Ling 525 Semantics Final 2019
(due 2:00 PM, May. 16, 2019)

Jean Mark Gawron
SDSU*

May 9, 2019

1 Introduction

The final will be due at 2:00 PM on Thursday May 16, 2019 in my office in Storm Hall West, SHW 238. Thre can be no collaboration of any kind on the final.

Please type out short-answer question such as the aspect section. You may write logical forms by hand, but you must use black or blue ink. You must leave 1" margins on the top, bottom, left, and right hand sides of your pages. Your font must be at least 11 pt.

Begin your answer to any question with a numbered list of examples that will be discussed in your answer, beginning with an examples I've given you (see model answer to the aspect assignment). When you are discussing an example, refer to it by number. Grammaticality judgement markers ('*', '?' '#') belong at the beginning of the sentence, as in the following:

(1) a. * Those children likes apples.
b. Those children like apples.
c. * Those child like apples.

*San Diego State University, Department of Linguistics and Oriental Languages, SHW 238, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182-7717, gawron@mail.sdsu.edu.

2 Modality [25 pts]

For the following modal sentences, write down modal truth definitions for **all** the readings. Please note: There **are** ambiguous examples. Some sentences exhibit more than one of three possible kinds of modality,

For example:

(a) Alice must leave.
(b) $p =$ Alice leaves
"Alice must leave" is true iff
$\forall w_{\text{po}}[p$ is true in $w_{\text{po}}]$

Note the following error strongly suggests you aren't thinking very hard about this:

(a) Alice must leave.
(b) $p =$ Alice must leave.
"Alice must leave" is true iff
$\forall w_{\text{po}}[p$ is true in $w_{\text{po}}]$

Notice the possible worlds aren't playing any role in the explanation of what *must* means, since since you're just made *must* part of the unanalyzed statement p. If you don't factor out the modality in your definition your answer gets zero credit. Here's another example of doing the same thing:

(a) It is permissible for John not to go.
(b) $p =$ It is permissible for John not to go.
"It is permissible for John not to go" is true iff
$\exists w_{\text{po}}[p$ is true in $w_{\text{po}}]$

The word whose meaning you are explaining is *permissible*, so it can't part of p. Similarly, *not* can't be part of p. A good answer for the example above is:

(a) It is permissible for John not to go.
(b) $p =$ John goes.
"It is permissible for John not to go" is true iff
$\exists w_{\text{po}}[p$ is not true in $w_{\text{po}}]$

Important: Translate modal expressions like *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *must*, *should*, and *allow*, consistently. For example, if you use $\exists w$ for epistemic readings

of *may*, use it for deontic readings as well, and if you use it
$\exists w$ in one example with *may*, use it in all. There are ambiguous examples and you are required to give more than one translation in that case. If you think a example is ambiguous, but one reading is much likelier than another, say so.

2.1. Lila is forbidden to sing.

2.2. John may not have read the letter.

2.3. John may not read the letter.

2.4. Children are required to eat a cookie at lunchtime.

2.5. Greg must not learn Italian. (Context:If he does, the maid will tell him the truth about his son.)

2.6. Greg must not know Italian. (Context: Or he'd really be mad about what that waittress just said to him.).

2.7. A linguist should know a non-Indo-European language.

2.8. I could have been a contender.

2.9. It is not permissible for olives to be smoked.

3 Opacity

3.1 Basic

For each of the following sentences, determine whether the underlined NP is in an opaque context. **Demonstrate** you are right with a substitution test. **Explain** how the results of the test justify your conclusion.

(2) a. The queen forced Superman to buy new underwear.
b. My great uncle Zoltan wants Rebecca to come to dinner.
c. I noticed that Rebecca was wearing a wedding ring.
d. Frank needs to marry the president of Singapore.

4 Aspect

Classify the following sentences as achievments, accomplishments, processes, or states. Provide tests sufficient to justify your classification, and explain what each test shows. Discuss the **subinterval property** (progressive entails or does not entail the non progrssive) in at least two different examples, and use an appropriate test to show that the given clause either has or does not have the subinterval property, If you think an example is ambiguous, says so, and provide tests to justify the ambiguity.

(3) a. John resembled a haddock.
b. The eastern half of the dark sky brightened.
c. Sue found her keys under the staircase.
d. Bill pushed the rake across the front yard.

5 Events

5.1 Basic

Translate the following sentences using event semantics (Chapter 11). Use the Neo-Davidsonian version (p. 245). In this section, You may treat all NPs like proper names (that is, you translate all NPs, even indefinites, as a constant. (*the teacher* = **t**, *an apple* = **a**, etc.)

(4) a. John carefully crossed out her signature.
b. Fred assisted Myrtle across the street.
c. Bert resigned from the commission last Tuesday in Boston.
d. Ed phoned Susan from Rio.

5.2 Putting it all together

Translate the following sentences using neo-Davidsonian event semantics. This time you may not translate all NPs with a constant. You can only do that with proper names and definites. You must translate indefinite NPs with $\exists$. as in the following example in which the definite NP *the leaves* is translated with the constant l, and the indefinite NP *a rake* is translated with $\exists$.

(5) a. John gathered the leaves with a rake.

b. $\exists\, x\, [\, \text{rake}(x)\, \&\, \exists e\, [\, \text{gather}(e)\, \&\, \text{agent}(\text{j},\, e)\, \&\text{patient}(\text{l},\, e)\, \&\, \text{with}(x,\, e)\,]\,]$

Unless instructed otherwise, you should be on the lookout for ambiguities. Explain them. Give two translations. Say which reading goes with which translation. You should translated any adverbs using the standard event semantics for adverbs, **unless treating the adverb that way would produce an incorrect entailment**. If translating an adverb using the standard event semantics treatment produces an incorrect entailment, you may leave it out, but you should explain why you are leaving it out. When the directions give you a situation in which the sentence is true, you should translate the reading that is true in that situation. In (d) and (e) treat *his resignation* as a description of an embedded event, the way we treated *Kennedy's assassination* in the homework problem.

(6) a. John partially cleaned the bathroom.
b. Alice carelessly lost a letter from Sue.
c. Bill took a letter away from Sue.
d. Bill announced his resignation from the podium on Tuesday.
e. Bill announced his resignation from the cabinet.

6 A Final thought