

Appendix: The semantic interpretation system

Hamblin Functional Application

If α is a branching node with daughters β and γ and $[[\beta]]^{w,g} \in D_\alpha$ and $[[\gamma]]^{w,g} \in D_{\langle\beta\rangle}$, then $[[\alpha]]^{w,g} = \{a \in D_\beta; \exists b \in c [b \in [[\beta]]^{w,g} \& c \in [[\gamma]]^{w,g} \& a = c(b)] \}$.

Sentential quantifiers¹

For $[[\alpha]]^{w,g} \in D_{\langle st \rangle}$:

- (i) $[[\Box\alpha]]^{w,g} = \{ \Box w'. \Box p [p \in [[\alpha]]^{w,g} \& p(w') = 1] \}$
- (ii) $[[\Box\Box\alpha]]^{w,g} = \{ \Box w'. \Box p [p \in [[\alpha]]^{w,g} \& p(w') = 1] \}$
- (iii) $[[\text{Neg } \alpha]]^{w,g} = \{ \Box w'. \Box p [p \in [[\alpha]]^{w,g} \& p(w') = 1] \}$
- (iv) $[[Q\alpha]]^{w,g} = [[\alpha]]^{w,g}$ or (Groenendijk & Stokhof 1984)
 $[[Q\alpha]]^{w,g} = \{ \Box w'. \Box p [p \in [[\alpha]]^{w,g} \& [p(w) = 1 \vee p(w') = 1]] \}$

Generalized quantifiers

For $[[\alpha]]^{w,g} \in D_c$:

- (i) $[[\Box\alpha]]^{w,g} = \{ \Box P\Box w'. \Box a [a \in [[\alpha]]^{w,g} \& P(a)(w') = 1] \}$
- (ii) $[[\Box\Box\alpha]]^{w,g} = \{ \Box P\Box w'. \Box a [a \in [[\alpha]]^{w,g} \& P(a)(w') = 1] \}$ Etc.

Predicate Abstraction

If α is a branching node whose daughters are an index i and β , where $[[\beta]]^{w,g} \in D_\alpha$, then $[[\alpha]]^{w,g} = \{f: f \in D_{\langle e \rangle} \& \exists a [f(a) \in [[\beta]]^{w,g[a/i]}] \}$ ².

Pronouns and traces

For any index i , $[[i]]^{w,g} = \{ g(i) \}$.

References

- Alonso-Ovalle L. & P. Menéndez-Benito (2003) Some Epistemic Indefinites. To appear in S. Kawahara (ed.): Proceedings of NELS 2002. GLSA UMass Amherst.
- Beck, S. (1996) Quantified Structures as Barriers for LF Movement. *Natural Language Semantics* 4(1), 1-56.
- Dayal, V. (1998) Any as Inherently Modal. *Linguistics & Philosophy*, 21(5), 433-476.
- Diesing, M. (1992) *Indefinites*. Cambridge/Mass: The MIT Press.

¹. There should be a choice for the world index with respect to which α is to be evaluated in (i) to (iv), an important issue that I will neglect.

². There is a question about the correctness of the definition for Predicate Abstraction. It does not quite deliver the expected set of functions. As far as I can see, however, no wrong predictions are actually made, as long as we only use the definition for generating propositional alternatives. Predicate modification operations within a Hamblin semantics present another interesting issue that I have to neglect here.

- Giannakidou, A. (2001) The Meaning of Free Choice. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 24, 659-735.
- Hagstrom, P. A. (1998) *Decomposing Questions*. MIT Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Hamblin, C. L. (1973) Questions in Montague English. *Foundations of Language* 10, 41-53.
- Haspelmath, M. (1997) *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford :Oxford University Press.
- Heim, I. (1982): *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. UMass Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Kadmon, N. & F. Landman (1993) *Any*. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 16, 353-422.
- Kamp, H. (1984) A Theory of Truth and Semantic Representation. In J. Groenendijk, T. Janssen and M. Stokhof (eds.) *Truth, Interpretation, and Information*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1-41.
- Kratzer A. & J. Shimoyama (2002) Indeterminate Pronouns: The View from Japanese. In Yukio Otsu (ed.): [The Proceedings of the Third Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics](#). Tokyo (Hituzi Syobo), 2002, 1-25. Longer version downloadable from [Semantics Archive](#).
- Krifka, M. (1994) Some Remarks on Polarity Items. In D. Zaefferer (ed.) *Semantic Universals and Universal Semantics*. Dordrecht: Foris, 150 -189.
- Krifka, M. (1995) The Semantics and Pragmatics of Polarity Items. *Linguistic Analysis* 25(3-4), 209-257.
- Kuroda, S. - Y. (1965) *Generative Grammatical Studies in The Japanese Language*. MIT Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Ladusaw W. A. (1992) Expressing Negation. In C. Barker & D. Dowty (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT II*. Linguistics Department, Ohio State University, Columbus, 237 – 259.
- Ladusaw W. A. (1996): *Negation and Polarity Items*. In S. Lappin (ed.) *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*. Oxford (Basil Blackwell), 321 – 341.
- Lahiri, U. (1998) Focus and Negative Polarity in Hindi. *Natural Language Semantics* 6(1), 57-123.
- Matthewson, L. (2001) Quantification and the Nature of Crosslinguistic Variation. *Natural Language Semantics* 9(2), 145 – 189.
- Nishigauchi, T. (1986) *Quantification in Syntax*. UMass Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Nishigauchi, T. (1990) *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Ohno, Yutaka (1989) *Mo*. In E. Bach et al. (eds.), *Papers on Quantification*, NSF Grant Report, Department of Linguistics, UMass, Amherst, GLSA 224-250 .
- Ramchand, G. C. (1997) Questions, Polarity, and Alternative Semantics. *Proceedings of NELS 27*, GLSA Amherst, 383-396.
- Saebø, K.J. (2001) The Semantics of Scandinavian Free Choice Items. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24, 737-787.
- Shimoyama, J. (1999) Complex NPs and Wh-Quantifiers in Japanese. *Proceedings of NELS 29*, GLSA Amherst, 355-385.
- Shimoyama, J. (2001) *Wh-Constructions in Japanese*. UMass Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Stechow, A. v. (1996) Against LF Pied-Piping. *Natural Language Semantics* 4(1), 57-110.