

## PHILOSOPHY TRIPOS, PART IA

---

Thursday 8 June 2023

09.00–12.00

---

Paper 3

MEANING

Answer **three** questions only.

Write the number of the question at the beginning of each answer.

If you are answering the either/or question, indicate the letter as well.

**STATIONERY REQUIREMENTS**

20 Page Answer Book x 1

Rough Work Pad

***You may not start to read the questions printed on the subsequent pages of this question paper until instructed that you may do so by the Invigilator***

1. Would we lose anything in ordinary speech if we replaced all the indicative conditionals with suitable disjunctions?
2. When is a conditional assertible?
3. Is there any point in distinguishing the sense of a name from its reference?
4. Suppose S says, 'Arthur's boss is ruthless', when Arthur has no boss. Can S be saying something true?
5. Are all a priori truths reducible to logical truths?
6. 'Speaker meaning is reducible to an intention to produce a belief in the audience. Therefore, all fiction is meaningless.' Discuss.
7. EITHER: (a) We can understand infinitely many sentences. Does this undermine intentionalism about meaning?  
  
OR: (b) We can understand infinitely many sentences. Does this undermine conventionalism about meaning?
8. In virtue of what does 'Napoleon Bonaparte' refer? Does your answer hold also of 'Sherlock Holmes'? If so, how? If not, why not?
9. Does verificationism rule out all forms of metaphysical inquiry?
10. 'Nothing is analytic'. Discuss.

**END OF PAPER**