

First Paper 4-6 double-spaced pages.

Select just one of the topics below (or a topic of your own choosing that I have approved. This paper is a lot like an exam. I want you to show me that you understand the material. If you are using linguistic examples, feel free to use examples in your native language (Cantonese or Putonghua or French, or whatever), but make sure to translate the examples for me and explain them in a way that I can understand (and to tell me what language they're in!).

1. In Hardegree's Basic Categorial Semantics, what semantic types would be assigned to verbs like 'sit' and 'kick' (e.g. as in "John sat" and "Bill kicked John")? What particular functions with those semantic types would be the meaning of 'sit' and 'kick'? How would those functions combine with the meanings of the other expressions in the sentence to form a meaning for the whole—e.g. for a sentence like "John kicked Bill"? [Feel free to use Hardegree's or Montague's semantic types.]

2. What is the "Isomorphism Thesis" and the "Type Correspondence Rule" (Hardegree p. 3, p. 11)? Explain, as best you can, how syntax is supposed to mirror semantics. Which ways are syntactic objects like semantic values? How is the way syntactic objects combine akin to the way semantic objects combine? Bonus: how would it be possible for the syntax NOT to be isomorphic to the semantics?

3. Explain what compositionality is. Argue, in your own words, that compositionality is true. You might want to consult Pagin & Westerstahl pp14-19. Feel free to present the arguments they give, but make sure to do so in your own words. You might also want to consult: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/compositionality/#3>

4. Explain what compositionality is. In your own word, explain as best as possible why quotation and belief sentences pose a threat to compositionality. You might want to consult Pagin & Westerstahl pp22-24. Additionally, the classic source for these arguments is [http://alfanos.org/pdfs/03\\_intro\\_philo\\_spr09/02\\_Frege.pdf](http://alfanos.org/pdfs/03_intro_philo_spr09/02_Frege.pdf) Frege's "On Sense and Reference." Feel free to incorporate a discussion of Frege into your paper.

5. If I ask you "do you have one dollar?" it seems acceptable for you to answer "I have one dollar" even though you have much more than one dollar. If I ask "how much money do you have?" it seems unacceptable for you to answer "I have one dollar" when you have much more than one dollar. What is the standard Gricean account for this difference? Explain in detail.

6. What is a “scalar implicature”? (Why is it called “scalar”? What is an implicature?) Explain which conversational maxim is relevant to scalar implicature. Detail the reasoning from the maxim to the implicature in several cases. Try to use unique examples that haven’t been discussed in class or the readings. Bonus: does every linguistic scale give rise to scalar implicatures?

7. Explain Horn’s Q principle (p. 13). What maxims/ submaxims in Grice’s framework is it supposed to replace. Give examples (original examples of your own devising) showing how the replaced maxims work and give examples showing how the proposed Q principle works. (That is, explain the sort of reasoning a hearer would go through if she assumed the maxims, versus if she assumed the Q principle.)

8. Explain Horn’s R principle (p. 13) What maxims/ submaxims in Grice’s framework is it supposed to replace. Give examples (original examples of your own devising) showing how the replaced maxims work and give examples showing how the proposed R principle works. (That is, explain the sort of reasoning a hearer would go through if she assumed the maxims, versus if she assumed the R principle.)