

# Proof Theoretic Semantics for Questions

November 14, 2016

## 1 Interrogatives in NM-MS

We start with a language of atomic sentences,  $\mathcal{L}_0 = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  and define a consequence relation over it such that  $\vdash_0 \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}_0) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}_0)$ . The structure  $\langle \vdash_0, \mathcal{L}_0 \rangle$  has the following properties:

1.  $\emptyset \not\vdash_0 \emptyset$
2.  $\mathcal{L}_0 \vdash_0 \emptyset$
3.  $\forall \Delta, \Lambda, p (\Delta, p \vdash_0 p, \Lambda)$  (**Containment**)

## 2 Interrogatives in NM-SS

In addition to  $\mathcal{L}_e$ , we construct another language, called  $\mathcal{L}_Q$  which has two categories of well-formed expressions: *d-wffs* and *e-wffs*, that is, claims and questions. (For simplicity, we drop the 'e' notation from our turnstile.) The syntax of  $\mathcal{L}_Q$  is just that of  $\mathcal{L}_e$  plus the following:  $?$ ,  $\{$ ,  $\}$ , and the comma. D-wffs are just sentences of  $\mathcal{L}_e$ . E-wffs, on the other hand, are expressions of the following form:  $?\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  where  $n > 1$  and  $A_1 \dots A_n$  are pairwise syntactically distinct d-wffs of  $\mathcal{L}_e$ . If  $?\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  is a question, then each of the d-wffs  $A_1 \dots A_n$  is a possible direct answer to the question, and these are the only possible direct answers. Not that any question in  $\mathcal{L}_Q$  has at least two possible direct answers and that the set of those answers is always finite. We must stress that e-wffs are NOT sets of d-wffs, but rather singular expressions of a strictly defined form. We can paraphrase e-wffs as asking *Which of the following claims am I entitled to:  $A_1, \dots, A_n$ ?*

Here are possible rules for e-wffs:

**Right rule for  $?\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$**

$$\frac{\Gamma, A_1 \vdash B \dots \Gamma, A_n \vdash B}{\Gamma, B \vdash ?\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}} \quad \text{where } \Gamma, B \not\vdash A_1 \dots \Gamma, B \not\vdash A_n$$

**Possible left rule for  $?\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A_i}{\Gamma, ?\{A_1, \dots, A_n\} \vdash \perp} \quad \text{where } 1 \leq i \leq n$$

**(Negative) Partial Answer**

$$\frac{\Gamma, B \vdash \perp}{\Gamma, ?\{A_1, \dots, A_n, B\} \vdash ?\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}}$$

We can give the semantics for a non-factive why-question, *Why B?*, as follows:

$$?\{A_1 \twoheadrightarrow B, \dots, A_n \twoheadrightarrow B\}$$

Once  $\mathcal{L}_e$  is extended to include traditional logical operators, we can give the semantics for *factive* why questions, e.g. *Why B?*, as follows:

$$?\{(A_1 \twoheadrightarrow B) \wedge B, \dots, (A_n \twoheadrightarrow B) \wedge B\}$$

Notice that once one has an answer to this question, one is entitled to the explanans.

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash_e^\uparrow B}{\Gamma \vdash_e A \twoheadrightarrow B} \quad \text{EER}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_e A \twoheadrightarrow B}{\Gamma, A \vdash_e^\uparrow B} \quad \text{EES}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash_e^\uparrow B \quad \Gamma \vdash_e B}{\Gamma, B, A \twoheadrightarrow B \vdash_e A} \quad \text{EEL}$$

**Quantified Material Consequence (QMC):**

$$\Gamma, A \vdash_e^{\uparrow W} B \iff_{df} \begin{cases} 1. W \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \\ 2. \forall \Delta \in W(\Gamma, A, \Delta \vdash B) \end{cases} \quad \text{and}$$

**Modally Robust Consequence (MRC):**

$$\Gamma, A \models^W B \iff_{df} \begin{cases} 1. \Gamma, A \models^W B & \text{and} \\ 2. \forall W' (\Gamma, A \models^{W'} B \implies W' \subseteq W) & \text{and} \\ 3. \forall \Delta (\Gamma, A, \Delta \models^\uparrow \perp \implies \Delta \notin W) \end{cases}$$

**Sturdy Consequence (SC): [Sets]**

$$\Gamma, \Sigma \models^\uparrow B \implies \begin{cases} 1. \Gamma, \Sigma \models^\uparrow B & \text{where } B \notin \Sigma, \text{ and} \\ 2. \forall \Theta (\Gamma, \Theta \models^\uparrow B \implies W \not\subseteq W') & \text{where } B \notin \Theta \end{cases}$$