

## Part-1 Gricean reasoning (pragmatics)

[a]

What does B's utterance implicate:

- B has a cat but it is not a Siamese cat good

How is this derived in the Gricean framework:

- Gricean Maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner
- The reply of B certainly meets the requirement of relation and manner
- But it violates quantity, since the information it provides is less than what required by A good
- 15/15 • B must have done so to meet the requirement of quality
- Therefore, it is either: 1) B does not have a Siamese cat; or 2) B is not sure if the cat is a Siamese cat good
- We tend to believe that B knows enough about his/her own cat
- Hence, we conclude that B's cat is not a Siamese good

Why would B choose to respond this way as opposed to simply "no":

- People tend to use stronger version of saying
- If B replies "no", it may implicate that B does not even have a cat, because:
  - If B has a cat but not a Siamese cat, B will be clear about that or at least just 'no' is
  - So simply saying "no" implies that B does not even have a cat underinformative
- 14/15 • But B can not reply "yes", since B's cat is not a Siamese cat and therefore a violation of quantity
- Therefore, B can only claim that he/she has a cat, which guides A to as well implicate that B's cat is not a Siamese cat.

do a cancellation test to show that this is an implicature and not an entailment ~~on~~ 0/3

## Part-2 Possessives and more

Please refer to the .ipynb file for the solution to this part

## Part-3 Expressive adjectives (semantics/pragmatics)

[a]

What does an epithet contribute to the DP/sentence it appears in? What is the role of the context of utterance in determining the contribution of an epithet?

- Such epithets express some subjective sentiment/emotion of the speaker to the particular DP that it modifies, so that it contributes to the sentiment/emotion of the entire sentence. good
- In the example of "Alfonso broke the damn computer", it expresses the speaker's frustration to the computer.

what happens if you move ADJ around in the sentence?

10/11

- The context can help us to decide how the emotion to the DP projects to the entire sentence.
- For example, if the context is “did break the damn computer”, it implies that the speaker is at least not unhappy about this event, since he/she hates the computer; if the context is “did not break the damn computer”, it implies that the speaker may feel regretful about this event, since he/she hates this computer and may hope that it is broken.

good

[b]

Is this contribution a conversational implicature, an at-issue entailment, a presupposition, or something else?

- We can first try the negation test for the example of “damn”:
  - Alfonso broke the damn computer
  - Alfonso did not break the damn computer
- We can find that the sentiment/emotion projects out of the negation, i.e., in both sentences, the speaker expresses frustration to the computer.
- Therefore, it is a presupposition, instead of an entailment or implicature.

there are other tests, too. Does it always project?

what is exactly is being presupposed then?

need to show whether it is an implicature via a cancellation test

[c]

Analysis of adjectival epithets: what is their type?

- The type of adjectival epithets is  $\langle\langle e, t \rangle, \langle e, t \rangle\rangle$  good
- The denotation of “damn” is:  $\|damn\|^c = \lambda f. \lambda x. f(x) \cap \text{Hate}(\text{Speaker}^c, x)$
- The derivation of the entire DP “the damn computer”:
  - $\|the\|^c = \lambda f. \iota x. x \in C_c \cap f(x)$  so is this your attempt to capture the 'presupposition'?
  - $\|damn\|^c = \lambda f. \lambda x. f(x) \cap \text{Hate}(\text{Speaker}^c, x)$  this is a good start, but it doesn't adequately capture all the projection facts
  - $\|computer\|^c = \lambda x. \text{Computer}(x)$
  - Therefore, we do the derivation as follows:
    - $\|the\|^c(\|damn\|^c(\|computer\|^c))$
    - $\|the\|^c(\|damn\|^c(\|computer\|^c))$
    - $\|the\|^c(\|damn\|^c(\|computer\|^c))$
    - $(\lambda f. \iota x. x \in C_c \cap f(x))(\lambda f. \lambda x. f(x) \cap \text{Hate}(\text{Speaker}^c, x))(\lambda x. \text{Computer}(x))$
    - $(\lambda f. \iota x. x \in C_c \cap f(x))(\lambda x. \text{Computer}(x) \cap \text{Hate}(\text{Speaker}^c, x))$
    - $\iota x. x \in C_c \cap \text{Computer}(x) \cap \text{Hate}(\text{Speaker}^c, x)$

9/11

[d]

What, if any, are the differences in meaning across expressive adjectives, and how could these be captured? (A fuller list of such expressive adjectives might include “damn”, “(god)damn”, “fucking”, “stupid”, “idiotic”, “amazing”, “brilliant”, “wonderful”.)

6/11

- All these listed adjectival epithets express different subjective sentiment/emotions. *yes, valence*
- They vary from hatred, frustration to joy of the speaker to the DP that they modify *and also intensity*  
*so what kind of mechanism could you propose to capture these dimensions in the lambda calculus?*