

Cluster automata

András Kornai

Budapest University of Technology and Economics
H-1111 Budapest Egry J u 1
kornai@math.bme.hu

Abstract

We introduce a new class of *clustered* Moore automata (CMA), investigate their temporal behavior, and describe some applications.

Clustered Moore automata (CMA) are subsequential Moore transducers whose states can contain smaller CMA that operate on a faster timescale, subject to an Artinian limitation. In Section 1 we begin with some simple examples, both to motivate the subsequent definitions and in order to fix terminology and notation. In Section 2 we discuss the temporal structures carried by CMAs in the finite domain that is of chief interest in linguistic applications. Some of these applications, in particular island parsing and disambiguation are described in Section 3.

1 Introduction

We will use Moore (as opposed to Mealy) automata, but keep our terminology neutral across deterministic and nondeterministic, full and partial flavors, and whether we use an *output function* $G : Q \rightarrow O^*$ where Q is the *state space* and O is a finite *output alphabet* that may be (but need not be) disjoint from the *input alphabet* Σ . Terminological sticklers can call these ‘subsequential transducers’ rather than ‘automata’ but many of our examples come from domains where automata are naturally endowed not just with input but also with output capability, so we use *automata* as a cover term for both, including for weaker ‘semiautomata’ (transition systems, both labeled and unlabeled) that may lack well-defined initial and accepting states.

While we keep the discussion general, most of our automata will actually have a single distinguished state (standardly called the *initial*, *resting*, or *reset* state) $q_0 \in Q$, and will be *synchronizing* in the sense that for its transition function δ there exists some word $w \in \Sigma^*$ such that $\forall q \in Q \delta(q, w) = q_0$ i.e. a word that will take the

automaton from whatever current state to the initial state. For the history of the synchronization property, going back to (Ashby, 1956; Hennie, 1964), and some of the early motivating examples, see (Volkov, 2008), where one of the oldest unsolved problems in formal language theory, the Černý conjecture, is discussed.

Example 1. *The k -wheel S_k .* The are k states which are hard to individuate beyond the fact that one of them (not necessarily the initial state) produces output ‘1’ whereas the others are silent (outputting nothing, implemented as a blank/whitespace symbol ‘0’). Conceptually, the wheel has no input: we realize this condition by using an unary input alphabet $\Sigma = \{e\}$ containing the elementary time tick e . The states are arranged cyclically, so that if time flows in an approximately uniform manner (time ticks arrive approximately uniformly) we will see S_k ticking (emitting signal ‘1’) every k th tick of the underlying time signal e . Larger wheels, with $10^3 < k < 10^4$ will help keep approximate synchrony between different *timescales*, but we defer these to Section 2. Here we begin with smaller wheels where some states may be endowed with self-loops and/or jumps as in the classic (Bakis, 1976) acoustic models (where 3-11 states were typical, and the loop is unrolled, see \mathcal{E}_k in 2.2 below).

Example 2. *The looped 2-wheel S_2^1* has two states a (initial) and b (signaling):




Figure 1: State diagram and transition matrix of S_2^1 .

This simple automaton illustrates an important conceptual difference between nondeterminism, the free choice between the two paths leaving a , and the direct probabilistic interpretation, where this choice is governed by the outcome of tossing a fair coin.

Proposition 1. As an NDA, the looped 2-wheel spends, on the average $\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{3+\sqrt{5}} \sim 0.618$ of the time in the looped state, and $\frac{2}{3+\sqrt{5}} \sim 0.382$ in the other state.

Proof Computing the n th power of the transition matrix shows that after n time ticks there are f_{n+1} paths leading from a back to itself, but only f_n from a to b , where f_i is the i th Fibonacci number. Since $\frac{f_{n+1}}{f_n}$ converges to $\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ the result follows.

Proposition 2. As a probabilistic automaton the looped 2-wheel spends, on the average, $2/3$ of the time in the looped state, and $1/3$ in the other state.

Proof The transition matrix is $\begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and the stable distribution $(\tau, 1 - \tau)$ is the eigenvector corresponding to eigenvalue 1. Direct computation shows that the unique solution is $(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$.

Discussion Unsurprisingly, in both cases the time spent in the looped state is perceptibly greater than the time spent in the other state. Perhaps more surprising is the fact that at least in principle we could make a distinction between the nondeterministic and the probabilistic model as we take state occupancy observations over longer runs (over $10^3 - 10^4$ elementary time steps) or, what is the same, compute ensemble averages over many shorter runs.

Proposition 3. Given a deterministic k -wheel S_k (no self-loops or jumps) and output signals $1, 2, \dots, r$ attached to n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r of the states uniquely so that $\sum_i n_i = k$, the observed signal coming from the wheel will be i with probability n_i/k . This obviously also holds if all states have self-loops.

In other words, temporal occupancy statistics endow even deterministic automata with a probabilistic character. Prop. 3 shows how random variables can be approximated to arbitrary precision by CMA.

Example 3. Wheels within wheels. In \mathcal{W} we assume an outer automaton \mathcal{S}_2 and consider its states a, b to contain wheels \mathcal{S}_l and \mathcal{S}_m . Assume the inner wheels are sensitive to the same time tick, and produce output at every l and m steps respectively, with m, l relative primes. Now, if this output ‘1’ drives (acts as the time tick for) the outer \mathcal{S}_2 , we see it moving across its two states and spending about the same time in each. The reasoning gets more complicated if l and m are not coprime, but the average time spent in the two macro-states is $1/2$ each independent of the choice of l and $m \geq 2$

Discussion For any finite sample space Ω , any probability distribution P over it, and any $\epsilon > 0$ we can construct a wheel that produces output i with the prescribed probability p_i within ϵ . The fact that state occupancy statistics can be used as a universal approximator for finite probability distributions justifies the viewpoint taken in this paper: the *random variables* of interest in linguistics *take values* not just in any measurable space but *in the state space of finite automata*.

Example 4. The abstract synapse \mathcal{R} . We have $|Q| = 4$. The states will be *rest*, *aroused*, *transmit*, *blocked* written $Q = \{r, a, t, b\}$, with transitions arranged cyclically $r \rightarrow a \rightarrow t \rightarrow b \rightarrow r$. Loop transitions are permitted everywhere except at the transmitting state t , as shown in Fig. 2. There are again just two outputs ‘0’ and ‘1’, so this is effectively S_4^i where i is 0, 1, 2, or 3 depending on the number of loops we permit. The ‘no-loop on t ’ proviso is used for enforcing a well known constraint that is operative on biological synapses, namely that the transmission of a signal uses energy and must be followed by some time spent in the blocked (refractory) state.




Figure 2: State diagram of the abstract synapse \mathcal{R}

Actual synapses **come in many varieties**, and our \mathcal{R} is only broadly inspired by these. What Fig. 2 provides is not a fully specified \mathcal{R} but rather a small parametric family of these. In particular, we have not discussed whether the synapse can get in aroused state in the absence of external signals, a matter we shall return to in Section 3.

For more realistic modeling of biological synapses (which come in several varieties) one would have to provide far more detail on occupancy statistics of the four states r, a, t, b and specify the underlying timescale e.g. as centiseconds or milliseconds. Discussion of the timescales R_i is deferred to Section 2, here it suffices to say that the i will be integers between fixed max and min values: modern physics has R_{\min} in the attosecond $10^{-18}s$ and R_{\max} in the exasecond $10^{18}s$ range.

Our Ex. 3 had automata operating on one timescale inside the states of automata operating

on a slower scale. In full generality, we will permit wheels within wheels within . . . wheels as long as the outermost automaton is at R_{\max} or lesser, and the innermost ones are at R_{\min} or greater.

Definition 1. *Clustered Moore Automata (CMA)* are defined recursively:

- (i) The single-state automaton \mathcal{S}_1 with output alphabet $O = \{0, 1\}$ is a CMA
- (ii) Each CMA can be driven externally by a time-tick e_i where i is a timescale index ranging between pre-set integer values \min and \max
- (iii) If not driven externally, each CMA can be driven internally by CMA contained in its states. In such cases, the outer CMA's time ticks are provided by the outputs of the inner CMAs, which much run on a timescale strictly faster than that of the outer machine
- (iv) Embedding of machines can stop at any level and must stop when the fastest timescale R_{\min} is reached (which makes further placement of yet smaller machines no longer feasible).

The distinction between being externally and internally driven is not as sharp as it may appear at first blush. While it may not be observable what happens at R_{\min} or below, Ex. 3 shows how to construct a balanced binary ticker at $R_{\min+1}$, and Ex. 4 shows how, with access to a ticker, one could inspect the output of \mathcal{R} to gather a maximum of two bits of information. To communicate more than two bits asynchronously we use a different CMA.

Example 5. The *wire* automaton \mathcal{D} will have one state for each symbol in its input/output alphabet plus a rest state 'transmitting nothing'. From any state, upon receiving symbol σ , it transitions to the state indexed by σ , where it will emit σ . (It would be easier to construct wires using Mealy machines, but we stay with Moore as mixing the two would bring in unnecessary difficulties.) This enables temporal amplification across timescales: If input is received on scale R_i output can be produced on any scale $R_j, j \geq i$.

\mathcal{D} is loosely modeled on the process of object perception whereby objects cause disturbances, the disturbances radiate outward, and senses are capable of perceiving them. When machines are embedded in other machines, the outputs of the inner machine are by design accessible as inputs to the outer machine, but not necessarily beyond. Wires

are a means of instrumenting internal machines for perception by external machines which may operate on a considerably slower scale.

2 Space and time

With CMA, nothing comes for free: operations easily taken for granted, such as writing, reading, or erasing a piece of memory require specific, often nontrivial constructions. One key issue is *persistent storage*, how information can be preserved over larger timescales. In computers, change of internal state happens on a scale noticeably faster than the recording of the result: internal change is on the nanosecond scale, whereas the writing of hard drives takes several milliseconds and DRAM refresh is still on the millisecond scale. For the Presocratics, the same difference in timescale must have been evident in relation to the time it takes to write something down versus the 'lightning speed' of thought.

2.1 Memory

We begin by introducing a CMA \mathcal{T} aimed at capturing the behavior of ordinary Turing Machine *tapes* as the behavior of the CMA. Turing (1937) permitted any finite tape alphabet, but this can be limited to binary 0/1 without loss of generality, and for ease of presentation we stay with this. Remarkably, the number of states in \mathcal{T} can be limited to 4, independent of tape length l . Three of these capture the contents of the tape, and the fourth *counter* state will store the position of the read/write head. The alphabet of \mathcal{T} will contain not just 0 and 1 but also dedicated symbols μ for 'move left'; ν 'move right'; α 'write 1'; and ω 'erase' (write 0).

The actual contents of the tape will reside in smaller CMA inside the three states: these smaller machines are hypercubes of size 2^l where 'being in a given state at a given time' can be conveniently modeled as the satisfaction of certain *fluents* (time-sensitive predicates) that hold on the 1 coordinates of the point and fail on the 0 coordinates. (These three replicas are required only for 1-bit error correction – if this is not a concern the number of top-level states can be limited to two, see the Appendix.)

To accommodate the more nuanced multi-scale version of time that we propose here, the standard event calculus (for extended introductions, see Shanahan (1997); Thielscher (2000); van Lambalgen and Hamm (2005)) will have to be revised:

instead of some predicate F obtaining at some time t , we will write $F(i.j)$, where the first index refers to the scale, and the second to the unit on that scale. The key difference from the standard view is that in CMA we admit *cyclic* fluents like Day(3.j) and Night(3.j). Since these are non-overlapping events which neither precede nor follow each other, they fail the axiomatization of precedence and overlap proposed by (Kamp, 1979). While the urge to ban discontinuous events may be strong, we would like to reassure the reader that there are no paradoxes, the whole phenomenon of cyclic fluents is perfectly consistent with the traditional discrete model of time where we already have interleaving predicates like Even(n) and Odd(n).

Altogether, we will have l fluents $F_k(i,j)$ for each tape position $1 \leq k \leq l$, with the idea that $F_k(i,j)$ is true iff on scale i at time j position k of the tape has a '1'. Both for reading and writing we need to know which position is under scan. This information takes up $\log_2 l$ bits, and needs to be stored and manipulated just like the data stored on \mathcal{T} . This requires a smaller \mathcal{T}_1 , which will be stored in the counter state of the larger \mathcal{T} . It follows that starting with a byte-size automaton \mathcal{B} at the innermost level, we can gain control of a tape of length 8, which in turn enables gaining control of a tape of length 2^8 , and so on until we run out of levels at max. Except for the explicit termination clause, this is reminiscent of the *predicative arithmetic* of Nelson (1986). Observe that termination does not amount to a perceptible limitation on memory, in that with three layers we are already at 2^{2^8} i.e. a tape capable of storing over 10^{154} bits, more than the storage capacity of the entire universe (Lloyd, 2002).

Standardly a TM is composed of a tape with a read/write head and a finite state control, putting no explicit limits on the complexity of the latter. To complete our discussion (we defer the details of \mathcal{B} to the Appendix) we need to consider the limitations for such elementary (control) CMA. We state the limitations for the top level, but CMA are typically constructed bottom up, so the following apply for intermediary stages as well:

- ss** No single-layer CMA can contain more than a myriad ($m = 10^4$) states
- io** No input or output alphabet can contain more than $s = 2^8$ symbols
- od** No state can have out-degree $o \geq 8$
- id** No state can have in-degree $i \geq m$

These limits are set generously, more with LLMs than with biological neurons in mind. In particular, the i/o restriction permits direct modeling of fp8 computations, whereas biological synapses, the inspiration for our \mathcal{R} , appear to be at most two-bit devices (see Hertz et al. (1991) 10.2). Using one \mathcal{T} as control, connected to a tape by a wire, requires only four symbols μ, ν, α, ω . By cascading, larger out-degrees could easily be modeled as soon as $o = 2$ is permitted: having larger numbers serves no purpose beyond avoiding too many layers of cascading.

Definition 2. We define any temporal *instant* j as being located on some fixed timescale R_i . Time-sensitive predicates (*fluents*) take $(i.j)$ instances as arguments. We write $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}$ if the automaton \mathcal{A} is inside a single state of \mathcal{B} .

The 'element of' relation \in is eternal in the sense that all instances j on timescale $i - 1$ belong in a single time tick k on scale i . This means that we can reuse the \in symbol for time unit containment and write $\forall j(i-1.j) \in (i.k)$. What is not necessarily eternal is the structure of automata which may, on larger timescales, actually lose or gain states and transitions.

Example 5. Budapest phone numbers. The automaton (regexp) describing phone numbers evolved, on a decade scale, as follows. 1960s: 6-digit numbers starting with 1 or 3; 1970s: other leading digits gradually added; 1980s: switch to 7 digit numbers, initially adding a leading digit 9; 1990s: other leading digits gradually added; 2000s: city code 1 added as obligatory first digit; 2010s: inter-urban prefix 06 or international prefix +36 made obligatory. What started out as 123456 eventually became +3619123456. We leave it to the reader to arrange the small automata corresponding to each regexp within successive states of the larger automaton moving in decade steps.

2.2 Temporal structure

At first blush it looks as if embedding CMA in one another will create a tremendous variety of temporalities. Our first theorem establishes that this is not so: there are only five families of discrete temporal structures up to bisimulation, and most of them are rather similar to the ordinary concept of discrete time that is widely used in computer science, and enforced by clock signals in computer engineering.

We begin by exemplifying these five kinds of

structures Z , N , P , L , and C . The first three are ‘infinitistic’ in the sense that CMA bisimulation cannot distinguish them from the well-known infinite structures \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{N} and $-\mathbb{N}$, but for ease of presentation we begin with the finitistic ones.

C stands for *cyclic*, and our first example, the k -wheel \mathcal{S}_k shows how this can be realized for any $k \leq m = 10^4$. This already gives a myriad examples of non-congruent cyclic temporal structures, but this can be pushed much farther. Even if we stay within the per-level limitation m we are imposing on elementary structures, we could build a much bigger system. Given r wheels $\mathcal{S}_{l_1}, \mathcal{S}_{l_2}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{l_r}$ arranged as the inner wheels of an outer wheel \mathcal{S}_r , the Chinese Remainder Theorem says that the entire structure will return to its initial state in exactly $\text{lcd}(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_r)$ steps.

There are 1229 primes less than a myriad, so we start with an outer loop of 1229 steps, and place wheels with length 8192, 6561, 3125, 2401, 1331, 2197, ... (maximum prime power length $p^{m_p} < m$) in these. Such a system would in principle take over 10^{4348} steps to return to its initial state. This number is vastly larger than the entire gamut from 10^{-44} (Planck time) to 10^{20} (lifetime of the universe) countenanced by contemporary physics. The naive (Presocratic) theory that is already sufficient for the linguistic applications discussed in Section 3 has considerably smaller gamut, 10^{14} instead of 10^{64} , but the point is the same: ‘cycles’ of such extraordinary length cannot be distinguished from the infinite system Z indexed by the integers in \mathbb{Z} .

L stands for *limited*, and the structures \mathcal{E}_k are obtained by removing from the wheel \mathcal{S}_k the transition leading to the initial state. This way we obtain a chain of k steps. This again yields a myriad non-congruent (to each other or to anything from C) linear structures. L structures, finite intervals with a definite beginning and end, are implicit in contemporary Big Bang/Big Crunch models and quite explicit in both Old and New Testament eschatology: the world has a definite beginning and a definite end.

In Z , which is modeled on \mathbb{Z} , we start numbering by 0 from now, using negative integers for predecessors (past time units, before) and positive integers for successors (future time units, after) as expected. In other words, we rely on ‘event time’ (Reichenbach, 1947) as our reference frame. Note that the modern Unix time, based on 64-bit rather than 32-bit counters, is capable of handling 292 billion years in either direction. Since this exceeds the

estimated past and expected future lifetime of the universe by more than an order of magnitude, C_{264} temporality is effectively indistinguishable from Z -time.

N is analogous to \mathbb{N} , with a definite starting point, but no endpoint. The future works as expected, but the past is limited to time-ticks since the origin. Unix time with unsigned quantities is a possible example, as are temporalities associated to imperfect linguistic expressions.

The final option P is the mirror image of N , with a definite endpoint but no starting point – the most common usage is countdowns, but this is the internal timeframe of telic expressions as well. Modern cosmology countenances N -models (those that have a Big Bang but no Big Crunch) and could perhaps permit P -models as well.

Common to all five notions of time is the existence of a definite instance preceding, and a definite instance following now, or any other instance. It is this Peano-style succession (no two units are succeeded by the same unit, and only one unit succeeds any unit) that distinguishes the Presocratic concept of time from the modern, continuous notion of time, where ‘immediately preceding’ and ‘immediately following’ make no sense (though the disjointness of the instances is preserved). Presocratic thought is not very specific on which of these five models is employed on any given scale, and for N - P - and L -time leaves open the question of whether the initial and/or final units are to be included or not.

Though simulation in one direction is often possible, e.g. a 4-wheel can simulate a 2-wheel, bisimulation is not: the inventory listed above is all that elementary CMAs are capable of.

Theorem 1. Single-scale structure There exist five (families of) structures Z , N , P , L , and C such that any timescale associated to a CMA has a bisimulation with one of these.

The proof, not presented in detail, is easy but tedious, requiring the checking of all combinations of the canonical temporal structures. For example, the direct product of a C and an L structure (effectively seen by embedding them as subautomata in \mathcal{S}_2) will again be C , if we permit a self-loop at the end of the L subautomaton, or L , if we don’t. Note, however, that the bisimulations we consider are *weak* in the presence of C structures in that ‘which happened first’ may not have a meaningful answer for events on cyclic scales. \square .

3 Linguistic applications

CMA timescales are neutral between the modern view described in ('t Hooft and Vandoren, 2014) and the 'naive' view characteristic of Greek philosophers from the Presocratics to the Hellenistic age. Since the modern view based on powers of 10 (scientific notation) will be thoroughly familiar to the reader, in 3.1 we concentrate on reconstructing the naive worldview, and pointing out salient differences from the modern view.

In 3.2 we use CMA to get a handle of some primitive categories of linguistic description, typically encoded in *bound morphemes*. Unsurprisingly, timescales easily lend themselves to describing tense/aspect markers, and perhaps more surprisingly, to the description of a naive theory of causation as well.

Finally, in 3.3 we use CMA to implement grammatical systems capable of island parsing and disambiguation.

3.1 The naive worldview

It is this, somewhat crude, view that underlies the use of ordinary language, and the reliance on *instants*, point-like elementary time particles without perceptible duration, is common to all formal ontologies attempting to characterize natural language, including the influential (Hobbs and Pan, 2004).

First, we need to pick a time unit in a manner that will make the events we are most concerned with easily expressible. Science settled on the *second* (s) but for the naive view we will measure time in *heartbeats*, obviously a more variable (and less reliable) unit. Either way, there is a unit that anchors the *real time* scale R_0 .

Going downwards, we find the *centisecond* (cs) timescale appropriate for fast events. In general, events not separated by 2-3 cs cannot be told apart by unaided perception, and structured human activity, such as speech, also requires units at least this long. (Normal speech sounds take 7-10 cs, but can be only 2-3 cs in extreme fast speech.) In vision, a still frame lasting 3-4 cs is sufficient for making movies appear natural, and using stills separated by 1cs fully eliminates film artifacts like strobing, flicker, and motion blur. Human reaction times are on the order of 10-30 cs. Altogether, events need to last several cs for discrimination, and even subliminal perception is hampered under 3cs and undetectable under 1 cs (Ionescu, 2016).

We could call R_{-1} the 'blink of an eye' scale (an eyeblink takes about 10 cs) but we emphasize that the unit on this scale, what we will call an *instant*, is soft in both directions. Even though microsecond measurement technology is available off the shelf, it makes no sense to measure eyeblinks down to this level. Similarly, it is not a fixed number that describes the conversion factor from instances to heartbeats but rather a probability distribution with noticeable variance.

Importantly, the centisecond instant constituted an absolute barrier of observability for the Presocratics the same way as Planck time units constitute an absolute barrier for physics today. Current measurement technology is in the zeptosecond range, still separated from Planck time by over 23 orders of magnitude, so assuming an absolute observability barrier R_{\min} is just as justified today as it was in antiquity. Progress in metrology pushes the minimum detectable unit down by half an order of magnitude every decade, but does not remove the conceptual limitation that we are incapable of detecting phenomena below some limit.

Moving upward, at the *kilosecond* (ks, quarter hour) timescale slow motion, such as that of the sun in the sky, is barely perceptible, though on the *day* scale, which contains 96 quarter-hour (86.4 ks) time slots, such motion is evident. The ks scale is well suited for describing changes in human perceptions regarding both internal states (hunger, sleepiness, tiredness) and external states (temperature, light, weather), for which the second scale, let alone the centisecond scale, are too detailed. It takes another two rough orders of magnitude (ROoM) for the change of *seasons* to be clearly discernible, and the largest celestial cycles of which knowledge can be safely ascribed to the Greeks of antiquity, the Metonic cycle (235 months) and Saros (223 months), require another two-three ROoMs. These comprise the *generation* scale both in terms of human development stages from child to adult to elder and in terms of successive generations. Finally, we have the *aeon*, a time unit of a few thousand years.

CMA can be used equally well to describe the modern view: for this we can simply use 10-wheels within 10-wheels within ... 10-wheels going down from R_{\max} to R_{\min} , setting the former at the expected lifetime of the universe (currently estimated below 10^{18} s). The naive view requires larger, and unevenly sized, wheels, on the order of $10^2 - 10^3$. The conversion factors k are not specified exactly,

but remain under an equally vaguely defined constant m , the *myriad* of Greek, Latin, and Classical Chinese, which we take to be $\leq 10^4$. In terms of temporal adjacency, we have two relations to consider: the same instant on different scales, and different instants on the same scale, and our notation in Definition 2 reflects this.

The naive worldview incorporates cyclic timescales. For the sake of simplicity assume the underlying time to be C_2 , say day/night, and assume a worker who can perform some task (dig a trench, add lines to a new copy of some codex, ...) every day. If the worker can overwrite a piece of memory that has persistence on a larger scale, *nulla dies sine linea* is not in vain: days and nights come and go, but the trench is ever longer, the codex is getting copied. (It would be ahistorical in the naive context, but the principle is not any different for our Turing machine tape \mathcal{T} .)

What appears to be endless (repetitive) toil on the day/night scale will correspond to significant progress on the next larger scale. But if there is no external (higher scale) record keeping, the automaton must preserve all information in its own state space, and this is limited to less than 14 bits by ss. If the automaton eventually halts, it needs to be externally reset for further use, but the overall time structure provided by it is still cyclic if these resets (synchronizing) are taken into consideration as argued by McCulloch (1945).

What do we mean when we say that a fluent $p(i,j)$ holds at some time unit j on timescale i ? Looking at this on the next smaller scale $i - 1$ there are two plausible definitions: $\forall(i - 1.k) \in (i,j) p(i - 1.k)$ (the \forall definition), or $\exists(i - 1.k) \in (i,j) p(i - 1.k)$ (the \exists definition). The choice becomes irrelevant only on the fastest timescale R_{\min} that is accessible to measurement, which we set as the R_{-1} (cs) scale for the Presocratics. On ordinary scales, such as R_1 (ks) we either countenance the possibility of inhomogeneity, that Hermocrates can be eating for a quarter hour without eating at every heartbeat, or we insist on the \forall definition, which forces homogeneity not just one scale down, but iteratively down to all accessible scales and perhaps beyond. An important consequence of the \forall choice is what is known in phonology as the *Absolute Slicing Hypothesis* (ASH) (Goldsmith, 1990), that boundaries of units on scale i must be coterminous with boundaries of edge units on the next smaller scale.

This hypothesis is hardwired in the modern view,

which relies entirely on the standard real line \mathbb{R} , making the division into ever smaller timescales containing exactly 10 units for one above it (or 10^3 as embodied in the SI system of prefixes from quetta to quecto) something of a historical accident, the widespread use of base 10 counting. The *essence* of such a system is continuous, the smaller scales appear only for practical reason and carry no theoretical significance. In contrast, the naive view is essentially discrete, with continuity akin to that of the nonstandard reals, ordinary reals enhanced with nilsquare infinitesimal (Bell, 2008) instances.

Historically, phonology has moved away from the ASH as there is clear evidence that independent articulators (such as the vocal folds, the tongue body, and the lips) do not move in perfect synchrony, so that the articulation of a single sound, such as a /p/ in /apa/ may begin with lip closure preceding the cessation of voicing, or the other way around, may start with lip closure only after the opening of the vocal folds (for a cs-level analysis of voice onset time effects, see (Cho and Ladefoged, 1999)). Phonology provides a clear contemporary example where using the \exists definition is more advantageous, but the fact that events following their own rhythm need not change at the same instance must have already been evident to the Presocratics, who knew perfectly well that the moon can appear during the day. But if satisfaction on all smaller scales is not required for the truth of a fluent $p(i,j)$, what is required?

Definition 3. $p(i,j)$ holds iff we have a *contiguous and preponderant* stretch of subunits $(i - 1.b), (i - 1.b + 1), \dots (i - 1.b + l)$ at which p holds.

However many R_{i-1} units there are in a R_i unit, it simply cannot be the case that both p and $\neg p$ units are preponderant, so the definition excludes i -level units that harbor contradictions. The possibility that $p(i,j)$ is undefined is left open, and is seen in practice for all cases where $p(i - 1.k)$ is *alternating*: days and nights, breathe in, breathe out. For these, assigning truth values *During a quarter hour, are people breathing in or breathing out* makes no sense.

What happens if 50.1% of p stands in opposition to 49.9% of $\neg p$? Modern theories of knowledge representation would have to say that we have a preponderance of p , but this is very far from Presocratic thinking, where preponderance requires a perceptible majority, maybe as much as two thirds. Units where neither p nor $\neg p$ are dominant are sim-

ply *transition* units, perhaps to be analyzed on the next smaller scale, if that is still accessible. Note that on the appropriate scale contiguity will make the p or $\neg p$ question clearly settled for most lower level units, except possibly the one where the transition is taking place.

For purposes of representing semantic knowledge, we use *frames* as in FrameNet (Baker et al., 1998; Fillmore and Atkins, 1998; Ruppenhofer et al., 2006), and temporally linked series of frames called *scripts* or (skeletal) *stories* (Schank and Abelson, 1995). We will also use cognitive structures that are not quite Saussurian signs, in that it is only the idea that is fully accessible to us, the form associated to the idea is less pronounced – we will call these *schemes* or *schemas*. We begin with a well-known example, the Exchange schema, used in the analysis of verbs like *buy* and *sell* (Hovav and Levin, 2008).

Example 6. Exchange. The temporal aspects are captured in \mathcal{E}_3 , a 3-state linear machine that requires no input, being driven by the time tick alone. We call the initial state b (before) and the final state a (after). There is just one fluent, x has y , that matters: we have (seller has goods)(b), (buyer has money)(b), (seller has money)(a) and (buyer has goods)(a).

This automaton operates on the heartbeat scale, and we could go in more minute detail, because these days the standard commercial exchange involves a great deal of background machinery: the buyer has a credit card, or better yet, a cellphone that acts as one, the seller has a credit card terminal, the buyer and the seller both have bank accounts linked to these, and the exchange of money is effected, perhaps substantially later, by some protocol neither buyer nor seller are fully in control of (Brandt and Kracht, 2011).

Note that the value of the fluent has is underspecified for now. It simply makes no difference whether we postulate that at the moment of the exchange both the seller and the buyer have the goods or neither, or whether we conceptualize it as the seller giving up possession of the goods before or after getting possession of the money. These details can matter for the purpose of debugging a transaction, but even there the governing considerations will not be framed in terms of such microanalysis but rather in terms of which fluent failed before or after. For example, if the transaction went through, and buyer has goods, the

seller should be able to obtain the money from the credit card company even if the buyer dies before his credit card is paid off. How the card company gets the money from the estate of the buyer is not the seller's concern, and the process may play out on the season scale, what happened on the heartbeat scale is irrelevant for this.

For human action that is driven by social conventions, such as buying and selling, the naive model still rules supreme, highlighting all and only the factors that matter. But for action driven by natural law, the difference between the contemporary and the naive view could not be more stark. We illustrate this on the example of gravity, which we can posit in the Newtonian form as $F = gmM/r^2$. Einstein field equations would be even farther from the naive theory, but this is already sufficient for making the point.

Example 7. Gravity. This is a two-state cyclic automaton with one (start and end) state being the Aristotelian resting state, where some form of support counterbalances gravitational pull, and in the other state no support is present and the object begins to fall.

Naive as this theory may be, it still lets us draw some key conclusions: that things, unless supported, will fall; that every fall ends in a (synchronizing) resting state; that the stars must be supported by some celestial sphere; and so on. Our contemporary selves may find these conclusions ridiculous, but nearly two thousand years after the Presocratics, in the 14th century Jean Buridan still maintained a theory of circular impetus to explain celestial mechanics, and it will be another three hundred years until Newton manages to unify the theory of sublunar and superlunar realms. To this day, children under six will regularly believe that if we spin in a circle a rock attached to the center by a string, if we abruptly cut the string the rock will continue on a circular or spiral orbit. Many retain this naive view into adulthood.

3.2 Bound morphemes

There is a great deal of evidence in favor of a CMA model of temporality in natural language, coming from a variety of bound morphemes that mark tense, aspect, frequency, duration, and related distinctions in a variety of ways in most, if not all, languages spoken around the world. We will begin with tense and Aktionsart, but we cannot possibly do justice to the broad linguistic and philosoph-

ical tradition here: for a survery sympathetic to our point of view consult (Fernando, 2015). The evidence for different scales is manifest in may languages like Tamil:

Past	Form	Gloss
Immediate	vantu viṭṭān	He just came
Recent	vantirukkiṭān	He has recently come
Remote	vantān	He came
Historical	vantiṭuntān	He had come long ago

Table 1: Distinctions in Tamil past tense (3sg masculine)

Immediate past is on a heartbeat scale, *he came a moment ago*; recent past on the quarter hour scale *he came earlier today*; remote past is on the day scale *he came yesterday/a few days ago*; historical past is on the generation/aeon scale *he came in ancient times*. Taking the moment of utterance to be 0, he arrived at some instant ($i-k$), where k is a small number ‘a few’, and $i = 0, 1, 2, 4$ respectively. We also mention Tagalog which, in addition to Immediate, Recent, Distant, and Remote Past, also has a Mythological Past used for legends and ancient history.

Analogous distinctions in the future exist both for Tagalog and for many other languages for Immediate future (happening very soon); Near future (expected within a short time); Distant future (further away but still definite); Uncertain/hypothetical future (may or may not happen): here again we refer to some instant ($i.l$) with l a small positive number and $i = 0, 1, 2, 4/5$.

Besides Tagalog and Tamil, etymologically unrelated languages like Kalaallisut (Greenlandic Inuit), Yagua, some Bantu languages, and perhaps many others (the World Atlas of Language Structures (Dryer and Haspelmath, 2013) suggests the majority) will make more than one scalar distinction in the past, the future, or both. To be sure, not all of these distinctions are purely morphological (various multi-word constructions are common) but the phenomenon is undeniable for tenses and for aspect markers to which we turn now.

Lexical aspect (Aktionsart, see Vendler (1967)) requires only small automata. Durative static actions, better named **states** like *know*, require a single state with a self-loop, \mathcal{S}_1 . Once in that state, on the relevant timescale there is no way out – perhaps you can unlearn on a longer scale, but you can’t un-know. An even simpler machine, one state and no self-loop, is appropriate for punctual **semelfactives** like *blink*. Such actions are assigned a single time

unit on the scale below the narrative event line, typically R_{-1} . **Achievements** like *find* are two-state automata \mathcal{E}_2 with no self-loops, as opposed to **accomplishments** which have a self-loop on the first state. Finally, Vendler’s **activities** like *walk* have self-loops on both states.

In general, perfect forms indicate that the underlying temporality is terminating, what we called P-time in 2.2. Nearly half of the languages considered in (Dahl and Velupillai, 2013) have some kind of perfective, often formed by some auxiliary word *has, finish, already*. Similar considerations could help organize imperfective/pluperfect forms and, with the aid of cyclic temporalities, habitual/frequentative ones as well, but this would take us far beyond the bounds of this paper. Instead of investigating the many ways temporal pointers *can* be updated by syntax, we will concentrate on the one case where they *must* be updated.

For this, we use the relation $a \text{ cause } b$ where, under any theory of causation, the cause must precede the effect, some kind of temporal update between a and b is necessary. In general, the naive worldview assumes inertia: changes are caused by some *force* and conversely, if no forces are present, things will continue as they are (Talmy, 1988). Consider the tale of the Crow and the Serpent from the *Pañcatantra* (Bk. I/5).

Once upon a time there lived a crow couple, who had built a nest on the top of a tree. But unfortunately the tree was inhabited by a serpent at its bottom. So the serpent used to crawl up the tree and eat all the eggs that the lady crow used to lay. The crow couple were deeply grieved and when this happened time after time, then they decided that the serpent was to be get rid of by a plan.

So the crow then approached his friend the jackal and asked for a plan. The jackal then told him to go and fetch a costly thing from the palace of the king and throw the thing in the burrow of the snake. The crow went to the palace, and stole a necklace of the queen while she was bathing. The guards of the palace ran after it. The crow then dropped the necklace in the burrow of the snake beneath the tree.

The guards on reaching the bottom of the tree, found the necklace guarded by

the serpent. Then they killed the serpent and recovered the necklace. So the crow family was now happy that their eggs were safe now. (Translation [source](#))

The causal chain proceeds from 1: (lady crow laying eggs) enable (serpent eating eggs) which in turn 2: 1 cause (crow grieving);
3: 2 cause (crow asking for plan);
4: 3 cause (jackal providing plan);
5: 4 cause (crow follow plan);
6: 5 cause (crow steal necklace);
7: 5 cause (crow drop necklace in burrow);
8: 7 cause (necklace in burrow);
9: 6 cause (servants want necklace back);
10: 7 cause (servants go to burrow);
11: 8 cause (servants kill snake);
12: 11 cause (serpent dead);
13: 12 cause (crow family happy);

Under 1 we have enable rather than cause, since the snake could, at least in principle, refrain from eating the eggs. Otherwise, the events are causing one another just by taking place in the right order, and that physical and mental events/actions are freely intermingled in the causal chain. Compound events can be built up by compound actions, e.g. the crow needs both to steal the necklace *and* to drop it down the burrow to trigger the servants' action, but the overall strength of the chain is not affected by this. The habitual aspect at the beginning of the tale is evident: it is not simply the one-time eating of the eggs that spurs the crows into action, but that this happens "time after time". (As mentioned above, wherever such aspects are present, time is not fully linear, loops are involved. While (Fernando, 2022) does not consider cyclic fluents, the kind of action logic he proposes is clearly related to the one suggested here, treating actions as transitions between the states of a finite automaton, and clustered Moore automata can perhaps be considered an extension of his interpretation.)

More formally, the above sketch of the clearly causal steps relies on a sequence of time units t_2, \dots, t_{12} not necessarily adjacent to one another, but all on the R_1 time scale (so the first index of our double indexing scheme could be dropped here). Let us begin at t_2 where we have (serpent eating eggs) cause (crow grieving) abbreviates a specific substitution instance of a more general scheme $(x \text{ parentOf } y) \wedge (y \text{ die}) \text{ cause } (x \text{ grieve})$. This scheme, 'death of offspring causes parental grief' is clearly causal in the weak sense

we are considering: death of offspring will indeed be followed by parental grief.¹

Similarly, going from t_2 to t_3 relies on general schemes, e.g. that grief is a pain, that sentient beings attempt to avoid pain, that thinking beings make plans not to repeat situations where they get in pain, and that asking a friend for help is a reasonable course of action. It also relies on knowledge specific to the situation such that jackal friendOf crow. Later steps of the analysis follow pretty much along the same lines, assuming little more than conventional pieces of lexical knowledge, e.g. that friends try to help friends (steps 4 and 5), what it means to put plans in action (steps 6 and 7), how obtaining something from the dwelling of a dangerous animal requires killing it (step 11), etc. Typically these schemas are accessible as extralogical axioms or 'meaning postulates' (Zimmermann, 1999) attached directly to lexical items, and the task of the logic is to spell out the ones not stored in the lexicon and the pattern recognition mechanisms required for instantiating the schemes.

3.3 Grammar building

At the beginning of Section 2 we already emphasized that in the finite state realm nothing comes for free: operations easily taken for granted by grammar writers, such as rewrite rules, movement transformation, pattern matching, variable substitution, quantification, lexical lookup, or 'merge' all require nontrivial constructions. In the Appendix we describe how to build limited Turing machines from CMA, and at a theoretical level this takes care of all devices required for grammar writing. But as a practical matter, we aim at a grammar architecture where string manipulation is pretty much restricted to *linearization*, at the last stage of a derivation.

In contrast to the (transformational) generative grammar tradition, where lexical lookup is the last stage, here we follow the categorial grammar tradition and begin with the lexical entries, morphemes, words, or multi-word constructions that get activated by the phonological component. We assume that each of these is a graph composed of a few nodes, with edges to and from some further graphs, limited by the in-degree and out-degree restrictions **id** and **od**). We use CMA to model the activation behavior of such graphs, beginning with the synapse \mathcal{R} of Ex. 4.

¹This is the default expectation: there may be some overriding factors that block the inference, but this is quite typical of natural language inference.

Distinguishing the synchronizing *rest* state r from the *aroused* state a permits a primitive form of counting, whereby it takes not just one but two ‘1’ impulses for \mathcal{R} to move to the transmit stage t . By manipulating the size of the main loop and the presence/absence of self-loops we could make the automaton count up to larger threshold values, but two will be sufficient for our purposes of modeling *spreading activation* (Quillian, 1968; Collins and Loftus, 1975) in the network composed of lexical items and naive laws.

Our two-input synapses are idealizations, corresponding to information transmission across larger units built from many, possibly thousands or even millions of biological neurons. Consider the naive law ‘death of offspring causes parental grief’. This is not a culture- or language-specific regularity of the kind Montague Grammar encodes in knowledge postulates. It is universal among humans and, as a matter of fact, clearly already in effect among higher animals, apes and cetaceans in particular. We don’t need differential equations or other highly sophisticated techniques for using it in predicting behavior, again the naive theory contains all and only the information that matters. We need some static links x parentOf y and some background knowledge that person has emotionalState and grief isA emotinalState before we can cast the law in terms of an active link person has grief, but we emphasize that the mechanism is pre-linguistic: grief will be triggered by the person seeing their offspring die, finding this out by linguistic means (someone telling them) is not necessary.

Once the configuration x parentOf y , x know (die y) is active, the (naive, empirical) law says that x has grief will be active. There is clearly an associative link from death to grief, and if the former is activated, the latter will automatically move from r to a or, if it was already in a , from a to t . The other wave of activation comes from the subject y of death, who is already linked to the parent x , so we can reasonably assume that x will grieve, as the (prelinguistic) grief node that x has will now be doubly activated, via y and via death. Notice how this simple mechanism already avoids the age-old philosophical puzzles (suppose that y is the son of x but x does not know this, her son dies, how come she is not grieving?) that go back to the Electra paradox of Eubulides.

We will not discuss here how we can use CMA to perform the pattern recognition (phonology) re-

quired for finding the lexical items in the speech stream, suffice to say that fp8 finite automata perform increasingly on a par with humans (Radford et al., 2022). The morphology is already well covered by finite state transducers (Koskenniemi, 1983). This model that has been extended to high-precision constraint-based descriptive grammars, but we select here a perhaps more intuitive grammar formalism, *island parsing* (Carroll, 1983), as it is a better fit with highly lexicalized theories that operate with complex verbal entries such as FrameNet.

Suppose therefore that the phonology already identified the morphemes in *Eleanor broke the record*, and that the morphology analyzed *broke* as *break.PAST*. The syntax requires reference to abstract grammatical categories, such that *Eleanor* is an NP, *break* is a noun or a transitive verb, *the* is an article, and *record* is a noun, transitive verb, or adjective. It further requires storage of abstract patterns, e.g. that Art followed by N may be an NP. As long as we have nodes in the graph for abstract categories (and we must, the data compression they facilitate is irresistible) we need only simple automata such as an instance of \mathcal{E}_3 which, upon receiving a signal from the (phonologically activated) Art automaton moves from its initial resting state to its next state where, upon receiving an N signal it will move to its final state and emit an NP signal.

Note that word *record*, or more precisely, the lexical entry activated by this phonological string, actually emits three signals N, Vt, A in parallel, but only one of these fits the (Art N) NP pattern. As there are no (Art V) and (Art A) patterns in English, the readings associated with verbal and adjectival *record* simply do not surface: we built the NP island but not the VP or AP. For the noun, there is still ambiguity between *record*₁ ‘vinyl or bakelite disc containing music’; *record*₂ ‘database record’; and *record*₃ ‘sports record’.

The process repeats with the (Vt NP), a VP pattern activated by the newly formed NP and the verbal reading of *break* (as opposed to the nominal ‘intermission’, which again gets no reinforcement from any pattern and dies out). Finally, we complete the NP VP sentential pattern, and may be capable of bringing information about Eleanor to bear on the ambiguity. If she is an athlete, we expect the last reading; if she is a famous hacker, we expect the second; and if she is known to be clumsy with things, we expect the first. Not know-

ing anything about her we are forced to keep all three readings active and hope that larger discourse context will later disambiguate.

4 Conclusions

We have introduced a definitional variant of the classic Moore automaton (transducer), but without taking seriously the notion of timescales that comes with it, clustered automata would be just regular Moore automata. While we have no doubt about the psychological reality of grammar, we don't currently expect micro-electrode arrays to be capable of targeting conceptual representations/lexical entries directly. Therefore, the best research path forward is locating analogous structures in LLMs (Templeton et al., 2024; Dao and Gu, 2024).

Theorem 1 leaves open the cosmological problem of whether the temporality of our Universe follows Z, N, P, L, or C. By the construction of CMA, workers cannot guarantee a linear timescale either above or below themselves. Calling modern physics to our aid is of no help here, since Poincaré recurrence time for the universe is on the order of $e^{10^{120}}$ Planck units, which is so far beyond the R_5 scale on which our civilization is located as to render speculation on this matter meaningless.

References

- W.R. Ashby. 1956. *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. Chapman & Hall.
- Collin F. Baker, Charles J. Fillmore, and John B. Lowe. 1998. [The berkeley framenet project](#). In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and 17th International Conference on Computational Linguistics - Volume 1*, ACL '98, pages 86–90, Stroudsburg, PA, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- R. Bakis. 1976. Continuous speech word recognition via centisecond acoustic states. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 59(S1).
- John Lane Bell. 2008. *A primer of infinitesimal analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Christoph Brandt and Marcus Kracht. 2011. Syntax, semantics and pragmatics in communication. In *I-SEMANTICS 2011, 7th Int. Conf. on Semantic Systems*, pages 195–202.
- John A. Carroll. 1983. *An island parsing interpreter for the full augmented transition network formalism*. ACL Proceedings, First European Conference.
- Taehong Cho and Peter Ladefoged. 1999. Variation and universals in VOT: evidence from 18 languages. *Journal of Phonetics*, 27:207–229.
- A.M. Collins and E.F. Loftus. 1975. [A spreading-activation theory of semantic processing](#). *Psychological Review*, 82:407–428.
- Östen Dahl and Viveka Velupillai. 2013. [The perfect \(v2020.4\)](#). In Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath, editors, *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Zenodo.
- Tri Dao and Albert Gu. 2024. [Transformers are ssms: Generalized models and efficient algorithms through structured state space duality](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.21060.
- Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath, editors. 2013. *WALS Online*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig.
- Tim Fernando. 2015. The semantics of tense and aspect: A finite-state perspective. In Shalom Lappin and Chris Fox, editors, *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, pages 203–236. Wiley.
- Tim Fernando. 2022. Action signatures and finite-state variations. In *Proc. 2nd Annotation, Recognition and Evaluation of Actions AREA II*. ESSLLI.
- Charles Fillmore and Sue Atkins. 1998. Framenet and lexicographic relevance. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*, Granada, Spain.
- John A. Goldsmith. 1990. *Autosegmental and Metrical Phonology*. Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.
- F.C. Hennie. 1964. Fault detecting experiments for sequential circuits. In *Proc. 5th Annual Symp. Switching Circuit Theory and Logical Design*, pages 95–110. IEEE.
- John A Hertz, Anders S Krogh, and Richard G Palmer. 1991. *Introduction to the Theory of Neural Computation*, volume 1. Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, CA.
- Jerry R. Hobbs and Feng Pan. 2004. An ontology of time for the semantic web. *ACM Transactions on Asian Language Processing (TALIP)*, 3(1):66–85.
- Malka Rappaport Hovav and Beth Levin. 2008. [The English dative alternation: The case for verb sensitivity](#). *Journal of Linguistics*, 44(1):129–167.
- M. R. Ionescu. 2016. [Subliminal perception of complex visual stimuli](#). *Romanian Journal of Ophthalmology*, 60(4):226–230.
- Hans Kamp. 1979. Events, instants and temporal reference. In U. Egli and A. van Stechow, editors, *Semantics from a Multiple Point of View*, pages 376–471. de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Kimmo Koskeniemi. 1983. *Two-Level Morphology: A General Computational Model for Word-Form Recognition and Production*. PhD thesis, University of Helsinki.

- S. Lloyd. 2002. Computational capacity of the universe. *Physical Review Letters*, 88(23):237901.
- W.S. McCulloch. 1945. A heterarchy of values determined by the topology of nervous nets. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics*, 7:89–93.
- Edward Nelson. 1986. *Predicative arithmetic*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- M. Ross Quillian. 1968. [Word concepts: A theory and simulation of some basic semantic capabilities](#). *Behavioral Science*, 12:410–430.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Tao Xu, Greg Brockman, Christine McLeavey, and Ilya Sutskever. 2022. [Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2212.04356.
- H. Reichenbach. 1947. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. Macmillan, London.
- Josef Ruppenhofer, Michael Ellsworth, Miriam R.L. Petruck, Christopher R. Johnson, and Jan Scheffczyk. 2006. *FrameNet II: Extended Theory and Practice*. International Computer Science Institute, Berkeley, California. Distributed with the FrameNet data.
- Roger C. Schank and Robert P. Abelson. 1995. Knowledge and memory: The real story. In Jr. Robert S. Wyer, editor, *Knowledge and Memory: The Real Story*, pages 1–86. Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Murray Shanahan. 1997. *Solving the frame problem*. MIT Press.
- Gerard 't Hooft and Stefan Vandoren. 2014. *Time in powers of ten: Natural Phenomena and Their Timescales*. World Scientific.
- L. Talmy. 1988. [Force dynamics in language and cognition](#). *Cognitive science*, 12(1):49–100.
- Adly Templeton, Tom Conerly, Jonathan Marcus, Jack Lindsey, Trenton Bricken, Brian Chen, Adam Pearce, Craig Citro, Emmanuel Ameisen, Andy Jones, Hoagy Cunningham, Nicholas L Turner, Callum McDougall, Monte MacDiarmid, Alex Tamkin, Esin Durmus, Tristan Hume, Francesco Mosconi, C. Daniel Freeman, Theodore R. Sumers, Edward Rees, Joshua Batson, Adam Jermy, Shan Carter, Chris Olah, and Tom Henighan. 2024. [Scaling monosemanticity: Extracting interpretable features from Claude 3 Sonnet](#).
- Michael Thielscher. 2000. *Challenges for Action Theories*, volume 1775 of *LNAI*. Springer.
- Alan Turing. 1937. On computable numbers, with an application to the entscheidungsproblem. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 42:230–265,544–546.
- Michiel van Lambalgen and Fritz Hamm. 2005. *The proper treatment of events*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Zeno Vendler. 1967. *Linguistics and Philosophy*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
- Mikhail V. Volkov. 2008. Synchronizing automata and the Černý conjecture. In *Proc LATA 2008*, volume LNCS 5196, pages 11–27.
- Thomas E. Zimmermann. 1999. Meaning postulates and the model-theoretic approach to natural language semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 22:529–561.

Appendix

4.1 \mathcal{B} Because we limited the tape alphabet to 0/1, storing a single byte already requires 8 cells on the tape. The resting state of \mathcal{B} is one where the read/right head is on the 0th of these cells (the low bit), and the contents of these bit-size cells are what they are. To store any byte on timescale R_i we need to assure that elementary time steps ($i.1$) leave these cells (conventionally organized in an 8-dim hypercube) undisturbed for a myriad steps, as long as there are no read/write signals present *and* to assure that the read-write pointer is synchronizing (decaying to the low bit). For both tasks we use CMA operating on scale R_{i-1} : the head position is stored on a chain \mathcal{E}_8 where there are only transitions going down, while the byte is stored in the hypercube where each node has only self-loops. As long as there are no other signals, the head pointer will decay to 0 in $(i-1.8)$ whereas the stored byte persists. The symbols μ and ν move the head in the expected manner, and the symbols α and ω move state at the coordinate pointed at by the head. The entire transition table would take over 10k cells ($256 \cdot 8 \cdot 5$) to spell out, but the point is clear: we can build richer memory cells as needed.

4.2 Building \mathcal{T}_1 from \mathcal{B} Now that we have our hand on a memory cell capable of storing 256 different values, we can repeat what we did with \mathcal{B} but this will be a bit slower: we need to make this pointer decay in $(i + 1, k)$ steps for some small k . The fastest way to do this is coordinatewise, so $k = 8$, but this takes some care in designing the transition table and, more important, is not repeatable for the next higher level up, where we would need to make 2^{256} coordinates decay. For practical purposes this does not matter: after all, we know how to build large memory from elementary components that can be updated on a nanosecond scale, and can be made to persist on a generation scale at I/O speeds. But we have no means for persisting anything beyond that: less than 2^7 generations have passed and we still live in the same aeon as the Presocratics, yet we can know their thoughts only in a fragmentary form.