

The Cooperative Principle

following Paul Grice 'Logic and conversation' in P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (eds.):
Syntax and Semantics Volume 3: Speech Acts. Academic Press 1975, p.48

Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

The maxims

Quantity

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Quality Try to make your contribution one that is true.

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Relation Be relevant.

Manner Be perspicuous.

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.

Example: Man: *Does your dog bite?*
 Woman: *No.* (The man reaches down to pet the dog.
 The dog bites the man's hand.)
 Man: *Ouch! Hey! You said your dog doesn't bite.*
 Woman: *He doesn't. But that's not my dog.*

Hedges

They indicate that the **speakers are not only aware of the maxims**, but also want to show that they are **trying to observe them**.

1. *So, to cut a long story short, we grabbed our stuff and ran.*
2. *As far as I know, they're married.*
3. *I don't know if this is important, but some of the files are missing.*
4. *I'm not sure if this makes sense, but the car had no lights.*

Some more examples:

- *Not to change the subject, but is this related to the subject?*
- *I won't bore you with all the details, but it was an exciting trip.*
- *I may be mistaken, but I thought I saw a wedding ring on her finger.*
- *This may be a bit confused, but I remember being in a car.*

Types of implicature (conversational and conventional)

Conversational implicature

Jane: *I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.* *b & c?*
Paul: *Ah, I brought the bread.* *b (+>NOTc)*

Note! The sign +> means implies.

Scalar implicatures (type of conversational implicature)

There are many scalar implicatures produced by the use of expressions that may not be considered part of any scale (e.g. likelihood, obligation, coldness)

< *all, most, many, some, few* >

< *always, often, sometimes* >

Examples:

1. *I'm studying linguistics and I've completed some of the required courses.*
2. *They're sometimes really interesting.*

When speakers correct themselves, they typically cancel one of the scalar implicatures.

Generalized conversational implicature

(when no special background knowledge of the context of utterance is required to make the necessary inferences)

Example: *I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence.*
an X +> not speaker's X

Particularized conversational implicature

(when some locally recognized inferences are required to work out the conveyed meanings)

- Examples:
1. Rick: *Hey, coming to the wild party tonight?*
Tom: *My parents are visiting.*
 2. Leila: *Whoa! Has your boss gone crazy?*
Mary: *Let's go get some coffee.*

Sometimes the answer is so obvious that the question does not need to be asked, as in the following:

3. Bert: *Do you like ice-cream?*
Ernie: *Is the Pope Catholic?* ('Obviously, yes!')
4. Bert: *Do vegetarians eat hamburgers?*
Ernie: *Do chickens have lips?* ('Of course not!')

Examples:

1. *You have won five dollars!* (implies: +> ONLY five)
- 2.a. *You've won at least five dollars!*
- 2.b. *You've won five dollars, in fact, you've won ten!*
- 2.c. *You've won five dollars, that's four more than one!*

Conversational implicatures can be calculated, suspended, cancelled, and reinforced. None of these properties apply to conventional implicatures.

Conventional implicature

- isn't based on the Cooperative Principle or the maxims
- doesn't have to occur in conversation
- doesn't depend on special contexts for its interpretation
- is associated with specific words (e.g. *but, even, yet*)

- Examples:
- 1.a. *Mary suggested black, but I chose white.*
b. *p & q (+>p is in contrast to q)*
 - 2.a. *Dennis isn't here yet.* (=NOT p)
b. *NOT p is true (+>p expected to be true later)*

Different 'meanings' of 'and' in English as examples of conventional implicature in different structures.

- Examples:
1. *Yesterday, Mary was happy and ready to work.*
(p & q, +> p plus q) two statements with static information
- *and* implies 'in addition' or 'plus'
 2. *She put on her clothes and left the house.*
(p & q, +> q after p) two statements with dynamic, action-related information
- *and* implies 'and then' and indicates sequence