

**UNIVERSITY OF LONDON**

**BA EXAMINATION 2007**

for Internal Students

This paper is also taken by Combined Studies Students

**PHILOSOPHY**

Optional subject (e): Philosophy of Language

Answer THREE questions. Avoid overlap in your answers.

1. What basis is there, if any, for distinguishing between the illocutionary and the perlocutionary acts performed by making an utterance?
2. 'The thesis that a statement's meaning consists in its truth-conditions must be wrong. For the statements "2 + 2 = 4" and "If it's raining then it's raining" are true in the same conditions (namely, in all conditions) but they plainly have different meanings.' Assess this argument.
3. Explain the distinction between referential and attributive uses of definite descriptions. Is this a semantic or a pragmatic distinction?
4. Is 'It is raining' semantically incomplete?
5. What notion of speaker-meaning should a semantic theorist make use of?
6. EITHER (a) Are there indicative sentences which provide adequate paraphrases of sentences in the interrogative ('question-asking') mood?  
  
OR (b) How does the grammatical mood of a sentence relate to the force that utterances of the sentence may have?
7. 'The meaning of an expression is constituted by the dispositions of speakers to accept sentences in which the expression occurs.' Discuss.
8. Is the descriptive theory of proper names refuted by the observation that often we know the meaning of a proper name, but cannot uniquely describe its bearer?

**TURN OVER**

9. Does Quine give any good arguments for the view that there is no such thing as the meaning of a word?
10. To what extent is language a matter of convention?
11. 'The meaning of a declarative sentence of a natural language is fixed by its assertibility-conditions.' Is this an improvement on the theory that meanings are fixed by truth-conditions?
12. "'I' is a proper name of myself.' What is right, and what is wrong, about this claim?
13. Is referential opacity an insuperable obstacle to providing a compositional semantics for a natural language?
14. Assess the claim that much of human knowledge of language is innate.
15. Kripke claims that belief reports remain puzzling whether or not we accept that one can substitute co-referring expressions *salva veritate*. Is he right?

**END OF PAPER**