

Intro to Language

Semantics: Sentence meaning relations

Background reading:

• *CL* Ch 6, §1.2, "Semantic relations involving sentences"

- When we know the meaning of a (declarative) sentence, we know the circumstances under which the sentence would be true or false — known as the truth conditions of the sentence
 - Intension of a sentence =
 - **Extension** of a sentence in a given situation =

- When we know the meaning of a (declarative) sentence, we know the circumstances under which the sentence would be true or false — known as the truth conditions of the sentence
 - **Intension** of a sentence = its **truth conditions**
 - Extension of a sentence in a given situation = its truth value (true or false) in that situation

- Once we have a way to think about sentence meaning, we can examine ways in which the meaning of one sentence **relates** to that of another
 - entailment
 - paraphrase
 - contradiction

- From *CL*, p 222: "When the truth of one sentence guarantees the truth of another sentence, we say that there is a relation of **entailment**."
 - What does "guarantees the truth" mean here?
 → Consider: This is about **truth conditions**
- A more explicit definition of entailment: Sentence A entails sentence B if <u>in all situations</u> where sentence A is true, sentence B is also true

(examples in Monday's outline slides)

Paraphrase is another meaning relation between sentences

- From *CL*, p 221: "Two sentences that have essentially the same meaning are said to be paraphrases of each other."
- Can we develop a more explicit definition of paraphrase, in terms of <u>entailment</u>?

- A more explicit definition of paraphrase: Sentences A and B are paraphrases of one another if A entails B and B entails A.
 - What kind of evidence do we have to provide to show that two sentences are *not* paraphrases of each other?

- A more explicit definition of paraphrase: Sentences A and B are paraphrases of one another if A entails B and B entails A.
 - What kind of evidence do we have to provide to show that two sentences are *not* paraphrases of each other?
 - \rightarrow Think of a situation in which one of A or B is true and the other is not

 A more explicit definition of paraphrase: Sentences A and B are paraphrases of one another if A entails B and B entails A.

Try it: Are sentences (3) and (4) paraphrases?
(3) Lucy ate the last piece of pizza.
(4) The last piece of pizza was eaten by Lucy.

 A more explicit definition of paraphrase: Sentences A and B are paraphrases of one another if A entails B and B entails A.

- Try it: Are sentences (3) and (4) paraphrases? | Yes
 (3) Lucy ate the last piece of pizza.
 (4) The last piece of pizza was eaten by Lucy.
 - In all situations where (3) is true, (4) is also true
 - In all situations where (4) is true, (3) is also true

 A more explicit definition of paraphrase:
 Sentences A and B are paraphrases of one another if A entails B and B entails A.

Try it: Are (1) and (2) (from Monday) paraphrases?
(1) Linus ate a sugar-covered doughnut.
(2) Linus ate something sweet.

 A more explicit definition of paraphrase: Sentences A and B are paraphrases of one another if A entails B and B entails A.

- Try it: Are (1) and (2) (from Monday) paraphrases? | No
 (1) Linus ate a sugar-covered doughnut.
 (2) Linus ate something sweet.
 - We showed on Monday that (2) does not entail
 (1), so these sentences are not paraphrases of each other

Contradiction is another meaning relation between sentences

 From *CL*, pp 222–3: "Sometimes, it turns out that if one sentence is true, then another sentence must be false. [...] When two sentences cannot both be true, we say that there is a **contradiction**."

 Can we develop a more explicit definition for contradiction, inspired by the way we have defined entailment?

- A more explicit definition of contradiction: Sentence A and B are contradictory if <u>there is</u> <u>no situation</u> in which both A and B can be true.
 - What kind of evidence do we have to provide to show that two sentences are *not* contradictory?

- A more explicit definition of contradiction: Sentence A and B are contradictory if <u>there is</u> <u>no situation</u> in which both A and B can be true.
 - What kind of evidence do we have to provide to show that two sentences are *not* contradictory?
 - → Think of a situation in which A and B are both true

 A more explicit definition of contradiction: Sentence A and B are contradictory if <u>there is</u> <u>no situation</u> in which both A and B can be true.

Are sentences (5) and (6) contradictory?
(5) The present king of France is bald.
(6) France is a republic.

 A more explicit definition of contradiction: Sentence A and B are contradictory if <u>there is</u> <u>no situation</u> in which both A and B can be true.

- Are sentences (5) and (6) contradictory? | Yes
 (5) The present king of France is bald.
 (6) France is a republic.
 - Since a republic is a nation with no king, (5) and
 (6) can never be true in the same situation

 What is all this stuff good for? When might we care whether one sentence entails another, or one sentence contradicts another?

- What is all this stuff good for? When might we care whether one sentence entails another, or one sentence contradicts another?
- How about situations such as...
 - legislation, contracts
 - testimony in court
 - claims of false advertising
 - ...

- One popular advertising technique is the use of language that tries to sound like it's making a stronger claim than it actually is
- It can be interesting to look carefully at the language of an advertisement and try to determine what claims are actually **entailed**

• Example:

No other chewing gum keeps your breath fresh longer!

- What might the ad like you to **conclude**?
- Is this conclusion **entailed** by the language in the ad? Can you prove whether it is?

- Example:
 - *Everything in the store is up to 75% off!*
 - What might the ad like you to **conclude**?
 - Is this conclusion **entailed** by the language in the ad? Can you prove whether it is?

- How is it possible for people to use language in ways that communicate *more* than what is *said*?
- This is part of the linguistic subfield of pragmatics, the study of language meaning in context
 - → Our next topic