

Orange = direct quotes "Logic and Conversation" H.P. Grice  
University of California, Berkeley  
Yellow = grammatical  
Pink = structural

Awbrey Collins  
Saint Edward's University – Linguistics  
Dr. Justin Cope

### Interpreting Philosophies of H. P. Grice

In order for Grice to establish formalities in language, listed, Grice uses a scenario in which "B" is a person whom is going to be explicit, responding to an every day rhetorical question, like how are you today?, in an asinine manner. In the same scenario, person "A" has just asked "B" how "C" is doing with his job. Person "B" responds "C" is doing well, he likes his colleagues and has yet to go to prison. "B"'s comment is subject to commonplace and can either be questioned or implicated for related information regarding "C"'s character or the characters around whom "C" is employed. What Grice makes clear is that "B" has either by choice or accident implied something encoded within his speech. (We must look at the encoding mainly for pretext; but also for friendly speech bias/variance; unfriendly flippant/facetious response to outside threat). Assuming "B" should not be mischievous, the erroneous response negates meaning from having had responded to "A" and the encounter entirely. (6)

Natural formation of language is called a formal device by Grice (1975). The formal devices can be inclusive of (not, and, or, if, some, the). When formal language is consistent in the uses of (not, and, or, if, some, the), divergencies and convergencies form in intra-personal interaction. In relation, the environment is not the context nor the contribution to society a valid response.

Grice explores two types of speakers who are rationalizing in responding; or in beginning a conversation, and speakers whom respond in context with their rationale in order to convey their idea or current momentum of thought, whom we will call formalists and informalists. Formalists are speakers that may explain through speaking analogously. Informalists' responses in a conversation usually avoid sayings and implicature, and may even avoid speaking altogether.

These two rival groups differ in that formalist prefer to use English expressions. The ideal language would lack smaller narrations and explanations which require interpretation. English expressions are something that are learned and are usually recorded in writing. Informalists reject using assumptions to contextualize their conversational habits. Informalists find importance in conversing the logic and reasoning behind meaning. Their rationale is usually in expressing conflict and converging towards a larger contextual basis. (2)

Grice agrees with rationalists because maxims and fundamental questions cannot exist without the principles they prescribe! Or, if we only spoke in sayings then we would never actually be able to identify anything. Grice mentions a quasi-contractual matter with parallels to outside the realm of discourse with which he agrees that when struggling with a concept, any feelings of exemption to the responsibility of the nature of the conversation is negligence.

In conversational exchanges, Grice philosophizes that conversational maxims are only relative to interest. If there is no interest, then the maxims he states have no purpose; or, their implicatures generate nonconventional purposes – implicate in the dictionary is defined as involving consequence, corollary (following of a point already proven), or natural inference; to bend together; to bring into intimate or incriminating connection. (1)

This conversational implicature is the philosophical discourse Grice uses to in order to discuss a brief understanding for Semantics and Pragmatics. The supermaxim is what Grice indicates is the common use of language in conversation. His critique entails you should avoid obscurity of expressions; avoid ambiguity; be brief avoiding unnecessary prolixity; be orderly. Also, he simplifies his

argument in stating that something you believe to be false should not be said, and saying something you have lack of adequate evidence of should not be said.

The scientific principle that Grice advises on is the uses from the arguments of Kant: use quantity as if the contributions are assisting the more or less required. An example is this is when asked to hand a couple, do not hand only two – hand atleast three. Use the quality of contirbutions in their genuinely constructed value of the response. An example is if you say you are building a railroad, do not talk about coffins that are burried in the ground in Louisiana because they were not afforded the concrete mosoleum. Treat your relation as a partnership and the contributions be appropriate to the immediate needs like mixing ingredients in a recipe. The last maxim is to observe manner among contributions, that in making partners and executing performance during a relationship, be allayed with your contractual agreements.

5

In using supermaxims, Grice comes to a dilemma. The common immediate aim may be transitory conversational interests that conflict with each other. Conversations that lead in a supermaxim leaves the partnership stranded. Contributions that lack mutual contributions devote themselves to a single party and cause their supermaxims to interact as static on a television. The rationale to understanding tacit transaction Grice applies to a premise of equality in agreement or the agreement should terminate. False consequence in question will fail to hold. Be perspicuous.

8

Fulfilling maxims becomes more and more complicated as the supermaxims expire and aspire to aluding lude behaviors and aluring the tempted mind into misbelief and mischief. So, violating the maxim at some point is liable to devalue the quality of an exchange and the maxims lose their manner causing contributions to elucidate the termination in the quantity that the requirments have met in each exchange.

Through the clashing of supermaxims, Grice uses the informative quantity to enable a 'second maxim' that develops from divluding such adquate evidence to suffice what you are saying. Supporting evidence with what you have formally rationalized prevents the use of rationale's formal use, like writer's block. A formalist would say at this point the conversation is not worth remembering, a more memorable saying. An informalist would call the supporting evidence, divulged after the fact, a piece that should have already been involved in the quantity, or assisiting in the understanding with any contractual agreement that may clash in the case the conversation converges towards a supermaxim.

4

Generalizing principles, proving just cause, delivering a standard for point of view and legitimately changing agreements is generally Grice's cooperative principles - 'CP'. Strategically failing to produce the maxims is in itself a supermaxim called a contradiction, aside from a oxymoron and separate from a paradox. Of course, Grice does simplify the philosophical question further by confirming that casual conversation should not be considered formal. He also says that initial proposals of questions for discussion avoids formalities in that you are purposing the question for discussion and must construct the maxims.

“These analogies are relevant to what I regard as a fundamental question about the CP and its attendant maxims, namely, what [is] the basis for assumption [that] we seem to make, and on which (I hope) it will appear that a great range of implicatures depend, that talkers will in general (other things being equal and in the absence of indications to the contrary) proceed in the manner that these principles prescribe.” (Grice 1975)

3

I like to think on the next part like the “Hero Code”. Grice compares fomalists and informalists on conventional use and conversational sense. Like prolixity, an evidence in evolution or lack of evolution of the conversation discovers the falsality in the maxim and discredits the legitimacy of the conversation. When words are compared in their meanings with their identities and reject reference to what is involved. The CP and its maxim should exist within prolixity. Any utterance, the linguistic identity of the falsality proof, should otherwise exist contextually. Other items of background

7

Yellow = grammatical

Pink = Structural

knowledge should be afforded within the definition of the word choice.

Grice provides a final proximation which relevant items fall beneath previous headings, like the second maxim. For example, if two supermaxim's clash but coincide, then the general cooperative principle is still applicable. Listeners rely on their reason to suppose their observations fall within mannerism. Unless it is thought the observations were to be immediately perceived, like reading someone's mind, Grice's supposition is to try thinking on not thinking.

Grice provided some examples like these ones:

In a case for no maxim is violated, or at least it is not clear that any maxim is violated.

**We need to go down stairs at the mall, and you reply there is an escalator over there and stairs that-a-way**

*staying*

Being relevant is the fringe in which the modes of getting to the mall's lowers story are identified and the idea of taking the elevator is still open for conversation. Adjacent remarks seem to regard the case of the second maxim as the supermaxim. These ideas a prevasive. An informal preposition of this would be to use an implacature, such as: instead of saying atleast he has not gone to prison, like in Grice's original example – you are driving to go down town and you say you need to stop and get money, you are obviously going to a bank.

*\* - insane lost it*

In a case where a maxim is violated, but its violation is to be explained by the supposition of a clash contained in a separate maxim –

**Where the quality of a response contains contractual agreements that require navigation, problems and solutions may seem as if they are not, or can not be, remembered.**

"Let's get coffee"

your victim responds - "I have no money"

"Then its a date! I'll buy."

your victim responds - "I have homework today"

"Yea, I meant that we were going to get coffee so we can study."

*generation of observations that must be analyzed in order for quality response*

*example for [B]*

Explanation: Each time there is a response it leads to the evidence that the supermaxim still applies but only in the case the previous question does not superceed any maxim. Because the supermaxim still exists then the continuity does not cease to exist.

In a case where exploitation occurs procedurally and a maxim is purposed as to construct a new conversational implicature by means of something of the nature of a figure of speech.

**Required observance of Grice's work is within the Cooperative Principle:**

Like the supermaxims overlapping, or clashing, falsality can occur when one speaks clearly and or when letters written provide the substance that prevents maxims from being violated and supermaxims do not negate, but are divergent or convergent. The extreme exists in the linguistic extreme when utterances begin to suffer because written testimony, a lack of on-going cooperation continues or an inability to recall information that is wanted can be provided. As in the supermaxim, Grice's tautology is provided in the explanation in the uninformative remarks that become the ongoing testimony among linguistic utterance.

*sense perception*

The sensuality of a phrase or saying is how things are recalled through recollection and more importantly Grice tries to consider for us the idea that this sensuality is developed because of the usual noncontroversial phenomena conversation is to linguistics. He describes sensual perceptions in sea fearing and the return from long thought on points. He also describes like situations where

*\* situational basis only occurs in past tense*

*Yellow = grammatical*

*Pink = structural*

Yellow = grammatical

psychologists and lawyers have relationships with on-going deceit and/or deception. Conversational games follow an assumption basis he references as related to the Cooperative Principle. A reasonable basis occurs because of following our rationale.

Grice considers the ideas of generalizing the implicature and the normalcy existing in platonic friends. Like violating privacy is to ask what a phrase or saying would mean. How is it to ask what someone means when you know they will respond, "Just that."

quality as compared: the editorial perspective phenomenal  
negation occurs in the non-controversial  
~~Sea of sense perception~~

~~like~~ a contractual agreement fulfilling  
its obligations.  $\Rightarrow$  of language [responsive "subject"]

Good ((reiteration)) of how the formal language devices can be applied to fulfill the cooperative principle. To continue ~~confirming~~ quality in exchange one {must simply navigate a train of thought}

reiteration as double-speak

Notes on: “Interpreting Philosophies of H.P. Grice  
(Semantics and Pragmatics)

1. Implications are not just “applied fine arts” {gratification [termology]}. *We* suspect much of each other, have stereotypes and predispositions; as well, *we* learn our own gratifications: for admonishment, and clarity; for subjugation in a “free-world” [context]. Implication is not something that will always be seen. Our intuitive abilities, to take responsibility for action, are an initiator of the common action, instinct; in order, to scientifically find a new result.
2. H.P. Grice compares utterances to vague assumptions. Making implications on their own, the comparison of utterances is made, “slips”, in speech [context], or encoded meanings. *We* hide, by occasion, in both written and spoken voice {spoken conversationalism}.
3. Any “indication” seems brief, of how it is said; and, what is meant by it - *we* shall suspect to judgment every indication of speech revealing not what is necessarily meant. It is going to be translated, or interpreted by the encoded meanings prior to speaking from memory [experience].
4. References we can seek for implications: through developed imperatives; maxims; reflective tenacity [experience]. Cause for rationale [context]; meanings of forced implied meaning {use of utterances}.
5. Some language has simple remarks, encoded use in speech meaning {reflection of written meaning} and hide [literal means of proof] what truly describes lax or loose pronunciation. \*Utterances and remarks are due in {imperative} conversation, and hidden outside conversationalism [comparative analysis].
6. The origins of speech formulation [language] of speech {culture: dialect, “slang”, fragmentary language} [imperative] attempt consistency to avoid ambiguity – preventative definition gratifies the doer {philosophy: [Kant]} changes contextual meaning of what is meant
7. The manner, speaking {or written terms} are as follows:
  - (a) Information relates our point, either proven or unproven
  - (b) Reasons to admit, to transpire a maxim, maintaining relevance
  - (c) Quantity and quality, by speech contains the code meaning [context] as well brief enforcement of obligatory meaning [imperative] which conversationalism continues
8. Grice, compares speaking “falsely”. The comparison, its described: as rulers, subjects; created maxim [supplanted argument] identified by rules; as the comparison of constraints: “quantity and quality”.

Grice found conversational exchange too narrow for actual data collection. Quality information is too narrow; and, mannerisms are in terms of ASE contain few effective continence. Clarity and specificity connected the principal for implicating our speech without ambiguity. Therefore, I find it relevant Grice tries to explain his theory; that “if”, *we* could communicate, by only saying the same things over and over again, {“I love you”}, *we* then have more effective implication of obligatory speech, enabling formal communication of what it is *we* are trying to say. The phrase for synthesis used is “I hope”.