

**UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
ARTS FACULTY
MA EXAMINATION
for Internal Students
PHILOSOPHY NEW REGULATIONS**

PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

Answer THREE questions.

1. Are expressions of the form 'the F' referring expressions, or are they quantifiers?
2. Can meaning be explained in terms of truth conditions?
3. Can anything be true solely in virtue of what it means?
4. Is the thesis that proper names are rigid designators incompatible with the thesis that proper names have sense as well as reference?
5. Can dispositional accounts of meaning accommodate the normativity of meaning?
6. 'A causal theory of reference cannot explain how the terms of our theory obtain a determinate reference, because a causal theory of reference is just more theory.' Discuss.
7. Can a compositional theory of meaning explain a speaker's linguistic capacities?
8. EITHER (a) Quine tells us that while one may or may not be a behaviourist in psychology, in linguistics it is mandatory. Chomsky tells us that mentalism in linguistics is mandatory. Is either right?

OR (b) Quine claims to have no indeterminacy thesis about syntax. Can he reconcile this with his view that there could be two different grammars which accounted for the same grammatical facts about a language?
9. Critically assess Dummett's view that the significance of language is to be explained in terms of a speaker's knowledge of the language.
10. 'The correct use of a speaker's idiolect answers to nothing more than the speaker's opinions about correct usage.' Does this rule out a coherent notion of a speaker's idiolect?
11. What account of meaning would be compatible with Quine's contention that radical translation is indeterminate?

PLEASE TURN OVER

12. 'What a speaker's words mean can depend on factors beyond the speaker's body.'
Discuss.
13. What problems do indexicals pose for a theory of meaning? How can they be solved?

END OF PAPER