

Seminar on Context-Sensitivity

Week Nine

1 The Liar: basics

Q Q is not true.

(1) $Q = 'Q \text{ is not true}'$

(2) $Q \text{ is true} \leftrightarrow 'Q \text{ is not true}' \text{ is true}$

(3) $[Q \text{ is true} \wedge 'Q \text{ is not true}' \text{ is true}] \vee [Q \text{ is not true} \wedge 'Q \text{ is not true}' \text{ is not true}]$

2 Options for the theorist

(i) Accept that Q is not true (\approx "classical gap theory")

(ii) Accept that Q is true (\approx "classical glut theory")

(iii) Accept that Q is either true or not true, but refuse to believe that it is true and refuse to believe that it isn't true (\approx "weakly classical theory")

(iv) Refuse to accept that Q is either true or not true (paracomplete theory)

(v) Accept both that Q is true and that it isn't (dialethism)

3 Warnings

4 Context-sensitivity: the indexical model

Q^* Q^* is not true in any context.

Q_c Q_c is not true in my present context.

5 Context-sensitivity: expressing multiple propositions

(T) The proposition that ϕ is true iff ϕ .

(E) ' ϕ ' expresses the proposition that ϕ .

Q_\forall Q_\forall expresses no true proposition.

Q_\exists Q_\exists expresses some proposition that isn't true.

Argument that Q_\exists expresses more than one proposition:

(1) Q_\exists expresses the proposition that Q_\exists expresses some proposition that isn't true. ((E))

(2) Suppose Q_\exists expressed only true propositions.

(3) Then the proposition that Q_\exists expresses some proposition that isn't true would be true. ((1), (2))

(4) Then Q_\exists would express some proposition that isn't true. ((3), (T))

(5) So Q_\exists expresses some proposition that isn't true. ((4))

(6) So the proposition that Q_\exists expresses some proposition that isn't true is true. ((5), (T))

(7) So Q_\exists expresses at least one true proposition. ((1),(6))

(8) So Q_\exists expresses at least two propositions. ((4), (7))

6 Asserting multiple propositions

Q_\forall^* I am now asserting nothing true.

Q_\exists^* I am now asserting at least one untruth.

7 Analogy: clubs

- (1*) Michael is the secretary of a club whose members are exactly those who are secretary to some club of which they are not a member.
- (2*) Suppose Michael were a member of every club of which he is a secretary.
- (3*) Then Michael would be a member of a club whose members are exactly those who are secretary to some club of which they are not a member ((1*), (2*))
- (4*) Then Michael would be secretary to some club of which he was not a member. ((3*), (T))
- (5*) So Michael is secretary to some club of which he is not a member. ((4*))
- (6*) So Michael is a member of every club whose members are exactly those who are secretary to some club of which they are not a member. ((5*))
- (7*) So Michael is secretary to a club of which he is a member. ((1*), (6*))
- (8*) So Michael is secretary to at least two clubs. ((4*), (7*))

8 Montague's theorem

Factivity $T(\phi) \rightarrow \phi$

Closure $(T(\phi_1) \wedge \dots \wedge T(\phi_n)) \rightarrow T(\psi)$ whenever ψ follows from $\phi_1 \dots \phi_n$ in predicate logic

Second-level factivity $T(T(\phi) \rightarrow \phi)$

$\lambda \quad \neg T(\lambda)$

- (1) $T(\lambda = \neg T(\lambda))$ (premise)
- (2) $T(T(\lambda) \rightarrow T(\neg T(\lambda)))$ ((1), Closure)
- (3) $T(T(\neg T(\lambda)) \rightarrow \neg T(\lambda))$ (Second-level factivity)
- (4) $T(T(\lambda) \rightarrow \neg T(\lambda))$ ((2), (3), Closure)
- (5) $T(\neg T(\lambda))$ ((4), Closure)
- (6) $\neg T(\lambda)$ ((5), Factivity)
- (7) $\lambda = \neg T(\lambda)$ ((1), Factivity)
- (8) $\neg T(\neg T(\lambda))$ ((6), (7))

Upshot: (E) has instances that don't express only truths.

9 "Strengthened" Liars

Natural thought: say that a sentence ϕ *standardly* expresses a proposition p iff ϕ expresses p , and there is no instance ψ of (E) and false proposition q such that $\ulcorner \phi \wedge \psi \urcorner$ expresses the conjunction of p and q .

$Q_{\exists+}$ $Q_{\exists+}$ standardly expresses at least one untruth.

$Q_{\forall+}$ $Q_{\forall+}$ standardly expresses nothing true.

(E)+ ϕ standardly expresses the proposition that ϕ

Further upshot: (E)+ has instances that don't standardly express only truths. . . .