

April 9, 2008

1.

For each dialogue, answer the accompanying question based on the implicature that you can draw from the second speaker's response. Think about why you drew those implicatures.

- (a) Carmen: Did you get the milk and the eggs?
Dave: I got the milk.
Did Dave buy the eggs?
- (b) Carmen: Did you manage to fix that leak?
Dave: I tried to.
Did Dave fix the leak?
- (c) Faye: I hear you've invited Mat and Chris.
Ed: I didn't invite Mat.
Did Ed invite Chris?
- (d) Steve: What happened to your flowers?
Jane: A dog got into the garden.
Did the dog belong to Jane?

2.

If you were Jane, what implicatures would you have drawn from each of Steve's responses?

- (a) Jane: Who used all the printer paper?
Steve: I used some of it.
- (b) Jane: I hear you're always late with the rent.
Steve: Well, sometimes I am.
- (c) Jane: Mike and Annie should be here by now. Was their plane late?
Steve: Possibly.

Now look at this dialogue. Would you normally infer that Steve had not kept the cheese in the freezer?

- (d) Jane: This cheese looks funny. The label said to store it in a cool place.
Steve: Yeah, I did.

3.

Now examine those implicatures in light of the following information known only to Steve. Would you say that Steve was lying to Jane in Exercise 2? Why?

- (a) Steve has in fact used all the printer paper.
- (b) Steve has been late with the rent every month since he moved in.
- (c) Steve knows for a fact that the plane was late because Mike and Annie called him from the airport.
- (d) Steve had absentmindedly put the cheese in the freezer and thawed it out before dinner hoping that Jane wouldn't notice.

4.

Look at each of these dialogues and the implicatures which appear in brackets. Then decide what knowledge the speaker and hearer would have to share in order for that implicature to be drawn:

- (a) Tom: Are you going to Mark's party tonight?
Annie: My parents are in town. (No)

- (b) Tom: Where's the salad dressing?
Gabriela: We've run out of olive oil. (There isn't any salad dressing)
- (c) Steve: What's with your mother?
Jane: Let's go into the garden. (I can't talk about it in here)
- (d) Mat: Want some fudge brownies?
Chris: There must be 20,000 calories there. (No)

5.

Here are four dialogues where Annie has 'cancelled' either a presupposition contained in her utterance or an implicature that could be drawn from her utterance (the cancellation comes after the 'dash'). Do you notice a difference between presuppositions and implicatures when they are cancelled?

- (a) Cancelling an existential presupposition:
Mike: What happened?
Annie: Steve's dog wrecked the garden - and in fact, Steve doesn't have a dog.
- (b) Cancelling a 'lexical' presupposition:
Mike: What's up?
Annie: I've stopped smoking - although I've never smoked.
- (c) Cancelling a generalized implicature:
Mike: What's happened to the shampoo?
Annie: I used most of it - actually, I used all of it.
- (d) Cancelling a particularized implicature:
Mike: Are you coming to the party?
Annie: My parents are in town - but I am coming.

6.

Apply the cancellation test we used in Exercise 5.5 to decide whether each of the inferences in brackets is a presupposition or an implicature.

- (a) Linda: What's with Jean?
Jen: She discovered that her central heating's broken. (Her central heating is broken')
- (b) Terry: How do you like your bath?
Phil: Warm. ('I don't like it hot')
- (c) Annie: What do you think of this necklace and bracelet?
Mike: The bracelet is beautiful. ('The necklace is not beautiful')
- (d) Lois: Has the kitchen been painted?
Gabriela: Tom's away. ('No')
- (e) Jane: Have you seen my sweater?
Steve: There's a sweater on the sofa. (It's not Steve's sweater')
- (f) Mike: How come Mary's all dressed up?
Annie: We're going to the D-E-N-T-I-S-T. ('Mary hates the dentist')
- (g) Austin: It works now.
Barbara: When did Eric fix it? (Tric fixed it')

7.

Which of the inferences in Exercise 6 are generalized implicatures? Which ones are particularized implicatures?

8.

Apply the cancellation test we used in Exercises 5 and 6 to decide whether each of the inferences in brackets is a presupposition or an implicature. For the implicatures, decide whether they are generalized or particularized.

- (a) Mike: I heard about the mess.
Dave: Yeah, Steve really regrets sending that e-mail. (`Steve sent that e-mail')
- (b) Patrick: I didn't take it.
Virginia: Why do you always lie? (`You always lie')
- (c) Doris: Did Carmen like the party?
Dave: She left after an hour. (`She didn't like the party')
- (d) Mat: How did you do on those exams?
Chris: I failed physics. (`I didn't fail the others')
- (e) Reporter: Senator, what is the present state of your marriage?
Senator: Well, we, I think have been able to make some very good progress and it's - I would say that it's - it's - it's delightful that we're able to - to share the time and the relationship that we - that we do share. (`The marriage is not in a good state')
- (f) Steve: Did you buy the car?
Ed: It cost twice as much as I thought it would. (`Ed didn't buy the car')
- (g) Maggie: The bathroom's flooded!
James: Someone must have left the tap on. (`It wasn't James who left the tap on')

9.

For the particularized implicatures in Exercises 6 and 8, what sort of particular or 'local' knowledge is needed to draw that implicature? What sorts of general knowledge do they require? Try writing scenarios where changing the 'local' knowledge would lead to quite different implicatures.

10.

We have pointed out that generalized implicatures tend to be based on a flouting of the quantity maxim. That is, on the surface they are noticeably less informative than we would expect. What maxim or maxims were flouted in each of the particularized implicatures in Exercise 6?

11.

There is a semantic relationship between words called hyponymy. Here are some examples of hyponymy:

Hyponym	Super-ordinate
rose	flower
salmon	fish
hammer	tool

In the relation of HYPONYMY the meaning of the SUPERORDINATE term is included in the meaning of the HYPONYM. That is, the meaning of rose includes the meaning of flower. We can also say that the hyponym is 'a kind of the super-ordinate. For example, a rose is a kind of flower. Note also that the entailment relationship between hyponyms and their super-ordinates is one-way. For example, I picked a rose entails I picked a flower, but I picked a flower does not necessarily entail I picked a rose. **Discuss the types of implicatures that can be drawn in the following dialogues which exploit the relation of hyponymy. Would you class some of these as generalized implicatures?**

- (a) Mike: Did you buy her a rose?
Annie: I bought her a flower.
- (b) Jane: There's salmon on the menu.
Steve: I don't like fish.
- (c) Ed: Be careful of that sofa.
Meridyth: It's a piece of furniture, Dad.
- (d) Mat: So you've taken up teaching.
Chris: It's a job.

12.

Can AUXILIARY VERBS like *should*, *may*, *might*, *must*, *will* create scalar implicatures? For example, compare *You should wash the dishes* and *You must wash the dishes*.