I. Administration

A. Reading for next week – Lepore & Stone

B. New classroom participation grading scheme

C. Questions?

II. Motivation for the Book

A. They are interested in exploring “how best to think of language, collaboration, and meaning, in light of the developments in philosophy and linguistics since Grice (1957)” (p. 8)

B. In particular, they are interested in reconciling actual language use with these claims:

   1. “Utterances are contributions to joint activity

   2. What [utterances] communicate is public, and so can be shared

   3. Utterances can nevertheless prompt us to idiosyncratic and open-ended understandings of the world and one another” (p. 8)

C. Grice rules pragmatics, and in fact gave us a way in to the formal development of this aspects of meaning; however, the semantics/pragmatics distinction is “deeply contested” (p. 3), and in fact is confused given its foundation in Grice

D. What Grice suggests is a uniform strategy for developing the pragmatic meaning of utterances, which privileges rationality and is in many cases determinate; however, they argue that “it’s a mistake to think of the process [of identifying what speakers mean] as a matter of collaborative reasoning about speakers’ intentions—or any other uniform strategy” (p. 7)

III. Structure of the Book

A. Consider Grice on communication and the implications of this for the
semantics/pragmatics distinction

B. Present a case for thinking that much which is typically regarded as conversational implicature is in fact a part of the conventionally encoded meanings of sentences/utterances

C. Present a case for the more free-form, imaginative construction of meaning beyond the conventional than Grice allows for

D. Use the results of Parts II and III to sketch out a new theory of language and communication that draws on Lewis and dynamic semantics

IV. On Grice

A. Truisms

1. “Intention recognition is necessary for all collaboration” (p. 6)

2. “… communication requires the audience to recognize the speaker’s intended interpretation of her utterance” (p. 12)

3. “Communication … requires success. A speaker communicates only if her audience gets the message” (p. 21)

B. Grice on Meaning

1. Role of intentions in Grice’s analysis of meaning

2. Relation of linguistic behavior to behavior more generally

3. Role of rationality as a source of norms for language and communication

C. Grice on Conversational Implicature

1. What is said and what is implicated

2. The Cooperative Principle and its maxims

   a. How to be cooperative in conversation

   b. Expectations and the pre-eminence of rationality – creating the need for an additional chunk of meaning (e.g., by flouting)

3. Conversational implicature

   a. “By saying $p$, the speaker conversationally implicates that $q$ just in case she is presumed to be following the maxims or at
least the Cooperative Principle; and the supposition that she is aware or thinks that \( q \) is required in order to maintain that she is following these maxims; and she thinks (and would expect her audience to think that she thinks) that it is within the competence of her audience to work out or grasp intuitively that the supposition that \( q \) is required” (pp. 20-1)

b. Cancelability

c. Calculability

d. Non-detachibility

e. Simplification (e.g., reduces reliance on ambiguity)

D. Three essential claims

1. Because meaning is “intimately intertwined with interlocutors’ intentions in contributing to conversation”, rationality occupies a pre-eminent place at the interface of semantics and pragmatics (p. 36)

2. “Contributions to conversation have an analogous status, whether they follow from principles of rationality or the conventions of meaning” (p. 36)

3. “Principles of rationality distill normative considerations” (p. 36)

V. Beyond Grice

A. Stalnaker

1. Possible worlds & direct reference

2. The need for conversational implicature to save the day – e.g., “Hesperus and Phosphorus”

B. Thomasson

1. Presupposition and presupposition triggers

2. *Rule of accommodation*: interlocutors make their intentions known, and they accommodate the intentions of others, removing obstacles and rectifying potential problems so that a speaker’s communicative intentions can go through.

3. This can involve attributing something like conversational implicatures.