Assignment 7
Chris Potts, Ling 130a/230a: Introduction to semantics and pragmatics, Winter 2023
Distributed Mar 7; due Mar 14

Final project task  
[10 points]

This problem is required only for people doing a final project, and it is the only problem that people doing final projects need to do. Everyone else should answer questions 1–4 below.

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!
1 What kind of meaning is this?  [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 (A).

(A) Carol ate almost all the pizza.
\[ p = \text{Carol did not eat all the pizza.} \]

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 Fuzzy presuppositions  [2 points]

Does the predicate \( \text{regret} \) always presuppose its complement clause?

Part 1. Apply the negation test to an example English sentence and provide the relevant entailments to support the diagnosis that \( \text{regret} \) presupposes its complement. Your example sentence should be of the form \( X \text{ regrets that } C \), where \( C \) is the complement clause that expresses the target meaning.

Part 2. Consider the sentences below, some of which are able to cancel the target meaning of \( \text{regret} \), and others which are not (and marked as ill-formed accordingly):

(1) a. \# Mary regrets that she missed the chance to see her dad, but she didn't actually miss the chance to see him.
   b. Falsely believing that he had left, Mary regrets that she missed the chance to see her dad, but she didn’t actually miss the chance to see him.

(2) a. \# Oedipus regretted killing the stranger on the road to Thebes, but in fact he didn't kill him.
   b. Under the false impression that he had inflicted a fatal wound, Oedipus regretted killing the stranger on the road to Thebes, but in fact he didn't kill him.\(^1\)

(3) a. \# Carla regretted staying up too late, but she didn’t actually stay up too late.
   b. Under the illusion that she overslept an exam, Carla regretted staying up too late, but she didn’t actually stay up too late.

(4) a. \# Carla regretted staying up past midnight, but she didn’t actually stay up past midnight.
   b. \# Under the illusion that she overslept an exam, Carla regretted staying up past midnight, but she didn’t actually stay up past midnight.

Based on these data, formulate a generalization for when the target meaning of \( \text{regret} \) can be cancelled.

\(^1\)Example from Klein, Ewan. 1975. Two sorts of factive predicates. Pragmatics Microfiche it 1.1. frames B5–C14.
3 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; [both] is given on the 'Presupposition' handout.

- $[\text{kids}] = \{[\text{Bart}], [\text{Lisa}], [\text{Maggie}]\}$
- $[\text{parents}] = \{[\text{Homer}], [\text{Marge}]\}$
- $[\text{skateboard}] = \{[\text{Bart}]\}$

3.1

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

3.2

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

4 The puzzle of full

[4 points]

The adjective full was treated differently by children and adults in experiment 1 of Syrett et al. First, what is this difference? (2–3 sentence response.) Second, they offer three possible explanations for the difference. What are those explanations, and what is their assessment of them? (4–5 sentence response.)