Notes and reminders

• This is due on March 23, by 6:30 pm. No late work will be accepted. This is also the final due date for all late work. We cannot be flexible about this due to constraints imposed by the University on when grades need to be submitted.

• You must submit your work electronically via Canvas.

• No collaboration of any kind is permitted. You are, though, free to use your notes and any other reference materials you like.

• Please submit questions on the Ed forum or to the staff email address. Questions sent to individual instructors probably won’t be answered in a timely enough fashion to be useful.

1 Quantifiers, entailments, and implicatures [2 points]

A classic Gricean argument is that most is semantically consistent with every but tends to exclude it pragmatically because of a quality–quantity interaction. This argument depends on the semantic claim that every entails most. Your task is to support this claim, assuming the following meanings:

(M) \[
\text{[most]} = \lambda X \left( \lambda Y \left( \top \text{ if } |X \cap Y| > |X - Y|, \text{ else } F \right) \right) \]

(E) \[
\text{[every]} = \lambda X \left( \lambda Y \left( \top \text{ if } X \subseteq Y, \text{ else } F \right) \right) \]

In this context, a determiner meaning $D_1$ entails another determiner $D_2$ if and only if the following holds: if $[D_1](A)(B) = \top$, then $[D_2](A)(B) = \top$, for all $A$ and $B$. Assume throughout that the first argument to the determiner is non-empty.

2 Presuppositional quantificational determiner [2 points]

Keenan defines a quantified, presupposition-free version of the ten as follows:

(K) \[
\text{[the ten]} = \lambda X \left( \lambda Y \left( \top \text{ if } |X| = 10 \text{ and } X \subseteq Y, \text{ else } F \right) \right) \]

Convert this to a presuppositional quantificational determiner, on the model of our presuppositional treatment of neither and both.
3 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 attempted to hide her feelings.

\[ p = \text{Carol hid her feelings.} \]

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.

4 Scalar adjective experimental predictions [2 points]

The adjective striped can be modified by minimal standard adverbs like slightly (as in slightly striped), but not maximal standard adverbs like completely (as in *completely striped). In light of this, on the theory developed by Syrett et al. (2009), what is the expected pattern of behavior (for children and adults) for the prompt ‘Hand me the striped one’ in an experimental condition in which the subject is presented with two cups, both partly striped, but one noticeably more striped than the other, and why is this the expected behavior on their theory? (2–3 sentence response.)

5 Illocutionary effects [3 points]

In Speaking of Crime, Solan and Tiersma observe that people in police custody often perform the speech act of invoking their right to counsel very indirectly, with utterances like “Maybe I need a lawyer”. Your task: using the properties of illocutionary force given in section 4.2 of the ‘Speech acts’ handout, give two reasons why people in custody might behave in this way. (There are a number of sensible reasons that connect with the illocutionary force properties. You can just pick two. We expect each reason to take 3–5 sentences to describe.)

6 Swearing and the FCC [3 points]

Provide three cogent linguistic or cognitive arguments in favor of the position that swears like the F-word should be subject to different legal restrictions than other kinds of speech. (2–4 sentences per argument; the arguments might not be persuasive to you, but they should make sense!)