

Semantics Final 2020

Jean Mark Gawron

May 9, 2020

Direction. Your final is due Thursday, May 14 at 5:00 PM. It must be neatly typed (a Word or PDF file). It must be submitted as one file by email. The name of your file should include your name in it. If there is an issue about meeting the deadline or complying with these instructions, please contact me by email.

1 Reference

- 1.1. Consider one of the sentences we've been discussing with respect to the referential attributive distinction and a small variant:

- a. The man with the martini glass is a spy.
- b. That man with the martini glass is a spy.

(b) uses the demonstrative determiner *that*. The question is: Does (b) have both a referential and attributive reading? In your answer consider at least one context for a referential reading and one context for an attributive reading and say whether you think (b) works in each. Please skip the long quote from Donnellan (or the textbook) that you are dying to insert in your answer.

2 Presupposition

- 2.1. Suppose we acknowledge that the preposition *of* is highly ambiguous and that one of its meanings is *rules or administers*, as in *the duke of Milan* or *the president of General Motors* or *Dean of the college*; so, for example, *Duke of Milan* means the same as *the Duke who administers Milan*. Call this meaning of of_{13} . Which of the following translations best captures Russell's analysis of *The King of France is wise*? Explain why by explaining paraphrasing the wrong ones into English:

- a. $\exists x \text{ king}(x) \ \& \ of_{13}(x, \text{france}) \ \& \ \forall y [(\text{king}(y) \ \& \ of_{13}(y, \text{france})) \rightarrow y = x] \ \& \ \text{wise}(x)$
- b. $\exists x \text{ king}(x) \ \& \ of_{13}(x, \text{france}) \ \& \ \forall y [\text{king}(y) \rightarrow y = x] \ \& \ \text{wise}(x)$
- c. $\exists x \text{ king}(x) \ \& \ of_{13}(x, \text{france}) \ \& \ \forall y [\text{wise}(y) \rightarrow y = x] \ \& \ \text{wise}(x)$

- 2.2. Consider the following pairs of sentences, In each case the truth of a implies the truth of b.

- Determine with the appropriate test, whether a entails b or presupposes b. Show the test and state your conclusion (that is, it is not enough to produce the sentence or sentences involved in the test. You must explain what they tell us).
- If you identify an implication as a presupposition, say what the trigger is.
- If there are any factive predicates (verbs or adjectives), say what they are.

- (2.2.1) a. It is clear that Susan has feelings for Sidney.
b. Susan has feelings for Sidney
- (2.2.2) a. Melissa forgot that John had already left.
b. John had already left.
- (2.2.3) a. John won the race.
b. John competed in the race.
- (2.2.4) a. It is true that the moon is a satellite of the earth.
b. The moon is a satellite of the earth.
- (2.2.5) a. It is surprising that the dean of the college spoke to you that way.
b. The dean of the college spoke to you that way.
- (2.2.6) a. Lois accompanied Lucinda across the footbridge.
b. Lucinda went across the footbridge.
- (2.2.7) a. John is right that Mary and Bill are having an affair.
b. Mary and Bill are having an affair.
- (2.2.8) a. John is right that Mary and Bill are having an affair.
b. John believes that Mary and Bill are having an affair.
- (2.2.9) a. Alice got money for her Tiffany lamp.
b. Alice surrendered possession of her Tiffany lamp.
- (2.2.10) a. John went to PARIS too. (where the caps mean intonational prominence)
b. John went somewhere besides Paris

2.3. Consider the following sentence:

- (i) Lucinda's claim, which is based on extensive research, is highly controversial.
- (ii) Lucinda's claim is based on extensive research.

Sentence (i) seems to imply sentence (ii). Your question is: Is (ii) a presupposition or a conventional implicature of (i)? Sentence (ii) is what's called an appositive, or a parenthetical in (i), so in effect you are considering whether parentheticals in general are presuppositions or conventional implicatures, but you only have to consider (i) in answering this question. You should apply the appropriate test for distinguishing conventional implicatures from presuppositions, and you should move on with your life. In particular, you may be tempted to say, (ii) isn't either; it's an entailment (and that's not a crazy view either). But don't do that. Just apply the test for distinguishing conventional implicatures from presuppositions, report the results, and draw an appropriate conclusion. You don't have to consider the entailment question.

3 Aspect

Apply three aspectual tests to each of the following examples and report your results as illustrated in the model answer for the homework. Please be forewarned that if you simply produce the sentences that apply the test and report a one-word or one-sentence answer (“Therefore this is an accomplishment”), you will lose points. You need to explain the result of each test and what it indicates. You need to report conflicts in the test results, and say what ambiguities must be assumed in order to resolve them.

- 3.1. John crossed the bridge.
- 3.2. The refugees crossed the bridge.
- 3.3. The provost understands the need for caution.
- 3.4. Alicia clambered through the narrow passageway.
- 3.5. The pylon snapped under enormous strain.