1. Which of the following criticisms does Davidson deploy against rival accounts of action sentences?
   (a) That they fail to identify a logical form for action sentences that could be used as the basis of a theory of meaning.
   (b) That they fail to account for logical inferences amongst action sentences.
   (c) Both
   (d) Neither.

2. What would Davidson take the logical form of ‘Jones buttered the toast in the bathroom, with a knife, at midnight’ to be?
   (a) $\exists x (\text{Buttering}(\text{Jones, the Toast, } x)) \land \exists x (\text{In}(\text{bathroom, } x)) \land \exists x (\text{With}(\text{knife, } x)) \land \exists x (\text{At}(\text{midnight, } x))$
   (b) $\exists x (\text{Buttering}(\text{Jones, the Toast, } x) \land \text{In}(\text{bathroom, } x) \land \text{With}(\text{knife, } x) \land \text{At}(\text{midnight, } x))$
   (c) $\exists x (x \text{ consists of the fact that Jones butter the toast in the bathroom, with a knife, at midnight})$
   (d) None of the above

3. What would Davidson take the logical form of ‘Jones buttered the toast deliberately’ to be?
   (a) $\exists x (\text{Buttering}(\text{Jones, the Toast, } x) \land \text{Deliberate}(x))$
   (b) $\exists x (\text{Buttering}(\text{Jones, the Toast, } x) \land \text{Deliberate}(\text{Jones, } x))$
   (c) It was deliberate of Jones that $\exists x (\text{Buttering}(\text{Jones, the Toast, } x))$
   (d) He explicitly declines to discuss such cases.

4. On Davidson’s analysis, which of the following is a logical consequence of ‘Jones buttered the toast in the bathroom, with a knife, at midnight’?
   (a) $\exists x (\text{Buttering}(\text{Jones, the Toast, } x))$
   (b) $\exists x (\text{In}(\text{bathroom, } x) \land \text{With}(\text{knife, } x) \land \text{At}(\text{midnight, } x))$
   (c) Both
   (d) Neither