1 Introduction

The final will be due at 2:00 PM on Thursday May 10, 2018 in my office in Storm Hall West, SHW 238.

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) \( p = \text{Alice leaves} \)
   “Alice must leave” is true iff
   \( \forall w_{po}[p \text{ is true in } w_{po}] \)

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

---
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(a) Alice must leave.
(b) \( p = \) Alice must leave.

“Alice must leave” is true iff
\[
\forall w_{po} [p \text{ is true in } w_{po}]
\]

Notice the possible worlds aren’t playing any role in the explanation of what \textit{must} means, since since you’re just made \textit{must} part of the unanalyzed statement \( p \). If you don’t factor out the modality in your definition your answer gets zero credit.

Important: Translate modal expressions like \textit{can}, \textit{could}, \textit{may}, \textit{might}, \textit{must}, \textit{should}, and \textit{allow}, consistently. For example, if you use \( \exists w \) for epistemic readings of \textit{may}, use it for deontic readings as well, and if you use it \( \exists w \) in one example with \textit{may}, use it in all.

2.1. John is forbidden to eat pretzels.
2.2. Luisa may not have seen the murder.
2.3. You are required to report to the cafeteria
2.4. Susan must not go to Lisbon.
2.5. Greg must not know Italian.
2.6. You should aim for the stars.
2.7. Ethan could have been elected mayor.
2.8. Fred may not enter the bedroom.

3 Opacity

3.1 Basic

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

(1) a. Larry thinks that Rebecca is a white militant.
   b. Larry regrets that Rebecca is a white militant.
   c. Larry persuaded the masked burglar to leave.
   d. Frank needs the leader of his choir to approve his trip.
4 Additional

The following sentence has *de re* and *de dicto* readings. Explain what these are by giving a context in which each is true. Then give logical translations showing that these readings can be treated as a scope ambiguity. Please say which translation represents the *de re* reading and which translation represents a *de dicto* reading.

(2) Lisa intends to study a Dravidian language.

5 Aspect

Classify the following sentences as achievements, 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-progressive) 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 mowed the lawn.
   b. Ferdinand knows Italian.
   c. Rita regained consciousness.
   d. The sky darkened.

6 Events

6.1 Basic

Translate the following sentences using event semantics (Chapter 11). Use the NeoDavidsonian version (p. 245). You may translate all NPs as a constant. (*the teach = t*).

(4) a. John carefully crossed the bridge.
   b. Fred assisted the teacher with the grading.
   c. Alice jumped over the fence.
   d. Susan called Ed up on the phone.
6.2 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 leaves* is translated with teh constant $l$, and *a rake* is translated with $\exists$.

(5) a. John gathered the leaves with a rake.
   b. $\exists x [\text{rake}(x) \& \exists e [\text{gather}(e) \& \text{agent}(j, e) \& \text{patient}(l, e) \& \text{with}(x, e)]]$

Unless instructed otherwise, you should be on the look out 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.

(6) a. John quietly crept into the living room.
   b. Roland allegedly chopped up the onion with an axe.
   c. Susan bought an excellent meal for Will.

7 A Final thought

Of that which we cannot speak we must remain silent.