

NOTES ON

HEARER PRESUPPOSITIONS AND THE ART OF LANGUAGE BASED PROFILING

Section 5

Examples of Alternating HP Branches of Type A

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Alternating HP Branches. In this Section 5, we give verbal and diagrammatic descriptions of alternating HP branches of type A for several different scenarios. Our verbal and diagrammatic descriptions closely follow the template given in Section 4 for alternating HP branches of type A, deviating only in relativizing the HPs in the template to the particular scenarios to which the template is being applied. To coordinate particular scenarios to the template, we use a paragraph numbering 1 through 8 to correspond to the similarly marked boxes in the template. Each of the boxes 1 through 8 indicated in these descriptions represent *terminal HPs* and unboxed verbal entries represent *intermediate* – i.e., non terminal HPs.

1.2. We Recall from Section 4: A *setting of an utterance U* involves a speaker S, an utterance U made (intentionally or not) by S, the context C in which S makes the utterance U, and a hearer H (intended or not) of the utterance U, and a *scenario of an utterance U* is an *interpreted setting*, that is, a setting as interpreted by the hearer in the sense of also including: (i) the hearer's understanding C* of the context C (which may or may not be the way others understand the context), (ii) the hearer's understanding U* of U

relative to his understanding C^* of C , (iii) the hearer's understanding U^* of the utterance U (which may or may not be the way others understand either the context or the utterance), and (iv) a UF Z which is a feature of the hearer's understanding U^* of the utterance U the hearer's understanding U^* of the utterance U (which may or may not be perceived as such by others).

2. THE “HELLO” SCENARIO

2.1. The Setting of the “Hello” Scenario

The context C is as follows: The hearer H is at the checkout counter of a grocery store in a town through which H is traveling and in which he is a stranger. S (the speaker) who is standing directly behind H , utters the utterance U : “Hello.”

2.2. The “Hello” Scenario

The “Hello” scenario includes its setting (2.1.) as well as: (i) H 's understanding C^* of the context C as a situation in which S is a person whom H does not know and who is standing directly behind him as he stands at the checkout counter, and (ii) H understands the utterance U as a greeting U^* in a manner (UF Z) which H perceives as directed loudly at him (i.e., at H).

2.2. Descriptive Form of an HP Alternating Branch of Type A for the “Hello” Scenario

2.2.1: One possible Level 2 HP chain is the two term sequence: $\langle S's \textit{utterance } U \textit{ was unintentional, } S \textit{ was talking to himself} \rangle$. The last term of this sequence, namely, “*S was talking to himself,*” would be the terminus (Box 1) of this HP chain.

2.2.2. A possible alternative Level 2 HP chain would be a chain whose first term is the *negation* of the first term of the above Level 2 chain in 1, namely, a chain whose first term is “*S's utterance was intentional,*” and whose last three terms are: “*S had no communication intent in uttering `Hello', S regarded it as appropriate to utter “Hello” in this context C,*” and a possible fourth term: “*S was practicing a greeting in English.*” Thus this

possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: < *S's utterance was intentional, S had no communication intent in uttering it, S regarded it as appropriate to utter "Hello", S was practicing a greeting in English*>. The last term of this sequence, "**S was practicing a greeting in English,**" would be the terminus (Box2) of this HP chain.¹

2.2.3. Another possible alternative level 4 HP chain is a chain whose first two terms are those of the level 4 HP chain in 2.2.2. (above), whose third term is: "*S did not regard it as appropriate to utter 'Hello' in this context,*" (the *negation* of the third term of the chain in 2.2.2), and whose fourth term is: "*S intended to disturb H.*" Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: <*S's utterance was intentional, S had no communication intent in uttering U, S did not regard it as appropriate to utter "Hello", S intended to disturb H*>. The last term of this sequence, namely, "*S intended to disturb H,*" would be the terminus (Box 3) of this HP chain.¹

2.2.4. Another possible alternative HP chain would be a level 4 HP chain whose first term is the same as the first term of the HP chain of 2.2.3, whose second term is the *negation* of the second term of that HP chain, namely, "*S had a communication intent in uttering 'Hello',*" whose third term is "*S regarded it as appropriate to utter 'Hello' in this context,*" and whose fourth term is "*S intended to communicate a greeting to H.*" Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: < *S's utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering "Hello," S regarded it as appropriate to utter "Hello" in this context, S intended to communicate a greeting to H*>. The last term of this sequence, namely, "*S intended to communicate a greeting to H*" would be the terminus (Box 4) of this HP chain.¹

2.2.5. Another possible alternative HP chain would be a level 5 HP chain whose first two terms are those of the level 4 HP chain of 2.2.4, but whose third term, "*S does not regard it as appropriate to utter 'Hello' "* is the *negation* of third term of the level 4 HP chain of 2.2.4, whose fourth term is "*S is not observing the cooperative principle (CP),*" and whose fifth term might be: "*S is not concerned to make his intention clear.*" Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: < *S's utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering U, S did not regard it as appropriate to utter "Hello" in this context, S is not observing the cooperative principle (CP), S is not concerned to make his intention clear*>

The last term of this sequence, “*S is not concerned to make his intention clear,*” would be the terminus (Box 5) of this chain.¹

2.2.6. Another possible alternative HP chain would be a level 6 HP chain whose first four terms are those of the level 5 HP chain in 2.2.5, whose fifth term is “*S is observing the cooperative principle (CP),*” which is the *negation* of the fifth term of the level 5 HP chain in 2.2.5, and whose sixth term is: “*S does not believe that H believes that S does not believe that it was appropriate to utter ‘Hello’ in context C*” [roughly: “*S believes that H believes that S regards his behavior as appropriate*”], and whose sixth term might be: “*S intended to get H’s, attention.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: < *S’s utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering U, S did not believe that it was appropriate to utter “Hello” in context C, S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S does not believe that H believes that S does not believe that it was appropriate to utter ‘Hello’ in context C, S intended to get H’s attention*> . The last term of this sequence, “*S intended to get H’s attention*>” would be the terminus (Box 6) of this chain¹.

2.2.7. Another possible alternative HP chain is a level 7 HP chain whose first four terms are those of the chain in 6, whose fifth term is “*S believes that H believes that S does not believe that it was appropriate to utter ‘Hello’ in context C*” (which is the *negation* of fifth term of the HP chain in 6), whose sixth term is “*S does not believe that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence,*” and whose seventh term might be: “*S intends to perplex H.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: < *S’s utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering U, S did not regard it as appropriate to utter “Hello” in this context, S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S believes that H believes that S does not regard behavior U as appropriate in context C, S does not believe that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence, S intends to perplex H*> . The last term of this sequence, “*S intends to perplex H* >” would be the terminus (Box 7) of this chain¹.

2.2.8. Another possible alternative HP chain is a chain of of length 7 whose first five terms are those of the HP chain in 7 (above), whose sixth term is “*S believes that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence,*” (which is the *negation* of sixth term of the chain in 7), and whose seventh term might be: “*S intends that H alter his understanding of*

behavior U and/or of Context C to make it consistent with the first six terms of this sequence.” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: *< S’s utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering ‘Hello’, S did not believe that it was appropriate to utter “Hello” in this context, S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S believes that H believes that S does not regard behavior U as appropriate in context C, S believes that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence, S intends that H alter his understanding of behavior in uttering “Hello” to make it consistent with the first six terms of this sequence > .* The last term of this sequence, namely, *“S intends that H alter his understanding of behavior U and/or of Context C to make it consistent with the first six terms of this sequence,”* would be the terminus (Box 8) of this chain^{1,2}.

Footnote 1. Regarding the terminus in this example, there are generally many possible alterations of H’s understanding of the utterance U and/or the context C that would be consistent with the preceding terms of the sequence.

Footnote 2. For example, regarding the terminus (Box 8) in 2.2.8 above, S may have uttered “Hello” in order to alert H of some situation of which H was not aware, such as that he (H) had dropped his car keys, or perhaps to alert H of his having impolitely insinuated himself ahead of S in the checkout line, regarding which S is taking issue. Overall, S may be intending to communicate something to H by uttering “Hello” in a manner which S believes is inappropriate in this context, and so may be effective in getting H’s attention.

3. THE “THIS IS NOT A JOKE” SCENARIO¹

3.1. The Setting of the “This Is Not A Joke” Scenario

The context C is as follows: H is in the audience of a group that is watching a comedian S (the speaker) who has come onto the stage, takes the mike in his hand, and says: “This is not a joke” (the utterance U) as his opening line to his audience.

3.2. The “This is not a joke” Scenario

The “This is not a joke” scenario includes its setting (3.1.) as well as: (i) H’s understanding C* of the context C as a situation in which (i) H expects S to

tell jokes and that any disclaimers S might make to the contrary are to be understood as part of S's comedy routine, and (ii) H understands U as U*, that is, as a preface to a joke, which, relative to H's understanding C* of the context C, has the UF: *Incongruity*, as its feature.

3.3. Descriptive Form of an HP Alternating Branch of Type A for the "This Is Not A Joke" Scenario

3.3.1: One possible level 2 HP chain is the two term sequence: <*S's utterance U was unintentional, S was unaware that he was speaking aloud*>. The last term of this sequence, namely, "*S was unaware the mike was on*" would be the terminus (Box1) of this chain¹.

3.3.2. A possible alternative HP chain would be a level 3 HP chain, whose first term, "*S's utterance was intentional,*" is the *negation* of the first term in the chain in 3.2.1 above (the term, "*S's utterance was unintentional,*" and whose second term is: "*S had no communication intent in uttering 'This is not a joke' in context C,*" and whose third term is: "*S believed it was appropriate to utter 'This is not a joke' in context C,*" and the possible fourth term: "*S believed that what he was about to say was a "bad joke."*" Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: <*S's utterance was intentional, S had no communication intent in uttering it, S regarded it as appropriate to utter "This is not a joke", S believed that what he was about to say was a "bad joke*>. The last term of this sequence, "*S believed that what he was about to say was a "bad joke,*" would be the terminus (Box2) of this chain¹.

3.3.3. Another possible alternative HP chain is a level 4 HP chain whose first two terms are those of the HP chain in 3.2.2, and whose third term is: "*S believed it was inappropriate to utter "This is not a joke" in context C,*" (i.e, the *negation* of the third term of the chain in 3.2.2), and whose fourth term is: "*S believed that the mike was not on*" Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: <*S's behavior U was intentional, S had no communication intent in uttering U, S believed it was inappropriate to utter "This is not a joke," S believed that the mike was not on*>. The last term of this sequence, "*S believed that the mike was not on*" would be the terminus (Box 3) of this chain¹.

3.3.4. Another possible alternative HP chain would be a level 4 HP chain whose base is “*S’s utterance was intentional*” (the *negation* of the base of the HP chain in 3.2.1 above), whose second term is “*S had a communication intent in uttering ‘This is not a joke’*” whose third term is “*S believed that it was appropriate to utter ‘This is not a joke’ in context C,*” and whose fourth term is “*S believed the utterance, ‘This is not a joke’ was as a useful (and common) lead-in to a comedy routine.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: < *S’s utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering U, S believes that it was it was appropriate to utter “This is not a joke,” in context C, S believed the utterance, “This is not a joke” was as a useful (and common) lead-in to a comedy routine* >. The last term of this sequence, namely, “*S believed the utterance, ‘This is not a joke’ was as a useful (and common) lead-in to a comedy routine.*” would be the terminus (Box 4) of this chain¹.

3.3.5. A possible alternative HP chain would be a level 5 HP chain whose first two terms are those of the HP chain in 3.2.4, but one whose third term, “*S believes that it was inappropriate to utter ‘This is not a joke’ in the context C,*” is the *negation* of the third term in 3.2.4, whose fourth term is “*S does not intend to observe the cooperative principle (CP),*” and whose fifth term might be: “*S intends to violate H’s expectations that what he is about to say would not be comedic, but as soon as he enters into it, it is clear that it is.*” Thus this possible alternative HP chain, in its entirety, would be: < *S’s utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering U, S believed that it was inappropriate to utter “This is not a joke” in the context C, S does not intend to observe the cooperative principle (CP), S intends to violate H’s expectations that what he is about to say would not be comedic, but as soon as he enters into it, it is clear to H that it is* >. The last term of this sequence, “*S intends to violate H’s expectations that what he is about to say would not be comedic, but as soon as he enters into it, it would be clear to H that it is*” would be the terminus (Box 5) of this chain¹.

3.3.6. Another possible alternative HP chain would be a level 6 HP chain whose first three terms are those of the level 5 HP chain in 3.2.5, whose fourth term, “*S intends to observe the cooperative principle (CP),*” is the *negation* of the fourth term of the chain in 3.2.5, whose fifth term is: “*S does not believe that H believes that S does not regard behavior ‘This is not a joke’ as appropriate in context C*” [roughly: “*S believes that H believes that S’s uttering ‘This is not a joke’ in this context is appropriate*”, *i.e.*,

that what *S* would next utter would not be a joke.”], and whose sixth term might be: “*S* intends that *H* believe that what *S* would next utter would not be a joke while *S* fully intends to next utter something that would be.”

Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: < *S*’s utterance was intentional, *S* had a communication intent in uttering ‘This is not a joke’, *S* did not believe that it was appropriate to utter “This is not a joke” in this context, *S* is observing the cooperative principle (CP), *S* does not believe that *H* believes that *S* does not believe his uttering ‘This is not a joke’ to have been appropriate in context *C*, *S* intends to allow *H* to believe that what *S* would next utter would not be a joke while *S* fully intends to next utter something that would be.>. The last term of this sequence, “*S* intends that *H* believe that what *S* would utter next would not be a joke while *S* fully intends to next utter something that would be.” would be the terminus (Box 6) of this chain¹.

3.3.7. Another possible alternative HP chain is a level 7 HP chain whose first four terms are those of the HP chain in 3.2.6, whose fifth term is “*S* believes that *H* believes that *S* does not believe his behavior ‘This is not a joke’ to have been appropriate in context *C*” (roughly, the *negation* of the fifth term of the HP chain in 6), whose sixth term is “*S* does not believe that *H* can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence,” and whose seventh term might be: “*S* intends to manipulate *H*’s understanding of what *S* is doing.” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: < *S*’s utterance was intentional, *S* had a communication intent in uttering ‘This is not a joke’, *S* did not regard it as appropriate to utter “This is not a joke” in this context, *S* is observing the cooperative principle (CP), *S* believes that *H* believes that *S* does not believe that *S*’s uttering ‘This is not a joke’ is appropriate in context *C*, *S* does not believe that *H* can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence, *S* intends to manipulate *H*’s understanding of what *S* is doing.> The last term of this sequence, “*S* intends to manipulate *H*’s understanding of what *S* is doing” would be the terminus (Box 7) of this chain¹.

3.3.8. Another possible alternative HP chain is a level 8 HP chain whose first five terms are those of the HP chain in 3.2.7, whose sixth term is “*S* believes that *H* can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence,” (roughly, the *negation* of sixth term of the chain in 7), and whose seventh term might be: “*S* intends that *H* alter his understanding of *U* and/or of Context *C* to make it consistent with the first six terms of this sequence.” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be:

< S's utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering 'This is not a joke', S did not regard it as appropriate to utter "This is not a joke" in this context, S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S believes that H believes that S does not believe that S's uttering is appropriate in context C, S believes that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence, S intends that H alter his understanding of the utterance 'This is not a joke' and/or his understanding of the context C > . The last term of this sequence, namely, "S intends that H alter his understanding of the utterance 'This is not a joke' and/or of the context C to make it consistent with the first six terms of this sequence.,," would be the terminus (Box 8) of this chain^{1,3}.

Footnote 3. Note regarding this terminus: S may have uttered "This is not a joke wholly intending H to make sense of it in the context of the comedy show and, accordingly, to alter his understanding of S's utterance in the context of a comedy routine as not having its ordinary meaning but rather meaning that what S would next utter would be intended as a "joke" after all. Thus, this altered meaning is opposed to the ordinary one; that is, this altered meaning is the opposite of the ordinary one (which is that S's next utterance would not be a joke) and instead would indeed be a joke.

4. THE "LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION" SCENARIO (GRICE)

4.1. The Setting of the "Letter of Recommendation" Scenario

The context C is one in which H receives a letter from S (the utterance U) in answer to H's request that S submit a letter of recommendation on behalf of a candidate seeking a job with H.

4.2. The "Letter of Recommendation" Scenario

The "Letter of recommendation scenario" includes its setting (4.1) as well as: (i) H understands the context C as C*, namely as a situation in which S would be expected to describe the qualities of the candidate as they relate to the job at issue; (ii) H understands U as U*, namely as being as closely responsive to H's request as S could manage; (iii) U* relative to C* has the associated UF "Omission of Relevant Details." (There are other UFs associated with this scenario, such as "Ambiguity" and "Pragmatic Incongruity, but we discuss this scenario only with respect to the one UF, namely, "Omission of Relevant Details".

4.3. Descriptive Form of an HP Alternating Branch of Type A for the “Letter of Recommendation” Scenario

4.3.1: One possible level 2 HP chain is the two term sequence: <*S’s omission of relevant details was unintentional, S was not aware that he had omitted them*>. The last term of this sequence, namely, “*S was not aware that he had omitted them*” would be the terminus (Box1) of this chain¹.

4.3.2. A possible alternative level 4 HP chain would be a sequence whose base is the *negation* of the first term of the level 2 HP chain of 4.3.1, namely, “*S’s omission of relevant details was intentional,*” and whose last three terms are: “*S did not intend to communicate anything in this letter of recommendation to H,*” “*S believed that it was appropriate to write a letter of recommendation for the job applicant,*” and possible fourth term the might be: “*S did not seriously address what was required in a letter of recommendation for this job applicant.* Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: <*S’s omission of relevant details was intentional, S did not intend to communicate anything in this letter of recommendation to H, S believed that it was appropriate to write a letter of recommendation for the job applicant, S did not seriously address what was required in a letter of recommendation for the job applicant.*>. The last term of this sequence, “*S did not seriously address what was required in a letter of recommendation for this job applicant,*” would be the terminus (Box 2) of this chain¹.

4.3.3. Another possible alternative level 4 HP chain is a sequence whose first two terms are those of the level 3 HP chain in 4.3.2 (above), whose third term is: “*S did not believe that it was appropriate to write a letter of recommendation for the job applicant*” (the *negation* of the third term of the HP chain in 4.3.2), and whose fourth term might be: “*S intended to write a non-responsive letter*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: <*S’s omission of relevant details was intentional, S intend to communicate something in this letter of recommendation to H, S did not believe that it was appropriate to write letter of recommendation for the job applicant, S intended to write a non-responsive letter*>. The last term of this sequence, “*S intended to write a non-responsive letter,*” would be the terminus (Box 3) of this chain¹.

4.3.4. Another possible alternative HP chain would be a level 4 HP chain whose second term is the *negation* of the second term of the level 4 HP chain in 4.3.3, namely, “*S intended to communicate something in his letter of recommendation,*” whose third term is “*S regarded it as appropriate to write this letter in the context C,*” and whose fourth term might be “*S intended to write a responsive letter.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: < *S’s utterance was intentional, S intended to communicate something in his letter of recommendation, S believed it was appropriate to write this letter in the context C, S intended to write a responsive letter in this context* >. The last term of this sequence, namely, “*S intended to write a responsive letter in this context C*” would be the terminus (Box 4) of this chain¹.

4.3.5. A possible alternative HP chain would be a level 5 HP chain whose first two terms are those of the HP chain in 4.3.4, but whose third term, “*S did not believe it was appropriate to write a letter of recommendation in the context C,*” (the *negation* of third term of the level 4 HP chain in 4.3.4), whose fourth term is “*S is not observing the cooperative principle (CP),*” and whose fifth term might be: “*S intends to show H that he (S) is displeased to write this letter U in this context.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: < *S’s utterance was intentional, S intended to communicate something in his letter of recommendation, S did not regard it as appropriate to write a letter of recommendation in this context, S is not observing the cooperative principle (CP), S intends to show H that he (S) is displeased in being asked to write this letter* >. The last term of this sequence, “*S intends to show H that he (S) is displeased in being asked to write this letter*” would be the terminus (Box 5) of this chain¹.

4.3.6. Another possible alternative HP chain would be a level 6 HP chain whose first two terms are those of the level 5 HP chain in 4.3.5, whose third term is “*S believe that it was appropriate to write a letter of recommendation in the context C,*” (the *negation* of third term of the HP chain in 5), whose fourth term is “*S is observing the cooperative principle (CP),*” whose fifth term is: “*S does not believe that H believes that S does not believe that H believes that this letter is appropriate in context C*” [roughly: “*S doesn’t believe that H believes that S regards his letter as appropriate*”], and whose sixth term might be: “*S believes his effort as a failed attempt to communicate his underlying intention in behaving inappropriately.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would

be: *< S's utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering U, S did not regard the letter as appropriate to write letter U in this context, S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S does not believe that H believes that S does not regard the letter as appropriate in context C, S believes his effort as a failed attempt to communicate his underlying intention by this inappropriate letter >* . The last term of this sequence, *"S believes his effort as a failed attempt to communicate his underlying intention by this inappropriate letter"* would be the terminus (Box 6) of this chain¹.

4.3.7. Another possible alternative HP chain is a chain of length 7 would be one whose first four terms are those of the chain in 4.3.6, whose fifth term (the negation of fifth term of the chain in 6) is *"S believes that H believes that S does not regard the letter as appropriate,"* (roughly: *"S believes that H believes that S regards his behavior as inappropriate"*), whose sixth term is *"S does not believe that H can work out the first five terms of this sequence,"* and whose seventh term might be: *"S intends to perplex H."* Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: *< S's utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in the letter, S did not regard the letter as appropriate, S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S believes that H believes that S does not regard the letter as appropriate in context C, S does not believe that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence, S intends to perplex H >* . The last term of this sequence, *"S intends to perplex H,"* would be the terminus (Box 7) of this chain¹.

4.3.8. Another possible alternative HP chain is a chain of of length 7 whose first five terms are those of the chain in 7 (above), whose sixth term is *"S believes that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence,"* (the negation of sixth term of the chain in 7), and whose seventh term might be: *"S intends that H alter his (H's) understanding of the letter as a letter of recommendation to make it consistent with the first six terms of the sequence."* Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: *< S's utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in in writing the letter uttering U, S did not regard it as appropriate to write this letter in this context, S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S believes that H believes that S does not the letter as appropriate in context C, S believes that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence, S intends that H alter his (H's) understanding of the letter as a letter of recommendation to make it consistent with the first six terms*

of this sequence. > . The last term of this sequence, namely, “*S intends that H alter his (H’s) understanding of the letter as a letter of recommendation to make it consistent with the first six terms of the sequence,*” would be the terminus (Box 8) of this chain^{1,4}.

Footnote 4. Note regarding this terminus: there are generally many possible alterations of H’s understanding of the letter (utterance U) and/or of the context C that would be consistent with the first six terms of this sequence and which would continue this chain. The alteration which Grice draws is an alteration of H’s understanding of the letter as intended by S as a letter of non-recommendation rather than as a letter of recommendation. There are, of course, other possible alterations of *H’s understanding of the letter U*, such as that S intended to alert H of some situation of which H was not aware, such as that S believed that he (and/or H) was in danger of being injured by this job applicant, or that he (H) had written this letter under duress. There are also possible alterations of *H’s understanding of the context C*, such as that H did not understand the context C as one in which S would actually be expected to describe the qualities of the candidate as they relate to the job at issue, because, say, S did not know the candidate and so could not be responsive to H’s request as S could manage, or did not otherwise believe that H was serious in his request, or had been coerced by the candidate to request it. *We thus note that the reason (an implicature, in Grice’s terms) behind S’s response (U) to H’s request that S write a letter of recommendation for a job applicant might be other than the reason, favored by Grice, namely that S felt compelled to write a letter of recommendation for a job candidate whom S regarded as inadequate to function in the job at issue, and was implicating, by omitting any mention of the candidate’s favorable qualities pertaining to the job, that he (S) regarded the candidate unqualified.*

5. THE “MISSING SALUTATION” SCENARIO

5.1. The Setting of the “Missing Salutation” Scenario

The context C of the “Missing salutation” scenario is as follows: The hearer H receives a letter U from a speaker S which is missing a salutation.

5.2. The “Missing Salutation” Scenario

The “Missing salutation” scenario includes its setting (5.1.) as well as: (i) H’s understanding C* of the context C as a situation in which (i) H believes S to have intended a particular individual as the recipient of this letter U, and (ii) H understands the letter U as U*, that is, as omitting any indication of its intended recipient which, relative to H’s understanding C* of the context C, has the Stylistic UF: “Missing Salutation.”

5.3. Descriptive Form of an HP Alternating Branch of Type A for the “Missing Salutation” Scenario

5.3.1: One possible level 2 HP chain is the two term sequence: <*S’s omission of a salutation was unintentional, S had forgotten to include it*>. The last term of this sequence, namely, “*S had forgotten to include a salutation*” would be the terminus (Box1) of this chain¹.

5.3.2. A possible alternative HP chain would be a level 4 HP chain whose base is the negation of the HP chain in 5.3.1, namely, a chain whose first term is “*S’s omission of a salutation was intentional,*” and whose following two terms are: “*S had no communication intent in omitting the salutation in this context,*” “*S regarded it as appropriate to omit it in this context,*” and a possible fourth term: “*It is S’s habit to omit salutations in letters.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: <*S’s omission of a salutation was intentional, S had no communication intent in omitting it, S regarded it as appropriate to omit it, S habitually omits salutations in letters*>. The last term of this sequence, “*S habitually omits salutations in letters,*” would be the terminus (Box2) of this chain¹.

5.3.3. Another possible alternative HP chain is a level 4 HP chain whose first two terms are those of the HP chain in 2 (above), whose third term is: “*S did not regard it as appropriate to omit a salutation in this letter,*” (the negation of the third term of the chain in 2), and whose fourth term is: “*S intended the hearer (H) not to regard the letter as personal to him.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: <*S’s behavior U was intentional, S had no communication intent in uttering U, S did not regard it as appropriate to omit a salutation in this letter, S intended the hearer (H) not to regard the letter as personal to him.*>. The last term of this sequence, “*S intended the hearer (H) not to regard the letter as personal to him*” would be the terminus (Box 3) of this chain¹.

5.3.4. Another possible alternative HP chain would be a level 4 HP chain whose base is the negation of the HP chain in 1, namely, “*S’s utterance was intentional,*” whose second term is “*S had a communication intent in omitting the salutation,*” whose third term is “*S regarded it as appropriate to omit the salutation,*” and whose fourth term is “*S intended the hearer (H) to regard the letter as not personal to him.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be the sequence: <*S’s utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering U, S regarded it as*

appropriate to omit the salutation, S intended the hearer (H) to regard the letter as not personal to him >. The last term of this sequence, namely, “*S intended the hearer (H) to regard the letter as not personal to him*” would be the terminus (Box 4) of this chain¹.

5.3.5. A possible alternative HP chain would be a level 5 HP chain whose first two terms are those of the HP chain in 4, but whose third term is, “*S does not regard it as appropriate to omit a salutation*” (which is the negation of the third term of the level 4 HP chain in 5.3.4), whose fourth term is “*S is not observing the cooperative principle (CP),*” and whose fifth term might be: “*S does not care what inference H might make regarding the omitted salutation*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: < *S’s utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering U, S did not regard it as appropriate to omit the salutation, S is not observing the cooperative principle (CP), S does not care what inference H might make regarding the omitted salutation* >. The last term of this sequence, “*S does not care what inference H might make regarding the omitted salutation*” would be the terminus (Box 5) of this chain¹.

5.3.6. Another possible alternative HP chain would be a level 6 HP chain whose first three terms are those of the HP chain in 5.3.5, whose fourth term is “*S is observing the cooperative principle (CP),*” (the negation of fourth term of the HP chain in 5.3.5), whose fifth term is: “*S does not believe that H believes that S does not believe that omitting the salutation in this letter was appropriate*” [roughly: “S believes that H believes that S’s omitting a salutation was appropriate,” by equating “S does not believe that H believes that U” as meaning “S believes that H believes that not-U,” that is, “that S believes that H believes that omitting the salutation was appropriate”], and whose sixth term might be: “*S believes that his intended purpose (whatever it was) in omitting the salutation is nullified by H’s unresponsive reaction to it.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: < *S’s utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering U, S did not regard it as appropriate to omit the salutation, S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S does not believe that H believes that S does not regard behavior U as appropriate in context C, S believes that his intended purpose (whatever it was) in omitting the salutation is nullified by H’s unresponsive reaction to it* >. The last term of this sequence, “*S believes that his intended purpose (whatever it was) in omitting the salutation is nullified by H’s unresponsive reaction to it* >” would be the terminus (Box 6) of this chain¹.

5.3.7. Another possible alternative HP chain is a level 7 HP chain whose first four terms are those of the HP chain in 6, whose fifth term is “*S does not believe that H believes that S does not regard his behavior U as appropriate*” (roughly, the negation of fifth term of the chain in 6), whose sixth term is “*S does not believe that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence,*” and whose seventh term might be: “*S intends to perplex H.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: *< S’s utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in omitting the salutation, S did not regard it as appropriate to omit the salutation, S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S believes that H believes that S does not regard behavior U as appropriate in context C, S does not believe that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence, S intends to perplex H >* . The last term of this sequence, “*S intends to perplex H >*” would be the terminus (Box 7) of this chain¹.

5.3.8. Another possible alternative HP chain is a level 7 HP chain whose first five terms are those of the chain in 7 (above), whose sixth term is “*S believes that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence,*” (roughly, the negation of sixth term of the chain in 7), and whose seventh term might be: “*S intends that H alter his understanding of omitting a salutation and/or of Context C to make it consistent with the first six terms of this sequence.*” Thus this possible alternative chain, in its entirety, would be: *< S’s utterance was intentional, S had a communication intent in uttering U, S did not regard it as appropriate to utter “Hello” in this context, S is observing the cooperative principle (CP), S believes that H believes that S does not regard omitting a salutation as appropriate in context C, S believes that H can work out the sequence of the first five terms of this sequence, S intends that H alter his understanding of omitting a salutation to make it consistent with the first six terms of this sequence >* . The last term of this sequence, namely, “*S intends that H alter his understanding of omitting a salutation and/or of Context C to make it consistent with the first six terms of this sequence,*” would be the terminus (Box 8) of this chain¹.

5.4. Diagrammatic Form of an HP Alternating Branch of Type A for the “Missing Salutation” Scenario

HP Chain 1 [Chain (0)^(box 1) in Template]:

*Level 1 HP: S's omission of Salutation is unintentional.
[box 1]*

HP Chain 2 [Chain (1)^(2)^(3)^(box 2) in Template]:

Level 1 HP: S's omission of Salutation is intentional [Chain link (1)]

Level 2 HP: S does not intend omission of Salutation as a communication to H. [Chain link (2)]

*Level 3 HP: S believes that omission of Salutation is appropriate.
[Chain link (3)]*

Level 4 HP: S intends that H not initially know that material in envelope is Anthrax. [box 2]

HP Chain 3 [HP Chain (1)^(2)^(4)^(box 3) in Template]:

Levels 1,2 HPs as in HP Chain 2 [Chain links (1)and (2)]

Level 3 HP: S does not believe that omission of Salutation is appropriate. [Chain link (4)]

Level 4 HP: S intends to contaminate H. [box 3]

HP Chain 4 [HP Chain (1)^(5)^(3)^(box 4) in Template]:

Level 1 HP as in HP Chain 3 [Chain link (1)]

*Level 2 HP: S intends omission of Salutation as a communication to H.
[Chain link (5)]*

*Level 3 HP: S believes that omission of Salutation is appropriate.
[Chain link (3)]*

Level 4 HP: S intends to have his intention in sending letter be belatedly understood by H. [box 4]

HP Chain 5 [HP Chain (1)^(5)^(7)^(8)^(box 5) in Template]:

Levels 1, 2 HPs as in HP Chain 4 [Chain links (1) and (5)]

*Level 3 HP: S believes that omission of Salutation is inappropriate.
[Chain link (7)]*

Level 4 HP: S intends that H not understand S's intent in omitting Salutation. [Chain link (8)]

Level 5 HP: S intends to pose conundrum for H. [box 5]

HP Chain 6 [HP Chain (1)^(5)^(7)^(9)^(10)^(box 6) in Template]:

Levels 1, 2, 3 HPs as in HP Chain 5 [Chain links(1), (5), (7)]

Level 4 HP: S intends that H understand S's intent in omitting Salutation. [Chain link (9)]

Level 5 HP: S does not believe that H believes that S believes that S's omission of Salutation was inappropriate (i.e., S does not believe that H "gets it"). [Chain link (10)]

Level 6 HP: S does not believe that H understands S's omission of Salutation prior to discovery. [box 6]

HP Chain 7 [HP Chain (1)^(5)^(7)^(9)^(11)^(12)^(box7) in Template]:

Levels 1, 2, 3, 4 HPs as in HP Chain 6 [Chain links(1), (5), (7), (9)]

Level 5 HP: S believes that H believes that S believes that omission of Salutation was inappropriate. [Chain link (11)]

Level 6 HP: S does not believe that H follows and understands the sequence of HPs of Levels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. [Chain link (12)]

Level 7 HP: S believes that this has been a failed communication. [box 7]

HP Chain 8 [HP Chain (1)^(5)^(7)^(9)^(11)^(13)^(box 8) in Template]:

Levels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 HPs as in HP Chain 7[Chain links(1), (5), (7), (9), (11)]

Level 6 HP: S believes that H follows and understands the sequence of HPs of Levels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. [Chain link (13)]

Level 7 HP: S intends that H not believe that S believes that omission of Salutation is appropriate.[box 8] (Grice Implicature)

Possible Continuation of Chain:

Level 8 HP: S intends that H believes that Brokaw was intended only as the addressee and not as the contamination target.

Level 9 HP: S intends to use Brokaw only as a conduit for publicizing the letter contents,

6. THE "MISSING ANTHRAX REFERENCE" SCENARIO

6.1. The Setting of the "Missing Anthrax Reference" Scenario

The context C of the "Missing Anthrax Reference" scenario is as follows:

The hearer H receives the Anthrax letter U from an unknown writer S, whose envelope contains spores found to be Anthrax, and in which no reference is made to Anthrax.

6.2. The “Missing Anthrax Reference” Scenario

The “Missing Anthrax Reference” scenario includes its setting (6.1.) as well as H’s understanding C* of the context C as a situation in which: (i) H believes S to have intended the letter U as a threat to its recipient H and to other mentioned entities, and (ii) H (belatedly) understands the letter U as U*, that is, as an implied threat to use Anthrax against indicated targets, not including the intended letter recipient (Brokaw) of the letter which, relative to H’s understanding C* of the context C, has the Stylistic UF: “Missing Key Reference.”

6.3. Diagrammatic Form of an HP Alternating Branch of Type A for the “Missing Anthrax Reference” Scenario⁵

Stylistic UF: “No Mention of Key Entity (Anthrax) in Letter”:

HP Chain 1 [Chain (0)^(box 1) in Template]:

*Level 1 HP: S’s omission of Anthrax mention is unintentional.
[box 1]*

HP Chain 2 [Chain (1)^(2)^(3)^(box 2) in Template]:

Level 1 HP: S’s omission of Anthrax mention is intentional [Chain link (1)]

Level 2 HP: S does not intend omission of Anthrax mention as a communication to H. [Chain link (2)]

Level 3 HP: S believes that omission of Anthrax mention is appropriate. [Chain link (3)]

Level 4 HP: S intends that H not initially know that material in envelope is Anthrax. [box 2]

HP Chain 3 [HP Chain (1)^(2)^(4)^(box 3) in Template]:

Levels 1,2 HPs as in HP Chain 2

Level 3 HP: S does not believe that omission of Salutation is appropriate. [Chain link (4)]

Level 4 HP: S intends to contaminate H. [box 3]

HP Chain 4 [HP Chain (1)^(5)^(3)^(box 4) in Template]:

Level 1 HP as in HP Chain 3

Level 2 HP: S intends omission of Anthrax mention as a communication to H. [Chain link (5)]

Level 3 HP: S believes that omission of Anthrax mention is appropriate. [Chain link (3)]

Level 4 HP: S intends to have his intention in sending letter to be belatedly understood by H. [box 4]

HP Chain 5 [HP Chain (1)⁽⁵⁾(7)⁽⁸⁾(box 5) in Template]:

Levels 1, 2 HPs as in HP Chain 4

Level 3 HP: S believes that omission of Anthrax mention is inappropriate.

Level 4 HP: S intends that H not understand S's intent in omitting Anthrax mention.

Level 5 HP: S intends to pose conundrum for H. [box 5]

HP Chain 6 [HP Chain (1)⁽⁵⁾(7)⁽⁹⁾(10)^(box 6) in Template]:

Levels 1, 2, 3 HPs as in HP Chain 5

Level 4 HP: S intends that H understand S's intent in omitting Anthrax mention.

Level 5 HP: S does not believe that H believes that S believes that S's omission of Anthrax mention was inappropriate (i.e., S does not believe that H "gets it").

Level 6 HP: S does not believe that H understands S's omission of Anthrax mention prior to discovery. . [box 6]

HP Chain 7 [HP Chain (1)⁽⁵⁾(7)⁽⁹⁾(11)⁽¹²⁾(box7) in Template]:

Levels 1, 2, 3, 4 HPs as in HP Chain 6

Level 5 HP: S believes that H believes that S believes that omission of Anthrax mention was inappropriate.

Level 6 HP: S does not believe that H follows and understands the sequence of HPs of Levels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Level 7 HP: S believes that this has been a failed communication. [box 7]

HP Chain 8 [HP Chain (1)⁽⁵⁾(7)⁽⁹⁾(11)⁽¹³⁾(box 8) in Template]:

Levels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 HPs as in HP Chain 7

Level 6 HP: S believes that H follows and understands the sequence of HPs of Levels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Level 7 HP: S intends that H not believe that S believes that omission of Anthrax mention is appropriate.[box 8] (Grice Implicature)

Possible Continuation of HP Chain 8:

Level 8 HP: S intends that H believe that omission of Anthrax mention was done for another purpose.

Level 9 HP: S intended to maximize harm to others by having more time elapse before spores were identified as Anthrax.

Footnote 5. We comment on a parallel between this diagrammatic form of an alternating branch of type A for the UF “No mention of Key Entity” in the Anthrax letter and the above descriptive form of an alternating branch of type A for the UF “Omission of Relevant Details” in the Grice Letter of Recommendation Example (for which no diagrammatic form was given): In the Grice Letter of Recommendation, the writer implies an intention to recommend a job applicant but which, by virtue of the way the letter was written, communicates an opposite intention, namely a recommendation not to hire the applicant. The parallel with the UF “No Mention of Key Entity” in the Anthrax letter is that, while the writer of the Anthrax letter implies an intention to harm the letter recipient (by virtue of including deadly Anthrax spores in the letter) but which, by virtue of suggesting to the recipient how he can save himself, communicates an opposite intention, namely, not to harm him.