

Korrekturen zum Artikel 33 *Model-theoretic Semantics* – mit Dank an Wolfgang Sternefeld

<i>Auf Seite</i>	<i>... steht:</i>	<i>Es muss aber heißen:</i>
762 (im Abstract)	<i>as a providing a mathematical reconstruction</i>	<i>as providing a mathematical reconstruction</i>
773, vor (14)	to the those of the subjects T :	to those of the subjects T :
775, (20), Z. 1f.	the <i>extension of A relative to</i> \mathcal{M}_w	the <i>extension of A relative to</i> \mathcal{M}_w
775, (20), Z. 3	grammatical complexity of A :	grammatical complexity of A :
777, 3. Spiegelstrich	$\rho_{(a,b)} = \lambda f. \{(\rho_a(x), \rho_b(y)) \mid f(x) = y\}$	$\rho_{(a,b)} = \lambda f. \{(\rho_a(x), \rho_b(y)) \mid f(x) = y\}$
779, 1. Definition	then w is <i>L-indistinguishable</i> from w	then w is <i>L-indistinguishable</i> from w'
783, 3. Z. nach (iv-c)	$\lambda w'. \mathcal{S} ^{\mathcal{M}_w} \mathcal{S} ^{\mathcal{M}_w}$	$\lambda w'. \mathcal{S} ^{\mathcal{M}_w}$
786, 11↑	sets; Cf. Mendelsohn (1997: 225ff)	sets; cf. Mendelsohn (1997: 225ff)
787	(35) If $w \neq w'$, then $\mathcal{M}_w \neq \mathcal{M}_w$.	(35) If $w \neq w'$, then $\mathcal{M}_w \neq \mathcal{M}_{w'}$.
789, zw. (39) und (49)	as as a <i>postulate system</i>	as a <i>postulate system</i>
793, (45iv-c)	$\llbracket \mathcal{V} \mathcal{S} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_w} = \llbracket \mathcal{S} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_w} (\lambda w'. \llbracket \mathcal{S} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{w'}})$	$\llbracket \mathcal{V} \mathcal{S} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_w} = \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_w} (\lambda w'. \llbracket \mathcal{S} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{w'}})$
793, 3. Z. u. (45)	$\llbracket \mathcal{A} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{w'}}$ and $\llbracket \mathcal{A} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_w}$	$\llbracket \mathcal{A} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_w}$, and $\llbracket \mathcal{A} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{w'}}$
794, (46)	a.	(a)
794, (46)	b.	(b)
794, (46b)	$\llbracket \mathbf{boy} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_w}$	$\llbracket \mathbf{boy} \rrbracket^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{w'}}$
796, Z. 10↓	\mathcal{S} $\beta\beta$ is <i>actually</i> true	\mathcal{S} is <i>actually</i> true
796, Def., 2. Spiegelstr.	in every member $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$	in every member of $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$
797 Mitte	models that only hiffer	models that only differ

800, letzter Absatz	one of them. There is little doubt that natural languages have the resources to express infinity; if they can also be shown to be able to express, say, the countability of the universe, Lindström's Theorem would imply that the notion of validity in them cannot be axiomatised – cf. Ebbinghaus <i>et al.</i> (1994) for the technical background. The model-theoretical study	one of them; cf. Ebbinghaus <i>et al.</i> (1994) for the technical background. In any case, there is little doubt that natural languages have the resources to express infinity. The model-theoretical study