Semantics 1

July 10, 2012

Gerhard Jäger



(July 10, 2012)

Semantics 1

Gerhard Jäger 1 / 11

Time and tense

- logical quantifiers do not only figure in the interpretation of nominal quantifiers of natural language
- further linguistic phenomenon that can be analyzed as quantification: **Tense**
- basic idea
 - there are variables and constants for time intervals
 - situations may be temporally restricted
 - function au maps a situation to the time interval where it obtains
 - tense morphemes (*present tense, past tense* restrict possible values of the situation variable
 - temporal adverbs (*always, sometimes* express quantification over time intervals

(1) Peter slept.

- intuitive meaning of past tense: Peter's sleep happened at **some** period of time in the past
- sentence is true in a situation s if Peter slept in a situation s' that temporally precedes s

 $\lambda s. \exists s'(\tau(s') < \tau(s) \land \text{SLEEP}'(s', p))$

Tense: examples

- remark:
 - "<" is a two-place relation between time intervals
 - correct notation would actually be $<(t_1, t_2)$, but infix notation (predicate symbol between the arguments; $t_1 < t_2$) is widely used
 - intended meaning or "<" is "completely precedes"

(2) Peter always sleeps.

• intuition: (2) is true in a situation s if for each time interval that completely precedes $\tau(s)$, there is a situation in which Peter slept.

$$\lambda s. \forall t (t < \tau(s) \to \exists s'(\tau(s') = t \land \text{SLEEP}'(s', p)))$$

- temporal adverb always has similar function as quantifier every → both introduce universal quantifier
- tense determines the restrictor of the quantifier, i.e. the material to the left of the implication

(3) Peter slept yesterday.

 $\lambda s. \exists s'(\tau(s') < \tau(s) \land \texttt{YESTERDAY'}(s,s') \land \texttt{SLEEP'}(s',p))$

- adverbs such as *yesterday* are interpreted as two-place relations between situations
- YESTERDAY' (s_1, s_2) iff s_2 is, viewed from s_1 , happened yesterday

Tense: examples

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \lambda s. \forall t(t < \tau(s) & \rightarrow & \exists s'(\tau(s') = t \land \text{SLEEP}'(s', p))) \\ & \subseteq \\ \lambda s. \exists s'(\tau(s') < \tau(s) & \land & \text{YESTERDAY}'(s, s') \land \text{SLEEP}'(s', p)) \end{array}$$

• part of our semantic knowledge: there was a yesterday, it is completely in the past, and whether a situation happened yesterday only depends on its temporal extension:

 $\begin{aligned} \forall s_1 \exists s_2 \text{YESTERDAY}'(s_1, s_2) \\ \forall s_1 \forall s_s (\text{YESTERDAY}'(s_1, s_2) \rightarrow \tau(s_1) > \tau(s_2)) \\ \forall s_1 \forall s_2 \forall s_3 (\text{YESTERDAY}'(s_1, s_2) \wedge \tau(s_2) = \tau(s_3) \rightarrow \text{YESTERDAY}'(s_1, s_3)) \end{aligned}$

- Such constraints on the possible interpretation of expressions (such as those for the interpretation of *yesterday*) are called **Meaning Postulates**.
- therefore prediction: that Peter always slept entails that Peter slept yesterday, even though this is not a logical entailment
- The former sentence and the meaning postulates logically entail the latter though.

(4) Peter will sleep.

$$\lambda s. \exists s'(\tau(s) < \tau(s') \land \text{SLEEP'}(s', p))$$

- (5) *Peter will sleep yesterday.
 - intuitively: conflicting information
 - yesterday implies past, while future tense implies future

 $\lambda s. \exists s'(\tau(s) < \tau(s') \land \texttt{YESTERDAY}'(s,s') \land \texttt{SLEEP}'(s',p))$

Tense: examples

- formula is consistent, even if we add the Meaning postulates on *yesterday*
- however, it is inconsistent with our conceptualization of time as being linearly ordered
- basic assumptions over the structure of time have to be added as **axioms**, e.g.

$$\begin{array}{l} \forall t \neg (t < t) \\ \forall t, t', t''(t < t' \land t' < t'' \rightarrow t < t'') \\ \forall t, t' \neg (t < t' \land t' < t) \end{array}$$

• interpretation of (5) is inconsistent with the third axiom; therefore (5) is odd