1 Contradictory laws (student question) [2 points]

Cases occasionally arise wherein laws both require and forbid a behavior in some context. For example, in some jurisdictions there are laws that require cyclists to signal impending turns with raised hands while also forbidding them from riding without both hands on handlebars. These contradictory laws could potentially be interpreted as contradictory members of a deontic ordering source: an instance of Kratzer’s A containing both both $p$ and $\neg p$. Is this kind of contradiction well formed? How do human possibilities and human necessities change when each half of the contradiction is added to an ordering source?

2 Semantic reconstruction [2 points]

The (b) reading of (1) is often said to involve reconstruction of the quantifier into the complement of seem.

(1) Every linguist seemed to Joan to be daydreaming.
   a. every linguist $x$ is such that $x$ seemed to Joan to be daydreaming ($\forall$ over seem)
   b. It seemed to Joan that every linguist was daydreaming. (seem over $\forall$)

Your task is to show that the semantic effects of such reconstruction can be captured without any syntactic reorganization. To do this, you should give a meaning for seem and a parsetree in which every linguist has syntactic scope over seem but nonetheless scopes under it semantically when all the lambdas are reduced.

3 Questions and entailment [2 points]

There is an important sense in which questions can be said to support entailments. In (2)–(3), it seems clear that the (a) cases entail the (b) cases:

(2) a. Who attended? ⇒
   b. Which students attended?

(3) a. Who attended? ⇒
   b. Did Sal attend?

For each pair, a complete answer to (a) is also a (more than) complete answer to (b).
i. Does Karttunen’s approach to questions support a definition of entailment that matches the pattern in (2) and (3)? If yes, provide the relevant definition and show how it works for (2) and (3). If no, explain why it does not.

ii. Does G&S’s approach to questions support a definition of entailment that matches the pattern in (2) and (3)? If yes, provide the relevant definition and show how it works for (2) and (3). If no, explain why it does not.

4 Final project: identifying the issues [2 points]

One of the tasks for the final project is to identify the central research questions for the sub-area you are focussing one. Articulate what those questions are, making connections with your lit-review papers where possible.

• I don’t really have concrete guidelines concerning how many questions you should have. I do suggest that you try to make the questions as specific as possible, so that they are close to being things one could address in a journal article.

• To do this right, you’ll need to have read through the articles from your lit-review at least once. The current assignment is relatively short in order to provide you with some space to do that.

5 A question from you [2 points]

The reading for next time is Karttunen 1977. Provide a question about it of the sort described on the syllabus: http://www.stanford.edu/class/linguist230b/syllabus.html#weekly. Since we want to think about a number of theories of interrogatives, I suggest focussing on the factual issues discussed in the paper, particularly those in section 1.