1  Presuppositional quantifiers  [2 points]

For each top (root) node in the following trees, use rule Q2 from the ‘Semantic composition’ handout 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

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{QP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{Both}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{kids}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{skateboard}
\end{array}
\]

1.2

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{QP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{Both}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{parents}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{skateboard}
\end{array}
\]

2  Diagnosing kinds of meaning  [2 points]

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 (P).

\((P)\) Gary met with Professor Smith.

\[p = \text{Smith is a professor.}\]

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.
3 Presupposition and implicature together [2 points]

Consider the following prompt from a questionnaire-based study of pragmatics:

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 A  Sundae B  Sundae C

Our theories of presupposition and conversational implicature, working together, predict that participants will choose Sundae C. How do the theories come together to make that prediction? (3–5 sentences)

4 Indirect illocutionary acts [4 points]

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.

Chris will send you, within 24 hours of your submitting assignment 6, a custom-made question to answer here (due along with the rest of the assignment, on Mar 8).