Conventional implicatures are...
non-cancellable, not `at-issue'; scopeless, and speaker-oriented [cf. Potts 2003; 2005]
⇒ 2 classes: Supplemental & Expressive CIs.

CIs project, just like presuppositions, but CIs provide new, instead of old, information

Challenge: a unified (DRT) account of CIs and presuppositions (reflecting the difference in information structure)
Solution: CIs are ‘piggy-backing’ on their projecting anchor

PDRT: Projective Discourse Representation Theory
[Venhuizen et al. 2013]

Projection pointers distinguish introduction- and interpretation-sites

Presupposition projection formalized as variable binding [cf. van der Sandt 1992]

MAPs: Minimally Accessible Projection-contexts indicating contextual constraints: ≤ or < or =

Subjective PDRT: personalised pointers introduce restrictions on the model of interpretation (s.t. each discourse agent is taken to introduce its own model).

The Why: piggy-backing on the anchor
CIs signal backgrounded and novel information.

This implies that every CI has an anchor (for coherence), which is specific (background) ⇒ non-restrictive ⇒ established referent

The CI content elaborates its anchor by attaching to the same projection site (piggy-backing)

The How: p-anaphoricity
CIs pose a constraint on their projection site (P_{local} < P_{ci}) and depend on the one of the anchor (P_{ci} = P_{anchor})

Personalized pointers of Subjective PDRT can represent expressive CIs: their content only needs to be true relative to some subjective model.

Conclusion and Discussion
The projection behaviour of CIs can be explained via their projecting anchor.

PDRT is a formal framework in which the interaction between asserted and (different types of) projected content is made explicit.

Are there any CIs without an anchor? Do these really behave just like anchored CIs? Are they CIs?

Check out PDRT SANDBOX to experiment with your own DRSs and PDRSSs: merge, translate, and more!