

References

- Beck, S. (1997). On the semantics of comparative conditionals. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20: 229–271.
- Brasoveanu, A. (2008). Comparative and equative correlatives as anaphora to differentials. Ms., Stanford. (To appear in *Proceedings of SALT 18*.)
- den Dikken, M. (2005). Comparative correlatives comparatively, *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 497–532.
- Kandybowicz, J. (2006). *Comp-trace* effects explained away. In D. Baumer, D. Montero, and M. Scanlon (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project, pp. 220–228.
- Kapetangianni, K., and H. L. Taylor (this volume). Comparative correlatives in Greek: the syntax of *oso*.
- Leung, T. T.-C. (2003). Comparative correlatives and parallel occurrence of elements. Ph.D. screening paper, University of Southern California.
- Smith, E. A. (2007). The semantics of comparative correlatives. Handout dated March 2, 2007, OSU.
- Srivastav, V. (1991). The syntax and semantics of correlatives. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 9: 637–686.
- Taylor, H. L. (2007). Movement from *if*-clause adjuncts. In A. Conroy, C. Jing, C. Nakao and E. Takahashi (eds.), *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics 15*, College Park, MD, pp. 192–206.
- Taylor, H. L. (to appear). The complementizer *the*. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*.

Department of Linguistics
University of Massachusetts at Amherst
150 Hicks Way
Amherst, MA 01003-9274
USA

bhatt@linguist.umass.edu

terms of a strictly increasing relation, as he does in Brasoveanu (2008), avoids this problem.

- (i) A relation *R* is monotonically increasing iff
 $\forall x, x', y, y' [(x < x' \wedge xRy \wedge x'Ry') \rightarrow y < y']$

Using relations allows for a weaker notion of proportionality. Two worlds with the same sugar differential from the reference world do not have to map to the same calorie differential, but if the sugar differential of w_1 exceeds that of w_2 , then the calorie differential of w_1 must also exceed that of w_2 . We can think of *R* in functional terms as mapping an element in its domain to a set of elements in its range such that the sets themselves preserve order between elements in the domain. In our example, this would mean that each sugar differential would map to a calorie differential range; the calorie differential ranges corresponding to sugar differentials would preserve ordering relations between sugar differentials. This line of inquiry seems promising. What remains is to examine how it extends to the cases of simple correlatives, where the relation involved seems to be identity.

Greek Generic Noun Phrases Involving the Free Choice Item *opjosdhipote* and the Definite Article

Dimitra Lazaridou-Chatzigoga
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

In this paper I study the Greek construction [definite article + F(ree) C(hoice) I(tem) *opjosdhipote* + Noun] in generic contexts, and on the basis of its distribution and characteristics I make the following claims: The NP as a whole contributes a variable that must be assigned quantificational force as in Heim's theory of indefinites, *opjosdhipote* is a domain widener and the definite article involved in this construction acts as a slack regulator in the sense of Lasnik (1999), operating on the GEN operator.

1. Introduction¹

In the recent literature on FCIs the existence of indefinite FCIs has been quite solidly established (see e.g. Quer 1999 and Garcia 2003 for Spanish, Horn 2005 for English and Kratzer & Shimoyama 2002 for German). This line of analysis treats a FCI like *cualquier* 'any' in Spanish as a Heimian indefinite (Heim 1982), an item that has no quantificational force of its own, but gains its quantificational force depending on the operator available in the context; it is thus interpreted existentially, universally or generically. The Greek FCI *opjosdhipote* has also been analyzed (see Giannakidou 2001; Giannakidou & Cheng 2006 and Lazaridou-Chatzigoga 2007) as a Heimian indefinite when it occurs as [*opjosdhipote* + Noun], as in (1), but also when it co-occurs with the indefinite article, as in (2):

- (1) Tis aresi na piramatizete me opjodhipote musiko organo.
 her like.3sg subj. experiment.3sg with FC musical instrument
 'She likes to experiment with any musical instrument.'

¹ I would like to thank various people who have helped me with comments, suggestions, judgments and questions to give shape to a lot of the ideas presented in this paper. I owe special thanks to Louise McNally, as well as to Josep Maria Brucart, Teresa Espinal, Michalis Kyratsous, Josep Quer, Estela Puig-Waldmueller, Cristina Real Puigdollers and Maribel Romero. I thank also my commentator at the Workshop on Greek Syntax and Semantics, Cleo Condoravdi, for her insightful comments and Anastasia Giannakidou for discussion. Absolutely any remaining errors are mine. This research has been supported by grants HUM2006-13295-C02-01 (MEC/FEDER) and SGR-00753-2005 (Generalitat de Catalunya). Amb el suport del Comissió per a Universitats i Recerca del Departament d'Innovació, Universitats i Empresa de la Generalitat de Catalunya.

- (2) Pes mu mia opjadhipote leksi.²
 tell me.GEN a FC word
 'Tell me a word, any word.'

The construction that will concern me in this paper has not received much attention before (as far as I know³, except for Lazaridou-Chatzigoga 2007) and involves *opjosdhipote* co-occurring with the definite article, as in (3):

- (3) O opjodhipote ixos ine musiki.⁴
 the FC sound is music
 'Absolutely any sound is music.'

The puzzle posed by the construction in (3) seems to cast doubt on the analysis of *opjosdhipote* as an indefinite, since it involves an indefinite (*opjosdhipote*) co-occurring with the definite article. This puzzle will be solved by looking closely at its characteristics, which lead me to argue that the definite article involved is used as a *slack regulator* in the sense of Lasersohn (1999) and that it operates on the GEN operator.

2. Syntax and Semantics of *opjosdhipote*: its Basic Structure and its Analysis as a Heimian Indefinite

As regards the syntax of the [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] construction, I argue that it has the following basic structure: *Opjosdhipote* combines first with the noun, forming a Q(uantificational)P(hrase), and the definite article is later adjoined to their outcome, as is shown in (4):

- (4)
-

² I have argued elsewhere (see Lazaridou-Chatzigoga 2007) that the [indefinite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] construction does not display any quantificational variability, but it is always interpreted existentially.

³ At the Workshop on Greek Syntax and Semantics I met E. Vlachou and had the opportunity to learn more about her work and her thesis (Vlachou 2007), which had not been accessible to me previously.

⁴ Throughout the paper I will translate this construction as 'absolutely any' and this translation reflects my analysis of the definite article as a slack regulator. Note also that Lasersohn (1999) also indicates that *absolutely* could be seen as a slack regulator, though he does not give a more detailed treatment of it.

The tree in (4) serves to show that according to my analysis the determiner of the whole phrase is *opjosdhipote*, that the definite article does not act as a regular definite article and, therefore, that it does not build a DP that would take *opjosdhipote* as an adjective. Further justification for this claim will be given later in this paper.

[*Opjosdhipote* + Noun] is treated as a Heimian indefinite (in line with Kadmon and Landman 1993 and Horn 2005, among others) and this means that it can take various quantificational forces depending on the context of its appearance. *Opjosdhipote* is analyzed on a par with regular indefinites like those denoted in English with *a*⁵, but differs from them in that it additionally involves domain widening⁶ in the sense of Kadmon & Landman (1993). As a consequence, a noun phrase involving *opjosdhipote* gets the following representation:

- (5) [[*opjosdhipote* *ihos*]] = sound_w(x)
 (the subscripted w indicates domain widening)

A further condition needs though to be added, because FC indefinites do not occur as freely as regular indefinites, but only in non-episodic contexts, as has been observed in the literature (see e.g. Giannakidou 2001). This can be stated as an anti-episodicity constraint (Giannakidou 2001:684) in the following way:

Licensing condition on FCIs:

A FCI α is grammatical in a sentence S iff:

- (i) α is in the scope of a nonveridical operator β ; and
 (ii) S is not episodic.

The question that naturally arises is what is the difference (if any) in interpretation between [*opjosdhipote* + Noun] and [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun]. In order to answer this question, a comparison of the contexts where these two constructions appear seems to be necessary. Their distribution seems to be almost identical. They appear in a great variety of non-episodic contexts, such as possibility or ability modals, generics, antecedents of conditionals and imperatives, examples of which I provide in the following section.⁷

In this paper I will focus only on the generic interpretation of NPs involving *opjosdhipote*, although other quantificational forces are also possible. According to the analysis of bare plurals in English as indefinites (see for instance Gerstner and Krifka 1993, Diesing 1992), genericity has two sources: on the one hand, it comes from kind-denoting terms and kind-level predicates (D-generics in the sense of Gerstner and Krifka 1993) and on the other hand,

⁵ I will not go through the arguments that support this analysis, but for Greek see Lazaridou-Chatzigoga (2007), which is based among others on Giannakidou (2001).

⁶ Kadmon & Landman (1993) define widening in the following way: *in an NP of the form any CP, any widens the interpretation of the common noun phrase (CP) along a contextual dimension.*

⁷ Further study of these contexts, however, reveals that the ones with the definite article can sometimes override the anti-episodicity constraint. I will return to this point.

from an implicit sentential GEN operator (I-generics in the sense of Gerstner and Krifka 1993). I argue that generics with *opjosdhipote* are involved in the second type of Genericity and therefore involve a dyadic modal operator GEN, which gives rise to the following tripartite structure (following Lewis 1975 and Heim 1982):

- (6) Opjosdhipote ihos ine musiki 'Any sound is music'
representation: Gen x [sound_w(x) & C(x)] [is.music(x)]

According to the representation in (6) and on the basis of the claims I make about the syntax and semantics of the construction in question, the sentence with the definite article *o opjosdhipote ihos ine musiki* 'absolutely any sound is music' gets the following tripartite representation, which is identical to the one without the article:

- (7) O opjosdhipote ihos ine musiki 'Absolutely any sound is music'
representation: Gen x [sound_w(x) & C(x)] [is.music(x)]

3. Some Data

In this paper I will concentrate only on generic contexts, where [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] appears.⁸ It appears in contexts with individual-level predicates (Carlson 1977), that is, with predicates that express permanent properties of individuals, as can be observed in (3) above or in (8)-(10) below:

- (8) An ehete tin opjadhipote pliroforia, kaleste mas.
if have.2pl. the.ACC FC information, call us
'If you have absolutely any information, call us.'

⁸ I leave other contexts for future research.

- (9) Htes milisa me ton psihanaliti tu patera
yesterday talked.1sg with the.GEN psychoanalyst the.GEN father
mu. Sas eksomologume oti dhen thimame pote onira
mine you.ACC confess.1sg that not remember.1sg never dreams
pu idha ti nihta.. To ksero oti afto to kusuri mu tha
that saw.1sg the.ACC night it know.1sg that this the defect mine fut
ekane ton opjosdhipote psihanaliti na pethani
make.3sg the.ACC FC psychoanalyst subj. die.3sg
tis pinas! Dhen tha mborusa na tu dygitho tipota apo
the.GEN hunger not fut. could.1sg subj him tell.1sg nothing from
ton kosmo ton oniron mu!
the.ACC world the.GEN dreams mine
'Yesterday I talked to my father's psychoanalyst. I confess to you that I don't ever remember dreams I saw at night...I know that this defect of mine would make absolutely any psychoanalyst die from hunger! I couldn't tell him anything from the world of my dreams!'

- (10) Apagorevonde i opjesdhipote alages tu simvoleu.
is.prohibited the.NOM FC changes the.GEN contract
'Absolutely any change of the contract is prohibited.'

On the other hand, this construction is not licit in episodic contexts like (11) or in what I will call "episodic" or plain imperatives like (12), as seen below. With respect to (11), this is expected since in general *opjosdhipote* is claimed to be banned from episodic contexts (see Giannakidou 2001), whereas (12) is a context where the bare *opjosdhipote* would be totally grammatical.

- (11) *Epekse to opjosdhipote musiko organo.
played.1sg the.ACC FC musical instrument
('I played absolutely any musical instrument.')
- (12) *Pekse tin opjadhipote nota.
imp. play.2sg the.ACC FC note
('Play absolutely any note.')

However, if we consider episodic sentences with intensional-like predicates like *apagorevo* 'forbid', (perhaps it is also relevant that a nominalization is involved here, namely *gathering*), we see that the construction becomes licit. Furthermore, if we consider imperatives like the one in (14) we see that the construction acquires an implication of indiscriminate choice.

- (13) Me afto to diatagma apagorefsan (tin) opjadhypote dimosia
 with this the decree forbade.3pl the FC public
 sigkentrosi.⁹
 gathering
 'With this decree they forbade any public gathering.'
- (14) Pare ton opjodhipote dimofili politiko.
 consider the FC popular politician
 'Consider any popular politician.'

In these examples, for reasons which are not entirely clear, the definite article with *opjodhipote* has truly universal quantificational force; the analysis of such examples will have to be left for future research.

4. The Interpretation of [Definite Article + *opjodhipote* + Noun]

I base my analysis on two blocks of arguments. The first two arguments will serve to show that the construction with the definite article is not definite in the relevant sense and the remaining three will provide the basis for an analysis of this construction in generic contexts.

The first argument has to do with the fact that they do not refer to specific and unique individuals. As can be seen in (3), *o opjodhipote ihos* 'absolutely any sound' does not make reference to some specific sound that is music and it does not denote any unique individual. We further observe that there is no need for previous mention, so someone can utter (10) for instance without there being any previous reference to changes. Finally, no reference to familiar discourse referents is established with these constructions as we can see in (9), where *ton opjodhipote psihanaliti* 'absolutely any psychoanalyst' cannot refer to the previously mentioned discourse referent of *ton psihanaliti* 'the psychoanalyst' and thus they cannot be understood as coreferential.

The second argument supporting the claim that these constructions are not definite comes from evidence from polydefiniteness in Greek. The fact that these DPs do not pick up familiar individuals can be explained if they are interpreted generically, and it is further shown by the phenomenon of polydefiniteness, in which in DPs modified by pre- or postnominal adjectives an extra determiner appears before the adjective. This extra determiner is optional in the case of prenominal adjectives and obligatory in the case of postnominal adjectives. Here are some examples illustrating the phenomenon:

⁹ I owe examples (13) and (14), as well as the relevant observations, to Cleo Condoravdi.

- (15) A: Ti tha paris telika? Tin trobeta i to saksofono?
 what fut take.2sg finally the.ACC trumpet or the.ACC saxophone
 'What will you buy finally? The trumpet or the saxophone?'
 B: To saksofono.
 the.ACC saxophone
 'The saxophone.'
- A: Pjo saksofono, to metaxirismeno i to kenurio?
 which saxophone the.ACC used or the.ACC new
 'Which saxophone, the used or the new one?'
 B: Nomizo tha paro to metaxirismeno to saksofono,
 think.1sg fut take.1sg the.ACC used the.ACC saxophone
 giati to kenurio ine poli pio akrivo.
 because the.ACC new is much more expensive
 'I think I'll buy the used saxophone because the new one is much more expensive.'

Kolliakou (2004) and Campos & Stavrou (2005) argue that the relevant notion for explaining the distribution of polydefiniteness is *familiarity*. A definite NP refers to a *familiar* discourse referent (in the sense of Heim 1982) if it denotes an entity that has already been introduced in the discourse. According to the analyses of Kolliakou and Campos & Stavrou, in order for the definite determiner to spread, the referent of the polydefinite should be familiar. More specifically, Kolliakou (2004:273) argues that polydefinites pick out a proper subset Y of a set X that has been previously introduced and is still salient in the discourse.¹⁰ So, in our example we see that the polydefinite *to metaxirismeno to saksofono*, lit. 'the used the saxophone' picks out a subset of the set of the two saxophones available in the discourse.

Going back to the construction in question, we see in (16) that polydefiniteness is not licensed either in prenominal or in postnominal position with *opjodhipote*. That is, the definite article co-occurring with it cannot spread:

- (16) a. *O opjodhipote o ihos ine musiki.
 the.NOM FC the.NOM sound is music
 b. *O ihos o opjodhipote ine musiki.
 the.NOM sound the.NOM FC is music

This is due to the fact that the referent of these nominals is not familiar in the relevant sense; these constructions cannot pick out a subset from a set available in the discourse, since they do not refer to familiar discourse referents. On the contrary, what *opjodhipote* seems to require is some kind of superset. This is due to the fact that *opjodhipote* carries a condition of widening the domain of quantification, so as to include more individuals. So, the polydefinite obtained by the definite article and *opjodhipote* would require at the same time a subset and a superset, something that is logically impossible.

¹⁰ Kolliakou uses the notion of *non-monotone anaphora*, which is not necessary for the claim I want to make.

The fact that polydefiniteness does not arise with [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] is expected given my claim that *opjosdhipote* is a determiner and not an adjective, and that the definite article is not really functioning as a determiner but it is rather adjoined later to the construction, as we saw in section 2. The treatment of *opjosdhipote* as a determiner is further supported by another construction, which crucially involves the definite article co-occurring with a determiner. This construction involves the quantifier *kathe* 'each' co-appearing with the definite article yielding *o kathe*, lit. 'the each'. This construction resembles the [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] in that it does not allow for the determiner to spread, as seen in (17)¹¹:

- (17) *To kathe to pedhi efage ena pagoto.
the.NOM each the.NOM child ate.3sg an ice cream

The second set of arguments has to do specifically with the tendency for the construction [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] to be interpreted generically. The first of these involves similarity to the bare *opjosdhipote* constructions. My claim that the construction [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] is not really definite, and that *opjosdhipote* is the determiner, is supported by the following facts.

First, Greek generics are typically constructed with the definite article (see Marmaridou 1984), as is seen in (18) and (19), while bare plurals in Greek are not interpreted generically in subject position, as we observe in (20). This is in contrast, for instance, to English.

- (18) To pagoto ine to pjo agapimeno kalokerino epidorpio.
the.NOM ice cream is the.NOM more favorite summer dessert
'Ice cream is summer's favorite dessert.'
- (19) I pinguini xorevun poli omorfa/ ehun eksafanisti.
the.NOM penguins dance.3pl very nicely/ have.3pl disappeared
'Penguins dance very nicely/are extinct.'
- (20) *Rinokeri ine thilastika/ ehun eksafanisti.
rhinos are.3pl mammals/have.3pl disappeared
'Rhinos are mammals/are extinct.'

As seen in examples (18) and (19), Greek does not normally allow for bare generics, so generics with *opjosdhipote* can be also seen as reflecting this general strategy of Greek, with *opjosdhipote* being the determiner. In Greek the indefinite article with generic interpretation is in general not allowed, as seen in (21), though it is possible (see Tsamadou-Jacobberger 1992) when there is more descriptive content present, e.g. some kind of modification as in (22), or

¹¹ I will come back to this construction towards the end of this paper.

emphatic stress (indicated here by capital letters) as in (23), and it almost always appears in sentences that receive a deontic reading:

- (21) *Enas pinguinos ine haritomenos.
a penguin is cute [* with a generic interpretation]
- (22) Mia kopela apo kali ikogenia kseri na pezi trobeta.
a girl from good family knows subj play.3sg trumpet
'A girl from a good family knows (=should know how) to play the trumpet.'
- (23) Mia KIRIA dhen ferete etsi.
a lady not behave.3sg so
'A (real) lady does not behave this way.'

Despite the fact that *opjosdhipote* can co-occur with the indefinite article, a fact already discussed before, we see in (24) that when it is interpreted generically, it can only be either bare or co-occurring with the definite article and not with the indefinite. This is why utterance (24) is deviant, if not ungrammatical¹², while (25) is fine:

- (24) ??Enas opjosdhipote ihos ine musiki.
a FC sound is music
- (25) (O) opjosdhipote ihos ine musiki.
the.NOM FC sound is music
'(Absolutely) any sound is music.'

In (25) we further observe that the insertion of the definite article into a generic noun phrase with *opjosdhipote* only gives rise to a small difference in interpretation; this is to be discussed in greater detail in sections 6 and 7.

The second argument has to do with the contexts that license this construction. The fact that [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] is largely restricted to generic contexts may be taken to indicate that either a licensing condition is involved or that if some other operator bound it, as in (26), the result would be semantically or pragmatically problematic. In order to see why this construction has an affinity with the GEN operator, let's return to one of the contexts exemplified in section 3, the imperative. Example (12), repeated here as (26) for convenience, is ungrammatical:

¹² The same observation having to do with the descriptive content holds, i.e. if we have more descriptive content, the sentence becomes licit:

- (i) Enas opjosdhipote oreos ixos ine musiki.
a FC nice sound is music
'Any beautiful sound is music.'

- (26) *Pekse tin opjadhipe nota.
imp play.2sg the.ACC FC note
 ('Play absolutely any note.')

The [definite article + *opjodhipote* + Noun] construction is not banned from imperatives in general, however. When the context permits a generic interpretation, the construction becomes licit, as can be seen in (27):

- (27) An thelis na kerdisis mia gineka, ekmetalefsu tin
if want.2sg subj. win.2sg a woman, take.advantage.2sg the.ACC
opjadhipe efkeria gia na tis diksis poso ksehoristi ine.
FC occasion for subj. her show.2sg how special is
 'If you want to win over a woman, take advantage of absolutely any occasion to show her how special she is.'

The construction in question is not licit with kind-level predicates in episodic contexts, as seen below:

- (28) *O opjodhipote dinosavros ehi eksafanisti.
the.NOM FC dinosaur has disappeared
 ('Absolutely any dinosaur is extinct.')

Notice, though, that, as predicted by my analysis, it is grammatical to have this construction with a kind-level predicate in a generic context:

- (29) I aderfi mu tha boruse na anakalipsi to
the.NOM sister mine fut could subj invent.3sg the.ACC
opjodhipote farmako.
FC medicine
 'My sister could invent absolutely any medicine.'

The last argument serves to show that these constructions involve generic quantification over individuals. Turning to the scope properties of generic noun phrases with *opjodhipote*, we observe that if we compare them with bare plurals in Greek, we get the following contrast: A bare plural can only get a narrow scope existential interpretation (see e.g. Carlson 1977) and the quantification is over situations, as we observe in (30).

- (30) a. I gonis tis Inos tin afinun na pezi musika
the.NOM parents the.GEN Ino her let.3pl subj. play/3sg musical
organa.
instruments
 'Ino's parents allow her to play musical instruments.'
 b. Gen s [C(s)] [$\exists y$ [allow (I-p, I, λx [play (x,y) \wedge
 musical.instrument(y)]) in s]

On the other hand, the construction with *opjodhipote*—with or without the definite article—gets a more prominent wide scope generic reading and,

crucially, the quantification is over individuals, in this case over musical instruments and not over situations. Consider the following example:

- (31) a. I gonis tis Inos tin afinun na pezi
the.NOM parents the.GEN Ino her let.3pl subj. play.3sg
 (to) opjodhipote musiko organo.
(the.ACC) FC musical instrument
 'Ino's parents allow her to play (absolutely) any musical instrument.'
 b. Gen x [musical.instrument(x)] [allow (I-p, I, λx [play (I,x)])]

5. *Opjodhipote* as an Indefinite and the Definite Article as a Slack Regulator

My analysis is based on two central claims. The first is that, as we saw in section 3, [*opjodhipote* + Noun] is interpreted as a Heimian indefinite that additionally widens the domain of quantification. This means that when it combines with the noun, it provides a variable to be bound by a contextually available operator. The second claim, to which I will turn to in the next two subsections, is that the definite article in this construction is used as a slack regulator in the sense of Lasersohn (1999).

5.1 The notion of slack regulator (Lasersohn 1999)

In this subsection I will introduce the notion of slack regulator, which is central to my analysis. Lasersohn argues that people often talk loosely and that they sometimes admit a pragmatically licensed deviation from truth called *pragmatic slack*. Furthermore, he argues that there exist expressions in natural language, called *slack regulators*, which serve to regulate the pragmatic slack permitted in the interpretation of an expression. Lasersohn's examples of slack regulators include *all*, *exactly* and *perfectly*. Let me illustrate his analysis with one example. Suppose we have the following two sentences:

- (32) a. The townspeople are asleep.
 b. All the townspeople are asleep.

According to Lasersohn the difference between these two utterances involves how much pragmatic slack is allowed in each case. In the first case it might be the case that a few weird townspeople are awake, but even though sentence (32a) is strictly truth-conditionally false, we accept it as 'close enough' to the truth. We just take it that the speaker may have spoken loosely, making use of pragmatic slack. What *all* does in (32b) is rule out an imprecise use of *the townspeople*. That is, no individual can be regarded as pragmatically irrelevant and therefore no exceptions are allowed. I give here the formalism Lasersohn uses, but I will not go into details:

All denotes an identity function. It maps each set onto a set that differs from it only in pragmatically ignorable ways. So, we'll have:

- (33) $[[all]]^{M,C} = f: f(g) = g$, for all groups of individuals g in M (relative to a model M and a context C)

If α is a group-denoting term, then we have $[[all \alpha]]^{M,C} = [[all]]^{M,C} ([[\alpha]]^{M,C})$, that is, $[[\alpha]]^{M,C}$.

According to Lasersohn the context associates each denotation with a set of objects of the same logical type as the denotation, and these objects are different from each other in ways that may be pragmatically ignorable. For example, the phrase *the townspeople* denotes a group of individuals and the context associates with this set a set of groups of individuals, groups that differ from the group of individuals denoted by *the townspeople* only in irrelevant ways, such as leaving out a few weird members. These sets are called *pragmatic halos* and the denotation of the expression is included always in these sets as their "centerpoint". All expressions have halos, and the halo of *all* is a set of functions approximating an identity function. Furthermore, there exists a rule for calculating the halo of an expression containing *all* and the purpose of this rule is to recover the centerpoint of the halo of a^{13} , i.e. its denotation.

5.2 The definite article as a slack regulator

Turning now to the construction in question, consider two examples with *opjosdhipote*, one bare and one with the definite article:

- (34) *Opjosdhipote ihos ine musiki. Ohi omos ke to na*
FC sound is music no though and the subj.
tsalakoni kapjos ena xarti!
crumple.3sg someone a paper
 'Any sound is music. Except someone crumpling up a piece of paper!'

- (35) *O opjosdhipote ihos ine musiki. # Ohi omos ke to*
the.NOM FC sound is music no though and the
na tsalakoni kapjos ena xarti!
subj. crumple.3sg someone a paper
 'Absolutely any sound is music. # Except someone crumpling up a piece of paper!'

According to Heim indefinites are represented as open propositions, formulas of the sort *sound(x)*, that is, predicates that involve a free variable. The meaning of a sentence is conceived as its context change potential, i.e. as a function from assignments to assignments, where an assignment is a function that gives a value (an object of the model) to each discourse referent. From this it follows that the denotation of an indefinite (given that it is treated as a proposition) is a function from assignments to assignments.

¹³ Given that α is a group of individuals, the halo of all α , $H_C(all \alpha)$ is a set of functions on groups of individuals and this is the rule Lasersohn gives to calculate the halo of an expression containing all: $H_C(all \alpha) = \{x \mid \exists y [\forall z y \leq_{\alpha,C} z \ \& \ \exists f [f \in H_C(all) \ \& \ f(y) = x]]\}$.

In order now to construct the halo of a Heimian indefinite we would have to do the following: Since the elements of the halo are required to be of the same type as the denotation, the halo of an indefinite would be a set of functions from assignments to assignments which would differ in terms of exactly how many assignment functions they would allow to satisfy the value of the variable in the indefinite. This means that if we have *opjosdhipote ixos ine musiki*, the halo of *opjosdhipote ixos* would be different functions, say f_1, f_2, f_3 etc. f_3 for instance would be a function that wouldn't return those assignment functions that set the sound of paper crumpling as the value for x . The center of the halo (also being a function) would include such assignments in its output on any given input. It would be a function returning those assignment functions that set the sound of paper crumpling as the value for x , in addition to those that return all other sounds as values for x . If we now have *opjosdhipote* co-occurring with the definite article and assume that the definite article is a slack regulator, its application would return the centerpoint of the halo, that is, the denotation of the expression, and not other functions that would differ from it in what assignment functions they allow for satisfying the free variable of the indefinite.

Going back to (34), the speaker includes, for example, in the set of sounds that can be considered as music the sounds produced by all natural instruments plus some other sounds, say, the sound of waves and rain falling. But, the speaker of (34) regards the sound of paper crumpling, for instance, as an exception to her claim. Now, someone with an even broader sense of what could be regarded as music utters (35). For the speaker of (35) even the sound of paper crumpling, of someone just breathing through a saxophone or of a truck passing by, that is actually, every possible sound is included in the domain determined by *sound(x)* and is claimed to be music; she does not tolerate any exceptions to her claim and this is shown by the fact that the continuation in (35) is pragmatically deviant.

On the basis of the above examples, the parallelism between these examples and those of Lasersohn is clear. It has to do with how much deviation from truth is allowed.

The definite article is not a necessary condition for genericity, but it is a sufficient one: in order for a construction like [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] to arise, [*opjosdhipote* + Noun] should be already interpreted generically. The definite article is applied to the restriction of the tripartite structure (*opjosdhipote ixos*), but has an effect on the domain of the implicit Generic operator, giving the impression that we have universal quantification (we could perhaps term this *maximal genericity*).

The treatment of the definite article as a slack regulator clarifies the difference between *ola the pedhia* 'all the children' and *ta opjadhipote pedhia* lit. 'the FC children', given that both *all* and the definite article can be treated as slack regulators. The noun phrase with *opjosdhipote* would indicate distributivity, and thus it is ungrammatical with collective predicates, while 'all the children' can also be used that way:

- (36) *Ola ta pedhia mazevonde stin avli gia na peksun.*
all the.NOM children gather.3pl in the.ACC yard for subj. play.3pl
 'All the children gather in the yard to play.'

- (37) *Ta opjadhipe pedhia mavezonte stin avli gia
 the.NOMFC children gather.3pl in.the.ACC yard for
 na peksun.
 subj. play.3pl

As I pointed out before in the discussion of polydefiniteness, the comparison of [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] with the construction *o kathe*, lit. 'the each', gives further evidence for my analysis. Following an analysis in Giannakidou (2004), I claim that what *o kathe* lit. 'the each', seems to indicate is *strong distributivity*. Note that both involve an optional use of the definite article and that both do not accept polydefiniteness. Additionally, both have been described as "more emphatic" forms in grammars of Greek and involve the same word order (article + quantifier/indefinite + Noun). This could be seen as an indication that in this construction, too, the definite article acts as a slack regulator, though further research on this line of thought needs to be done.

6. Conclusions

In this paper I have argued that in the [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] construction the NP as a whole contributes a variable that must be assigned quantificational force and that this variable shows a tendency to be bound by an implicit GEN operator. The FCI *opjosdhipote* is a domain widener in the sense of Kadmon and Landman (1993). The definite article involved in this construction does not show any characteristics of definiteness and therefore is analyzed as a slack regulator in the sense of Lasersohn (1999).

References

- Campos, Hector and Melita Stavrou (2005). Polydefinite Constructions in Modern Greek and Aromanian in *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. Ed. Milosevic, O. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carlson, Greg (1977). *Reference to Kinds in English*. University of Massachusetts Amherst, doctoral dissertation. Published 1980 by Garland Press, New York.
- Diesing, Molly (1992). *Indefinites*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Garcia, Sergi (2003). Los Términos de Elección Libre en Español: el caso de cualquier(a). *Trabajo de investigación*. UAB.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia (2001). The Meaning of Free Choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 24.6: 659-735.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia (2004) Domain restriction and the Arguments of Quantificational Determiners, *SALT* 14, 110-128.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia and Lisa Cheng (2006). (In)Definiteness, Polarity, and the Role of wh-morphology in Free Choice. *Journal of Semantics* 23: 135-183.
- Gerstner, Claudia and Manfred Krifka (1993). Genericity. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, Theo Vennemann (eds.), *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993. 966-978.

- Heim, Irene (1982). *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. PhD. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Garland Publishing Inc., 1988.
- Horn, Lawrence (2005). Airport '68 Revisited: Toward a unified indefinite any. In Carlson G. and Pelletier J. F. (eds.). pp. 179-205.
- Kadmon, Nirit and Fred Landman (1993). Any. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 15: 353-422.
- Kratzer, Angelika and Junko Shimoyama (2002). Indeterminate Pronouns: The View from Japanese. In Y. Otsu (ed) *Proceedings of the Third Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, Hituzi Syobo, Tokyo.
- Kolliakou, Dimitra (2004). Monadic definites and Polydefinites: their form, meaning and use. *Journal of Linguistics* 40.2: 263-323.
- Lasersohn, Peter (1999). Pragmatic halos. *Language*, Vol. 75, No. 3 (Sep., 1999), pp. 522-551.
- Lazaridou-Chatzigoga, Dimitra (2007). Free Choice Items and definiteness: evidence from Greek. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*, E. Puig-Waldmüller (ed.), Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, pp. 403-417.
- Lewis, David (1975). Adverbs of quantification in E.L. Keenan (ed.), *Formal semantics of natural language*, pp. 3-15, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Manolessou, Io (2000). Greek Noun Phrase structure: a study in syntactic evolution. Ph.D. diss. University of Cambridge.
- Marmaridou Sofia (1984). The Study of Reference, Attribution and Genericness in the Context of English and Their Grammaticalization in M. Greek Noun Phrases. Diss. Darwin College, Cambridge.
- Quer, Josep (1999). The quantificational force of free choice items. Unpublished MS. University of Amsterdam.
- Tsamadou-Jacobberger, Irini (1992). Subject noun phrases with generic reference (Ονοματικές φράσεις-υποκείμενα με γενικευτική αξία αναφοράς). In *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics Faculty of Philosophy Aristotle University of Thessaloniki 18-19 April 1991*. Thessaloniki, Kyriakides. pp. 329-338.
- Vlachou, Evangelia (2007). Free choice in and out of context: semantics and distribution of French, Greek and English free choice items. PhD dissertation. University of Sorbonne-Paris IV and University of Utrecht. LOT dissertation series 156.

Departament de Filologia Catalana
 Facultat de Lletres
 Edifici B
 Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
 08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona)
 Spain

Dimitra.Lazaridou@uab.es
<http://seneca.uab.es/ggt/membres/lazaridou.htm>