

# Logic and Conversation

## Assignment 4

Please return the assignment in pdf by email to: floris.roelofsen@gmail.com  
Due date: Monday 26/11

### 1 Inquisitive semantics

1. One difference between the formulation of the semantics in the NASSLLI lecture notes and the ISP paper, is that in the latter the absurd state  $\emptyset$  is dismissed, without really explicitly arguing for that. Can you think of an argument for or against taking the absurd state into account in view of the general conceptual content of the notion of a proposition?
2. Consider the formulas  $!(p \vee q) \rightarrow ?r$  and  $(p \vee q) \rightarrow ?r$ . Calculate the propositions that they express, and show that the first formula is entailed by the second.
3. Prove fact 15.3 and 15.4, concerning the notion of *assertions* in  $\text{InqB}$ .
4. Prove fact 16.2 and 16.3, concerning the notion of *questions* in  $\text{InqB}$ .

### 2 Inquisitive pragmatics

1. There is a table on p. 19 of the inquisitive semantics and pragmatics paper that summarizes how the four quality-maxims are related to the general conversational principles discussed in section 4 of the paper. The table also appears on slide 39 of the presentation of the paper, but with one difference: where in the paper it says that the maxim of informative sincerity relates to the principle *Be truthful!*, it says on the slides that it relates to *Maintain the Common Ground!*.

Assume that this is no mistake. Try to argue that the principle of being truthful can be subsumed under the principle to maintain the common ground.

2. Consider again the formulas  $!(p \vee q) \rightarrow ?r$  and  $(p \vee q) \rightarrow ?r$ . Can you derive implicatures of  $(p \vee q) \rightarrow ?r$ , using the fact that it entails  $!(p \vee q) \rightarrow ?r$ , along the lines of argumentation used in section 6?