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**Lectures on Pragmatics in Indian theories of meaning**

**Lecture 1: On sentence meaning**

What is the meaning of a sentence (*vākyārthaḥ*)? How does it relate to the meanings of the words in that sentence (*padārthaḥ*)? This lecture will organize reflections on sentence meaning in Indian thought into two types: “top-down” theories, such as those adopted by Bhartr̥hari and Prabhākara, which insist on the priority of the sentence to the word, and “bottom-up” theories, such as what we find in Śabara and Kumārila, which see sentence meaning essentially as a composite of word meanings. The former group sees the sentence as having a qualitatively different kind of meaning from the word, either “intuition” (*pratibhā*) or a “performable” (*kāryam*). This talk will conclude by comparing these views to recently-proposed theories of meaning outside of Indian philosophy.

**Lecture 2: On secondary meaning**

We commonly distinguish between “primary” and “secondary” senses of a word, but the basis of this distinction was already controversial by the time of Śabara (5th c. CE). Theories of secondary meaning developed in two directions. By far the more influential theory posited “secondary meaning” (*lakṣaṇā*) as a property of *words*, defined in relation to the word’s “primary meaning” and activated when that primary meaning is found to be impossible. But on an alternative view, where meaning is not a property of words at all but only of complete utterances, it is less useful and perhaps even impossible to distinguish between the “primary” and “secondary” senses of a word. Although these two positions were never in conversation in Indian texts, I will try to offer a critique of the first position from the vantage point of the second.

**Lecture 3: On implications**

When you say something without saying it, what are you actually doing? This question had two major moments: first, in the roughly two centuries between Ānandavardhana (9th c.) and Mahimabhaṭṭa (11th c.), and second, unrelatedly, in the middle of the 20th century, thanks largely to the ideas of Paul Grice. This talk will present Mahima’s theory as an anticipation, with several key differences, of Grice’s theory of implicature. One important legacy of Mahima’s arguments (and of the criticisms of Ānandavardhana more generally) is that they established “saying without saying” as an absolutely pervasive feature of language use, across the literary and non-literary domains. And ironically, they might have rescued Ānandavardhana’s theory of literature by distinguishing run-of-the-mill “implicatures”from literary “resonances.”