

Syntax-pragmatics interface

“Power of entailment”: can cancel existential presupposition
 entailment = necessary consequence of what is said
The King of England does not exist
 presupposition: King exists (as in: *The King of England smokes*)
 entailment: King does not exist
 • therefore: entailment = less pragmatic more a logical concept

- (1) *Evan bought 3 donuts* (p)
- (2) *Evan bought something* (q)
- (3) *Something/someone bought donuts* (r)
- (4) *Something happened* (s)

p ||- q, p ||- r ...

often word stress indicates which entailment should be focal

- focus shift by stress:
 foreground entailment: *Evan bought THREE donuts*
EVAN bought three donuts
- focus shift by syntax:
 it-cleft: *It was EVAN who bought tree donuts*

At the syntax-pragmatics interface

Bridging the gap:

- same proposition corresponds to multiple structures
- different structural types have different discourse functions cf. (adapted from Horn/Ward 2001)

- (1) *John did most of the work on that project*
- (2) *Most of the work on that project was done by John*
- (3) *Most of the work on that project John did*
- (4) *What John did was most of the work on that project*
- (5) *It was John who did most of the work on that project*

	Form	Function
(1)	SVO, active	unmarked
(2)	passive	introduces first given (<i>work</i>) then new (<i>John</i>)
(3)	topicalization = fronting movement for emphasis	links to previous discourse
(4)	<i>Wh-</i> or pseudo-cleft	reflect belief of speaker about certain belief of hearer
(5)	cleft sentence	

Syntactic constraints and discourse function

Given and new in discourse
 Given = on the topic; new = about the topic
 • function of topic marking: to relate a marked utterance to a previously raised topic
 → **left-dislocated** sentences *That car, it is simply amazing*
Fred, is he finally coming down?

Constraints of cleft sentences (cf. Levinson 1997:219)

presupposition: *John lost his coat*
 entailment: *John lost something*

but: *It wasn't his coat that John lost*
 entailment: *John lost something*

$\neg(\exists x (\text{Lost}(j,x) \ \& \ (x = j\text{coat})))$
 $\neg x (\sim\text{Lost}(j,x) \ \& \ (x = j\text{coat}))$
 $\exists x (\text{Lost}(j,x) \ \& \ (x \neq j\text{coat}))$
