

Formale Semantik

09. Tempus und Modalität

Roland Schäfer

Institut für Germanistische Sprachwissenschaft
Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena

Folien in Überarbeitung. Englische Teile (ab Woche 7) sind noch von 2007!
Stets aktuelle Fassungen: <https://github.com/rsling/VL-Semantik>

1

Tense

- Priorian operators
- Tense raising
- Interpretation
- Some problems

2

Modality

- Realizations of modality

- Types of modality

- Modeling the background

3

Embedding

- Syntax
- Believe semantics
- Ambiguities
- Infinitives and gerunds

Targets for this week

- Understand how simple tense logic can be represented by operators shifting i indices.

Targets for this week

- Understand how simple tense logic can be represented by operators shifting i indices.
- See why tense operators are sentence operators.

Targets for this week

- Understand how simple tense logic can be represented by operators shifting i indices.
- See why tense operators are sentence operators.
- See why a multi-dimensional theory of tenses and a better handling of tense embedding are required.

Targets for this week

- Understand how simple tense logic can be represented by operators shifting i indices.
- See why tense operators are sentence operators.
- See why a multi-dimensional theory of tenses and a better handling of tense embedding are required.
- See how we restrict (different types of) propositional backgrounds.

Targets for this week

- Understand how simple tense logic can be represented by operators shifting i indices.
- See why tense operators are sentence operators.
- See why a multi-dimensional theory of tenses and a better handling of tense embedding are required.
- See how we restrict (different types of) propositional backgrounds.
- Understand how opaque contexts affect meaning (incl. *believe* type verbs).

Targets for this week

- Understand how simple tense logic can be represented by operators shifting i indices.
- See why tense operators are sentence operators.
- See why a multi-dimensional theory of tenses and a better handling of tense embedding are required.
- See how we restrict (different types of) propositional backgrounds.
- Understand how opaque contexts affect meaning (incl. *believe* type verbs).
- Get a first idea of why we need the up operator $\hat{\cdot}$.

Tense

- **present:** no operator (ϕ 'it is the case that ϕ ')

Will, was... and always

- **present:** no operator (ϕ 'it is the case that ϕ ')
- **past:** P ($P\phi$ 'it was the case that ϕ ')

Will, was... and always

- **present**: no operator (ϕ 'it is the case that ϕ ')
• **past**: P ($P\phi$ 'it was the case that ϕ ')
• **future**: F ($F\phi$ 'it will be the case that ϕ ')

Will, was... and always

- **present**: no operator (ϕ 'it is the case that ϕ ')
• **past**: P ($P\phi$ 'it was the case that ϕ ')
• **future**: F ($F\phi$ 'it will be the case that ϕ ')
• it will always be the case... ($G = \neg F\neg\phi$)

Will, was... and always

- **present**: no operator (ϕ 'it is the case that ϕ ')
• **past**: P ($P\phi$ 'it was the case that ϕ ')
• **future**: F ($F\phi$ 'it will be the case that ϕ ')
• it will always be the case... ($G = \neg F\neg\phi$)
• it was always the case... ($H = \neg P\neg\phi$)

- $PD(a)$ 'Arno Schmidt (has?) died.'

- $PD(a)$ 'Arno Schmidt (has?) died.'
- relative to the current $\langle w, i \rangle$: $\llbracket PD(a) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, w, i, g}$

- $PD(a)$ 'Arno Schmidt (has?) died.'
- relative to the current $\langle w, i \rangle$: $\llbracket PD(a) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, w, i, g}$
- ...is true iff there is some i' , $\langle i', i \rangle \in <$ and

- $PD(a)$ 'Arno Schmidt (has?) died.'
- relative to the current $\langle w, i \rangle$: $\llbracket PD(a) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, w, i, g}$
- ...is true iff there is some i' , $\langle i', i \rangle \in <$ and
- $\llbracket PD(a) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, w, i', g} = 1$

- tense operators (TOp) are sentence (wff) Op's

Like it or not...

- tense operators (TOp) are sentence (wff) Op's
- **raise** it to sentence-scopal position

Like it or not...

- tense operators (TOp) are sentence (wff) Op's
- **raise** it to sentence-scopal position
- TP/IP position is motivated by copular/auxiliary elements

Like it or not...

- tense operators (TOp) are sentence (wff) Op's
- **raise** it to sentence-scopal position
- TP/IP position is motivated by copular/auxiliary elements
- *He **is** stupid.* vs. *Kare-wa bakarashi-i.*

- tense operators (TOp) are sentence (wff) Op's
- **raise** it to sentence-scopal position
- TP/IP position is motivated by copular/auxiliary elements
- *He **is** stupid.* vs. *Kare-wa bakarashi-i.*
- *He **was** stupid.* vs. *Kare-wa bakarashi-katta.*

- tense operators (TOp) are sentence (wff) Op's
- **raise** it to sentence-scopal position
- TP/IP position is motivated by copular/auxiliary elements
- *He **is** stupid.* vs. *Kare-wa bakarashi-i.*
- *He **was** stupid.* vs. *Kare-wa bakarashi-katta.*
- *What_i **did** you expect t_i?* vs. *Nani-o yokishi-ta-ka.*

New ps rules

- $T' \rightarrow TVP$ (adds tense to VP)

New ps rules

- $T' \rightarrow TVP$ (adds tense to VP)
- $TP \rightarrow NP T'$

New ps rules

- $T' \rightarrow TVP$ (adds tense to VP)
- $TP \rightarrow NP T'$
- $TP \rightarrow TP \text{ conj } TP$

New ps rules

- $T' \rightarrow TVP$ (adds tense to VP)
- $TP \rightarrow NP T'$
- $TP \rightarrow TP \text{ conj } TP$
- $TP \rightarrow \text{neg } TP$

New ps rules

- $T' \rightarrow TVP$ (adds tense to VP)
- $TP \rightarrow NP T'$
- $TP \rightarrow TP \text{ conj } TP$
- $TP \rightarrow \text{neg } TP$
- $[_{TP} NP T VP] \Rightarrow [_{TP} T NP VP]$ (T raising)

- $\llbracket \mathbf{PTP} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, w, i, g} = 1$

- $\llbracket \mathbf{PTP} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, w, i, g} = 1$
- iff among all $\langle i_n, i \rangle \in <$

- $\llbracket \mathbf{PTP} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, w, i, g} = 1$
- iff among all $\langle i_n, i \rangle \in <$
- there is **at least one** s.t. $\llbracket TP \rrbracket^{\mathcal{M}, w, i', g} = 1$

- U : domain of quantification

Valuations as in Chierchia's M_3

- U : domain of quantification
- $V(\beta)$: non-relativized function for all β which are not a proper name

- U : domain of quantification
- $V(\beta)$: non-relativized function for all β which are not a proper name
- $V(\beta)(\langle w, i \rangle)$: V evaluates β to a function from world-time pairs to the denotata of the predicate (sets of individuals, tuples of them, etc.)

- NL tenses beyond TOp's:

- NL tenses beyond TOp's:
- *Arno Schmidt had already read Poe when he started writing 'Zettels Traum'.*

- NL tenses beyond TOp's:
- *Arno Schmidt had already read Poe when he started writing 'Zettels Traum'.*
- *Gosh, I forgot to feed the cat.*

- NL tenses beyond TOp's:
- *Arno Schmidt had already read Poe when he started writing 'Zettels Traum'.*
- *Gosh, I forgot to feed the cat.*
- shifts of evaluation time

	past ($R < S$)	present (R, S)	future ($S < R$)
anterior ($E < R$)	$E < R < S$ <i>er war gegangen</i>	$E < R, S$ <i>er ist gegangen</i>	$S < E < R$ $S, E < R$ $E < S < R$ <i>er wird gegangen sein</i>
simple (E, R)	$E, R < S$ <i>er ging</i>	E, R, S <i>er geht</i>	$S < E, R$ <i>er wird gehen</i>
posterior ($R < E$)	$R < E < S$ $R < S, E$ $R < S, E$ $R < S < E$ <i>*er würde gehen</i>	$R, S < E$ <i>er wird gehen</i>	$S < R < E$ <i>*er wird gehen werden</i>

- *A man was born who will be king.*

- *A man was born who will be king.*
- **P**(a man is born **F**(who be king)) ?

Embedded tenses and adverbials

- *A man was born who will be king.*
- **P**(a man is born **F**(who be king)) ?
- *Yesterday, Maria woke up happy.*

Embedded tenses and adverbials

- *A man was born who will be king.*
- **P**(a man is born **F**(who be king)) ?
- *Yesterday, Maria woke up happy.*
- **Y**(**P**(Maria wake up happy)) ?

Modality

Types of modal expressions

- tense forms: *I eat up to 100 nachos a minute.*

Types of modal expressions

- tense forms: *I eat up to 100 nachos a minute.*
- mood: *Responderet alius minus sapienter.*

Types of modal expressions

- tense forms: *I eat up to 100 nachos a minute.*
- mood: *Responderet alius minus sapienter.*
- modal auxiliaries: *Herr Webelhuth can look like Michael Moore.*

Types of modal expressions

- tense forms: *I eat up to 100 nachos a minute.*
- mood: *Responderet alius minus sapienter.*
- modal auxiliaries: *Herr Webelhuth can look like Michael Moore.*
- adverbs: *Maybe Herr Keydana will show up.*

Types of modal expressions

- tense forms: *I eat up to 100 nachos a minute.*
- mood: *Responderet alius minus sapienter.*
- modal auxiliaries: *Herr Webelhuth can look like Michael Moore.*
- adverbs: *Maybe Herr Keydana will show up.*
- affixes: *Frau Eckardt is recognizable.*

The logical form of modal operators

- like tense: **sentence operators**

The logical form of modal operators

- like tense: **sentence operators**
- modal *Aux* in English is tense-insensitive (evidence for *Infl*)

The logical form of modal operators

- like tense: [sentence operators](#)
- modal *Aux* in English is tense-insensitive (evidence for *Infl*)
- \Box and \Diamond in intensional predicate calculi (IPC): exploit the full set of possible worlds

The logical form of modal operators

- like tense: **sentence operators**
- modal *Aux* in English is tense-insensitive (evidence for *Infl*)
- \Box and \Diamond in intensional predicate calculi (IPC): exploit the full set of possible worlds
- in NL: evaluation of modal expressions against restricted **conversational backgrounds**

The background

- different sets of possible worlds under consideration for different types of modal expressions

The background

- different sets of possible worlds under consideration for different types of modal expressions
- different types of modality: different sets of admitted possible worlds

The background

- different sets of possible worlds under consideration for different types of modal expressions
- different types of modality: different sets of admitted possible worlds
- we call the conversationally relevant background the set of $\langle w, i \rangle$ pairs relevant to the interpretation of the sentence

- *Agent Cooper cannot solve the mystery.*

- *Agent Cooper cannot solve the mystery.*
- translated into root modal IPC: $\neg\Diamond S(c, m)$

- *Agent Cooper cannot solve the mystery.*
- translated into root modal IPC: $\neg\Diamond S(c, m)$
- wrong interpretation: Under no possible circumstances can Cooper solve the mystery.

- *Agent Cooper cannot solve the mystery.*
- translated into root modal IPC: $\neg\Diamond S(c, m)$
- wrong interpretation: Under no possible circumstances can Cooper solve the mystery.
- usually, some obvious facts constitute the background:

- Agent Cooper *cannot* solve the mystery.
- translated into root modal IPC: $\neg\Diamond S(c, m)$
- wrong interpretation: Under no possible circumstances can Cooper solve the mystery.
- usually, some *obvious facts constitute the background*:
 - ▶ he could, but some relevant information is missing

- Agent Cooper *cannot* solve the mystery.
- translated into root modal IPC: $\neg\Diamond S(c, m)$
- wrong interpretation: Under no possible circumstances can Cooper solve the mystery.
- usually, some *obvious facts constitute the background*:
 - ▶ he could, but some relevant information is missing
 - ▶ he could, but is sick

- Agent Cooper *cannot* solve the mystery.
- translated into root modal IPC: $\neg\Diamond S(c, m)$
- wrong interpretation: Under no possible circumstances can Cooper solve the mystery.
- usually, some *obvious facts constitute the background*:
 - ▶ he could, but some relevant information is missing
 - ▶ he could, but is sick
 - ▶ he could, but ...

- *Leo Johnson must be the murderer of Laura Palmer.*

- *Leo Johnson must be the murderer of Laura Palmer.*
- in accordance with the **known facts** (e.g., in episode 7 of *Twin Peaks*):

- *Leo Johnson must be the murderer of Laura Palmer.*
- in accordance with the **known facts** (e.g., in episode 7 of *Twin Peaks*):
 - ▶ Leo Johnson is a violent person.

- *Leo Johnson must be the murderer of Laura Palmer.*
- in accordance with the **known facts** (e.g., in episode 7 of *Twin Peaks*):
 - ▶ Leo Johnson is a violent person.
 - ▶ Leo smuggles cocaine, Laura was addicted to it.

- *Leo Johnson must be the murderer of Laura Palmer.*
- in accordance with the **known facts** (e.g., in episode 7 of *Twin Peaks*):
 - ▶ Leo Johnson is a violent person.
 - ▶ Leo smuggles cocaine, Laura was addicted to it.
 - ▶ Leo is connected to Jacques Renault who is the bartender of *One Eyed Jack's* where Laura worked as a prostitute.

- *Leo Johnson must be the murderer of Laura Palmer.*
- in accordance with the **known facts** (e.g., in episode 7 of *Twin Peaks*):
 - ▶ Leo Johnson is a violent person.
 - ▶ Leo smuggles cocaine, Laura was addicted to it.
 - ▶ Leo is connected to Jacques Renault who is the bartender of *One Eyed Jack's* where Laura worked as a prostitute.
 - ▶ ...

- *Leo Johnson must be the murderer of Laura Palmer.*
- in accordance with the **known facts** (e.g., in episode 7 of *Twin Peaks*):
 - ▶ Leo Johnson is a violent person.
 - ▶ Leo smuggles cocaine, Laura was addicted to it.
 - ▶ Leo is connected to Jacques Renault who is the bartender of *One Eyed Jack's* where Laura worked as a prostitute.
 - ▶ ...
- which constitute the epistemic background, the sentence is true

- *Leo Johnson must be the murderer of Laura Palmer.*
- in accordance with the **known facts** (e.g., in episode 7 of *Twin Peaks*):
 - ▶ Leo Johnson is a violent person.
 - ▶ Leo smuggles cocaine, Laura was addicted to it.
 - ▶ Leo is connected to Jacques Renault who is the bartender of *One Eyed Jack's* where Laura worked as a prostitute.
 - ▶ ...
- which constitute the epistemic background, the sentence is true
- known facts narrow down the root background

- *Agent Cooper must not solve the mystery.*

- *Agent Cooper must not solve the mystery.*
- assume:

- *Agent Cooper must not solve the mystery.*
- assume:
 - ▶ there is some U.S. law which allows a local sheriff to ask the FBI to keep out of local murder investigations

- *Agent Cooper must not solve the mystery.*
- assume:
 - ▶ there is some U.S. law which allows a local sheriff to ask the FBI to keep out of local murder investigations
 - ▶ Sheriff Truman has asked the FBI headquarters to keep out of the Palmer investigation

- *Agent Cooper must not solve the mystery.*
- assume:
 - ▶ there is some U.S. law which allows a local sheriff to ask the FBI to keep out of local murder investigations
 - ▶ Sheriff Truman has asked the FBI headquarters to keep out of the Palmer investigation
 - ▶ as a special agent, Cooper is required to obey Bureau policy

- *Agent Cooper must not solve the mystery.*
- assume:
 - ▶ there is some U.S. law which allows a local sheriff to ask the FBI to keep out of local murder investigations
 - ▶ Sheriff Truman has asked the FBI headquarters to keep out of the Palmer investigation
 - ▶ as a special agent, Cooper is required to obey Bureau policy
- Deontic backgrounds are narrowed down by **normative rules** and **moral ideals**.

- *Agent Cooper must not solve the mystery.*
- assume:
 - ▶ there is some U.S. law which allows a local sheriff to ask the FBI to keep out of local murder investigations
 - ▶ Sheriff Truman has asked the FBI headquarters to keep out of the Palmer investigation
 - ▶ as a special agent, Cooper is required to obey Bureau policy
- Deontic backgrounds are narrowed down by **normative rules** and **moral ideals**.
- statable in propositional form (ten commandments, law, ...)

- specify the kind of background against which you evaluate under the given situation

Sets of propositions

- specify the kind of background against which you evaluate under the given situation
- we need:
a function from $\langle w, i \rangle$ to the relevant background set of $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$

Sets of propositions

- specify the kind of background against which you evaluate under the given situation
- we need:
a function from $\langle w, i \rangle$ to the relevant background set of $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$
- reuse g :
$$g(\langle w, i \rangle) = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\} = \{\langle w, i \rangle_1, \langle w, i \rangle_2, \dots, \langle w, i \rangle_n\}$$

Sets of propositions

- specify the kind of background against which you evaluate under the given situation
- we need:
a function from $\langle w, i \rangle$ to the relevant background set of $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$
- reuse g :
 $g(\langle w, i \rangle) = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\} = \{\langle w, i \rangle_1, \langle w, i \rangle_2, \dots, \langle w, i \rangle_n\}$
- such that all possible worlds are: $\bigcap g(\langle w, i \rangle)$

Embedding

- *that* is a complementizer, it turns a sentence into an argument.

CP structures: *that*

- *that* is a complementizer, it turns a sentence into an argument.
- ps rule: $CP \rightarrow C IP$

CP structures: *that*

- *that* is a complementizer, it turns a sentence into an argument.
- ps rule: $CP \rightarrow C IP$
- $[_{IP} \text{ Racine believes } [_{CP} \text{ that } [_{IP} \text{ theatre rules}]]]$

- *that* is a complementizer, it turns a sentence into an argument.
- ps rule: $CP \rightarrow C IP$
- $[_{IP} \text{Racine believes } [_{CP} \text{that } [_{IP} \text{theatre rules}]]]$
- CP (fully fledged sentence) receives theta role by *believe* under government.

- gerunds:
[_{IP} Stockhausen has plans [_{IP} to write another 29 hour opera]]

- gerunds:
[_{IP} Stockhausen has plans [_{IP} to write another 29 hour opera]]
- incomplete embedded IP, no subject

- gerunds:
[_{IP} Stockhausen has plans [_{IP} to write another 29 hour opera]]
- incomplete embedded IP, **no subject**
- internal theta role of *has plans*: to IP

- gerunds:
[_{IP} Stockhausen has plans [_{IP} to write another 29 hour opera]]
- incomplete embedded IP, **no subject**
- internal theta role of *has plans*: to IP
- external theta role of *write*: to ?

- gerunds:
[_{IP} Stockhausen has plans [_{IP} to write another 29 hour opera]]
- incomplete embedded IP, **no subject**
- internal theta role of *has plans*: to IP
- external theta role of *write*: to ?
- **PRO, controlled** by the subject of *has plans*:
[_{IP} Stockhausen has plans [_{IP} PRO to write another 29 hour opera]]

- verbs like *believe*: propositional attitude verbs

Propositional attitudes

- verbs like *believe*: **propositional attitude verbs**
- content of the believe: a piece of information held to be true by the believer, hence a proposition, a $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$

- verbs like *believe*: **propositional attitude verbs**
- content of the believe: a piece of information held to be true by the believer, hence a proposition, a $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$
- signalling one element in the background assumed by the believer

- verbs like *believe*: **propositional attitude verbs**
- content of the believe: a piece of information held to be true by the believer, hence a proposition, a $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$
- signalling one element in the background assumed by the believer
- belief: $\langle w, i \rangle$ is an element of the proposition of CP

- value of propositional attitude (PA) verbs: functions $[\langle w, i \rangle \rightarrow \langle u_n, p \rangle]$ with $u_n \in U$, p a proposition (set of $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$) and compatible to u_n 's background

Translating *that* as $\hat{}$

- value of propositional attitude (PA) verbs: functions $[\langle w, i \rangle \rightarrow \langle u_n, p \rangle]$ with $u_n \in U$, p a proposition (set of $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$) and compatible to u_n 's background
- $up(\hat{\chi})$: an operator which gives the intension of an expression χ

Translating *that* as $\hat{}$

- value of propositional attitude (PA) verbs: functions $[\langle w, i \rangle \rightarrow \langle u_n, p \rangle]$ with $u_n \in U$, p a proposition (set of $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$) and compatible to u_n 's background
- $up(\hat{\chi})$: an operator which gives the intension of an expression χ
- the full logic of $\hat{}$ and \sim as designed by Montague next week

Translating *that* as $\hat{}$

- value of propositional attitude (PA) verbs: functions $[\langle w, i \rangle \rightarrow \langle u_n, p \rangle]$ with $u_n \in U$, p a proposition (set of $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$) and compatible to u_n 's background
- $up(\hat{\chi})$: an operator which gives the intension of an expression χ
- the full logic of $\hat{}$ and \sim as designed by Montague next week
- $\hat{}$ rids us of the problem that the belief content looks truth-conditional (a sentence) but doesn't contribute to the embedding sentence's truth-value. PA verbs take intensions as arguments.

- Quine's story: Ralph knows...

- Quine's story: Ralph knows...
- Bernard J.Ortcutt, the nice guy on the beach.

- Quine's story: Ralph knows...
- Bernard J.Ortcutt, the nice guy on the beach.
- He sees a strange guy with a hat in the dark alley - a spy?

Meet B.J. Ortcutt

- Quine's story: Ralph knows...
- Bernard J.Ortcutt, the nice guy on the beach.
- He sees a strange guy with a hat in the dark alley - a spy?
- Ortcutt just likes to behave funny on the way to his pub...

Meet B.J. Ortcutt

- Quine's story: Ralph knows...
- Bernard J.Ortcutt, the nice guy on the beach.
- He sees a strange guy with a hat in the dark alley - a spy?
- Ortcutt just likes to behave funny on the way to his pub...
- and actually is sinister guy in the alley!

Meet B.J. Ortcutt

- Quine's story: Ralph knows...
- Bernard J.Ortcutt, the nice guy on the beach.
- He sees a strange guy with a hat in the dark alley - a spy?
- Ortcutt just likes to behave funny on the way to his pub...
- and actually is sinister guy in the alley!
- Only Ralph doesn't know.

Is Ralph insane?

- What's the truth value of...

Is Ralph insane?

- What's the truth value of...
- *Ralph believes that the guy from the beach is a spy.*

Is Ralph insane?

- What's the truth value of...
- *Ralph believes that the guy from the beach is a spy.*
- true: since Orcutt and the guy in the hat are one individual

Is Ralph insane?

- What's the truth value of...
- *Ralph believes that the guy from the beach is a spy.*
- true: since Ortcutt and the guy in the hat are one individual
- false: since Ralph doesn't know that and in a way 'doesn't believe it'

- the Russelian interpretation for *the* like \exists with a uniqueness condition (as a GQ):
 $\lambda Q \lambda P [\exists x [Q(x) \wedge P(x)] \wedge \forall y [Q(y) \leftrightarrow y = x]]$

- the Russelian interpretation for *the* like \exists with a uniqueness condition (as a GQ):
 $\lambda Q \lambda P [\exists x [Q(x) \wedge P(x)] \wedge \forall y [Q(y) \leftrightarrow y = x]]$
- in a raising framework: ambiguity between *THE* and *believe*

- the Russelian interpretation for *the* like \exists with a uniqueness condition (as a GQ):
 $\lambda Q \lambda P [\exists x [Q(x) \wedge P(x)] \wedge \forall y [Q(y) \leftrightarrow y = x]]$
- in a raising framework: ambiguity between *THE* and *believe*
- $[_{IP} \text{ the guy from the beach}_i [_{IP} \text{ Ralph believes } [_{CP} \text{ that } x_i \text{ is a spy}]]]$

- the Russelian interpretation for *the* like \exists with a uniqueness condition (as a GQ):
 $\lambda Q \lambda P [\exists x [Q(x) \wedge P(x)] \wedge \forall y [Q(y) \leftrightarrow y = x]]$
- in a raising framework: ambiguity between *THE* and *believe*
- $[_{IP} \text{ the guy from the beach}_i [_{IP} \text{ Ralph believes } [_{CP} \text{ that } x_i \text{ is a spy}]]]$
- $\text{Ralph believes } [_{CP} \text{ that } [_{IP} \text{ the guy from the beach}_i [_{IP} x_i \text{ is a spy}]]]$

- the Russelian interpretation for *the* like \exists with a uniqueness condition (as a GQ):
 $\lambda Q \lambda P [\exists x [Q(x) \wedge P(x)] \wedge \forall y [Q(y) \leftrightarrow y = x]]$
- in a raising framework: ambiguity between *THE* and *believe*
- $[_{IP} \text{ the guy from the beach}_i [_{IP} \text{ Ralph believes } [_{CP} \text{ that } x_i \text{ is a spy}]]]$
- makes the sentence true: the *de re* reading
- Ralph believes $[_{CP} \text{ that } [_{IP} \text{ the guy from the beach}_i [_{IP} x_i \text{ is a spy}]]]$

- the Russelian interpretation for *the* like \exists with a uniqueness condition (as a GQ):
 $\lambda Q \lambda P [\exists x [Q(x) \wedge P(x)] \wedge \forall y [Q(y) \leftrightarrow y = x]]$
- in a raising framework: ambiguity between *THE* and *believe*
- $[_{IP} \text{ the guy from the beach}_i [_{IP} \text{ Ralph believes } [_{CP} \text{ that } x_i \text{ is a spy}]]]$
- makes the sentence true: the *de re* reading
- Ralph believes $[_{CP} \text{ that } [_{IP} \text{ the guy from the beach}_i [_{IP} x_i \text{ is a spy}]]]$
- makes the sentence false: the *de dicto* reading

- *Yuri Gagarin might now have been the first man in space.*

- *Yuri Gagarin might now have been the first man in space.*
- some Mickey Mouse LFs:

- *Yuri Gagarin might now have been the first man in space.*
- some Mickey Mouse LFs:
- \diamond THE(first-man-in-space)(not-be-Gagarin)

- *Yuri Gagarin might now have been the first man in space.*
- some Mickey Mouse LFs:
 - $\Diamond \text{THE}(\text{first-man-in-space})(\text{not-be-Gagarin})$
 - $\text{THE}(\text{first-man-in-space})(\Diamond[\text{not-be-Gagarin}])$

- *Yuri Gagarin might now have been the first man in space.*
- some Mickey Mouse LFs:
 - \Diamond THE(first-man-in-space)(not-be-Gagarin)
 - at some $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$ the first individual in space is not Y.G.
 - THE(first-man-in-space)(\Diamond [not-be-Gagarin])

- *Yuri Gagarin might now have been the first man in space.*
- some Mickey Mouse LFs:
 - \Diamond THE(first-man-in-space)(not-be-Gagarin)
 - at some $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$ the first individual in space is not Y.G.
 - THE(first-man-in-space)(\Diamond [not-be-Gagarin])
 - at $\langle w, i \rangle$ the first individual in space (definitely Y.G.) is not Y.G. in an accessible world

Rigid designators

- *Yuri Gagarin might now have been the first man in space.*
- some Mickey Mouse LFs:
 - \Diamond THE(first-man-in-space)(not-be-Gagarin)
 - at some $\langle w_n, i_m \rangle$ the first individual in space is not Y.G.
 - THE(first-man-in-space)(\Diamond [not-be-Gagarin])
 - at $\langle w, i \rangle$ the first individual in space (definitely Y.G.) is not Y.G. in an accessible world
 - Names are rigid designators across world-time-pairs, definite descriptions aren't.

- CP has its own subject, *to*-IPs don't (PRO)

- CP has its own subject, *to*-IPs don't (PRO)
- PRO must be interpreted, in our examples by coindexation with the matrix subject

- CP has its own subject, *to*-IPs don't (PRO)
- PRO must be interpreted, in our examples by coindexation with the matrix subject
- infinitive embedding verbs: functions from world-time pairs to sets of individuals which have a certain property, the intension of a predicate \hat{P}

- CP has its own subject, *to*-IPs don't (PRO)
- PRO must be interpreted, in our examples by coindexation with the matrix subject
- infinitive embedding verbs: functions from world-time pairs to sets of individuals which have a certain property, the intension of a predicate \hat{P}
- *John tries to sing.*

- CP has its own subject, *to*-IPs don't (PRO)
- PRO must be interpreted, in our examples by coindexation with the matrix subject
- infinitive embedding verbs: functions from world-time pairs to sets of individuals which have a certain property, the intension of a predicate \hat{P}
- *John tries to sing.*
- *try(j, \hat{swim})*

Kontakt

Prof. Dr. Roland Schäfer
Institut für Germanistische Sprachwissenschaft
Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena
Fürstengraben 30
07743 Jena

<https://rolandschaefer.net>
roland.schaefer@uni-jena.de

Creative Commons BY-SA-3.0-DE

Dieses Werk ist unter einer Creative Commons Lizenz vom Typ *Namensnennung - Weitergabe unter gleichen Bedingungen 3.0 Deutschland* zugänglich. Um eine Kopie dieser Lizenz einzusehen, konsultieren Sie

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/de/> oder wenden Sie sich brieflich an Creative Commons, Postfach 1866, Mountain View, California, 94042, USA.