

Find: Formal proposal

- Crux of the analysis: *find* is an achievement predicate that describes an eventuality of opinion change grounded in experience
 - it takes structured propositions
 - it presupposes an event of experience (encounter with the object)
 - it asserts the punctual event of change-of-state to a resulting state of having an opinion
 - We abstract away from subjectivity and treat it as a primitive (this would work especially well with Coppock (2018), but is compatible with a range of views on subjectivity)
 - We extensionalize indices of evaluation
 - We treat attitude predicates as predicates of events that have propositional content (along the lines of Hacquard 2006, 2010)
 - event structure (following Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2020)):
 - experiential event e_{exp} by finder with embedded subject S
 - e_{exp} CAUSES change-of-state event e
 - e is a BECOME-ing to a new FINDSTATE s
 - s has content such that embedded property P is true of S
- (1) $\llbracket \text{find} \rrbracket = \lambda \langle S, P \rangle \in D_{\lambda} \lambda x \lambda e \lambda i :$
- a. presupposes:

P is judge dependent $\wedge$
 $\exists e_{exp} [\text{Exp}(x, e_{exp}, i) \wedge \text{Thm}(S, e_{exp}, i) \wedge \text{CAUSE}(e_{exp}, e, i)]$
 - b. asserts:

$\exists s [\text{BECOME}(s, e, i) \wedge \text{FS}(s, i) \wedge \text{Exp}(x, s, i) \wedge \forall i' \in \text{CON}(s, i) [P(i')(S)]]$

Base Case

- (2) Pranav found the tea authentic.
- (3) $\llbracket \text{Pranav find [the tea authentic]} \rrbracket = \lambda e. \lambda i :$
- a. presupposes:

$\lambda i \lambda x. \exists s [\text{authentic}'(s, i) \wedge \text{Thm}(x, s, i)]$ is subjective $\wedge$
 $\exists e_{exp} [\text{Exp}(\mathbf{P}, e_{exp}, i) \wedge \text{Thm}(S, e_{exp}, i) \wedge \text{CAUSE}(e_{exp}, e, i)]$
 - b. asserts:

$\exists s [\text{BECOME}(s, e, i) \wedge \text{FS}(s, i) \wedge \text{Exp}(x, s, i) \wedge \forall i' \in \text{CON}(s, i) [$
 $\exists s [\text{authentic}'(s, i') \wedge \text{Thm}(\text{tz.tea}'(z, i), s, i')]]]$

Stative *find*

- stative *find* is generic/habitual quantification over achievements
 - e_{exp} projects within *HAB*: requires new experience per instance of e in an overall plural event $e_{\oplus}$
- unlike characterizing sentences, these generic sentences require (Ferreira 2016)

- a verifying instance before the reference time
- the circumstantial possibility of verifying instances after the reference time

- (4) a. Pranav finds the tea authentic.
b. HAB [Pranav finds the tea authentic]
- (5) $\llbracket HAB$ [Pranav find [the tea authentic]] $\rrbracket =$
 $\lambda t \lambda i. \forall i' \in BEST(\mathcal{P}, M, O, i) [\exists e_{\oplus} : PL(\mathcal{P}(i'))(e_{\oplus}) \wedge t \subseteq \tau(e_{\oplus})]$, where
 $\mathcal{P} = \lambda i. \lambda e :$
- a. presupposes:
 $\lambda i \lambda x. \exists s [authentic'(s, i) \wedge Thm(x, s, i)]$ is subjective $\wedge$
 $\exists e_{exp} [Exp(\mathbf{P}, e_{exp}, i) \wedge Thm(S, e_{exp}, i) \wedge CAUSE(e_{exp}, e, i)]$
- b. asserts:
 $\exists s [BECOME(s, e, i) \wedge FS(s, i) \wedge Exp(x, s, i) \wedge \forall i' \in CON(s, i) [$
 $\neg \exists x [x <_i y \wedge tea'(x, i) \wedge \exists s [authentic'(s, i') \wedge Thm(x, s, i')]]]$

Quantified Case

► *find* semantics adjusted

- we lift S to Q , a generalized quantifiers
- the domain variable of Q is identified with $Thm(e_{exp})$, a plural individual y
- this yields a partitive meaning

► note: alternatively, we can get all of this by QR of Q to matrix position

- (6) $\llbracket \text{find} \rrbracket = \lambda \langle Q, P \rangle \in D_{\chi} \lambda x \lambda e \lambda i :$
- a. presupposes:
 P is judge dependent $\wedge$
 $\exists e_{exp}, y [Exp(x, e_{exp}, i) \wedge Thm(y, e_{exp}, i) \wedge CAUSE(e_{exp}, e, i)]$
- b. asserts:
 $\exists s [BECOME(s, e, i) \wedge FS(s, i) \wedge Exp(x, s, i) \wedge \forall i' \in CON(s, i) [Q(i)(IN(y))(P(i'))]]$
- (7) a. $\llbracket \text{no } Res \rrbracket = \lambda i \lambda D_{iet} \lambda P_{et} : \exists x [D(i)(x) \wedge Res(x, i)]. \neg \exists x [D(i)(x) \wedge Res(x, i) \wedge P(x)]$
b. $IN(y) = \lambda i'' \lambda z. z <_{i''} y$.
- (8) Pranav found no tea authentic.
- (9) $\llbracket \text{Pranav find [no tea authentic]} \rrbracket = \lambda e. \lambda i :$
- a. presupposes:
 $\lambda i \lambda x. \exists s [authentic'(s, i) \wedge Thm(x, s, i)]$ is subjective $\wedge$
 $\exists e_{exp}, y [Exp(\mathbf{P}, e_{exp}, i) \wedge Thm(y, e_{exp}, i) \wedge CAUSE(e_{exp}, e, i)] \wedge$
 $\exists x [x <_i y \wedge tea'(x, i)]$
- b. asserts:
 $\exists s [BECOME(s, e, i) \wedge FS(s, i) \wedge Exp(x, s, i) \wedge \forall i' \in CON(s, i) [$
 $\neg \exists x [x <_i y \wedge tea'(x, i) \wedge \exists s [authentic'(s, i') \wedge Thm(x, s, i')]]]$

References

- Beavers, J. and A. Koontz-Garboden (2020). *The Roots of Verbal Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coppock, E. (2018). Outlook-based semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 41(2), 125–164.
- Ferreira, M. (2016). The semantic ingredients of imperfectivity in progressives, habituals, and counterfactuals. *Natural Language Semantics* 24(4), 353–397.
- Hacquard, V. (2006). *Aspects of Modality*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Hacquard, V. (2010). On the event relativity of modal auxiliaries. *Natural Language Semantics* 18(1), 79–114.