Einführung in die Pragmatik und Texttheorie
Übungsblatt 1: Implikaturen

1. Erklären Sie, was Grice mit „meaning-nn" meint.

Solution Grice makes a distinction between *natural meaning* (also: literal meaning, sentence meaning, what is said) and *non-natural meaning* (also: meaning-nn, speaker meaning). Whereas the natural meaning covers what is literally said, meaning-nn includes also inferences that are **intended by the speaker** to be recognized by the hearer, which Grice calls **implicatures**. However, it does not include all possible inferences that can be drawn from what is said and all the knowledge of the world.

2. Warum verstehen kleine Kinder Ironie nicht? Warum verstehen sie z. B. *Sprachwissenschaft ist faszinierend* nur wörtlich und nie ironisch gemeint, d. h. als *Sprachwissenschaft ist langweilig*?

Solution Irony relies on exploitation of conventions, i.e., it exploits the co-operation principle, in particular the Quality Maxim. In order to recognize irony, a hearer must first recognize that the utterance is blatantly false or absurd, and then derive the opposite meaning as an implicature. However, small children can't handle this, they take utterances at face value, i.e. they assume that their conversation partners are straightforwadly cooperative.

3. Nennen Sie die „konversationellen Maximen" von Grice und erläutern Sie, was die jeweiligen Maximen besagen.

Solution

1. **Quality:** Try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:
   (i) do not say what you believe to be false
   (ii) do not say that for which you lack evidence

2. **Quantity:**
   (i) Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange
   (ii) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

3. **Relevance:** Make your contribution relevant

4. **Manner:** Be perspicuous, specifically:
   (i) avoid obscurity, (ii) avoid ambiguity, (iii) be brief, (iv) be orderly

4. Welche Quantitätsimplikaturen sind mit folgenden Sätzen assoziiert?
   (a) *Jan hat vier Kinder.*
   (b) *Das Pferd ist weiß.*

Solution (a) QCI: Jan has no more than four children.
(b) QCI: The horse is only white.

5. Gegeben sei der Dialog:

    A: Ich kaufe etwas für die Kinder.

    B: OK, aber kein E.I.S.

Welche Maxime wird verletzt und welcher **Typ** von Implikatur wird erzeugt?

$\boxed{\text{Solution}}$ Spelling words violates the maxim of Manner. If speaker **flouts** a maxim in an obvious and deliberate way, hearer still assumes cooperation and draws the inferences needed to explain this violation. These are **non-standard CIs**. The NSCI in this example is: B does not want ice-creams mentioned directly in front of the children.

---

6. Nennen und definieren Sie die formellen Eigenschaften von konversationellen Implikaturen.

$\boxed{\text{Solution}}$ Conversational implicatures are:

Defeasible: An inference is defeasible if it is possible to cancel it by adding new premises to the original ones.

Calculable: CIs are calculable in that it is possible to construct an argument of the type described above, showing how from (i) the literal meaning of the utterance and (ii) the cooperative principle and (iii) the maxims, it follows that the hearer would make the inference in question to preserve the assumption of coooperation.

    Calculating a CI: S implicates q if:

    (i)   S says p

    (ii)   There is no reason to think that S is not observing the cooperative principle

    (iii)   In order for S to say that p and be indeed observing the cooperative principle, S must think that q

    (iv)   S must know that it is mutual knowledge that q must be supposed if S is taken to be cooperative

    (v)   S has done nothing to stop me think that q

Non-detachable: An inference is non-detachable if it is attached to the semantic content of what is said rather than to its linguistic form, i.e., the same conversational implicatures hold for synonymous expressions.

Non-conventional: Conversational implicatures are non-conventional in that they are not part of the conventional meaning of an utterance. This is because:

- CIs are defeasible (truth-conditional meaning isn't).
- The literal meaning of an utterance needs to be known before its CIs can be computed
- An utterance can be true while its CI is false (if CIs were part of the conventional meaning the utterance would then be seen as false).

7. Geben Sie ein Beispiel, in dem eine Implikatur (i) suspendiert ist, (ii) explizit negiert ist. Gilt in solchen Fällen die Implikatur?

Solution

John has three children.
standard CI: John has no more than three children.
(i) *John has three children if not more.*
(the SCI that John has no more than three children is **suspended**)
(ii) *John has three children, in fact, he has four.*
(the SCI that John has no more than three children is **denied**=negated)
The implicatures do not hold in these cases.

9. Welche Eigenschaft von konversationellen Implikaturen wird durch das folgende Beispiel illustriert?
  (a) *Jan ist genial.*
  (b) *Jan ist ein Genie.*
  (c) *Jan ist sehr klug.*
  Gemeinsame Qualitätsimplikatur: *Jan ist ein Dummkopf.*

Solution The example illustrates the propoerty of non-detachability, i.e., that they are attached to the semantic content of what is said rather than to its linguistic form. The sentences are (nearly) synonymous, but they give rise to the same conversational implicatures.

10. Welcher Typ von Quantitätsimplikatur ist I1?
  Einige Jungen sind klug.
  I1: *Nicht alle Jungen sind klug.*

Solution Il is a scalar quantity implicature, i.e., a weaker statement according to a scale implicates that a stronger statement along the same scale doe not hold. I1 is based on the scale ⟨all, most, many, some, few ⟩.

11. Was ist ein „scale"? Geben Sie ein paar Beispiele.

Solution A linguistic scale consists of a set of linguistic alternates, or contrastive expressions of the same grammatical category, which can be arranged in linear order by degree of informativeness or semantic strength. Such a scale has the general form of an ordered set of scalar predicates $\langle e_1, e_2, ...e_n \rangle$ where if we substitute the scalar predicates in a sentence A, then $A(e_1)$ entails $A(e_2)$ ... entails $A(e_n)$, but not the other way round.

⟨ *all, most, many, some, few* ⟩, ⟨ *none, not all* ⟩
⟨ *n, . . . , 5, 4, 3, 2, 1* ⟩, ⟨ *and, or* ⟩,
⟨ *excellent, good* ⟩, ⟨ *hot, warm* ⟩,
⟨ *necessarily p, p, possibly p* ⟩,
⟨ *certain that p, probable that p, possible that p* ⟩,
⟨ *always, often, sometimes* ⟩, ⟨ *must, should, may* ⟩,
⟨ *succeed in Ving, try to V, want to V* ⟩, ⟨ *adore, love, like* ⟩

12. Welche klausale Implikatur wird mit folgendem Beispiel assoziiert und warum?
    Ich glaube, dass Jan weg ist.

Solution Clausal quality implicature: I do not know whether Jan is away.
The implicature arises because:
(i) The sentence contains an embedded expression *Jan ist weg* and
(ii) the sentence does not entail or presuppose *Jan ist weg* (i.e., it does not commit the speakr to it), and
(iii) there is a an alternative expression, i.e., *Ich weiß daß Jan weg ist*, which contains and entails *Jan ist weg.*
Therefore, by asserting the given sentence rather than *Ich weiß daß Jan weg ist*, speaker implicates that she does not know whether *Jan ist weg* is true or false.

13. Welche Implikaturen werden mit folgendem Beispiel assoziiert? Warum?
    Einige, wenn nicht alle, Studenten streiken.

Solution This is a case where the implicatures of an expression are not the sum of its implicatures, because some implicatures cancel others.
    (i) Scalar Implicature of "some": Not all of the students strike.
    (ii) Clausal Implicature of "if": Possibly all of the students strike.
    Although (i) and (ii) are inconsistent, the sentence is well-formed. Intuitively, the clausal implicature cancels the scalar implicature.