

**Ling 315:**  
**Intensional Semantics**  
**WiSe 2013-2014**

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This advanced seminar studies natural language constructions that involve quantification over possible worlds, including modal auxiliaries (e.g. *must*, *can*, *should*), attitude verbs (e.g. *think*, *want*) and conditional clauses. We will investigate the meaning components that underlie these intensional constructions, both at the level of the lexical items and of the inflectional morphology involved. Special attention will be paid to de re and de dicto ambiguities, transparent and opaque readings, de se interpretations, shifting readings of certain indexicals, mood choice, licensing of Negative Polarity Items, and the relation between epistemic modals and evidentials.

**INSTRUCTOR:** Prof. Maribel Romero (short for María Isabel Romero Sangüesa)  
[maribel.romero@uni-konstanz.de](mailto:maribel.romero@uni-konstanz.de)  
G212  
Office hours: Mondays 14:30-15:30h

**COURSE PREREQUISITES**

Background on semantics at least equivalent to Ling115.

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

- Attendance to the lectures
- Class presentation of a paper (Referat)
- Short presentation of your term paper (Hausarbeit) as work in progress at the Mini-Conference
- Term paper (Hausarbeit) due shortly after the end of classes

SCHEDULE (approximate dates)

<p>October 22</p>	<p><b>Introduction</b>  <b>General background in compositional semantics</b>          Heim, I. and A. Kratzer. 1998. <i>Semantics in Generative Grammar</i>. Blackwell.</p>
<p>October 29          Nov 5-12-19</p>	<p><b>Intensional Semantics</b>          von Fintel, K. and I. Heim. 2007. <i>Intensional Semantics</i>, MIT lecture notes.</p>
<p>Nov. 26          Dec. 3          Dec. 10</p>	<p><b>The meaning of attitude verbs</b></p> <p>PRESUPPOSITIONS AND NPI LICENSING:          Heim, I. 1992. Presupposition projection and the semantics of attitude verbs, <i>Journal of Semantics</i> 9(3): 183-221.          von Fintel, K. 1999. NPI licensing, Strawson entailment and context dependence, <i>Journal of Semantics</i> 16(2): 97-148.</p> <p>MOOD SELECTION:          Fabricius-Hansen, C. and K. J. Saebo. 2004. In a mediative mood: the semantics of the German reportive subjunctive, <i>Natural Language Semantics</i> 12: 213-257.          Farkas, D. 1992. On the semantics of subjunctive complements. In P. Hirschbühler and K. Koerner, ed.s, <i>Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory</i>, 69–104. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.          Giorgi, A. and F. Pianesi. 1997. <i>Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.          Portner, Paul. 2003. The semantics of mood. In L. Cheng &amp; R. Sybesma, eds., <i>The second Glot international state-of-the-article book</i>, 47–77. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.          Quer, Josep. 1998. <i>Mood at the interface</i>. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.          Romero, M. 2012. Mood Selection in Romance Complement Clauses, talk at <i>SinFonIJA 5</i>, University of Vienna.          Schlenker, P. 2005. The Lazy Frenchman’s Approach to the Subjunctive. In <i>Proceedings of Going Romance XVII</i>.          Villalta, E. 2008. Mood and gradability: an investigation of the subjunctive mood in Spanish. <i>Linguistics and Philosophy</i> 31: 467-522.</p>
<p>Dec. 17          January 14</p>	<p><b>Crosslinguistic variation</b>          Anand, P. and A. Nevins. 2004. Shifty operators in changing contexts. In <i>Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 14</i>.          Kratzer, A. 2009. Making a pronoun: Fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns, <i>Linguistic Inquiry</i> 40(2): 187-237.          Matthewson, L. 2010. Cross-linguistic variation in modality systems: The role of mood, <i>Semantics and Pragmatics</i> 3: 1-74.          Peterson, T. 2010. <i>Epistemic modality and evidentiality in Gitksan at</i></p>

	<p><i>the semantics-pragmatics interface</i>: University of British Columbia dissertation. <a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2429/23596">http://hdl.handle.net/2429/23596</a>.</p> <p>Quer, J. 2005. Context shift and indexical variables in Sign Languages. In <i>Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 15</i>.</p> <p>Rullmann, H., L. Matthewson and H. Davis. 2008. Modals as distributive indefinites, <i>Natural Language Semantics</i> 16: 317–357.</p>
<p>January 21 January 28</p>	<p><b>Intensionality in First Language Acquisition: Theory of Mind</b></p> <p>Lind, S.E. and D.M. Bowler. 2009. Language and Theory of Mind in autism spectrum disorder: The relationship between complement syntax and false belief task performance, <i>Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders</i> 39: 929-937.</p> <p>Papafragou, A. K. Cassidy and L. Gleitman. 2007. When we think about thinking: The acquisition of belief verbs, <i>Cognition</i> 105: 124-165.</p> <p>Perner, J. 1988. Developing semantics for theories of mind: From propositional attitudes to mental representation. In J. W. Astington, P. L. Harris, &amp; D. R. Olson, eds., <i>Developing theories of mind</i>, pp. 141-172. New York: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Perner, J., M. Sprung, P. Zauner and H. Haider. 2003. <i>Want That</i> is Understood Well before <i>Say That, Think That</i>, and False Belief: A Test of de Villiers' Linguistic Determinism on German-Speaking Children', <i>Child Development</i> 74: 179-188.</p> <p>Pyers, J. E. and A. Senghas. 2009. Language promotes false-belief understanding. Evidence from learners of a new sign language, <i>Psychological Science</i> 20(7): 805-812.</p> <p>Schick, B., P.A. de Villiers, J.G. de Villiers and R. Hoffmeister. 2007. Language and Theory of Mind: A Study of Deaf Children, <i>Child Development</i> 78: 376-396.</p> <p>de Villiers, J.G. and P.A. de Villiers. 2009. Complements enable representation of the contents of false beliefs: the evolution of a theory of Theory of Mind. Ms. Smith College.</p>
<p>February 1 February 14</p>	<p><b>Subjunctive Conditionals</b></p> <p>SIMILARITY:</p> <p>von Fintel, K. 2012. Subjunctive conditionals. In G. Russell &amp; D. Graff Fara, eds., <i>The Routledge companion to philosophy of language</i>, 466-477. New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Kratzer. A. 1989. An Investigation of the Lumps of Thought, <i>Linguistics and Philosophy</i> 12: 607-653.</p> <p>Moss, S.2012. On the pragmatics of counterfactuals, <i>Nous</i> 46: 561-586.</p> <p>COUNTERFACTUALITY AND SIMILAR EFFECTS:</p> <p>Iatridou, S. 2000. The grammatical ingredients of counterfactuality, <i>Linguistic Inquiry</i> 31: 231–270.</p> <p>Ippolito, M. 2003. Presuppositions and implicatures in counterfactuals, <i>Natural Language Semantics</i> 11: 145–186.</p> <p>Leahy, B. 2011. Presuppositions and antipresuppositions in conditionals, <i>Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory</i> 21, 257-274.</p>

Jan 7	Cancelled (most likely)
-------	-------------------------

Feb 18? 10-12h	MINI-CONFERENCE
-------------------	-----------------