1 C-command and scope

From the Szabolcsi reading: explain in your own words what hypotheses (10) and (11) on pages 10 and 11 are saying. Then explain why (33) and (34) “fully conform to (10), although they abandon (11)” (p. 19).

2 Chutes and ladders

Define a path around diagram 1 that begins with an entity (type e) and leads you all the way back around to that entity again. Write down the semantics of the steps you take.

3 Definite and indefinite

Show that THE and a differ by finding an argument for which they return different values. Articulate what the difference between the values is.

4 Coordination

Provide analyses of the following sentences using fragment 1, your proposed semantics for and from assignment 2, and any of the Partee type-shifters that you like:

(1) John and Mary run.

(2) Every man and woman ran.

What truth conditions does your analysis predict for (2) in a world in which there are men but none of them ran?
5  Exceptives

Consider the following proposed truth conditions for statements involving exceptive *but*:

(3)  Every Simpson but Maggie skateboards.
     \[
     \{x \mid x \text{ is a Simpson}\} \setminus \{\text{Maggie}\} \subseteq \{y \mid y \text{ skateboards}\}
     \]

(4)  No Simpson but Maggie skateboards.
     \[
     \{x \mid x \text{ is a Simpson}\} \setminus \{\text{Maggie}\} \cap \{y \mid y \text{ skateboards}\} = \emptyset
     \]

i. Assume at first that the above meanings are correct, and provide a denotation for exceptive *but* that can capture both meanings.

     Note: this is a basically a puzzle problem; strive to get the meanings right without worrying yet about elegance or generality.

     Note: it might help you to build from the following constituent structure, but you can break free of it if you feel justified in doing that:

     every/no Simpson but Maggie

ii. Do the truth conditions in (3) entail that Maggie does not skateboard? Do the truth conditions in (4) entail that Maggie does skateboards? Do your answers seem justified empirically? (For this, you can say as much as you like, but I would be happy with just a few sentences and maybe an example or two.)

6  A question from you

The reading for next time is Kratzer 1981. Provide a question about it of the sort described on the syllabus: http://www.stanford.edu/class/linguist230b/syllabus.html#weekly