Conventional Implicatures
(Mostly Potts 2005 Ch. 2; Kratzer 1999, Bayer and Obenauer 2009)

1. Data on Conventional Implicatures (CIs)
   - Recall our old picture of how to classify the different pieces of information or implications of a sentence. We add yet another type of implication along the vertical axis: CONVENTIONAL IMPICATURE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Literal meaning alone</th>
<th>Literal meaning plus Gricean reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Info presented as newly asserted information; at-issue content of sentence</td>
<td>ENTAILMENTS ( \Rightarrow ) CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURES +s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info presented as already assumed in conversation; content taken for granted by the sentence</td>
<td>PRESUPPOSITIONS ( \eta ) (CONVERSATIONALLY-TRIGGERED PRESUPPOSITIONS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info presented not as at-issue, but as a side comment of the speaker</td>
<td>CONVENTIONAL IMPLICATURES</td>
<td>***************</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIs do not introduce at-issue content; that is, they do not constitute what is being asserted. Rather, “CI expressions are used to guide the discourse in a particular direction or to help the hearer to better understand why the at-issue content is important at that stage.” (Potts 2005:7)

- Typical TEXTBOOK EXAMPLES (Grice 1975):
  1. **John is an Englishman but cowardly.**
     a. (At-issue) entailment: John is English and John is cowardly.
     b. CI: John's being cowardly is unexpected given his being an Englishman.
  2. **John is an Englishman; he is, therefore, brave.**
     a. (At-issue) entailment: John is English and John is brave.
     b. CI: John's being brave is a consequence his being an Englishman.

- To these type of examples (which he does not further analyze), Potts adds two main classes: suplements and expressives.

- SUPPLEMENTS are certain parenthetical constructions:
  - Appositives, non-restrictive Relative Clauses, and as-parentheticals:
    1. **a. Ames, the former spy, is now behind bars.**
    2. **b. Ames, who stole from the FBI, is now behind bars.**
    3. **c. Ames was, as the press reported, a successful spy.**

- EXPRESSIVES:
  - Expressive adjectives: e.g. damn, friggin’, bloody.
    1. **I haven't seen your damn dog!**
    2. **I have seen most bloody Monty Python sketches.**

- Expressive Noun Phrases, known as 'epithets':
  3. **Tommy sat down to eat. The little rascal was hungry.**
  4. **Smith has submitted a proposal for reform, but the stupid thing will not get anywhere.**

**QUESTION 1:** Characterize the entailments and CIs of (8) and (9) above and of their interrogative counterparts below. Are the CIs of the two versions the same?

- **Confidentially, Sal is about to get canned.**
- **Honesty, this dress does not suit you well.**

**QUESTION 2:** Characterize the entailments and CIs of (10)-(13).
• Honorifics: Among other honorifics, Japanese uses verbal honorific marking to indicate the speaker's relation to the grammatical subject (subject honorific in (14)) and/or the addressee (performative honorific in (15)).

(14) **Yamada sensei-ga o-warai-ni nat-ta.**
Yamada teacher-NOM *HON-laugh-DAT be-PERF
'Professor Yamada laughed.'

(15) **Ame ga furu-mashi-ta.**
rain SUBJ fall-*HON-PAST
'It rained.'

• Discourse particles, e.g. in German. [Data from Kratzer 1999]

(16) Context: Spencer is walking up the stairs in front of Webster.
Webster: *Du hast ja 'n Loch im Armel."
'There is JA a hole in your sleeve.'

(17) Context: Webster runs into Spencer at the bus stop:
Webster: *Du hast ja 'ne neue Frisur.
'You have JA a new hairdo.'

(18) Context: Webster asks Spencer: “Who did Austin marry?”
Spencer: *Austin hat ja Ashley geheiratet.
'Austin married JA Ashley.'

(19) Context: Webster has just become a father and he is breaking the news to Spencer:
Webster: *Wir haben ja eine Tochter.
'We have JA a daughter.'

(20) **Ja a** is appropriate in a context c if the proposition expressed by a in c is a fact of w. which, for all the speaker knows, might already be known to the addressee.

(21) Analysis of (16):
*Du hast ja 'n Loch im Armel*
a. (At-issue) entailment: You have a hole in your sleeve.
b. CI: For all the speaker knows, that the addressee has a hole of his sleeve might already be known to the addressee.

(22) Analysis of (18):
*Austin hat ja Ashley geheiratet.*
a. (At-issue) entailment: Austin married Ashley.
b. CI: For all the speaker knows, that Austin married Ashley might already be known to the addressee. ⇒ * in the context in (18).

**QUESTION 3:** What happens when two discourse particles appear in the same clause? To see this, compare the meaning of (21) with ja, (22) with *doch, and (23) with both ja and *doch. Formulate the pieces of information of (23) specifying if they are entailments or CIs.

(21) **Sie muss ja ihre Zwillinge versorgen.**
She must JA take care of her twins.

(22) **Sie muss *doch* ihre Zwillinge versorgen.**
She must DOCH take care of her twins.

(23) **Sie muss ja *doch* ihre Zwillinge versorgen.**
She must JA DOCH take care of her twins.

**QUESTION 4:** Kratzer reports a contrast in acceptability between (24a) and (24b) and between (25a) and (25b). What is, intuitively, the reason for this difference?

(24) a. **Tracy, die ja in Syracuse wohnt, wird kommen.**
'Tracy, who JA lives in Syracuse, will come.'
b. *Eine Kollegin, die ja in Syracuse wohnt, wird kommen.*
'A colleague who lives in Syracuse will come.'

(25) a. **Stacie hat ihren Job verloren, weil sie ja in der Gewerkschaft war.**
'Stacie lost her job, because she was JA in the union.'
b. *Jeder von diesen Arbeitern hat seinen Job verloren, weil er ja in der Gewerkschaft war.*
'Each of those workers lost his job because he JA was in the union.'
2. Tests to distinguish CIs from other implications.

2.1. CIs versus conversational implicatures.

- Conversational implicatures, which arise from Gricean reasoning in certain contexts, are defeasible. CIs are NOT defeasible.

26. Of course Nirit has four portable chairs! (In fact, she has six.)
   a. (At-issue) entailment: Nirit has at least four portable chairs.
   b. Conversational implicature: Nirit has exactly four portable chairs.

27. I haven't seen your damn dog! (# In fact, I like your dog.)
   a. (At-issue) entailment: I have not seen your dog.
   b. CI: I don't like your dog.

28. Ames, the former spy, is now behind bars. (# But is fact he was not a spy.)
   a. (At-issue) entailment: Ames is now behind bars.
   b. CI: Ames was a spy.

QUESTION 5: Construct examples to test (non-)defeasibility for German ja and doch.

2.2. CIs versus (at-issue) entailments.

- CIs are NOT semantically embeddef. That is, unlike at-issue material, CIs cannot be semantically embedded under other at-issue material. [In fact, according to Kratzer, CIs cannot be embedded inside other CIs either; see (21)-(23).]

29. If, unfortunately, SSV Reulingen loses the game, they will be out of the competition.
   a. (At-issue) entailment: If SSV Reulingen loses, then they'll be out.
   b. CI: SSV Reulingen losing would be unfortunate.

30. John is upset because it is obvious that Mary doesn’t love him.
   a. (At-issue) entailment: The obviousness of Mary's lack of love towards John upsets John.

31. John is upset because, obviously, Mary doesn't love him.
   a. (At-issue) entailment: Mary's lack of love towards John upsets John.
   b. CI: It is obvious that Mary does not love John.

32. Before the little rascal turned five, his parents had already bought him a bike.

33. Unless the criminal who recently escaped from Azkaban is captured, the ministry will send the dementors.

(34) Unless the criminal / Sirius Black, who recently escaped from Azkaban, is captured, the ministry will send the dementors.

QUESTION 6: Determine the (at-issue) entailments and CIs of (32)-(34).

- (At-issue) entailment material can be attributed to the speaker or to the subject of an attitude verb in the sentence. In constrast, CIs are always speaker-oriented.

35. Normal adjective:
   Leila thinks that the large dog might bite (though I don't find any of the dogs / the dog large at all.).
   a. (At-issue) entailment: Leila thinks that the large dog might bite.

36. Expressive adjective:
   Leila thinks that the bloody dog might bite (?)though I find the dog rather cute.
   a. (At-issue) entailment: Leila thinks that the dog might bite.
   b. CI: The spoken does not like the dog.
   - Leila does not like the dog.

QUESTION 7: Is (38) felicitous in the scenario below? Explain why / why not.

37. Scenario: While in his office, Obama sees the new statistics and exclaims: "The damn Republicans are gaining popularity!". As it turns out, McCain overhears this (through a bug) and then reports:

38. Obama thinks that the damn Republicans are gaining popularity.

- (At-issue) entailments can answer a question; CIs CANNOT ANSWER A QUESTION.

39. Ames, who stole from the FBI, is now behind bars.
   a. (At-issue) entailment: Ames is now behind bars.
   b. CI: Ames stole from the FBI.

40. Q: Where is Ames now?
   A: Ames, who stole from the FBI, is now behind bars.

41. Q: What crime did Ames commit?
   A: # Ames, who stole from the FBI, is now behind bars.

42. Q: What crime did Ames commit?
   A: Ames stole from the FBI and is now behind bars.

---

\(^1\) But Kratzer (1999) gives examples of discourse particles that allow for non-speaker-orientation:

\((i)\) **Jeder Zeugen behauptete, er habe ja mit eigenen Augen gesehen, dass....**

Each of the witnesses claimed he had **JA with own eyes seen that**
2.3. CIs versus presuppositions.

- Presupposition are not semantically embedded under holes, but they are embedded under plugs and receive a conditional form under filters. CIs are NOT EMBEDDABLE UNDER PLUGS and are NOT CONDITIONALIZED UNDER FILTERS.

  - Under holes: under negation, question, perhaps, imperative.

  a. John knows that the dog is bothersome.
  b. John doesn’t know that the dog is bothersome.
  c. Does John know that the dog is bothersome?
  d. Perhaps John knows that the dog is bothersome.
  e. Make sure that John knows that the dog is bothersome.

- Presupposition: The dog is bothersome.

  a. Paul is looking after Sheila's damn dog while she is on holiday.
  b. Paul is not looking after Sheila's damn dog while she is on holiday.
  c. Is Paul looking after Sheila's damn dog while she is on holiday?
  d. Perhaps Paul is looking after Sheila's damn dog while she is on holiday.
  e. Make sure that Paul is looking after Sheila's damn dog while she is on holiday.

- CI: Speaker does not like Sheila's dog.

- Under plugs: under say, think, etc.

  45) Leila thinks that the king of France is wise.

    - No Presupposition: There is a (unique) king of France.

  46) Leila thinks that the bloody dog might bite.

    - CI: Speaker does not like the dog.

    - Under filters: under and, if, then, etc.

  47) If France is a monarchy, then the king of France is wise.

    - Presupposition: If France is a monarchy, then there is a king of France.

  48) #If we are fans of the SSV Reutlingen, then, fortunately, the SSV Reutlingen won

    - If fortunately were a presupposition trigger rather than a CI-item, we would get the following presupposition: If we are fans of the SSV Reutlingen, then it is fortunate that the SSV Reutlingen won.

    - If we could get this presup, sentence (48) would sound ok.

    - (At-issue) entailment: If I'm a fan of SSV Reut then the SSV Reut won.

    - CI: It is fortunate that SSV Reut won.

    - But instead we get this, which, as a whole, is a funny thing to say.

- Presuppositions are backgrounded: they must be already guaranteed by the previous context (or else accommodated). CIs ARE ANTI-BACKGROUNDED: they are presented as new (on-the-side) information. In other words, stating the content of the presupposition explicitly in the previous discourse is fine, but stating the content of the CI explicitly in the previous discourse results in redundancy.

  49) Lance Armstrong survived cancer.

    a. And most riders know that Lance Armstrong is a cancer survivor.
    b. # When the reporters interview Lance, a cancer survivor, he often talks about the disease.

  50) If Sue is married, then she will regret being married.

  51) If Sue is married, then, regrettably, she is married.

    (# unless in the sense "White is white")

3. German particles and clause (sub-)types. (Bayer and Obenauer 2009)

- Consider plain information-seeking questions like (52). When the particles denn, bloß or schon are added, some extra CI meaning is conveyed.

  52) a. Wo habe ich meine Schüssel hingelegt?
    b. Wer zahlt gerne Steuern?

  53) Wo habe ich denn meine Schüssel hingelegt?

  54) Wo habe ich bloß meine Schüssel hingelegt?

  55) Wer zahlt schon gerne Steuern?

  QUESTION 9: Describe in your own words what CI meaning is conveyed by each particle.

- Stacking

  56) Wo bist du denn bloß den ganzen Tag gewesen?

    'Where on earth have you been the entire day (I am wondering)'

  57) * Wo bist du bloß denn den ganzen Tag gewesen?

  58) Wer zahlt denn schon gerne Steuern?

    'Who likes to pay taxes? (Nobody!)

  59) * Wer zahlt schon denn gerne Steuern?

- Syntactic constraint: the wh-phrase must have move passed the particle.

  60) Wie denkst du, dass es denn wo weitergehen soll mit euch?

    'How do you think that the two of you should carry on? (I’m wondering)'

  61) * Wem hast du denn erzählt, dass Karl denn recht hat?

    'Who did you tell that Karl was right?'

  QUESTION 10, open question!: How can we relate the meanings of the temporal schon, as in (62), and the question particle schon?

  62) Lucia is schon zu Hause.