1 Presuppositional quantifiers [1 point]

For each top (root) node in the following trees, use rule Q2 from the ‘Semantic composition’ hand-out to derive its meaning (if any) after all the allowable substitutions from functional applications. Assume the following lexical denotations; \([\text{both}]\) is given on the ‘Presupposition’ handout.

- \([\text{kids}] = \lambda x (T \text{ if } x \in \{[\text{Bart}], [\text{Lisa}], [\text{Maggie}]\}, \text{ else } F)\)
- \([\text{parents}] = \lambda x (T \text{ if } x \in \{[\text{Homer}], [\text{Marge}]\}, \text{ else } F)\)
- \([\text{skateboard}] = \lambda x (T \text{ if } x \in \{[\text{Bart}]\}, \text{ else } F)\)

1.1

\[
\text{S} \\
\text{QP} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{Both} \quad \text{N} \\
\text{kids} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{skateboard} \\
\]

1.2

\[
\text{S} \\
\text{QP} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{Both} \quad \text{N} \\
\text{parents} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{skateboard} \\
\]

2 The pragmatics of the verb \textit{suspect} [2 points]

Part 1 Use the negation test, the interrogative test, and the conditional-antecedent test to show that \textit{suspect} is not a factive verb – that is, that it does not presuppose the truth of its complement clause. This question is like Assignment 6, question 1, but you need to make up your own base sentence and then run the tests on it.

Note: Please restrict your attention to uses of \textit{suspect} as a verb with a sentential complement. (Set aside cases like \textit{Lisa suspects Bart of cheating}.)

Note: In order to get clear results, try to avoid sentences with biases that could creep in from world knowledge and interfere with the results. For example, \textit{Jim suspects the earth is round} is likely to be unreliable here because we all know the earth is round.
Part 2  In each of the following pairs of examples, the (b) case favors an inference that the embedded clause is true, even though we saw in Part 1 that suspect isn't truly factive. For example, (1b) suggests that the speaker has in fact been exercising less, whereas (1a) suggests that the doctor's opinion could be wrong. Formulate a hypothesis about the difference between suspect and think that accounts for this. You can express this as a prose description of the meaning difference that you think is behind these constraints (1–2 sentences expected, but longer is fine).

(1)  a. My doctor thinks that I’ve been exercising less.
   b. My doctor suspects that I’ve been exercising less.

(2)  a. Astronomers think that there is extraterrestrial life.
   b. Astronomers suspect that there is extraterrestrial life.

(3)  a. The philosopher thinks that Chomsky’s theory is wrong.
   b. The philosopher suspects that Chomsky’s theory is wrong.

(4)  a. The teacher thinks that Sandy stole the cookies from the cookie jar.
   b. The teacher suspects that Sandy stole the cookies from the cookie jar.

(5)  a. The pedestrian thinks that she had the right of way.
   b. The pedestrian suspects that she had the right of way.

3  Break-verbs, hit-verbs, and other verbs  [3 points]

For each of the verbs slap, pat, and shatter, determine whether the verb is a break-type verb, a hit-type verb, or a different type of verb. Support your argumentation using the evidence from the conative alternation, the body-part possessor ascension alternation, and the causative alternation provided in (6)–(8) below. Remember that an asterisk (*) before a sentence indicates that the sentence is ungrammatical.

(6)  Conative alternation

   a.  slap
      i.  Monica slapped his face.
      ii. Monica slapped at his face.

   b.  pat
      i.  Monica patted the dog.
      ii. *Monica patted at the dog.

   c.  shatter
      i.  Monica shattered the mirror.
      ii. *Monica shattered at the mirror.
(7)  Body-part possessor ascension alternation

a.  *slap*
   i.  Monica slapped the boy's back.
   ii. Monica slapped the boy on the back.

b.  *pat*
   i.  Monica patted the dog's head.
   ii. Monica patted the dog on the head.

c.  *shatter*
   i.  Monica shattered the man's wrist.
   ii. *Monica shattered the man on the wrist.

(8)  Causative alternation

a.  *slap*
   i.  Monica slapped his face.
   ii. *His face slapped.

b.  *pat*
   i.  Monica patted the dog.
   ii. *The dog patted.

c.  *shatter*
   i.  Monica shattered the mirror.
   ii. The mirror shattered.

4  Indirect illocutionary acts

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

Re-read Solan and Tiersma’s short chapter “Consensual searches”, and then consider the question *Can I look in the trunk?* in contexts of interactions between police officers and drivers they have stopped. How can the interactions of Grice’s maxims help us to understand the intended illocutionary force and perlocutionary effects of such a question in these contexts? How are these Gricean interactions relevant to legal issues surrounding the Fourth Amendment and the precedents mentioned on page 37? (We expect answers to be about a half page. Strong answers here will draw heavily on Grice and on speech-act theory.)
5 Final project task [4 points]

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

The goal of this question is get you as close as possible to a complete rough draft that your project mentor can provide feedback on. The specific requirements are meant to accommodate the fact that you might not yet be in a position to produce a truly complete rough draft:

i. A preliminary title is required. If you like, you can give a few different options with some commentary about their strengths and weaknesses, and your mentor will provide feedback.

ii. You should include your full introduction from Assignment 6, updated based on the feedback you received.

iii. From here, you need to map out your current view of the rest of the paper: all the sections and subsections with their titles. Ideally, you will actually draft all of this prose – messy, non-final prose is fine if it helps your reader see what you are aiming to say. If you don’t feel ready to write the actual prose, you should resort to organized bulleted lists of things you need to convey, claims you need to make, and gaps you need to fill in, etc. We will read these as establishing the framework for your paper, and we will assume that you’ll turn it all into actual paper prose later.

iv. For projects that aren’t traditional papers:

- If you’re planning an experiment, include draft instructions for participants and drafts of the crucial experimental items. We need to see these in detail at this stage, since so much of your project will depend on getting them right.
- If you’re creating a corpus, include the examples you’ve collected so far. If you haven’t collected data by this time, then you probably need to refocus your project so that it doesn’t depend on corpus examples – please discuss this with your project mentor.
- If you’re implementing a model, include your code so far, and make sure your draft includes lots of specific details about what the code does and what you still have planned in terms of improvements and extensions.

v. The draft should include a proper bibliography. The entries should appear alphabetically and give at least full author name(s), year of publication, title, and outlet if applicable (e.g., journal name or proceedings name). Beyond that, we are not picky about the format. Electronic references are fine but need to include the above information in addition to the link.

Prose from your previous project assignments can be reused freely. We’re hoping that all of this is building cohesively to the final submission!