

# Comparing expressive power in two-dimensional semantics

Thomas Ede Zimmermann (Goethe University Frankfurt)  
Bonn Workshop *Context-Sensitivity and Logical Consequence*, June 2019

## 0. The bigger picture

*Variables explained away*

Quine (1960)

(0a)  $(\exists x) [P(x) \wedge Q(x)]$  vs.  $P \cap Q \neq \emptyset$

(b)  $(\exists w) [w_0 R w \wedge p(w)]$  vs.  $\diamond p$

*Explaining index variables away*

Köpping & Zimmermann (forthcoming)

Whether two-dimensional logic is expressively equivalent to intensional logic is open to interpretation (and ideology).

*Propositionalism*

Quine (1953); D. Kaplan (1975); Larson (2002)

Intensionality is (reducible to) clausal embedding.

*Law of the instrument*

A. Kaplan (1964: 28)

Give a small boy a hammer, and he will find that everything he encounters needs pounding.

## 1. Comparative Expressivity of Formal Languages

*Schematic definitions*

• A language  $L^*$  is *at least as expressive as* a language  $L$  iff for any (relevant) expressions  $\alpha$  in  $L$  there is a (relevant) expression  $\alpha^*$  in  $L^*$  such that  $\alpha^* \sim \alpha$ .

where ‘ $\sim$ ’ denotes model-theoretic equivalence, i.e.:

•  $\alpha^* \sim \alpha$  iff  $\llbracket \alpha^* \rrbracket^{\vec{d}^*} = \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{\vec{d}}$

... for all  $L$ -determinants  $\vec{d}$  and matching  $L^*$ -determinants  $\vec{d}^*$ .

*Examples*

#	$L$	$L^*$	relevant expressions	determinants	reversible?
1	1 <sup>st</sup> order logic	pred. functor logic	(closed) sentences	structures	+
2	2 <sup>nd</sup> order logic	PFL2	(closed) sentences	structures	+
3	modal prop. logic	1 <sup>st</sup> order logic	formulae	pointed structures	-
4	modal prop. logic	mon. 2 <sup>nd</sup> order logic	formulae	frames	-
5	int. type logic	2-sorted type theory	typed terms	pointed models	-
6	2-sorted type theory	int. type logic	(closed) sentences	structures + $g(i_0)$	+
7	2-sorted type theory	int. type logic	intensional terms	structures + $g(i_0)$	+

$\alpha \in L$	$\alpha^* \in L^*$	cf.
(1) $(\exists x) [P(x) \wedge Q(x)]$	<b>ERK</b> $PQ$	Quine (1960)
(2) $(\exists P) (\forall x) [P(x) \wedge \neg P(x)]$	<b>E</b> <sub>1</sub> <b>N</b> <b>E</b> <sub>0</sub> <b>N</b> <b>R</b> <sub>0</sub> <b>R</b> <sub>1</sub> <b>K</b> <b>P</b> <b>R</b> <b>E</b> <b>D</b> <b>N</b> <b>P</b> <b>R</b> <b>E</b> <b>D</b>	Dosen (1988)
(3) $\diamond [p \wedge q]$	$(\exists w) [w_0 R w \wedge [p(w) \wedge q(w)]]$	Fine (1975)
(4) $[p \rightarrow \diamond p]$	$(\forall w) w R w$	van Benthem (1984)
(5) $[\lambda P^{s(et)}. (\exists x^e) [\mathbf{B}(x) \wedge P\{x\}]]$	$[\lambda P. (\exists x) [\mathbf{B}(i_0)(x) \wedge P(i_0)(x)]]$	Gallin (1975)
(6) $(\forall f^{s,s}) (\exists j^s) \mathbf{B}(f(j)(x))$	$(\forall R) [\Phi(R) \rightarrow (\exists p^{s,t}) \Sigma(p) \wedge \diamond [p \wedge \mathbf{B}(x)]]$	
... where $\Sigma$ abbreviates: $[\lambda p^{s,t}. \diamond [ \lambda Q^{(s,t),t}. [p = \wedge [[\lambda q. \forall q] = Q]]](\lambda q. \forall q)$		Gallin (1975)
... and $\Phi$ abbreviates: $[\lambda R. (\forall p) [\Sigma(p) \rightarrow \Sigma(R(p))]]$		
(7) $[\lambda p^{et}. [\lambda x^e. (\forall j^s) [i_0 \mathbf{Epi}_{x,j} \rightarrow p(j)]]]$	$[\lambda p^{st}. [\lambda x^e. [\lambda q^{st}. \square [\forall q \rightarrow \forall p]]] (\mathbf{Epi}(x))]]$	Zimmermann (1989)

### 3. Two-dimensional Languages

Kamp (1971), Montague (1970), Kaplan (1979), Lewis (1980)

#### Determinants of denotation

$\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{M,c,i,\dots}$ , where

- $M$  is an interpretation (of non-logical constants)
- $c$  is a context
- $i$  is an index
- ‘...’ could be empty or contain more determinants (e.g. a variable assignment) and will be suppressed

#### Additional structural assumptions

- **Diagonal:**

Each context  $c$  determines its index  $i_c$  due to parameterization:

$c = (c_1, \dots, c_n, \dots, c_k)$ , and:  $i^c = (i_1^c, \dots, i_n^c)$ .

- **No monsters:**

Kaplan (1989)

if  $\wedge \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{M,c} = \wedge \llbracket \alpha' \rrbracket^{M,c}$  and  $\wedge \llbracket \beta \rrbracket^{M,c,i} = \wedge \llbracket \beta' \rrbracket^{M,c,i}$ , then:  $\llbracket \alpha\beta \rrbracket^{M,c,i} = \llbracket \alpha'\beta' \rrbracket^{M,c,i}$ ,

where  $\wedge \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket^{M,c}$  is the *intension* of  $\gamma$ :  $\wedge \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket^{M,c}(i) = \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket^{M,c,i}$ , for any index  $i$ .

- ... or, equivalently:

All syntactic constructions are (at most) intensional, i.e.: for every context  $c \in C$ , there is a corresponding operation  $\Gamma_c$  on (possible) intensions such that for any expression  $\alpha$  built up by  $\Sigma$  from expressions  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ , the following equation holds:  $\wedge \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{M,c} = \Gamma_c(\wedge \llbracket \beta \rrbracket^{M,c}, \wedge \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket^{M,c})$ .

#### Relevant determinants

- *characters* assigning denotations  $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{M,c,i}$  relative to models  $M$  and (arbitrary) points of reference  $(c,i)$ .

Motivation: linguistic meaning, cognitive significance

Montague (1970), Kaplan (1989)

- *epistemic contents* assigning denotations  $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{M,c} = \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{M,c,i^c}$  relative to models  $M$  and contexts  $c$ .

Motivation: logical validity; cognitive significance

Montague (1970); Lewis (1979)

- *intensions* assigning denotations  $\wedge \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{M,c}$  relative to models  $M$  and contexts  $c$ .

Motivation: indirect denotation, expressed content

Montague (1970); Kaplan (1989)

#### Notions of Truth

$\varphi$  is *true at* (or *in*) a context  $c$  [relative to a model  $M$ ] iff  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{M,c} = 1$ .

$\varphi$  is *true of* an index  $i$  [relative to a context  $c$  in a model  $M$ ] iff  $\wedge \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{M,c}(i) = 1$ .

[Hence being true in a context is being true of its index]

$\varphi$  is *true of* an index-component  $i_m$  as the  $m$ -component [relative to ...] iff

$\wedge \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket^{M,c}(c_1, \dots, i_m, \dots, c_n) = 1$ .

### 4. Properties as Objects of Intentional Attitudes

#### Propositionalism

cf. Forbes (2001), Montague (2007)

Any intentional attitude is [definable in terms of] a propositional attitude.

#### Examples

To seek a unicorn is to try for it to be the case that one finds a unicorn.

Quine (1953)

To want chocolate is to desire for it to be the case that one has chocolate.

Larson (2002)

### Counterexamples

To think of a unicorn is not to think that there is a unicorn. Montague (1969)  
To like chocolate is not to like for oneself to have chocolate. Montague (2007)

### Anti-propositionalism

Some intentional attitudes are irreducibly attitudes towards properties. cf. Grzankowski (2013)

### Perspectivism

Some intentional attitudes are irreducibly attitudes towards properties. Lewis (1979)

### Question

What distinguishes anti-propositionalism and perspectivism?

Some tentative answers:

The difference between ...

... having a property and being exposed to a property

... properties as attributes vs. properties as objects

... truth *at* a location and truth *of* an object

### References

van Benthem, Johan: 'Correspondence Theory'. In: D. M. Gabbay & F. Guentner (eds.), *Handbook of Philosophical Logic, Vol. II*. Dordrecht 1984: 167–248.

Fine, Kit: 'Some Connections Between Elementary and Modal Logic'. *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics* **82** (1975), 15–31.

Dosen, Kosta: 'Second-order logic without variables'. In: W. Buszkowski *et al.* (eds.), *Categorial Grammar*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia 1988: 245–264.

Gallin, Daniel: *Intensional and Higher-order Modal Logic*. Amsterdam 1975.

Grzankowski, Alex: 'Non-Propositional Attitudes'. *Philosophy Compass* **8** (2013), 1123–1137.

Kamp, Hans: 'Formal Properties of "Now"'. *Theoria* **37** (1971), 227–273.

Kaplan, Abraham: *The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology of Behavioral Science*. San Francisco 1964.

Kaplan, David: 'How to Russell a Frege-Church'. *Journal of Philosophy* **72** (1975), 716–729.

Kaplan, David: 'On the Logic of Demonstratives'. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* **8** (1979), 81–98.

Kaplan, David: 'Demonstratives'. In: J. Almog *et al.* (eds.), *Themes from Kaplan*. Oxford 1989: 481–563.

Köpping, Jan; Zimmermann, Thomas Ede: 'Looking Backwards in Type Logic'. *Inquiry*. Forthcoming. [Early access version available online]

Larson, Richard: 'The Grammar of Intensionality'. In: G. Preyer & G. Peter (eds.), *Logical Form and Language* Oxford 2002. 228–262.

Lewis, David K.: 'Attitudes *de dicto* and *de se*'. *Philosophical Review* **88** (1979), 513–543.

Lewis, David K.: 'Index, Context, and Content'. In: S. Kanger & S. Öhman (eds.), *Philosophy and Grammar*. Dordrecht 1980: 79–100.

Montague, Michelle: 'Against Propositionalism'. *Noûs* **41** (2007), 503–518.

Montague, Richard: 'On the Nature of Certain Philosophical Entities'. *Monist* **53** (1969), 159–195.

Montague, Richard: 'Universal Grammar'. *Theoria* **36** (1970), 373–398.

Quine, Willard Van Orman: 'Reference and Modality'. In: W. V. O. Quine (ed.), *From a Logical Point of View*. New York 1953: 139–159.

Quine, Willard Van Orman: 'Variables explained away'. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* **104** (1960), 343–347.

Zimmermann, Thomas Ede: 'On the Proper Treatment of Opacity in Certain Verbs'. *Natural Language Semantics* **1** (1993), 149–179.