

My notes

Patrick D. Elliott

April 7, 2020

$$(1) \quad \text{someone} := \lambda k . \exists x[k\ x] \qquad (e \rightarrow t) \rightarrow t$$

Let's try the obvious way of lifting an existential quantifier into a dynamic setting:

$$(2) \quad \text{someone}^\dagger := \lambda k . \lambda \omega \omega' . \exists x[k\ x\ \omega\ \omega'] \qquad (e \rightarrow T) \rightarrow T$$

Now let's apply Gennaro's Discourse Referent (DR)-lift function to a one-place predicate:

$$(3) \quad \text{swim}^{A_n} := \lambda x . \lambda \omega \omega' . \omega \stackrel{n/x}{=} \omega' \wedge \text{swim}\ x \qquad e \rightarrow T$$

Applying the lifted quantifier to the lifted predicate gives us something sensible, namely an indeterministic update:

$$(4) \quad \lambda \omega \omega' . \exists x[\omega \stackrel{n/x}{=} \omega' \wedge \text{swim}\ x] \qquad T$$

What about if we try the same thing with a universal? Observe that, if the cardinality of the domain is greater than 1, the result is an inconsistent update.

$$(5) \quad \lambda \omega \omega' . \forall x[\omega \stackrel{n/x}{=} \omega' \wedge \text{swim}\ x] \qquad T$$

This seems reminiscent of **demirok2019**'s explanation for why indefinites but not universals take exceptional scope.