Contents

1 A Compositional Semantics for Counterfactuals 1
2 Conditionals and Causality 2
3 MIT-Themes: Anankastic Conditionals and Weak Necessity 2
4 Conditionals and Conditional Probability 2
5 Conditional Perfection and Biscuit Conditionals 2
6 More on Lumping 2
7 Simplification of Disjunctive Antecedents 3
8 Sobel-Sequences and their Reversals 3

Tell us until January 3rd 2011, by email, which topics you are most interested for the last four lectures, and also if you might want to present such a topic in class, and/or write a term paper about it.

1 A Compositional Semantics for Counterfactuals

· how is the “counterfactual conditional meaning” composed out of elements ‘would’ and ‘past tense’ etc.

· reading:
2 Conditionals and Causality

- how to derive a premisse function from manipulation of a causal network
- Katrin Schulz (2010). “If you’d wiggled A, then B would’ve changed” — Causality and Counterfactual Conditionals”. In: Synthese

3 MIT-Themes: Anankastic Conditionals and Weak Necessity

- anankastic conditionals like “If you want X, you have to do Y” pose a compositionality problem:
- the meaning of weak necessity modals such as “should”:

4 Conditionals and Conditional Probability

- can we identify the probability that $A > C$ is true with the conditionals probability of $A$ given $C$?

5 Conditional Perfection and Biscuit Conditionals

- how much conditionality do we read into a conditional?
  (1) a. If you mow the lawn, I’ll give you five dollars.
     b. $\neg$ If you don’t mow the lawn, I will not give you five dollars.
     c. $\neg\neg$ I’ll give you five dollars.
  (2) a. There are biscuits on the sideboard if you want them.
     b. $\neg\neg$ If you don’t want them, there are no biscuits on the sideboard.
     c. $\neg$ There are biscuits on the sideboard.


6 More on Lumping

- how to select premisses for premiss semantics in terms of “lumping”
· triviality result:

7 Simplification of Disjunctive Antecedents


8 Sobel-Sequences and their Reversals

· why does order of occurrence play a role in the acceptability of counterfactuals:
  (3) If Sophie had gone to the parade, she would have seen Pedro.
  (4) But if Sophie had gone to the parade and been stuck behind a tall person, she wouldn’t have seen Pedro.
  (5) If Sophie had gone to the parade and been stuck behind a tall person, she wouldn’t have seen Pedro.
  (6) # But if Sophie had gone to the parade, she would have seen Pedro.

· reading:
  · Sarah Moss (to appear). “On the Pragmatics of Counterfactuals”. In: *Noûs*