I. Administration
A. Reading for Thursday – Lepore & Stone through p. 195
B. Questions?

II. The Gricean Target
A. Specific: Group A implicatures – where it is not clear that the CP (or any of its maxims) has been violated
B. General:
   1. The idea that there is non-conventional, non-truth-conditional content that is added to the conventionalized, semantic meaning of utterances via pragmatic enrichment
   2. L&S argue that much more of it is conventional than we would have thought
   3. Or more provocatively: conversational implicatures do no theoretical work in a mature theory of language

III. Other Conventional Responses
A. L&S allow that there are others who have proposed conventional explanations of data like these, including Horn & Levinson and Grice himself
B. Horn & Levinson: they also agree that the content elements identified are grammatical, but they offer accounts of the grammatical nature of these elements that doesn’t emphasize their conventionality and is also different from the way in which L&S prefer to think about semantics (i.e., they are lexical or processing accounts, rather than accounts involving logical form)
C. Grice:
   1. *Conventional implicatures*:
      a. Examples: ‘therefore’, ‘but’
b. These are cases in which there is conventionalized meaning that is non-truth-conditional but nevertheless a part of the total content of an utterance.

c. This is a story that could be extended by the Gricean to cover the data considered by L&S.

2. Are the content elements that L&S identify merely conventional implicatures? They admit that it could be taken this way. The next section is intended to expand the scope of content considerations in a way that will make it difficult for the Gricean to lean on this in general.

IV. The Data from Chs. 6-8

A. Chapter 6: indirect speech acts; speech acts understood as indicating discourse relations (i.e., discourse-level meaning that is recovered from speech acts) → these are handled by expanding what counts as conventional aspects of grammar.

B. Chapter 7: pronominal anaphora, temporal anaphora, tense, aspect → these are handled with discourse referents, which are cashed out in terms of updates to common ground, understood as involving presupposition and attention.

C. Chapter 8: marked prosody, scalar implicatures → these are handled with information structure understood as being closely related to intonation patterns in English.

D. In general, L&S want to expand the role of grammar, broadly construed to include discourse structure and phonological aspects of language, in explaining specific content elements added to utterance interpretation.

V. Summary: The Three Purposes of L&S in Part II

A. They have sought to challenge the Gricean orthodoxy that many Group A-type interpretive effects are the result of general interpretive principles.

B. Defend the idea that disambiguation plays a much bigger role in explaining specific interpretive effects that are considered to be CIs by Griceans.

C. Critique specific arguments made by Griceans, thereby defending a disambiguation account over a reinterpretation account.