

Philosophy of Logic and Language
Pragmatics
(Conventional and conversational implicatures)

Primary Readings

- (!) Grice, P., 'Logic and Conversation', in Grice, P., *Studies in the Ways of Words*, Harvard University Press (1989). (Reprinted in Davis, S. (ed.), *Pragmatics: a Reader*, OUP (2001)).
- (!) Grice, P., 'Further notes on logic and Conversation', in Grice, P., *Studies in the ways of Words*.
- (!) Sadtok, J., 'On testing for conversational implicature', in Davis, (ed.), *Pragmatics: a reader*.
- Bach, K., 'Conversational implicature', *Mind and language* 9 (1994), pp.124-162.
- Recanti, F., 'The pragmatics of what is said', in *Mind and Language* 4 (1989), pp. 295-239.
- Salmon, N., 'The pragmatic fallacy', *Philosophical Studies* 63 (1991), pp.83-97.
- Bach, K., 'The myth of conventional implicature', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22, (1999), pp. 367-421.

Background Readings:

- Lycan, W., *The Philosophy of Language*, ch. 13.

Questions:

- (1) Is there a clear distinction between what a sentence literally says, what it *conventionally* implies and what it *conversationally* implies?
- (2) What is the relation between speaker meaning and conversational implicatures?
- (3) How, if at all, do the words 'and' and 'but' differ in meaning?