

Pragmaticists argue that we need saturation for all kinds of sentences; their literal content does not provide information leading to their truth-value. But cases they quote are usually isolated from the normal context of conversation. In these cases the link seems to be linguistic and thus arguably semantic, rather than pragmatic. Once we give up on this isolationism, we might get more interested in situations in which our target sentences are responses to something just said; the semantics of such responses is very different from the semantics of isolated utterances (sentences and often sub-sentences). They get saturated from the preceding material, and the anaphoric or quasi-anaphoric link they have with the conversational context offers syntactic and semantic guidance for saturation. In brief, anaphora is semantic. It determines the truth-conditional content and guides the hearer in recognizing this determining. Most problematic cases are anaphora-like, only with more guidance and less strict determination. In short, saturation is the main semantic or almost-semantic process in the conversation. The rest can be dealt with, therefore, the guidance view is the right one.

So, semantics is not mere skeleton: semantic content provides the guidance and the main force. It is a powertrain as opposed to mere lining.