SUMMARY

In the first chapter it was demonstrated that in English the activity and accomplishment-times reject a (proper) temporal inclusion of the time of evaluation (simple present tense), the time indicated by point-time adverbials (combinations with e.g. 6 o'clock), the time corresponding to what is expressed in a temporal subordinate clause (when-sentences), or again the evaluation-time in a possible extension of the activity-time (inferences form past tensed sentences). English activities and accomplishments appeared "inaccessible", as it were. For Dutch, however, only the present perfect appeared inaccessible.

Since temporal inclusion presupposes the existence of intervals, an obvious theory within which to try and account for the observed differences between Dutch and English is Interval Semantics (IS). But in the second chapter it was shown that IS cannot account for the relevant differences. In IS, the Vendler-classes are directly interpreted in terms of sections of the time-axis, in terms of moments and intervals, that is. As a consequence, not only will the interpretation of the Vendler-classes be the same for every language, but also the corresponding explanations for the "behaviour" of those classes on the time-axis. Explanations, for instance, as regards temporal inclusion relations, which, however, were shown in the first chapter "to be different for Dutch and English. A semantics, therefore, in which the differences between the Vendler-classes are expressed in terms of moments and intervals does not provide a framework within which both Dutch and English can be dealt
with. So before we could begin with an account of the observed differences between Dutch and English we had to make the interpretation of the Vendler-classes independent of the time-axis, independent, that is, of the moments and intervals.

In chapter III, another framework was developed within which to deal with the examples of the first chapter. The Vendler-classes are considered classes of tenseless sentences which are interpreted by sets of "situations" - the linguistic representations of real world events. Different closure-conditions on these sets correspond to the characteristics of the various Vendler-classes. It may sometimes be the case that situations from different interpretation-sets can be used to represent the same real world event (cf. the *He grew/had a beard* examples), but, taking such flexibility into consideration, situations and events must be "compatible" (in the sense of Kamp 1981) and the notion of "truth" is dependent on a compatibility relation \( R \) which must hold between the situation(s) and the event(s) that the situation(s) represent(s). In order to check on the relative order of the situations such as given in a tensed sentence as compared to the relative order of the corresponding events, both must be mapped to the time-axis \( t \). The order of events is always defined on \( t \), but the map from the situations to \( t \) is a linguistic matter. Tense triggers a map from the situations to \( t \) and only then can it be checked whether the earlier/later arrangement of the situations is in accordance with the earlier/later relation that the truth-conditions of the various tenses require. Given the relation \( R \) between the situations and the events involved, and the required relative order of the situations, a sentence will receive the appropriate truth-value.

The map to \( t \) has, since \( IS \) interpretation is on the time-axis, within \( IS \) interpretation and the \( t \) provided by \( IS \) is lacking in \( IS \), but for the Dutch and English, an "accessibility-condition" is formulated in such a way that all activity- and accomplishment they are mapped to the corresponding situation-time of a situation, interpretation-set as a situation.

This accessibility distribution of acceptable sentences in Dutch and English also provides the corresponding situations that were considered the "proper temporal non-terminal proper activity- and accomplishment", that is, the "proper temporal non-terminal proper activity- and accomplishment".

In section 5 of this chapter, despite the differences in the use of perfect in Dutch and English, there is a perfect in Dutch and English. In the same way for the perfect of a perfect sentence contains as initial situation- and interpretation-set of a situation, and a final with the corresponding
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situations. The order was developed of the first ordered classes of situations characterized by sets of interpretations of real situations on these sets that can be used to represent situations. "grew/had a beard" is dependent on a context between the situations that the relative order of the situations as corresponding events, must follow. The order of the map from the situation(s) to the map to t is a complication which IS does not have, since IS interprets the Vendler-classes directly on the time-axis, without a map "in between" the interpretation and the time-axis. This complication, however, provides the language-dependent level that was lacking in IS, but found to be necessary for an account of the Dutch and English sentences in the first chapter. An "accessibility-condition" on the map to t was formulated in such a way that English, but not Dutch, activity- and accomplishment-situations violate it when they are mapped to t in such a way that on t the corresponding situation-times must properly include a situation-time of a situation which is not from the same interpretation-set as that activity- or accomplishment-situation.

This accessibility-condition correctly predicts the distribution of acceptability for present tenses in Dutch and English (including the "reportive present"). It appeared that the accessibility-condition also provides the correct results for the other cases that were considered in the first chapter, provided that the "proper temporal inclusion" is understood to be "non-terminal proper temporal inclusion".

In section 5 of chapter II it was argued that despite the differences between the uses of the present perfect in Dutch and English, the perfect can be analysed in the same way for the two languages: the interpretation of a perfect sentence is a set of situations each of which contains as initial substitution a situation from the interpretation-set of the corresponding non-perfect situation, and a final substitution which is co-extensive with the corresponding E.
In the second part of the section it was argued that differences between the use of the present perfect versus the simple past in Dutch and English are due to the inaccessibility induced by the perfect. The perfect makes non-perfect situations inaccessible in both languages, but since the non-perfect situations differ as regards accessibility in Dutch and English, the consequences of the perfect as "accessibility-operator" will also be different for the two languages.