Linguistics - Lesson 19 - 2023/01/12

ʔθðʃʒmŋd͡ʒʌ

Pragmatics cont.

In semantics we were talking about entailments - cannot be cancelled

In pragmatics we are talking about implicature, which can be cancelled and are context dependent.

One of the ways we draw implicatures are through violations of Grice's Maxims (Grice 1975)

- Quality
- Quantity
- Relevance
- Manner

Quantity -

TMI:

Q: Where is the students union?

A: Get up, close your notebook, leave the room, go downstairs, leave the building, etc...

Usually Manner is not sufficient on its own to draw implicature, but sometimes it can.

a) John washed the dishes and cleaned the room

b) John washed the dishes and *then* cleaned the room

$$a \not\Rightarrow b$$

a does not imply b, since a does not specify order, but it does strongly imply it.

---

a) John was running in the park and singing

The sentence does not entail the two actions were simultaneous, but it strongly implies it

---

a) I tasted the cake

b) I didn't eat the whole cake

---

a) John was a candidate for a nobel prize

b) John didn't win a nobel prize

---

a) John has three children

b) John doesn't have four children

In all three above pairs we do not have entailment, but we do have strong implicature

The reason for all of these implicatures is the **degree** of information.

Ate the whole cake > tasted the cake

Won a prize > Was a candidate

4 children > 3 children

In all three cases we are talking about the **degree** of information. In all three converstations, if the stronger information were true, the speaker would have said so. When the speaker provided the weaker information, we **assume** the stronger information is untrue, because why would the speaker not have said so.

Once the stronger information is not said, we *draw the implicature* that it is not true.

This is called a **scalar implicature**.

Q: Have you ever tasted this kind of cake?

A: Yes, I even ate a whole cake

---

a) (for (e) even) John passed the test

b) John didn't fail the test **entailed by (a)**

c) John likes pizza **not an implicature or entailment**

d) John didn't receive 100 on the test **can be implied by (a) or (b)**

e) The speaker didn't expect John to pass the test / It is surprising that John passed the test **Not exactly an entailment, but can't exactly be cancelled. Provided information about attitude/mood**, This is called **conventional implicature**.

- implication

- entailment - cannot be cancelled
- coversational implicature (including scalar) - can be cancelled depending on context
- Conventional implicature - somewhere inbetween an entailment and a conversational implicature. To a great extent - they cannot be cancelled.

Context: John and Mary are a couple

a) John likes theatre and Mary likes movies

b) John likes theatre but Mary likes movies

The same two fact are reported in the two sentences, but the selection of the word *but* instead of the word *and* affects how we perceive the relationship between the two facts. In the second sentence causes us to perceive a conflict between the two fact. This too is an example of **conventional implicature**.

c) The speaker perceives it as conflict

Entailments provide information about facts. **Conventional implicature** relates to speakers **attitude** to fact or to the **relation** between facts.

Conventional implicature is about discourse markers and **** that *code* a given *perception* about the facts.

Entailment - about the facts and cannot be cancelled

Conversational implicature - Always cancellable, can sometimes be explained in relation to the four maxims, If there is a violation we should say so. There is also *scalar implicature* which is about the degree of information.

Converstaional implicature - The are not usually cancellable but provide information about the relation between the facts or about the speakers attitude about the facts.

- Semantics
  - Truth conditions semantics - formal semantics
  - Lexical semantics

Lexical semantics

Examines words, the relation between them and how they change.

Here we talk about ambiguity, where the word can mean multiple different things depending on the context.

bank$_1$

bank$_2$

smells$_1$

smells$_2$

knows$_1$

nose$_2$

- pronounciation
- spelling
- bank - **homonymy**
  Same pronounciation and same spelling
  Not related
- smells - **polysemy**
  Same pronounciation and same spelling
  relation between meanings, same semantic field
- [nauz] - **homophony**
  Same pronounciation, different spelling
  Not related
- **homography**
  Sam espelling different pronounciation
  yaldut
  yeladot
  miskenot
  mesaknot

---

semantic shift/drift

meat

Usually involves diacronic knowledge, but can also give much insight to synchronic knowledge.

reflexive verbs

a) John washed himself

b) John washed

c) $\text{raxa}\widehat{\text{ts}}$

c) $\text{hitraxe}\widehat{\text{ts}}$ - May imply a *full* action

$\text{raxa}\widehat{\text{ts}}$ et hapanim