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"Temporal distance’ involves, by definition, a measurement of the distance between two points or intervals in time; this implies that for this dimension to be relevant, at least two such time points should be involved in the interpretation of a sentence. Given the Reichenbachian points S, R and E, there are the following possibilities: In the unmarked case, R coincides with either S or E. In those cases, which constitute the overwhelming majority in any text, the only possible distance to measure will be between S and E, that is, ‘distant’ will mean ‘distant from the time of speech’” (Dahl 1985: 120, emphasis JB)
the early take on TRMs (cont.)

(1.1) Temporal remoteness distinctions in ChiBemba (Givón 1972)

a. baàléébomba  
   ‘They were working (before yesterday).’

b. baáléébomba  
   ‘They were working (yesterday).’

c. baàciláábomba  
   ‘They were working (earlier today).’

d. baábomba  
   ‘They’ve just worked (a little while ago).’  (Cable 2013: 220)

\[ [\text{TRM}] = \Delta(E,S) \]

\[ \text{Figure 1.1. The traditional picture of TRM semantics} \]
If R is separate, however, we will have two intervals to measure: on one hand, the distance S-R, on the other, the distance R-E. In principle, both these might be relevant in a TMA system. The tendency, however, seems rather to be for remoteness distinctions to be neutralized in such contexts; many languages do not even have a separate category which like the English Pluperfect is used for events that take place before an R which in turn precedes S. I also have relatively little information concerning these cases - being conceptually more complex, they are rather hard to elicit reliable information about - and shall just note one fairly clear example of a minimal pair differing in the distance between a past R and a preceding E.” (Dahl 1985: 120-121, emphasis JB)
the one example of an anaphoric TRM distinction
Dahl (1985: 121) and Comrie (1985: 86) cite

Sesotho (Southern Bantu, Lesotho and South Africa)

(1.2) Ha letsatsi le-likela re-ne re-
tsoa tloha Maseru
when sun PRV-disappear we-PAST we-IMMP leave Maseru
‘At sunset, we had just left Maseru.’

(1.3) Ha letsatsi le-likela re-ne re-tloh-ile Maseru
when sun PRV-disappear we-PAST we-leave-RECP Maseru
‘At sunset, we had left Maseru.’ Morolong (1978: 77; glosses JB)

Figure 1.3. Morolong’s analysis of -tsoa and -ile in the Reichenbachian system
new perspectives: the break with Reichenbach – toward an integrated theory of tense and viewpoint aspect


  - tense constrains the *topic time* $t_{\text{TOP}}$ of an utterance vis-a-vis an *evaluation time*
    - which may be *utterance time* $t_U$
      - or some *reference time* $t_R$ (cf. Bohnemeyer 2014)
  
  - the relation between $t_{\text{TOP}}$ and the event time $\tau(e)$ is constrained, not by tense, but by viewpoint aspect

- how do TRMs fit into this model?
new perspectives: Klecha & Bochnak (2016)

purely anaphoric TRMs in Luganda (NE Bantu, Uganda) in ‘iterated’ constructions

Figure 1.4. Klecha & Bochnak’s schematic representation of the semantics of iterated TRM
new perspectives: Klecha & Bochnak (2016) (cont.)

- analysis: Luganda TRMs simply encode an anteriority relation between two time intervals plus their distance

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Luganda Inventory of Temporal Remoteness Morphemes} \\
\text{a. } [\text{REC.P}] &= \lambda t \lambda u \lambda w [t < u \land \text{close}(t, u) > s(\text{close})] \\
\text{b. } [\text{INT.P}] &= \lambda t \lambda u \lambda w [t < u \land \text{far}(t, u) < s(\text{far})] \\
\text{c. } [\text{DIST.P}] &= \lambda t \lambda w [t < u]
\end{align*}
\]

- \(t - t_{TOP}\)
  - apparently, K&B assume that in the iterated construction, the AUX’s \(t_{TOP}\) is the main verb’s \(t_R\)
- \(u - \text{evaluation time} = t_U \text{ or } t_R\)
- close, far - measure functions
- \(s - \text{positive standard function (Kennedy 2007)}\)

I don’t really get why they don’t say distance \((t,u) > s(\text{close})\) or < \(s(\text{far})\)

The way they do it seems confusing
new perspectives: Cable (2013)

Gĩkũyũ (NE Bantu, Kenya) TRMs constrain $\Delta(\tau(e), t_U)$, not $\Delta(t_{TOP}, t_U)$ - they are not tenses in the Kleinian (etc.) sense (1.6)

The graded tenses of Gĩkũyũ (Mugane 1997)

a. ‘Current Past’:
   Mwangi n̄ēkũinaga.
   ‘Mwangi was dancing (within the day).’

b. ‘Near Past’:
   Mwangi ni̊araínaga.
   ‘Mwangi was dancing (within last few days).’

c. ‘Remote Past’:
   Mwangi n̄āinaga.
   ‘Mwangi was dancing (prior to ‘Near Past’).’

d. ‘Current Future’:
   Mwangi n̄ēkuina.
   ‘Mwangi will dance (within the day).’

e. ‘Remote Future’:
   Mwangi n̄aikaína.
   ‘Mwangi will dance (tomorrow or later).’ (Cable 2013: 221)
new perspectives: Cable (2013) (cont.)

the evidence for this analysis comes from the structure of distance categorization in this system

*Generalization regarding the ‘Remote Past’*
REMP is used when a speaker does not know whether an event occurred on the day of the utterance, ‘recently’, or some time prior to that.

*Generalization regarding the ‘Near Past’*
NRP is used when a speaker does not know whether an event occurred on the day of the utterance or at an earlier ‘recent’ time, *but does know that it occurred ‘recently’.*

*Generalization regarding the ‘Remote Future’*
REMF is used (in interrogatives) when a speaker does not know whether an event will occur on the day of the utterance or some time after that.

*The TRM Specificity Principle*
Speakers must use the most specific TRM consistent with their knowledge. If the use of a particular TRM $\alpha$ is ‘licit’ in some context, then the speaker cannot use any TRM weaker than $\alpha$. (Cable 2013: 245-247)
new perspectives: Cable (2013) (cont.)

rejecting a Gricean analysis, Cable instead proposes that Gĩkũyũ TRMs denote partial identity functions on events (1.7)

a. $[[\text{CUR}]]^{g_t} = [\lambda e : T(e) \propto \text{day surrounding } t . e ]$

b. $\text{IMPST}(t)$:
   A function from temporal intervals to temporal intervals. Maps interval $t$ to an interval $[t'...t'']$, where $t', t'' < t$, and both lie within the day surrounding $t$.
   
   Illustration:
   $\text{IMPST}('12\ PM; 5/31/12') = ['11\ AM; 5/31/12' \ldots '11:30\ AM; 5/31/12']$

c. $\text{REC}(t)$:
   A function from temporal intervals to temporal intervals. Maps interval $t$ to an interval $[t'...t'']$, where $t' < t$ and lies before the day surrounding $t$, and $t''$ is the endpoint of the day surrounding $t$.
   
   Illustration:
   $\text{REC}('12\ PM; 5/31/12') = ['3\ PM; 5/27/12' \ldots '11:59\ PM; 5/31/12']$

d. $[[\text{IMM}]]^{g_t} = [\lambda e : T(e) \propto \text{IMPST}(t) . e ]$

e. $[[\text{NRP}]]^{g_t} = [\lambda e : T(e) \propto \text{REC}(t) . e ]$

f. $[[\text{REM}]]^{g_t} = [\lambda e : e ]$  

(Cable 2013: 253-254)
new perspectives: Cable (2013) (cont.)

- as such, they introduce presuppositions the content of which is defined by the partial identity functions

- e.g., the feature CUR encoded by both the ‘current future’ and ‘current past’ TRMs has the meaning

(1.8) $[[ \text{CUR} ]]^{g,t} = [ \lambda e : \tau(e) \infty \text{ day surrounding } t_U . e ]$

- this presupposes the existence of a suitable event since the meaning of the TRM is undefined otherwise

- however, Cable argues that these presuppositions do not project and thus cannot be tested
new perspectives: Cable (2013) (cont.)

- Cable uses this presuppositional semantics to generate the observed usage extensions of the TRMs by invoking the **Maximize Presupposition** maxim of Heim (1991)

> “Maximize Presupposition: Among a set of alternatives, use the felicitous sentence with the strongest presupposition.” (Chemla 2008)

(1.9) a. #A weight of our tent is under 4lb (Heim 1991)

  b. #I talked to a father of the victim (Hawkins 1991)

  c. #Every candidate should send his book (# if some candidates wrote multiple books) (Sauerland 2008)
and now: Yucatec

- formalizing an analysis informally sketched in Bohnemeyer (1998: 328-342)
- Yucatec TRMs constrain $\Delta(\tau(e), t_{TOP})$
  - so their behavior combines features of the TRMs of Gĩkũyũ and Luganda
    - they are purely anaphoric, like the TRMs of Luganda
    - they directly access $\tau(e)$, like the TRMs of Gĩkũyũ on Cable’s analysis
  - however, unlike the Gĩkũyũ TRMs, they relate $\tau(e)$ to $t_{TOP}$, not to $t_U$ or some other evaluation time $t_R$
and now: Yucatec (cont.)

Yucatec has been argued to be a profoundly tenseless language (Bohnemeyer 1998, 2009)

the occurrence of TRMs in such a language further emphasizes their non-tense-like character

however, Yucatec does distinguish future-oriented TRMs and past-oriented TRMs

which still raises questions for a profoundly tenseless analysis
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two functional categories expressing temporality in Yucatec clauses

- preverbal aspect-mood (AM) markers and status suffixes
  - every finite verbal projection has exactly one of each
  - the AM marker selects for a particular status category in its lexicon entry

(2.1) Morphologically bound AM markers

a. \( K\)-in=xok-\( ik \) \( le=periyòodiko=o' \)
   Imperfective \( \text{IMPF-}A1\text{SG}=\text{read-INC}(B3\text{SG}) \text{ DEF}=\text{newspaper}=D2 \)
   'I (used to) read the paper'

b. \( T\)-in=xok-\( ah \) \( le=periyòodiko=o' \)
   Perfective \( \text{PRV-}A1\text{SG}=\text{read-CMP}(B3\text{SG}) \text{ DEF}=\text{newspaper}=D2 \)
   'I read the paper'

the remaining 13 or so AM markers are stative predicates (not auxiliaries or light verbs)
synopsis of the system: the aspectual AM markers

**Table 2.1. The aspectual AM markers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subset</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Category label in Bohnemeyer 2009</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Status category selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspectual</td>
<td>(t-/h-)\</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>Perfective aspect</td>
<td>CMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k-)\</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>Imperfective aspect; habitual/generic reference</td>
<td>INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t(\text{`a}n)</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Imperfective aspect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ts(\text{`o}k)</td>
<td>Terminative</td>
<td>Perfect aspect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mukah/mikah/bikah</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>Prospective aspect</td>
<td>INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/SUBJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
synopsis of the system: the modal AM markers

Table 2.2. The modal AM markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subset</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Category label in Bohnemeyer 2009</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Status category governed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td><em>yan</em></td>
<td>Obligative</td>
<td>Social obligations; plans; scheduled events; future time reference to naturally occurring events</td>
<td>INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>k’a’náan</em> /k’abéet</td>
<td>Necessitive</td>
<td>Deontic necessity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>táak</em></td>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>Desires and bodily needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>hev... =e</em></td>
<td>Assurative</td>
<td>Commitments, promises, agreement, assurances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>óolak</em></td>
<td>Penative</td>
<td>Proximity of realization in counterfactual worlds</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
... and today’s protagonists: the TRMs

**Table 2.3. The TRMs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subset</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Category label in Bohnemeyer 2009</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Status category governed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of remoteness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>biin</td>
<td>Remote future</td>
<td>Presumption: $t_{top} &lt; \tau(e)$; at-issue content: $\Delta(t_{top}, \tau(e))$ is great by contextual standards</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ta’itak</td>
<td>Proximate future</td>
<td>Presumption: $t_{top} &lt; \tau(e)$; at-issue content: $\Delta(t_{top}, \tau(e))$ is small by contextual standards</td>
<td>INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t’aantik</td>
<td>Immediate past</td>
<td>Presumption: $\tau(e) &lt; t_{top}$; at-issue content: $\Delta(t_{top}, \tau(e))$ is very small by contextual standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...=e’</td>
<td>…=e’ Immediate past</td>
<td>Presumption: $\tau(e) &lt; t_{top}$; at-issue content: $\Delta(t_{top}, \tau(e))$ is very small by contextual standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sáam</td>
<td>Recent past</td>
<td>Presumption: $\tau(e) &lt; t_{top}$; at-issue content: $\Delta(t_{top}, \tau(e))$ is small by contextual standards</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>úuch</td>
<td>Remote past</td>
<td>Presumption: $\tau(e) &lt; t_{top}$; at-issue content: $\Delta(t_{top}, \tau(e))$ is large by contextual standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
testing for deictic tense: is a clause formed with a given marker compatible with present, past, and future topic times?

e.g., the perfect-like ‘terminative’ aspect marker *ts’o’k*

with a past topic time, like a pluperfect:

\[(2.2) \quad \text{K-u=k’uch-ul-o’b=e’,} \]
\[\text{IMPF-A.3=arrive-INC=TOP} \]

*ts’o’k*  \[u=\text{kim-il} \quad le=\text{chàampal=e’}.\]
**TERM** \[A.3=\text{die-INC} \quad \text{DEF=small:child=D3} \]

’(By the time) they arrived, the baby **had** already died.’
with a future topic time, like a future perfect:

(2.3)  
Sáamal  óok-a'n+k'ìin=e'
     tomorrow  enter-RES+sun=TOP

  ts'o'k  u=bèet-ik  le=túus+bèel=o'
TERM    A.3=do-INC(B.3.S)  DEF=send+way:REL=D2

'By tomorrow at dusk (the boy) **will have done** the errand.'
(Andrade 1955: 135-136)

all Yucatec clauses are freely compatible with topic times in
the past, present, and future of utterance time

with one exception: the perfective aspect marker **t-/**h-
perfective aspect excludes FTR in matrix clauses

(2.4) #T-in=ts'on-ah le=kèeh sáamal=o',

PRV-A1SG=shoot-CMP(B3SG) DEF=deer tomorrow=D2
intended: ‘I will shoot the deer tomorrow’

it does, however, occur w/ FTR in conditional protases

(2.5) Wáah t-in=ts'on-ah le=kèeh sáamal=o',

ALT PRV-A1SG=shoot-CMP(B3SG) DEF=deer tomorrow=D2

he' in=tàas-ik=e'!

ASS A1SG=come:CAUS-INC(B3SG)=D3

‘If I shoot the deer tomorrow, I agree to bring it!’
the use of the perfective in conditional protases does not convey counterfactuality

for this meaning, subjunctive mood is used

(2.6) [I’m not allowed to vote in the upcoming local election, since I’m not a Mexican Citizen.]

Pero wáah káa bèey-\textit{lak} in=bóotare’,
but ALT SR like.this-INCH.\textbf{SUBJ}(B3SG) A1SG=vote
hi’n=bóotar-t-ik Pablo=e’.
ASS:A1SG=vote-APP-INC(B3SG) Pablo=D3

‘But if I were able to vote, I’d definitely vote (for) Pablo.’
the (complex) basic facts of future time reference in Yucatec

Table 2.4. *Finite clauses and future topic times in Yucatec*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic environment</th>
<th>Matrix clauses</th>
<th>Conditional protases</th>
<th>Other finite subordinate clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspectual reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stative (lexical state predicates; non-perfective aspect)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Unconstrained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eventive = perfective</td>
<td>B: Future $t_{top}$ excluded</td>
<td>C: Unconstrained</td>
<td>D: Future $t_{top}$ requires irrealis marking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The color schema of this presentation is a riot
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like Luganda TRMs, Yucatec TRMs are anaphoric, not deictic

like Gĩkũyũ TRMs on Cable’s analysis, they directly access $\tau(e)$

however, unlike the Gĩkũyũ TRMs, they relate $\tau(e)$ to $t_{TOP}$, not to $t_U$ or some other evaluation time $t_R$

in the following examples, $t_{TOP}$ is introduced by topicalized subordinate clauses marked in blue
remote past marker úuch with a future $t_{TOP}$

(3.1) [Context: Jorge, visiting the speaker’s village, is about to return to the United States. It is known that he plans to visit again the following year. Jorge knows that the speaker plans to build a house and has asked when it will be completed. Response:]

Chéen ka’=sùunak-ech t-u=láak’ ha’b=e’,
SR:IRR REP=turn\ATP:SUBJ-B2SG PREP-A3=other year=TOP
úuch in=mèet-∅ le=nah=o’
REMP A1SG=do:APP-SUBJ(B3SG) DEF=house=D2

“When you return next year, it will be long ago that I built the house.’

Figure 3.1. Diagramming the analysis of (3.1)
remote future marker \( b\text{\textit{in}} \) with a past \( t_{\text{TOP}} \)

(3.2) [Context: Jorge has just returned to Pedro’s village. It has been two years since his last visit. He learns that Pedro has built a house and asks whether it’s new. Response:]

\[
K\text{\textit{aa}}=h-\text{t\textit{aal-}}\text{ech} \quad \text{way} \quad h-\text{ts’o’k} \quad \text{ka’}p’eel \quad \text{ha’b=e’},
\]

\[
\text{CON}=\text{PRV-}\text{come-B2SG} \quad \text{here} \quad \text{PRV-end(B3SG)} \quad \text{two}=\text{CL.IN} \quad \text{year=D3}
\]

\[
\text{\textit{b\text{\textit{in}}} in=m\text{\textit{eet-}}\emptyset} \quad \text{le=nah=o’}
\]

\[\text{REMF} \quad \text{A1SG}=\text{do:APP-SUBJ(B3SG)} \quad \text{DEF=house=D2}\]

‘When you came here two years ago, it was going to be a long time before I would build the house.’

(4/4 speakers consulted: it was only a vague idea at the time)
immediate past marker táantik \(=\) with a future \(t_{TOP}\)

(3.3) [Context: Jorge, visiting the speaker’s village, is about to return to the United States. It is known that he plans to visit again the following year. Jorge knows that the speaker plans to build a house and has asked when it will be completed. Response:]

Chéen ka’=sùunak-ech \(\text{t-u=láak’}\) ha’b=e’,
SR:IRR REP=turn/ATP:SUBJ-B2SG PREP-A3=other year=TOP

táantik \(\text{in=mèet-ik}\) le=nah=o’
IMMP A1SG=do:APP-INC(B3SG) DEF=house=D2

‘When you return next year, I will have just build the house.’

(4/4 speakers consulted: SPKR plans to finish the house b4 July, the month Jorge usually visits)

Figure 3.3. Diagramming the analysis of (3.3)
constraining $\tau(e)$ vis-à-vis $t_{TOP}$, Yucatec TRMs behave like viewpoint aspect markers, not like tenses

- more specifically, since they involve $\tau(e) < t_{TOP}$ or $t_{TOP} < \tau(e)$, they behave like non-perfective aspects

support for this analysis

- Yucatec TRMs do not occur in the main line of narratives, only in the background (examples???)
- Yucatec TRMs can be paraphrases using prospective aspect for future-oriented TRMs and perfect (‘terminative’) for past-oriented TRMs
- Yucatec TRMs are incompatible with $\tau(e)$ adverbials and cannot be used in questions about $\tau(e)$, just like the English (present) perfect
  - and the Yucatec ‘terminative’, i.e., perfect (Bohnemeyer 2009)
YUCATEC TEMPORAL REMOTENESS MARKERS (CONT.)

blah

Add examples showing speakers' paraphrases
incompatibility with event time specifications

(3.x) [Context: It has been established that B mailed a certain letter a while ago. A wishes to know when exactly this happened:]

A: ??Ba’x k’íin sáam/úuch a=tùucht-eh?
    what sun(B3SG) RECP/REMP A2=send-SUBJ(B3SG)
    [Intended: ‘When (lit. what day) did you send it?’]
    lit. ‘At what day was it recent/long ago that you sent it?’

B: ??Lúnunes-ak sáam/úuch in=tùucht-eh
    Monday-CAL RECP/REMP A1SG=send-SUBJ(B3SG)
    [Intended: ‘Last Monday (was when) I sent it.’]
    lit. ‘It was last Monday that it was recent/long ago that I sent it’
the Yucatec TRMs are stative predicates that quantify the distance between two times

- by characterizing it as great or small relative to contextual standards

- they do not actually encode an ordering relation $R(\tau(e), t_{TOP})$

  - i.e., they do not distinguish among $\tau(e) < t_{TOP}$, $t_{TOP} < \tau(e)$, and $\tau(e) \propto t_{TOP}$

- this distinction is instead contributed by the construction that combines the TRM with the verbal core

  - including the status suffix
examples of REMP úuch and RECP sáam as lexical stative predicate neutral wrt. temporal orientation

Add these from Bohnemeyer (1998)!
Yucatec TRMs treat only $\Delta(\tau(e), t_{TOP})$ as at-issue content

- the ordering relation $R(\tau(e), t_{TOP})$ is projective

(3.x)

a. Ma’ sáam sùunak le=kòombi=o’...
   NEG(B3SG) RECP turn\ATP:SUBJ(B3SG) DEF=van=D2
   ‘It’s not a while ago that the collective returned;…’

b. ...inw=a’l-ik=e’, h-ts’o’k mèedyàòora.
   A1SG=say-INC(B3SG)=TOP PRV-end(B3SG) half hour
   ‘…I think it was half an hour ago.’

c. ??...tuméen ma’ sùunak=ì’.
   CAUSE NEG(3SG) turn\ATP:SUBJ(B3SG)=D4
   ‘…because it hasn’t returned yet.’

ADD MORE EXAMPLES ILLUSTRATING THIS BEHAVIOR!
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combine Klecha & Bochnak-style scalar distance semantics

with Cable-style partial identity functions over events
that generate the observed ordering presuppositions

\[(4.1) \quad [[\text{REMP}]]^{g,t} = \lambda \tau \lambda t \lambda w[\lambda e: \tau(e) < t_{TOP} \cdot e \quad \& \quad \Delta(\tau(e), t_{TOP}) > s(\text{recent})]\]
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- blah
THANKS!