

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi
<i>General Preface</i>	xiii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Two conceptions of reference	2
1.2 NPs	4
1.2.1 NPs with determiners	5
1.2.2 NPs in sentences	7
1.3 The contents and structure of this book	8
1.4 Punctuation	10
2 Foundations	12
2.1 Mill	12
2.1.1 Denotation and connotation	12
2.1.2 Mill on proper names	14
2.1.3 Mill on propositions	15
2.1.4 Summary	15
2.2 Frege	15
2.2.1 Identity statements	16
2.2.2 Sense and reference	17
2.2.3 Compositionality and the sense and reference of sentences	18
2.2.4 Frege on propositional attitudes	22
2.2.5 Frege on proper names	24
2.2.6 Summary and comments	25
2.3 Russell	26
2.3.1 Quantification	26
2.3.2 Russell's analysis of definite descriptions	28
2.3.3 Russell on propositional attitudes	30
2.3.4 Russell on proper names	33
2.4 Comparisons of Mill, Frege, and Russell	36
2.4.1 Sense vs reference	36
2.4.2 Definite descriptions	36

2.4.3	Empty NPs	37
2.4.4	Propositional attitude contexts	38
2.4.5	Proper names	39
2.5	Concluding remarks	39
3	Subsequent developments	41
3.1	Semantic scope	41
3.1.1	Quantificational NPs	42
3.1.2	Some other sentence operators	43
3.1.3	Scope ambiguities	44
3.1.4	Modal operators	47
3.1.5	Some complications	49
3.1.6	Summary	51
3.2	Possible worlds, extensions, and intensions	52
3.2.1	Possible worlds	52
3.2.2	Extensions	52
3.2.3	Intensions	53
3.2.4	A note about time	56
3.3	Extensionality and intensionality	57
3.3.1	Extensionality	57
3.3.2	Intensionality	58
3.4	Propositions	60
3.4.1	Propositions as sets of possible worlds	61
3.4.2	Propositions as sets of situations	63
3.4.3	Intensional structure	64
3.4.4	Russellian singular propositions	65
3.4.5	Summary	66
3.5	Existence independence	66
3.6	Summary	68
4	The proper treatment of quantification	69
4.1	Grice and conversational implicatures	70
4.2	Introduction to Montague's work	75
4.3	Two problems	76
4.3.1	Rampant intensionality?	76
4.3.2	Quantificational NPs and generalized quantifiers	78

4.4	Overview of the PTQ grammar	83
4.4.1	The English fragment	84
4.4.2	IL	85
4.4.3	The translation rules	86
4.5	Some examples	88
4.6	Individuals vs individual concepts	89
4.7	Proper names	91
4.8	Summary and developments	92
4.8.1	Barwise and Cooper (1981) on generalized quantifiers	93
4.8.2	Partee (1986) on type-shifting	96
4.9	Concluding remarks	98
5	Proper names	99
5.1	Review: Mill, Frege, and Russell	100
5.2	The cluster view	102
5.3	The return to Mill's view	104
5.3.1	Descriptions neither necessary nor sufficient	104
5.3.2	Kripke's modal argument	105
5.3.3	Natural kind terms	107
5.4	The new theory of reference	107
5.4.1	What connects names with referents?	108
5.4.2	What is the semantic contribution of a proper name?	109
5.4.3	Direct reference, rigid designation, singular and object-dependent propositions	110
5.5	Problems!	112
5.6	Solutions? Part 1: metalinguistic approaches	114
5.6.1	Quotational approaches	115
5.6.2	Causal description theories	117
5.6.3	"The bearer of N"	118
5.7	Kripke's puzzle	120
5.7.1	London/Londres and Paderewski	120
5.7.2	Metalinguistic responses	122
5.8	Solutions? Part 2: hidden indexical and bite-the-bullet approaches	123
5.8.1	Hidden indexical theories	124
5.8.2	Bite-the bullet-approaches	125
5.9	Summary and conclusions	127

6	Definite descriptions	130
6.1	Review	131
6.1.1	The views of Mill, Frege, and Russell	131
6.1.2	Comparison of referential and quantificational views	132
6.2	Strawson's objections to Russell	135
6.2.1	Expressions vs uses of expressions	135
6.2.2	Presupposition vs assertion	136
6.2.3	Incomplete descriptions	137
6.2.4	Summary	140
6.3	Donnellan's referential-attributive distinction	140
6.3.1	Introduction of the referential construal	141
6.3.2	Semantic analyses	143
6.3.3	Kripke's pragmatic analysis	147
6.3.4	Defense of the semantic analyses	150
6.4	Indefinite descriptions	153
6.5	Concluding remarks	156
7	Plurals and generics	158
7.1	Plurals and mass terms	158
7.1.1	Link's analysis	159
7.1.2	Plural and mass definite descriptions	161
7.2	Distributive, collective, and cumulative readings	162
7.3	Genericity	165
7.3.1	Statement genericity	165
7.3.2	Bare NPs—Carlson's analysis	167
7.3.3	Generic uses of singular descriptions	169
7.3.4	Bare NPs—an alternative analysis	172
7.4	The average American	174
7.5	Concluding remarks	179
8	Indexicality and pronouns	180
8.1	Character and content	182
8.2	Essential indexicals?	186
8.2.1	Belief states	187
8.2.2	Belief <i>de se</i>	188
8.3	Index vs denotation	189
8.4	Demonstrative NPs	191

8.5	The interpretation of (third-person) pronouns: reference, coreference, and binding	194
8.5.1	The “free variable” interpretation	195
8.5.2	Dynamic semantics	197
8.5.3	Quantificationally bound pronouns	198
8.5.4	Non-quantificational binding	200
8.5.5	Plural pronouns	203
8.6	Pronouns and descriptions	204
8.6.1	Bound descriptions	205
8.6.2	Descriptive pronouns	206
8.7	Concluding remarks	208
9	Definiteness, strength, partitives, and referentiality	209
9.1	Existential sentences	210
9.2	Characterizations of “definite NP”	214
9.2.1	Uniqueness	214
9.2.2	Familiarity	218
9.2.3	Non-null intersection	221
9.2.4	Type <i>e</i>	223
9.3	Strong and weak	226
9.4	Partitive NPs	230
9.5	Concluding remarks	237
10	NPs in discourse	238
10.1	Pronouns in discourse	239
10.1.1	Donkey pronouns	239
10.1.2	Dynamic semantics and unselective binding	240
10.1.3	E-type pronouns	242
10.1.4	Some remaining issues	246
10.2	Choosing NPs in discourse	251
10.2.1	Prince (1981b, 1992)	251
10.2.2	Ariel (1988, 1990)	253
10.2.3	Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski (1993, 2001)	254
10.2.4	What is encoded?	257
10.3	Referents	261
10.3.1	Discourse referents	261
10.3.2	Nonexistent entities	264
10.4	Concluding remarks	267

11 Taking stock	268
11.1 Individual concepts	269
11.2 Which NPs can be used to refer?	270
11.3 Which NPs (if any) have a (singular) referent?	274
11.4 Concluding remarks	280
 <i>References</i>	 281
<i>Index</i>	299