1 Diagnosing kinds of meaning

The handout ‘Diagnosing different kinds of meaning’ provides a flow-chart for classifying meanings as variously at-issue, conventionally implicated, presupposed, or conversationally implicated. Use that framework to classify meaning \( p \) as expressed in (D).

\[
\text{(D)} \quad \text{Gerald deigned to empty the dishwasher.} \\
\quad p = \text{Gerald emptied the dishwasher.}
\]

Section 3 of the handout provides model answers. Your own answer could adopt the same format, and we’re looking for a similar level of explanation about the relevant examples.

2 A modal hypothesis

Consider the following hypothesis, which is parallel to the hypotheses formulated for negation and questions on the ‘Presupposition’ handout:

**Hypothesis M** If \( p \) is a presupposition of sentence \( S \), then \( p \) is a presupposition of the version of \( S \) with the modal auxiliary *might* or *could* inserted into its top-most verbal structure. (For example, if the initial sentence is *Sue smokes*, then the two modalized versions are *Sue might smoke* and *Sue could smoke*.)

**Your task** Pick two lexical items that qualify as presupposition triggers by the negation test, the question test, and the conditional-antecedent test, and then use them to assess hypothesis M. (You are free to pick lexical items that we discussed in class. If you pick new ones, then you should give the data for all three established tests as well as hypothesis M. If you pick items we’ve discussed, then you need only give the data for hypothesis M.)

3 Presuppositional framing

Many of the meanings involved in framing, in the sense of the ‘Framing’ handout, are presuppositional. In light of this, which of George Lakoff’s ‘Central tenets of framing’ follows from our theory of presuppositions, and why? (3–5 sentences.)
4 Illocutionary acts and the law

This is not required for people doing a final project. Final projectors should answer question 5 instead.

Imagine a police officer here in the U. S. knocks on the door of your home and says, “I hereby order you to let me search the premises!”, with the illocutionary force of a command. In what sense does this speech act ‘misfire’, using the observations in Speaking of Crime, chapter 3, and our theory of speech-acts? What strategies do police officers employ instead, to avoid such blatant speech-act misfirings while still getting permission to search, again according to Speaking of Crime, chapter 3?

5 Final project task

This problem is required only for people doing a final project. Everyone else should answer question 4 instead.

Chris will send you, within 24 hours of your submitting the assignment, a custom-made question to answer here (due along with the rest of the assignment, on Mar 10).

Extra credit 1

This question just asks for your linguistic intuition about a hypothetical scenario. The best thing would be for you to give your immediate judgment and then (if you choose) go on to the next extra-credit problem.

Suppose you and a friend are looking at an ice-cream bar with three pre-made sundaes (ice cream, hot fudge, cherries). Your friend’s hands are full, so she says to you,

“Could you get me the one with the cherry.”

Identify the sundae that you think she is asking for:

Sundae 1    Sundae X    Sundae A

Extra credit 2

Having responded to the previous question using your own intuitions about language and communication, think about it from a theoretical perspective: What do our theories of presupposition and conversational implicature, working together, predict about the listener’s preferred inference in this ice-cream bar scenario, and how do the theories make that prediction? (3–5 sentences)