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Bird’s eye view

• Commonalities
• Differences

Street view

• Inquisitive semantics as a semantic framework
• Repercussions for logic
• Repercussions for pragmatics

Final remarks

• From framework to theories
Commonalities

Formal machinery

- The formal machinery developed by both frameworks makes essential use of alternatives.

Empirical focus

- Theories that are based on alternative or inquisitive semantics often focus on a similar range of linguistic constructions, namely those that are taken to ‘introduce alternatives’: interrogatives, disjunction, indefinites, indeterminate pronouns.
Purposes

• The main purpose of alternative semantics is to facilitate a compositional semantics of constructions involving indefinites/disjunctive/indeterminate pronouns.

• The main purpose of inquisitive semantics is to develop a new notion of semantic meaning, which does not only embody informative content, but also inquisitive (and attentive) content.
Second difference

Improvement vs enrichment

- Alternative semantics makes previous theories better at doing what they were always intended to do: deriving the truth-conditions / context change potential of a sentence in a compositional way.

- Inquisitive semantics enriches previous frameworks: it allows formal semantic theories to capture aspects of meaning that previous theories were never even intended to capture.
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• Alternative semantics makes previous theories better at doing what they were always intended to do: deriving the truth-conditions / context change potential of a sentence in a compositional way

• Inquisitive semantics enriches previous frameworks: it allows formal semantic theories to capture aspects of meaning that previous theories were never even intended to capture

Compare:

• From extensional to intensional semantics

• From static to dynamic semantics
Third difference

Repercussions

- Inquisitive semantics enriches the notion of semantic meaning
- This gives rise to a richer pragmatics as well
  - Maxims concerned with informative content, but also with inquisitive and attentive content
- It also leads to a richer logic
  - Informative, inquisitive, and hybrid notions of entailment
  - Logical notions of relatedness, e.g. compliance
- Alternative semantics leaves the notion of meaning in tact. As such, it has no direct repercussions for pragmatics or logic.
Summary

Commonalities

• alternative-based formal machinery
• similar empirical focus

Differences

• completely different purposes
• improve vs enrich
• repercussions for logic and pragmatics
Street view

Semantics

- Propositions as proposals
- Projection operators
- Algebraic operators

Logic

- Informative, inquisitive, and hybrid entailment
- Compliance

Pragmatics

- Sincerity
- Transparency
- Relation
The Traditional Picture

- Meaning = informative content
- Providing information = eliminating possible worlds
The Traditional Picture

- Meaning = informative content
- Providing information = eliminating possible worlds
The Traditional Picture

- Meaning = informative content
- Providing information = eliminating possible worlds
The Traditional Picture

- Meaning = informative content
- Providing information = eliminating possible worlds
The Traditional Picture

• Meaning = informative content
• Providing information = eliminating possible worlds

• Captures only one type of language use: providing information
• Does not reflect the cooperative nature of communication
The Inquisitive Picture

- Propositions as proposals
- A proposal consists of one or more possibilities
- An inquisitive proposal offers several alternative possibilities
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The Inquisitive Picture

- Propositions as proposals
- A proposal consists of one or more possibilities
- An inquisitive proposal offers several alternative possibilities
Worlds, possibilities, and propositions

- Start with a universe of possible worlds
- Possibility: set of possible worlds
- Proposition: set of possibilities

Illustration
Information, issues, and attention

A proposition $\pi$:

- **draws attention** to all the possibilities in $\pi$
- **provides** the **information** that at least one of these possibilities contains the actual world
- **requests** enough **information** to establish for at least one of these possibilities that it indeed contains the actual world
A proposition \( \pi \):

- **draws attention** to all the possibilities in \( \pi \)
- **provides** the **information** that at least one of these possibilities contains the actual world
- **requests** enough **information** to establish for at least one of these possibilities that it indeed contains the actual world

\[ \Rightarrow \] a single semantic object captures attentive, informative, and inquisitive content all at once
Three possibilities:

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha &= \{w_1, w_2\} \\
\beta &= \{w_1, w_3\} \\
\gamma &= \{w_1\}
\end{align*}
\]

- Providing the information that at least one of \(\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}\) contains the actual world is the same as providing the information that at least one of \(\{\alpha, \beta\}\) contains the actual world.
- Requesting enough information to establish at least one of \(\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}\) is the same as requesting enough information to establish at least one of \(\{\alpha, \beta\}\).
- So: as long as we are only interested in capturing informative and inquisitive content, \(\gamma\) is irrelevant.
Alternative and residual possibilities

Three possibilities:

\[ \alpha = \{w_1, w_2\} \]
\[ \beta = \{w_1, w_3\} \]
\[ \gamma = \{w_1\} \]

- In generally, for any proposition \( \pi \), we distinguish:

  - **Residual possibilities**
    - properly contained in a maximal possibility in \( \pi \)
    - only play a role in capturing **attentive content**

  - **Alternative possibilities**
    - not properly contained in a maximal possibility in \( \pi \)
    - completely determine **informative and inquisitive content**
A proposition $\pi$ provides the information that the actual world is contained in \textbf{at least one} of the possibilities in $\pi$.

So, the informative content of $\pi$, $\text{info}(\pi)$, is determined by the \textbf{union} of all the possibilities in $\pi$:

$$\text{info}(\pi) = \bigcup \pi$$
A proposition \( \pi \) provides the information that the actual world is contained in at least one of the possibilities in \( \pi \).

So, the informative content of \( \pi \), \( \text{info}(\pi) \), is determined by the union of all the possibilities in \( \pi \):

\[
\text{info}(\pi) = \bigcup \pi
\]
Informative, inquisitive, and attentive propositions

- $\pi$ is **informative** iff it proposes to eliminate at least one world
- $\pi$ is **inquisitive** iff it offers at least two alternative possibilities
- $\pi$ is **attentive** iff it contains at least one residual possibility

purely informative

purely inquisitive

purely attentive
Interlude: relevance for natural language semantics

(1) John is in London.  
(2) Is John in London?  
(3) John might be in London.  
(4) John is in London or he is not in London.  
(5) Mary is in Paris or she is not in Paris.

informative  
inquisitive  
attentive  
attentive
Back to propositions in abstracto: projections
Projections onto the axes

- $[?]\pi$ purely informative projection
- $[!]\pi$ purely inquisitive projection
- $[\Diamond]\pi$ purely attentive projection
Projections onto the planes

Issues

\[ ? \Diamond \pi \]
\[ ?! \pi \]
\[ ! \Diamond \pi \]

Attention

Information

\[ ? \Diamond \pi \text{ non-informative projection} \]
\[ ! \Diamond \pi \text{ non-inquisitive projection} \]
\[ ?! \pi \text{ non-attentive projection} \]
Example: purely informative projection

Requirements

- $![\pi]$ should preserve the informative content of $\pi$
- $![\pi]$ should be non-inquisitive
- $![\pi]$ should be non-attentive

Implementation

- $![\pi] = \{\bigcup \pi\}$
Example: purely informative projection

Requirements

• $[!]\pi$ should preserve the informative content of $\pi$
• $[!]\pi$ should be non-inquisitive
• $[!]\pi$ should be non-attentive

Implementation

• $[!]\pi = \{ \bigcup \pi \}$

≈ ‘existential closure’ in alternative semantics
Another example: non-inquisitive projection

Requirements

- $[!\Diamond]\pi$ should preserve the informative content of $\pi$
- $[!\Diamond]\pi$ should be non-inquisitive
- $[!\Diamond]\pi$ should preserve the attentive content of $\pi$

Implementation

- $[!\Diamond]\pi = \pi \cup \{\bigcup \pi\}$
Interlude: relevance for natural language semantics

- It makes sense to think of $[!]\Diamond$ as the semantic contribution of \textit{declarative complementizers}

- Earlier examples:

(4) John is in London or he is not in London.
(5) Mary is in Paris or she is not in Paris.
Ordering propositions, join and meet

Classically

- Propositions are ordered in terms of informative content
- $\pi \geq \pi'$ iff $\pi$ provides at least as much information as $\pi'$
- Formally: $\pi \geq \pi' \iff \pi \subseteq \pi'$

Join and meet

- Relative to $\geq$, every two classical propositions have
  - a greatest lower bound (aka their meet)
  - a least upper bound (aka their join)
- The meet of two propositions amounts to their union
- The join of two propositions amounts to their intersection
- Disjunction and conjunction are usually seen as the syntactic counterparts of these semantic operations
Ordering propositions in inquisitive semantics

- In inquisitive semantics, propositions can be ordered in terms of their informative content, but also in terms of their inquisitive or attentive content, or a combination thereof.
- We focus here on the case where propositions are only intended to capture informative and inquisitive content.
- In this setting, propositions are sets of alternative possibilities.
- The order between them has an informative and an inquisitive component.
Ordering propositions

• $\pi \geq_{\text{info}} \pi'$ iff $\pi$ provides at least as much information as $\pi'$:
  \[ \text{info}(\pi) \subseteq \text{info}(\pi') \]

• $\pi \geq_{\text{inq}} \pi'$ iff $\pi$ requests at least as much information as $\pi'$:
  \[ \forall \alpha \in \pi. \exists \beta \in \pi'. \alpha \cap \text{info}(\pi') \subseteq \beta \]

• $\pi \geq \pi'$ if and only if $\pi \geq_{\text{info}} \pi'$ and $\pi \geq_{\text{inq}} \pi'$
Join and meet

- As before, relative to $\geq$, every two propositions have
  - a greatest lower bound (aka their meet)
  - a least upper bound (aka their join)

- To determine the meet of two propositions, we first take their union, and then filter out residual possibilities:

$$\text{MEET}(\pi, \pi') = \text{ALT}(\pi \cup \pi')$$

- To determine the join of two propositions, we first take their pointwise intersection (denoted by $\sqcap$), and then filter out residual possibilities:

$$\text{JOIN}(\pi, \pi') = \text{ALT}(\pi \cap \pi')$$

- Disjunction and conjunction can still be seen as the syntactic counterparts of these semantic operations
\langle \Sigma, \geq \rangle \text{ is not a Boolean algebra}

• The existence of meets and joins implies that the set of all propositions \( \Sigma \), together with the order \( \geq \), forms a lattice

• Moreover, \( \Sigma \) has:
  • a smallest element, \( \top = \{ W \} \)
  • a greatest element, \( \bot = \{ \emptyset \} \)

• This means that \( \langle \Sigma, \geq \rangle \) forms a bounded lattice

• However, notably, \( \langle \Sigma, \geq \rangle \) does not form a Boolean algebra

• That is, not every \( \pi \in \Sigma \) has a complement \( \pi' \) such that:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MEET}(\pi, \pi') &= \top \\
\text{JOIN}(\pi, \pi') &= \bot
\end{align*}
\]
\[ \langle \Sigma, \geq \rangle \text{ is a Heyting algebra} \]

- We do have that for every two propositions \( \pi, \pi' \) there is a unique minimal element \( \delta \) of \( \Sigma \) such that \( \text{Join}(\pi, \delta) = \pi' \)
- This element \( \delta \) is called the \text{relative pseudo-complement} of \( \pi \) with respect to \( \pi' \), and is denoted as:

\[ \pi \Rightarrow \pi' \]

- The existence of relative pseudo-complements implies that \( \langle \Sigma, \geq \rangle \) forms a Heyting algebra
- The (non-relative) \text{pseudo-complement} of \( \pi \) is defined as:

\[ \sim \pi := \pi \Rightarrow \bot \]

- Implication and negation could be seen as the syntactic counterparts of \( \Rightarrow \) and \( \sim \), respectively
Intermediate conclusions

- The main purpose of inquisitive semantics is to offer a new notion of semantic meaning: propositions as proposals.
- This new type of propositions can be studied from a purely semantic perspective—without reference to any formal or natural language.
- This gives rise to projection operators like $[?]$ and $[!]$, and algebraic operators like $\text{join}$, $\text{meet}$, $\Rightarrow$, and $\sim$.
- Complementizers and connectives in formal and natural languages could be seen as syntactic counterparts of these semantic operators.
Logic

Traditionally

- logic is concerned with **entailment** and **(in)consistency**
- given these concerns, it makes sense to identify semantic meaning with informative content

Vice versa

- if semantic meaning is identified with informative content, and propositions are construed as sets of possible worlds
- then there are only three possible relations between two propositions: **inclusion**, **overlap**, and **disjointness**
- these correspond to entailment and **(in)consistency**
- other relations between propositions cannot be captured
Enailment and (in)consistency

If propositions are construed as sets of possible worlds then two propositions can only be related in one of the following three ways:

- **inclusion**
- **overlap**
- **disjointness**

**entailment**

**consistency**

**inconsistency**
Inquisitive logic

A new perspective

- Enriching the notion of semantic meaning leads to a new perspective on logic as well

New logical notions

- Besides classical entailment, we get a notion of inquisitive entailment: \( \varphi \) inquisitively entails \( \psi \) iff whenever \( \varphi \) is resolved, \( \psi \) is resolved as well;
- We also get logical notions of relatedness. In particular, \( \varphi \) is a compliant response to \( \psi \) iff it addresses the issue raised by \( \psi \) without providing any redundant information.
Inquisitive logic

A new perspective

- Enriching the notion of semantic meaning leads to a new perspective on logic as well

New logical notions

- Besides classical entailment, we get a notion of inquisitive entailment: \( \varphi \) inquisitively entails \( \psi \) iff whenever \( \varphi \) is resolved, \( \psi \) is resolved as well;
- We also get logical notions of relatedness. In particular, \( \varphi \) is a compliant response to \( \psi \) iff it addresses the issue raised by \( \psi \) without providing any redundant information.

Note: classical notions are preserved; the logical agenda is extended, not revised (compare, e.g., with intuitionistic logic)
Pragmatics specifies how cooperative speakers should use the sentences of a language, given a particular context and the semantic meaning of those sentences.

Classical (Gricean) pragmatics

- identifies semantic meaning with informative content
- is speaker-oriented

- Quality: say only what you believe to be true
- Quantity: be as informative as possible
- Relation: say only things that are relevant for the purposes of the conversation
Inquisitive pragmatics

A new perspective

- Enriching the notion of semantic meaning leads to a new perspective on pragmatics as well

Inquisitive pragmatics

- based on informative, but also inquisitive/attentive content
- speaker-oriented, but also hearer-oriented

- **Sincerity**: say only what you know, ask only what you want to know
- **Transparency**: publicly announce unacceptability of a proposal
- **Quantity**: say more, ask less
- **Relation**: be optimally *compliant*
Final remarks

• Natural language semantics seeks to assign appropriate meanings to linguistic expressions in a systematic way.

• Much work in inquisitive semantics so far has focussed on developing a richer space of meanings, and investigating the internal properties of these meanings, independently of the expressions in natural language that they may be assigned to.

• This work establishes a framework for natural language semantics, but not really a theory of natural language.


Wh-questions

- To underline this point, consider the case of wh-questions

- Inquisitive semantics, qua framework, does not make any claims about the proper semantic analysis of wh-questions

- It offers a general framework to capture inquisitive content

- Hamblin’s, Karttunen’s, and Groenendijk & Stokhof’s theories can all be expressed and compared in this framework

- The framework as such does not favor any of these theories

- Indeed, combinations are also possible
From framework to theory

- There is already some work connecting the new type of meanings with specific constructions in natural language.
- However, much remains to be done on this front.
- And this is exactly where the techniques developed in alternative semantics are bound to be extremely useful!
Conclusion

- Inquisitive and alternative semantics are not notational variants or competing theories.
- They are complementary efforts, using the same basic formal machinery, for very different purposes.
- Alternative semantics offers an attractive compositional account of various constructions involving disjunction, indefinites, and indeterminate pronouns.
- Inquisitive semantics offers a new notion of semantic meaning, that is intended to capture not only informative content, but also inquisitive and attentive content.
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