

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic stopped us for two years in organizing our longstanding course Philosophy of Language and Linguistics which started in 2005 and is always held at the Interuniversity Center (IUC) in Dubrovnik. We continued in September 2022. Selected papers from all our conferences are customarily printed in the Croatian Journal of Philosophy.

In 2022, the course was primarily dedicated to the discussion of the book by Una Stojnić Context and Coherence (Oxford University Press 2021). Part of the course included the discussion of Fabrizio Cariani's book, The Modal Future. A Theory of Future-Directed Thought and Talk (Cambridge University Press 2021) The discussion of Cariani's book was scheduled for 2020, the year the course was not held, so we decided to have his book discussed in 2022. The first five papers in this volume are on Stojnić's book while a jointed paper by Cariani and Glanzberg on Cariani's work follows.

Una Stojnić gives a valuable précis of her book Context and Coherence. The book develops and defends a thoroughly linguistic account of the meta-semantics of context-sensitivity: the interpretation of context-sensitive expressions is fully determined by linguistic rules, discourse conventions. If this is right, the dominant, extra-linguistic account must be rejected. This précis also outlines some other key themes in Context and Coherence. The papers that follow are different answers given and questions posed to Stojnić's provocative claim.

Peter Pagin in his contribution "Linguistic conventions or open-ended reasoning: Some questions for Una Stojnić" is mainly concerned with Stojnić's strong claim that linguistic phenomena related to prominence and coherence, in particular the interpretation of pronouns, are governed by linguistic conventions and are not pragmatic in nature. Pagin's presented views are opposite to Stojnić's. Pagin also questions Stojnić's view that coherence relation has priority over the interpretation of pronouns. Magdalena Kaufmann's paper "From coherence relations to the grammar of pronouns and tense" argues against Stojnić's strong claim that the content of linguistic utterances is determined by the rules of natural language grammar more than it is generally assumed. Kaufmann also takes a close look at the empirical evidence from English and Serbian that Stojnić offers in support of her position on coherence. Kaufmann adds examples from German and Japanese. She argues that there is no compelling evidence for the assumption that coherence relations directly determine the resolution of pronouns. Inten-

tionalism is the view that a demonstrative refers to something partly in virtue of the speaker intending it to refer to that thing. The article “Intentionalism and the natural interpretation of discourses” by Alexandru Radulescu is a critical assessment of Stojnić’s contrary claim that the natural interpretation of demonstratives is that they refer to the objects but not by speakers’ intentions. Radulescu further argues that many phenomena presented by Stojnić can be explained from an intentionalist point of view. Sašo Živanović and Petar Ludlow in their contribution “The Syntax of Prominence” offer what they label “a friendly amendment” to the proposal in Stojnić. The notion of prominence at its core, they argue, is a syntactic relation holding between nodes on the discourse trees. Michael Devitt in his article “Incoherent meanings” argues against the radical view that coherence relations determine the reference of context-sensitive language. His starting point is that the theoretical interest in language comes from an interest in thoughts and their communication. A person can have any thought at all, however incoherent. Thus, a thought’s meaning and reference are independent of its coherence and coherence has no place in the theory of meaning or reference. He concludes that the error in Stojnić’s approach exemplifies the widespread confusion of the metaphysics of meaning with the epistemology of interpretation.

*One of the driving themes of Fabrizio Cariani’s book *The Modal Future* concerns the interplay of tense and modality in powering future reference. Cariani’s book opens by contrasting a ‘symmetric’ paradigm in which languages have three tenses (past, present and future) with an alternative on which past and present are the ‘just’ tenses. Building on prior work in semantics Cariani argues that the devices languages recruit to power future-directed discourse are modals. Fabrizio Cariani and Michael Glanzberg in the joined article “What is tense, anyway?” explain that an implicit corollary of the above thesis is that because expressions like *will* are modals, they cannot also be tenses. The article ends with a question: Does identifying modal features in *will*, or any other future expression, entail that it’s not a tense? In this paper, the authors argue that the answer to this question is in an important sense indeterminate. There are multiple conceptions of tense which yield diverging answers to the question whether tense and modality are compatible—thus illuminating the relationship between tense and modality in a different way.*