Zimmermann and Sternefeld (2013) *IntoSem* Chapter 8: Intensions

Exercises

Exercise 1: Upward and Downward Entailing Attitudes

In Section 5, Zimmermann and Sternefeld discuss the semantics of attitude verbs like think or know. Now the two predicates aware and surprised also express propositional attitudes.

- (1) John is aware that Mary won a medal.
- (2) John is surprised that Mary won a medal.

Is there an entailment relation between (1) and (3), so that we can infer one from the other?

(3) John is aware that Mary won a gold medal.

Does the same or another relation obtain between (2) and (4)?

(4) John is surprised that Mary won a gold medal.

How could we explicate the difference?

Exercise 2: Modal Verbs

In Section 4, Zimmermann and Sternefeld note that modal verbs like *must* are interesting and that compositional semantics may provide the tools for their analysis.

Indeed, on a standard theory, the extension of must is a set of propositions, those that follow from the 'conversational background' H_w :

$$\llbracket must \rrbracket_w = \{ p : \cap H_w \subseteq p \}$$

 H_w is a set of propositions, and $\cap H_w$ is the intersection between them all, a proposition (set of worlds). H will vary from context to context; it might be

- our norms,
- your ideals,
- what I require of you,
- what is mostly the case,

together with relevant facts. What H instantiations are relevant for (5)–(8)?

- (5) You must have put on weight.
- (6) You must share my interest in metal.
- (7) You must take the wallet to the police station.
- (8) One thing is for sure, you must see a doctor about this.

Now *must* and *may* are said to be **duals**. How could the meaning of *may* be defined?

Exercise 3: Closeness between Worlds

The extension of the adverb almost (or nearly) can be defined as the set of propositions that contain at least one world very similar to the world w:

$$\llbracket almost \rrbracket_w = \{ p : w \notin p \text{ but } w' \in p \text{ for a } w' \approx w \}$$

Then what about barely? Cf.

(9) Asteroid barely misses Earth



Exercise 4: Counterfactuals and Semifactuals

- (10) is a counterfactual conditional; (11) is a so-called 'semifactual'.
- (10) If she had worn her seatbelt, she would still be alive.
- (11) If she had worn her seatbelt, she would still be dead.

What justifies that label? Does still mean the same in the two cases?