corgi isn't sleepy} \\ \# & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

In trivalent semantics, the *semantic presupposition of a sentence* S is the set of worlds w , such that $\llbracket S \rrbracket w$ is either true or false.

- (2) The semantic presupposition of S (def.),
 $S^\pi := \{ w \mid \llbracket S \rrbracket w = 1 \vee \llbracket S \rrbracket w = 0 \}$

1.2 Update and Stalnaker's bridge

The *update* induced by a sentence S , written as $c[S]$ is a partial function $u : W \mapsto W$.

- (3) Stalnakerian update (def.)
$$c[S] := \begin{cases} \{ w \mid w \in c \wedge \llbracket S \rrbracket w \} & c \subseteq S^\pi \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

A (bivalent) proposition p is *redundant* wrt a context set c if $c \subseteq \{ w \mid p w \}$.

Stalnaker's bridge places a precondition on an update of c by S — S^π must be *redundant* wrt C .

1.3 Successive update

A (trivial?) observation: updating c with a sentence S can make the presupposition of a sentence S' redundant, thus ensuring that $c[S']$ is guaranteed to be defined.

- (4) Sarah has a corgi. Sarah's corgi is sleepy.

Stalnakerian pragmatics directly captures this, since successive assertion gives rise to a successive update.

We can write a successive update of c with S followed by S' as $c[S][S']$.

- (5) $c[S][S'] := (c[S])[S']$

$$c[\text{Sarah has a corgi}] = \overbrace{\{ w \mid w \in c \wedge \text{Sarah has a corgi in } w \}}^{c'}$$

$$c'[\text{Sarah's corgi is sleepy}] = \begin{cases} \{ w \mid w \in c' \wedge \text{Sarah's corgi is sleep in } w \} & c \cap \{ w \mid \text{Sarah has a corgi in } w \} \\ & \subseteq \{ w \mid \text{Sarah has a corgi in } w \} \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$c'[\text{Sarah's corgi is sleepy}] = \{ w \mid w \in c' \wedge \text{Sarah's corgi is sleep in } w \}$$

1.4 Towards an update semantics

Successive assertion patterns with *conjunction* wrt presupposition projection (Danny's handout from last week; Karttunen's generalization).

A natural way of cashing this out: a conjunctive sentence induces successive update.

- (6) Conjunctive sentences in update semantics (def.)
 $c[S \text{ and } S'] := c[S][S']$

What kind of rule is this? It looks very much like a *construction-specific* update rule.