

# Factual content in an algorithmic theory of meaning

Eleni Kalyvianaki

Graduate Program for Logic, Algorithms and Computation (ΜΙΙΛΑ)  
Department of Mathematics, University of Athens  
ekalyv@math.uoa.gr

BIRS, February 2007

# Theory of Referential Intensions

## Meaning as the algorithm that computes the denotation

---

Sentence  $A$   $\mapsto$  (Global) Meaning  $\text{int}(A)$   $\mapsto$  Denotation  $\text{den}(A)$

---

Utterance at  $a$   $\mapsto$  Local Meaning at  $a$   $\text{int}(A(\bar{a}))$   $\mapsto$  Denotation at  $a$   $\text{den}(A(\bar{a}))$

---

## ***Factual Content at $a$***

Information that a Sentence Conveys about the World

# Syntax of $L_{ar}^{\lambda}(K)$

- Types:  $\tau ::= e \mid t \mid s \mid (\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2)$
- $K$  : finite set of constants with types  
 $\tilde{\sigma} ::= (s \rightarrow e) \mid (s \rightarrow t) \mid \tilde{\sigma}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}_2$

## EXAMPLES

John :  $\tilde{e}$ , he :  $\tilde{e}$ , love :  $\tilde{e} \times \tilde{e} \rightarrow \tilde{t}$ , Necessarily :  $\tilde{t} \rightarrow \tilde{t}$

- Terms:  $A ::= c \mid x \mid B(C) \mid \lambda(v)B \mid$   
 $A_0$  where  $\{p_1 := A_1, \dots, p_n := A_n\}$

## EXAMPLES

John loves Mary  $\xrightarrow{\text{render}}$  love(John, Mary)

John loves himself  $\xrightarrow{\text{render}}$   $\lambda(x)(\text{love}(x, x))(\text{John})$ ,  
love( $p, p$ ) where  $\{p := \text{John}\}$

# (Global) Meaning

- Denotational Semantics:  $A : \tau \mapsto \mathbf{den}(A)(g) \in \mathbb{T}_\tau$
- Reduction Relation ( $A \Rightarrow B$ ) defined by ten reduction rules
- For each term  $A$ , there is a unique (up to congruence) irreducible recursive term  $\mathbf{cf}(A) \equiv A_0$  where  $\{p_1 := A_1, \dots, p_n := A_n\}$  such that  $A \Rightarrow \mathbf{cf}(A)$ .

## EXAMPLES

$\mathbf{love}(\mathbf{John}, \mathbf{Mary}) \Rightarrow_{\mathbf{cf}} \mathbf{love}(p, q)$  where  $\{p := \mathbf{John}, q := \mathbf{Mary}\}$

$\lambda(x)(\mathbf{love}(x, x))(\mathbf{John}) \Rightarrow_{\mathbf{cf}} \lambda(x)(\mathbf{love}(x, x))(p)$  where  $\{p := \mathbf{John}\}$

- **Referential Intension of  $A$  ( $\mathbf{int}(A)$ ):** tuple of functions defined by  $\mathbf{cf}(A)$ .

# Referential Synonymy

**The canonical form of  $A$  defines formally within the language the meaning of  $A$**

$A$  is **referentially synonymous** with  $B$  ( $A \approx B$ ) if and only if

$$A \Rightarrow_{\text{cf}} A_0 \text{ where } \{p_1 := A_1, \dots, p_n := A_n\}$$

$$B \Rightarrow_{\text{cf}} B_0 \text{ where } \{p_1 := B_1, \dots, p_n := B_n\}$$

$$\text{and } \forall g, \text{den}(A_i)(g) = \text{den}(B_i)(g) \quad (i = 0, \dots, n)$$

## EXAMPLES

$\text{love}(p, p) \text{ where } \{p := \text{John}\} \approx \lambda(x)(\text{love}(x, x))(p) \text{ where } \{p := \text{John}\}$

$\text{love}(p, p) \text{ where } \{p := \text{John}\} \not\approx \text{love}(p, p) \text{ where } \{p := \text{he}\}$

# Local Meaning

- **Local Meaning of  $A : \tilde{t}$  at state  $a$ :**  $cf(A(\bar{a}))$
- $A$  at state  $a$  is **locally synonymous** with  $B$  at state  $b$  if and only if  $A(\bar{a}) \approx B(\bar{b})$ .

EXAMPLE 1 -  $\forall p, love(p, p)(a) = hate(p, p)(a)$

$love(p, p)(\bar{a})$  where  $\{p := John\} \approx hate(p, p)(\bar{a})$  where  $\{p := John\}$

EXAMPLE 2 -  $John(a) = he(a)$

$love(p, p)(\bar{a})$  where  $\{p := John\} \not\approx love(p, p)(\bar{a})$  where  $\{p := he\}$

## What is Said about the World

## Local associate $f_*$ of an object $f$

- Locality:  $love : \tilde{e} \times \tilde{e} \rightarrow \tilde{t}$
- "Unfolding" of types:  $\tilde{\sigma} \equiv \tilde{\sigma}_1 \times \dots \times \tilde{\sigma}_n \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}_0$  where  $\tilde{\sigma}_0 \equiv \tilde{e}$  or  $\tilde{t}$ .

### Definition

$f : \tilde{e}$  or  $\tilde{t}$ , then  $f_* = f$ .

$f : \tilde{\sigma}_1 \times \dots \times \tilde{\sigma}_n \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}_0$ , then  $f_* : \mathbf{s} \times \sigma_1 \times \dots \times \sigma_n \rightarrow \sigma_0$  such that

$$f(f_1, \dots, f_n, a) = f_*(a, (f_1)_*(a), \dots, (f_n)_*(a)).$$

### EXAMPLE

$love_* : \mathbf{s} \times \mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{e} \rightarrow \mathbf{t}$  and for any  $f_1, f_2 : \tilde{e}, a : \mathbf{s}$ ,

$$love(f_1, f_2, a) = love_*(a, (f_1)_*(a), (f_2)_*(a)) = love_*(a, f_1(a), f_2(a)).$$

$A$ , state variable  $u \mapsto A^{*,u}$

- If for all  $c : \tilde{\sigma} \in K$  are such that  $c \in \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\sigma}}$  is local, then for all closed terms  $A$ ,  $\text{den}(A)$  is local.

## Question

Is it possible to define formally for local terms  $(\text{den}(A))_*$  ?

- $A : \tilde{\sigma}$ , state variable  $u \mapsto A^{*,u} : \sigma$ 
  - For closed  $A$ ,  $A^{*,u}$  defines the associate of  $A$  at  $u$ , and
  - the  $*$ -transformation respects the reduction calculus
- in an extension of  $L_{\text{ar}}^\lambda(K)$  with **Associate Application**

## EXAMPLE

$(\text{love}(p, p) \text{ where } \{p := \text{John}\})^{*,u} \equiv \text{love}[u](q, q) \text{ where } \{q := \text{John}[u]\}$



# Factual Content

- $A$  at state  $a \mapsto A^{*,\bar{a}} \mapsto \text{cf}(A^{*,\bar{a}})$
- **Factual content of  $A$  at state  $a$ :**  $\text{cf}(A^{*,\bar{a}})$
- $A$  at state  $a$  is **factually synonymous** with  $B$  at state  $b$  if and only if  $A^{*,\bar{a}} \approx B^{*,\bar{b}}$ .

EXAMPLE-  $\text{John}(a) = \text{he}(a)$

$\text{love}[\bar{a}](q, q) \text{ where } \{q := \text{John}[\bar{a}]\} \approx \text{love}[\bar{a}](q, q) \text{ where } \{q := \text{he}[\bar{a}]\}$

Theorem

$A \approx B \iff \lambda(u)A^{*,u} \approx \lambda(u)B^{*,u}$

# Factual Content for arbitrary terms

- Necessarily :  $\tilde{t} \rightarrow \tilde{t}$ , former :  $(\tilde{e} \rightarrow \tilde{t}) \times \tilde{e} \rightarrow \tilde{t}$
- Tracing locality – **locality input index**  $\ell$
- Associate  $(f)_*^\ell$  of an object  $f$  with respect to a closed locality input index  $\ell$ .

## EXAMPLE

$(Necessarily)_*^\ell : s \times \tilde{t} \rightarrow t$  with  $\ell \equiv \langle I \mapsto 1 \rangle$

$Necessarily(f_1, a) = (Necessarily)_*^\ell(a, (f_1)_*^\ell) = (Necessarily)_*^\ell(a, f_1)$

- Formal definition of  $(den(A))_*^\ell$  in  $L_{ar}^\lambda$  using the formation tree of  $A$  suitably labeled with locality indices (**locality proof**)
- Work in Progress: Uniqueness, Compositionality

# Theory of Referential Intensions

## Meaning as the algorithm that computes the denotation

---

|                 |           |                                     |           |                               |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|
| Sentence<br>$A$ | $\mapsto$ | (Global) Meaning<br>$\text{int}(A)$ | $\mapsto$ | Denotation<br>$\text{den}(A)$ |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|

---

|                                  |           |  |           |   |
|----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----------|---|
| Utterance at $a$<br>$A(\bar{a})$ | $\mapsto$ | Local Meaning at $a$<br>$\text{int}(A(\bar{a}))$ | $\mapsto$ | Denotation at $a$<br>$\text{den}(A(\bar{a}))$ |
|----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----------|---|

---

|                |           |  |           |                            |
|----------------|-----------|--|-----------|----------------------------|
| $A^*, \bar{a}$ | $\mapsto$ | Factual Content at $a$<br>$\text{int}(A^*, \bar{a})$ | $\mapsto$ | $\text{den}(A^*, \bar{a})$ |
|----------------|-----------|--|-----------|----------------------------|