

Multiple Contexts in Drama: Henry V

Sigrid Beck, Uni Tübingen
(presenting joint work with Matthias Bauer)

1. Introduction

- topic:
 - hearer/reader's subjective interpretation of fictional texts
 - in particular utterances in dramatic dialogue
 - crucial property: an internal (other characters) and an external hearer (audience)
 - internal and external contexts are actively used to create subjective meaning
- the example - from Shakespeare's *King Henry V*:
 - (1) For though I speak it to you, I think [that] the king is but a man, as I am.
 - (2) context in drama:
 - King Henry V is the speaker in (1).
 - disguised as a soldier, speaking to a group of 'other' soldiers.
 - audience knows that the speaker is actually the king.
 - soldiers he addresses do not know that the speaker is the king.
 - (3) effect:
 - unremarkable in internal context
 - external: "H is but a man and H is but a man" (H = King Henry)
oddness triggers reflection on who/what the king is
 - diverging contexts (informed/uninformed hearer) exploited to interpretive effect
- our background:
 - interpretation of fictional texts - meaning for a hearer/reader
 - mapping between fictional worlds and actual world - relation
 - application to drama and multiple contexts
- structure of the talk:
 - section 2: Background theory
 - section 3: Analysis of example (1)
 - section 4: Generalization
 - section 5: Conclusions

2. Background theory

2.1. Bauer & Beck (2014): FictionalAssert

- fictional texts have a meaning for a hearer/reader by way of making them relate what happens in the text to their own situation. Prime example: a fable, which is meant to teach a lesson. The lesson is what we call the meaning for the hearer or the **subjective meaning**. (Note: this is not the semantic interpretation of the text, and it is not usually an object of study of linguistics.)
- Bauer & Beck model this via the operator 'FictionalAssert'. The operator introduces an **inference** from the literal content of the text to the hearer/reader's reality.

- (4) FictioinalAssert - interpretation of fictional texts as a conditional inference:
 $\lambda T.\lambda w.\forall w'[T(w') \rightarrow R(w')(w)]$
 'All worlds in which what the text T says is the case stand in relation R to w (the actual world).'

- an example from *Magnyfycence* (an allegorical play):

- (5) I am Adversyte, that for thy misdeed
 From God am sent to quyte the mede. [i.e. to pay your reward]
 [...]
 Thy pleasure now with payne and trouble shalbe tryde [tried]. (ll. 1876-81)
- (6) context: - Magnyfycence, a great prince, is ruined by his giving in to the temptations to waste his fortune on pleasures offered by corrupt counsellors.
 - He is “*beten downe and spoylyd from all his goodys and rayment*”
 - At this point, a character called “Adversyte” appears and says (5).

- we pick a particular hearer as a concrete example:

- (7) Roy Hartlock, a famous but overly ambitious professor, is watching a students’ production of the late medieval morality play *Magnyfycence*. Hartlock thinks that (5) can be adapted to his own situation. He has been tempted by a colleague to submit an article to a well-known journal even though he knows the data are fishy. A publication in that journal would enhance his fame considerably. He does not believe in divine punishment but watching the play he still thinks Adversyte’s words may apply to himself. What they mean to him is: giving in to his colleague could get him into deep trouble.

- Hartlock's subjective interpretation:

- (8) If what the play says is true, then one could be lead astray by bad advice and get into real trouble for it.

- he inferred the following relation connecting the play to his situation (@ the actual world):

- (9) $R(w)(@)$ iff the worlds w of the play are just like @ except Magnyfycence is the counterpart in w of Hartlock in @ and wealth stands for reputation.

=> (8) is the subjective interpretation of the play (including (5)). How does this come about?

2.2. Bauer & Beck (to appear): Mapping

- making the connection from the situations described by the fictional text and reality relies on **mapping** particular aspects of the fictional text to real world entities and concepts. Plausible mappings are **structure preserving**.

- (10) $R(w)(@)$ iff there is an isomorphic mapping f such that
- f maps individuals in w to individuals in $@$
 - f maps relations between individuals in w to relations between individuals in $@$
 - if a relation holds in w between w -individuals, then the counterpart relation holds in $@$ between the counterpart $@$ -individuals.

- in the example (5):

(11)	drama:	reality:
	Magnyfycence	Hartlock
	advisor	colleague
	Adversyte	justice
	squander fortune	compromise conscience and reputation
	give in to temptation	give in to temptation
		...

- other hearers/readers may infer other particular mappings but mappings guided by the text have certain properties in common.

=> Isomorphic mapping informs relation fiction-reality and subjective interpretation.
The mapping is structure preserving: while the individuals are different in domain and range, their properties and the relations between them are more stable.

2.3. Contexts for Adversyte & Magnyfycence and Hartlock

- in the simple example (5), multiple contexts are not used in an interesting way to contribute to the text's meaning. But in our case study (1) they are; we practice with (5) before we turn to (1).
- a context c is a triple $\langle S_c, H_c, C_w \rangle$ with speaker S_c , hearer H_c and context set or common ground ("cg" - common ground and context set used interchangeably) C_w . A context update with proposition p (" $c+p$ ") is adding p to the cg: $C_w \cap p$

- (12) a. internal context $c_1 = \langle A, M, C_1 \rangle$
 speaker A (Adversyte)
 hearer M (Magnyfycence)
 common ground $C_1 = \{w: \text{Magnyfycence has lost all his wealth in } w \text{ \& } \dots\}$
- b. external context $c_2 = \langle \text{Author}, H, C_2 \rangle$
 speaker Author (the author speaking through Adversyte's lines)
 hearer H (Hartlock)
 common ground $C_2 = \{w: \text{for worlds } w' \text{ in which what is portrayed in } w \text{ is the case, Magnyfycence has lost all his wealth in } w' \text{ \& } \dots\}$

- (13) a. $c_1 + (5)$:
 $C_1' = \{w: M \text{ has lost all his wealth in } w \text{ \& } \underline{M \text{ is punished by God for his foolish love of pleasure in } w} \text{ \& } \dots\}$
- b. $c_2 + (5)$:
 $C_2' = \{w: \text{for worlds } w' \text{ in which what is portrayed in } w \text{ is the case, } M \text{ has lost all his wealth in } w' \text{ \& } \underline{M \text{ is punished by God for his foolish love of pleasure in } w'} \text{ \& } \dots\}$

- (14) Hartlock's overall subjective interpretation:
 $c_2 + (5) + f(c_1 + (5))$:
 $C_2'' = \{w: \text{for worlds } w' \text{ in which what is portrayed in } w \text{ is the case,}$
 $M \text{ has lost all his wealth in } w' \text{ \& } M \text{ is punished by God for his foolish love of pleasure in}$
 $w' \text{ \& if what the plays says is true, Author is warning } H \text{ in } w \text{ \& ...}\}$
- (4') FictionalAssert as function from contexts to contexts:
 $\lambda T. \lambda c. \lambda c': c' = \langle S_c, H_c, C_w \cap [\lambda w. \forall w' [T(w') \rightarrow R(w')(w)]] \rangle$

The content of the assertion in (5) is added to the common ground of the internal context. In the external context, it is added as information on the content of the play; in addition, the inference it triggered via FictionalAssert is added.

=> The external common ground C_2'' contains not just the information that certain things happened in the play, but also the inference the hearer drew on the basis of the play - the subjective meaning. The inference is based on FictionalAssert & the associated mapping.

3. The core example

3.1. The example's context in the drama

- (1)=(15) is from William Shakespeare's play *King Henry V*, written and first staged ca. 1599. Act 4, Scene 1, lines 101-02

- after King Henry V of England, who was advised by his court to take by force the throne of France. The play presents this conquest, which culminates in the Battle of Agincourt, historically in 1415, eventually deciding the war in favour of the English.

- (1) is part of a conversation that takes place in the night before the Battle of Agincourt in Act 4, Scene 1 of the play. The speaker is King Henry V himself; in order to enter into unbiased dialogue with his soldiers, the King has disguised himself as one of them.

- the soldiers Williams, Bates, and Court, are addressed in (1); to them, he identifies himself as a "friend" (4.1.92) who serves in the same army. Because the English army is vastly outnumbered, the soldiers share their concerns about their situation, even questioning whether it was just to go to war in the first place. In this context they speak of the King and their perception of him.

=> Though the audience knows that the speaker is the King in disguise, the soldiers do not, but assume that they are speaking to one of their own. This discrepant awareness between external context and internal context ('multiple common grounds') becomes instrumental in our analysis of the utterance.

3.2. Semantics/pragmatics: literal interpretation of the example

(15) For though I speak it to you, I think [that] the king is but a man, as I am.

- property equative:

- (16) a. John is a linguist, as I am.
 b. $[_{IP} [_{CP} \text{John is a linguist}_i] [_{CP} \text{as}_i \text{I am}]]$
 c. $\lambda w.\text{linguist}(w)(\text{John}) \ \& \ \text{linguist}(w)(S_c)$
 'John is a linguist, and S_c (the speaker) has the same property, 'linguist'.'

- scalar *but*:

- (17) a. John is but a lieutenant.
 b. John is only a lieutenant.
 c. $\lambda w.\text{lieutenant}(w)(\text{John}) \ \& \ \forall P[\text{P is ranked higher than lieutenant} \rightarrow \neg P(w)(\text{John})]$
 'John is a lieutenant and no more than that.'
- (18) a. John is but a linguist, as I am.
 b. John is a linguist and no more than that, and S_c is a linguist.
 c. John is a linguist and no more than that,
 and S_c is a linguist and no more than that.

- reference:

- (19) The king is but a man, as I am.
- (20) a. $[[I_i]]^g$ is only defined if $g(i)=S_c$. Then, $[[I_i]]^g=g(i)$
 b. $[[\text{the NP}]]$ is only defined if there is a unique x such that $[[NP]](x)$.
 Then, $[[\text{the NP}]]$ is that x .
 c. $[[\text{the NP}]]$ is only defined if there is a unique x such that $x \neq S_c \ \& \ x \neq H_c$
 & $[[NP]](x)$. Then, $[[\text{the NP}]]$ is that x .
 (" $x \neq S_c \ \& \ x \neq H_c$ " should perhaps not be modeled as a PSP - simplification.)
- (21) a. $\lambda w:\text{there is a unique individual } K \text{ such that } \text{king}(w)(K) \ \& \ K \neq S_c.$
 $\text{man}(w)(K) \ \& \ \forall P[\text{P is ranked higher than 'man'} \rightarrow \neg P(w)(K)] \ \& \ \text{man}(w)(S_c)$
 'The king, who is not S_c , is a man and no more than that, and S_c is a man.'
 b. $\lambda w:\text{there is a unique individual } K \text{ such that } \text{king}(w)(K) \ \& \ K \neq S_c.$
 $\text{man}(w)(K) \ \& \ \forall P[\text{P is ranked higher than 'man'} \rightarrow \neg P(w)(K)]$
 & $\text{man}(w)(S_c) \ \& \ \forall P[\text{P is ranked higher than 'man'} \rightarrow \neg P(w)(S_c)]$
 'The king, who is not S_c , is a man and no more than that,
 and S_c is a man and no more than that.'

- in fact $K=S_c$. This contradicts the PSP (meaning component) $K \neq S_c$. Suspending the PSP leads to redundancy: "K is a man and no more than that and K is a man (and no more than that)".

- propositional attitude verb *think*:

- (22) a. $[_{IP} \text{I think } [_{CP} \text{the king is but a man, } [_{CP} \text{as I am}]]]$
 b. $[_{IP} [_{IP} \text{I think } [_{CP} \text{the king is but a man}]] \ [_{CP} \text{as I am}]]$

- interpretation (21b) embedded in (22a) leads to the paraphrase in (23) (simplifying as much as possible (*de dicto* reading only, PSP projection not properly modelled)).

- (23) In all Belief-worlds w of S_c in $@$, there is a unique individual K such that
 $\text{king}(w)(K) \ \& \ K \neq S_c \ \& \ \text{man}(w)(K) \ \& \ \forall P[P \text{ is ranked higher than 'man'} \rightarrow \neg P(w)(K)]$
 $\& \ \text{man}(w)(S_c) \ \& \ \forall P[P \text{ is ranked higher than 'man'} \rightarrow \neg P(w)(S_c)]$
 'According to S_c 's beliefs, the king, who is not S_c , is a man and no more than that, and S_c is a man and no more than that.'

- the structure (22b) gives rise to (24) (based on (21b) as well, which we focus on here):

- (24) In all Belief-worlds w of S_c in $@$, there is a unique individual K such that
 $\text{king}(w)(K) \ \& \ K \neq S_c \ \& \ \text{man}(w)(K) \ \& \ \forall P[P \text{ is ranked higher than 'man'} \rightarrow \neg P(w)(K)]$
 $\& \ \text{man}(@)(S_c) \ \& \ \forall P[P \text{ is ranked higher than 'man'} \rightarrow \neg P(@)(S_c)]$
 'According to S_c 's beliefs, the king, who is not S_c , is a man and no more than that; and S_c is (actually) a man and no more than that.'

- anti-PSP of *think*:

- (25) a. I think that I have a cousin in the US.
 b. I know that I have a cousin in the US.

- (26) (25a) anti-PSPs that I don't know that I have a cousin in the US.

- in (1), adding the anti-PSP gives rise to (27a,b) for the 'scalar property equative' readings (23) and (24) (and parallel for the readings based on (21a), neglected here).

- (27) a. S_c believes but isn't sure that the king and S_c are men and no more than that.
 b. S_c believes but isn't sure that the king is a man and no more than that;
 and S_c is (actually) a man and no more than that.

- speech act modifier:

- (28) $[[\text{ASSERT}]] = \lambda p. \lambda c. \lambda c': c' = \langle S_c, H_c, C_w \cap p \rangle$ type $\langle \langle s, t \rangle, \langle c, c \rangle \rangle$
 speech act operator updates a context $\langle S_c, H_c, C_w \rangle$ with cg C_w with proposition p (" $c+p$ ")

- (29) 'for though I speak it to you, ASSERT (p)(c):'
 S_c asserts that p in c although c entails possible reasons against S_c doing so.

- (30) $[_{\text{ForceP}} [\text{for though I speak it to you}] [_{\text{Force}'} \text{ASSERT } [_{\text{IP}} \dots]]]$

- (31) a. Although c entails possible reasons against S_c doing so, S_c asserts that S_c believes but isn't sure that the king and S_c are men and no more than that.
 b. Although c entails possible reasons against S_c doing so, S_c asserts that S_c believes but isn't sure that the king is a man and no more than that;
 and that S_c is (actually) a man and no more than that.

- (32) Even though I say so myself, I don't know that the king is just a man, like I am;
I only think that this is the case.

=> (1) combines several elements that are operative at the semantics/pragmatics interface:

- **Person feature PSPs**: first and third person presuppose non-identity of the speaker and the king, while in the context of the drama they are actually the same person.
- **Property equative**: what does it mean that the same property is attributed first to the king, then to the speaker, when they are in fact the same person? Under what circumstances is this **redundant** (a violation of the Gricean Maxim of Quantity)?
- **Anti-PSP** triggered by *think* is that the speaker does not know that they (as the speaker/as the king) are just a man. Under what circumstances is this plausible?
- **Speech act modifier** indicates the presence of information in the context suggesting that the speaker is not in a position to assert that they/the king are just a man. Which information?

=> **issues**: identity, roles, relation to peers & subordinates.

3.3. Adding the example to the context

- formalizing (31b):

- (31) b. Although c entails possible reasons against S_c doing so, S_c asserts that S_c believes but isn't sure that the king is a man and no more than that; and that S_c is (actually) a man and no more than that.

- (33) $\lambda c: c$ entails reasons against S_c asserting p & $\forall w' \in C_w: [[\text{the king}]](w') \neq S_c$.
 $\iota c': c' = \langle S_c, H_c, C_w \cap p \rangle$,
 where $p = [\lambda w. S_c$ believes but isn't sure in w that the king is a man and no more than that; and S_c is a man and no more than that in $w]$

- reminder: multiple contexts (actually, three: role playing within drama - Henry is in the know):

- (34) a. internal context $c_1 = \langle H, S, C_1 \rangle$
 H : Henry V
 S : soldiers
 $C_1 = \{w: H \text{ and } S \text{ are preparing for battle in } w \text{ \& ...}\}$
 b. external context $c_2 = \langle \text{Author}, A, C_2 \rangle$
 Author (the author speaking through Henry's lines)
 A : audience
 $C_2 = \{w: \text{for worlds } w' \text{ in which what is portrayed in } w \text{ is the case, } H \text{ and } S \text{ are preparing for battle in } w' \text{ \& } \underline{H \text{ is the king in } w'} \text{ \& ...}\}$
- (35) middle context $c_m = \langle H, H, C_m \rangle$
 H : Henry V
 $C_m = \{w: H \text{ and } S \text{ are preparing for battle in } w \text{ \& } \underline{H \text{ is the king in } w} \text{ \& ...}\}$

- update of internal context:

- (36) $c_1 + (33) = (33)(c_1) =$
 $\langle H, S, C_1 \cap \{w: S_c \text{ believes but isn't sure in } w \text{ that the king is a man and no more than that; and } S_c \text{ is a man and no more than that in } w\} \rangle$
provided that c_1 entails reasons against S_c asserting this & $[[\text{the king}]] \neq S_c$.
 $= \langle H, S, \{w: H \text{ and } S \text{ are preparing for battle in } w \text{ \& } H \text{ believes but isn't sure in } w \text{ that the king is a man and no more than that; and } H \text{ is a man and no more than that in } w \text{ \& ...}\} \rangle$

- update of external context: external common ground C_2 entails that $[[\text{the king}]] = S_c$ hence the PSP ' $[[\text{the king}]] \neq S_c$ ' has to be **cancelled**; assume e.g. (32); update modally subordinated:

- (37) $c_2 + (33) =$
 $\langle \text{Author}, A, C_2 + \{w: S_c \text{ believes but isn't sure in } w \text{ that the king is a man and no more than that; and } S_c \text{ is a man and no more than that in } w\} \rangle$
 $= \langle \text{Author}, A, \{w: \text{for worlds } w' \text{ in which what is portrayed in } w \text{ is the case, } H \text{ and } S \text{ are preparing for battle in } w' \text{ \& } H \text{ is the king in } w' \text{ \& } H \text{ believes but isn't sure in } w' \text{ that the king is a man and no more than that; and } H \text{ is a man and no more than that in } w' \text{ \& ...}\} \rangle$

- bringing out the *de dicto* interpretation of 'the king':

- (38) H believes but isn't sure that whoever is king is a man and no more than that; and H is a man and no more than that.
- (37') $c_2 + (33) =$
 $\langle \text{Author}, A, \{w: \text{for worlds } w' \text{ in which what is portrayed in } w \text{ is the case, } H \text{ and } S \text{ are preparing for battle in } w' \text{ \& } H \text{ is the king in } w' \text{ \& } H \text{ believes but isn't sure in } w' \text{ that whoever is king is a man and no more than that; and } H \text{ is a man and no more than that in } w' \text{ \& ...}\} \rangle$

- formalizing (31a):

- (31) a. Although c entails possible reasons against S_c doing so, S_c asserts that S_c believes but isn't sure that the king and S_c are men and no more than that.
- (39) $\lambda c: c$ entails reasons against S_c asserting p & $\forall w' \in C_w: [[\text{the king}]](w') \neq S_c$.
 $\iota c': c' = \langle S_c, H_c, C_w \cap p \rangle$,
where $p = \lambda w. S_c \text{ believes but isn't sure in } w \text{ that the king is a man and no more than that and that } S_c \text{ is a man and no more than that}$.

- redundancy (as long as H believes that H is the king):

- (40) H believes but isn't sure that whoever is king is a man and no more than that and that H is a man and no more than that.

- possible pragmatic inferences (implicatures) from redundancy:

- (41) a. H is saying the same thing twice to be affirmative:
H is definitely just a man!
- b. H is revealing an inner uncertainty by being oddly repetitive:
H is in doubt about whether he is more than a man.

- a plausible updated external context:

- (42) $c_2 + (31a) =$
 $\langle \text{Author}, A, \{w: \text{for worlds } w' \text{ in which what is portrayed in } w \text{ is the case, H and S are preparing for battle in } w' \text{ \& H is the king in } w' \text{ \& H believes but isn't sure in } w' \text{ that whoever is king is a man and no more than that, \& } \underline{\text{H is in doubt in } w' \text{ whether he is more than a man}} \text{ \& ...} \rangle$

- we assume that all possible interpretations of a text/play may contribute to the subjective interpretation. Moreover, a cancelled PSP like ' $[[\text{the king}]] \neq S_c$ ' isn't simply gone. The interpretive attention and labour guides a hearer towards what is important. Interpretive stumbling stones:

- (43) a. cancelled PSP: $H \neq [[\text{the king}]]$
- b. PSP from speech act modifier: Is H uncertain about who or what he is?
- c. anti-PSP: is H sure that H is a man and no more than that?
- d. implicature: is H in doubt whether he is more than a man?

=> semantic **issues** (identity, roles, relation to peers & subordinates) carried into pragmatics.

3.4. Subjective interpretation

Remember from the allegorical play and Hartlock: subjective meaning is based on FictionalAssert and a Mapping - " $c_2 + (1) + f(c_1 + (1))$ ". Here as well we pick an example:

- (44) Scholastica Bings is watching a performance of Henry V. Scholastica Bings, like Roy Lockhart, is a professor. Unlike Lockhart, Bings is not focused on fame. She is somewhat unworldly and, though she tries to disguise this and appear practical, in her heart believes that the only thing that really matters is scientific insight. Despite this, or perhaps because of it, her colleagues have chosen her as the chair of an important committee. She is finding this position difficult, since she is suddenly in charge of her colleagues and must make important decisions that affect them. As Scholastica Bings watches the play, she relates it to her personal struggle in coming to terms with her newfound authority. She thinks that the message of (1) may well relate to her own situation.
- (45) Scholastica Bings's (B) overall subjective interpretation (" $c_2 + (1) + f(c_1 + (1))$): $C_2 = \{w: \text{for worlds } w' \text{ in which what is portrayed in } w \text{ is the case, H and S are preparing for battle in } w' \text{ \& H is the king in } w' \text{ \& H believes but isn't sure in } w' \text{ that whoever is king is a man and no more than that; \& H is in doubt in } w' \text{ whether he is more than a man; \& } \underline{\text{B is wondering in } w \text{ whether she, as their chair, is any different than her colleagues}} \}$

4. Generalizing from (1): who is Henry V and how does he relate to Scholastica Bings?

First we examine (1) in the context of the drama; then we return to (45) and how it comes about.

4.1. The drama

- (46) KING I myself heard the King say he would not be ransomed.
WILLIAMS Ay, he said so to make us fight cheerfully; but
when our throats are cut he may be ransomed and
we ne'er the wiser.
KING If I live to see it, I will never trust his word after.
WILLIAMS You pay him then! [...]
You may as well go about
to turn the sun to ice with fanning in his face with a
peacock's feather. You'll never trust his word after!
Come, 'tis a foolish saying.
KING Your reproof is something too round; I should be
angry with you if the time were convenient. (4.1.189-95, 197-202)
- (47) O hard condition,
Twin-born with greatness, subject to the breath
Of every fool whose sense no more can feel
But his own wringing! What infinite heart's ease
Must kings neglect that private men enjoy!
And what have kings that privates have not too,
Save ceremony, save general ceremony?
And what art thou, thou idol ceremony?
[...]
Canst thou, when thou command'st the beggar's knee,
Command the health of it? No, thou proud dream, [...] (4.1.230-37, 53-54)

=> pragmatic issues and subjective interpretation supported by further passages in the drama.

4.2. Bings and other hearers

Remember our background theory: fiction is interpreted via the FictionalAssert operator which introduces an inference about the actual world, (48). The inference is based on a mapping, (49).

- (48) FictionalAssert:
 $\lambda T. \lambda c. \lambda c': c' = \langle S_c, H_c, C_w \cap [\lambda w. \forall w' [T(w') \rightarrow R(w')(w)]] \rangle$
- (49) $R(w)(@)$ iff there is an isomorphic mapping f such that
- f maps individuals in w to individuals in $@$
 - f maps relations between individuals in w to relations between individuals in $@$
 - if a relation holds in w between w -individuals, then the counterpart relation holds in $@$ between the counterpart $@$ -individuals.

- Scholastica Bings' mapping for (45):

(50)	drama:	reality:	
	Henry	Scholastica Bings	
	soldiers	colleagues	
	king	chair	
	command	be in charge of	
	be just a man	be just a colleague	
	doubt/wonder about role	doubt/wonder about role	
	perception of role	perception of role	...

- Bings's subjective interpretation of the drama (informally):

(51) If what the drama says is the case, then I cannot expect my colleagues to share in my situation, even though I am probably not any different than they are.

- Scholastica Bings is a particular example. Other members of the audience are unlikely to draw inferences about a university committee and the role of its chair.

- But the text guides them to pick mappings with parallel properties. The owner of a small business might reflect on her relationship with her employees; the player-coach of a local soccer team might think about giving up her active soccer career.

- Generally the play guides members of the audience to think about positions of authority and responsibility towards others, and our own and others' perception of us in those roles (*be in charge of, be just a peer, doubt/wonder about role, perception of role*).

- Modulo the individuals involved, there is stability in the properties and relations negotiated in the mapping: 'doubt/wonder about role', 'perception of role', etc.

=> Generalization: inferences supported by the text share certain properties, making certain types of interpretation plausible. This is captured by way of plausible isomorphic mappings, which have higher order concepts (properties, relations) in common.

4.3. Mapping management: how does the Author guide the hearer towards a mapping?

- one type of cue: the stumbling stones (43) "pay attention here!"

- second type of cue: multiple common grounds, in two ways:

- (i) We are not simply absorbed by the action of a play but become aware of our situation as participants and observers through the unequal distribution of knowledge. This awareness is a trigger of, and the key to, subjective interpretations like (45).
- (ii) the divergent contexts c_1 and c_2 guide the choice of the mapping function. The nature of the divergence of c_2 from c_1 - here: the identity of the speaker and the king, and the properties that he has in his different roles - guide the hearer/reader towards what is important, and what is preserved in the mapping.

- the 'middle' context (35): Remember that (1) is uttered in a role-playing within the drama, where Henry pretends to be a common soldier. This also concentrates the hearer/reader's attention on the

different roles a person may play (king, soldier), and on how one and the same individual is perceived by others in those different roles; it also focuses the (non-) identity of the king and Henry. In this way, the middle context is instrumental to making particular mappings salient (difference to the external context: not embedded under fiction! H has same information state as audience, but a different update occurs).

=> Our case study shows that the pragmatic effects triggered by multiple contexts make a complex, but objectively traceable contribution to the literary meaning of text.

5. Conclusions and Outlook

- multiple contexts are an instrument an author may use to focus a hearer/reader's attention on how to relate the fiction to her own situation.
- more work on mapping management to generalize insights from our case study (violations, ambiguities, mismatches,...).
- explore different effects of multiple common grounds.

Selected References

- Bauer, M. & Beck, S. (2014). On the Meaning of Fictional Texts. In D. Gutzmann, J. Köpping & C. Meier (Eds.), *Approaches to Meaning: Composition, Values, and Interpretation* (pp. 250-75). Leiden: Brill.
- Bauer & Beck (to appear). Isomorphic Mapping in Fictional Interpretation. In E. Maier & A. Stokke (Eds.), *The Language of Fiction*.
- von Fintel, K. & Heim, I. (2011). *Intensional semantics*. Lecture notes, Spring 2011, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.
- Heim, I. (1991). Artikel und Definitheit. In von Stechow, A., & Wunderlich, D. (Eds.), *Semantik: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung* (pp. 487-535). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hohaus, V., & Zimmermann, M. (to appear). Comparisons of equality with German so...wie, and the relationship between degrees and properties equatives. *Journal of Semantics*.
- König, E. (1991). Gradpartikeln. In A. von Stechow & D. Wunderlich (Eds.), *Semantik / Semantics* (pp. 786–803). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Krifka, M. (2014). Embedding Illocutionary Acts. In M. Speas and T. Roeper (Eds.), *Recursion: Complexity in Cognition* (pp. 59-87). Berlin: Springer.
- Percus, O. (2006). Antipresuppositions. In A. Ueyama (Ed.), *Theoretical and Empirical Studies of Reference and Anaphora: Toward the Establishment of Generative Grammar as an Empirical Science* (pp. 52-73). Report of the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B), Project No. 15320052, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.
- Rapp, I. & Wollmann, R. (to appear). Inszenierte Ironie: Zur Analyse von Qualitätsverstößen in Schillers Drama *Kabale und Liebe*.
- Sauerland, U. (2003). A new semantics for number. In R. Youn and Y. Zou (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 13th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 13)* (pp. 258–275). Ithaca, NY: Cornell Linguistics Club Publications.
- Shakespeare, W. *King Henry V*. 1599 (1995). Ed. T.W. Craik. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Cengage.
- Stalnaker, R. (1973). Presuppositions. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 2, 447-457.