

Proof Theoretic Semantics for Questions

November 9, 2016

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

$$\frac{\Gamma, B, A_i \vdash \perp}{\Gamma, B, ?\{A_1, \dots, A_n\} \vdash ?\{A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}\}} \quad \text{where } n > 2 \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq n$$

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.

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

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

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

Quantified Material Consequence (QMC):

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

Modally Robust Consequence (MRC):

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

Sturdy Consequence (SC): [Sets]

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