Comments on Chap 2, Section 2.5 (pp. 63-71)



I think you should use one term for P throughout. If you are following Condoravdi, then maybe what she uses – P is a predicate of eventualities or it is saturated eventuality? Any adjust appropriately.

Re binding of t’ – I don’t think there is any harm in ∃-binding it. I suppose it depends on the intuition. Is it contextually fixed? Or does it feel more quantificational – at some point or other not too far in the future from t-r… You could also just footnote that you are leaving it open which is the better option.

Pp. 66-67





I have a few questions/comments on this part. First I think t’ in 129b (defined only if t’ < t\*) I think you mean t.

~~I’m not sure why you have subseqInst in (129 d) instead of what you have in (127), ie Subseq.~~

Also, perhaps you want to change the order of the lambda’s, with λP outermost if you are going to feed in “he cook dinner” first, as you do in (129d).

I couldn’t read your comment/question on the left. I assume that the first sentence sets the t-r at which the bambai sentence is interpreted. So I’m not sure what the problem is.

pp. 68-69

(131b)-(131c) you need to add the subj argument.

(131d) – same appoint as in the earlier section about having λP on the outside and about subseq/subseqinst except that this time it is right there in (131d). I’m guessing you switched at some point and this may be just a residue effect.

Your question in the left margin – I am a bit confused about your t variables - t-r, t\*, and t’. What gets bound and when needs to be decided. But maybe you can send out the defense draft and then work on this. I think it is clear what you want to say.

Pg. 70 – do you need to move to bambai’s prejacent being a proposition? Intuitively I can see that it doesn’t make much difference whether you talk about propositions or eventualities but switching suggests that there is something more crucial to these choices? Is there?