

Pragmatic Side Effects

Jiri Marsik, Maxime Amblard

► **To cite this version:**

Jiri Marsik, Maxime Amblard. Pragmatic Side Effects. Redrawing Pragmasemantic Borders, Mar 2015, Groningen, Netherlands. <<https://sites.google.com/site/redraw2015/>>. <hal-01164729>

HAL Id: hal-01164729

<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01164729>

Submitted on 17 Jun 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Pragmatic Side Effects

workshop redrawing pragmasemantics borders

Jirka Maršík Maxime Amblard

1 Introduction

In the quest to give a formal compositional semantics to natural languages, semanticists have started turning their attention to phenomena that have been also considered as parts of pragmatics (e.g., discourse anaphora and presupposition projection). To account for these phenomena, the very kinds of meanings assigned to words and phrases are often revisited. To be more specific, in the prevalent paradigm of modeling natural language denotations using the simply-typed lambda calculus (higher-order logic) this means revisiting the types of denotations assigned to individual parts of speech.

However, the lambda calculus also serves as a fundamental theory of computation, and in the study of computation, similar type shifts have been employed to give a meaning to side effects. Side effects in programming languages correspond to actions that go beyond the lexical scope of an expression (a thrown exception might propagate throughout a program, a variable modified at one point might later be read at another) or even beyond the scope of the program itself (a program might interact with the outside world by e.g., printing documents, making sounds, operating robotic limbs...).

2 Side Effects and Pragmatics

We now explore some of the parallels between side effects of programming languages and the pragmasemantic phenomena of linguistics.

2.1 Parallel Functions

We notice that pragmatics seems to do a similar service to natural language semantics as does the study of side effects to programming language semantics. Discourse anaphora is an example of an action whose effect transcends the lexical scope of the expressions involved (the referent and the referring expression), similar to the way a mutable store bridges the gap between a variable write and read instruction. Presuppositions, such as those triggered by definite descriptions, can be seen as propagating through the structure of the discourse until they are either validated by some established or hypothesized knowledge or accommodated at the correct level, much like an exception is propagating throughout a program until it is caught by some

handler. Finally, pragmatics is interested in how a linguistic system interacts with the world of its users similar to how programs interact with the world of their users through side effects.

2.2 Parallel Theories

When semanticists turn their attention to phenomena whose effects go beyond the scope of their syntactic domains, they are often forced to generalize the types of the denotations assigned by their theory to be able to keep a compositional treatment. In dynamic semantics, the type of a proposition changes into a function from discourse contexts to propositions and updated discourse contexts in order to handle anaphora. In programming languages, the type of a value changes into a function from states of memory to values and updated states of memory to handle mutable variables.

Computer scientists have developed general notions of a side effect that allow us to abstract over effects and compose them with relative ease (monads and monad morphisms [3], algebraic effects and handlers [4]). A prominent feature of these theories is that they decompose a complex denotation type (such as the ones seen above) into a *computation type* with two components: the type of value being computed and the set of effects this computation has.

This decomposition allows us to put the effects aside and makes it easier to explore their combinations. Our motivation is to have grammars that encompass multiple pragmasemantic phenomena and tackle their interactions, which haven't been studied as much as the individual phenomena themselves. So far, we have a prototype dealing with dynamics (based on type-theoretic dynamic logic [1]), presuppositions¹ (based on presuppositions as exceptions [2]) and some of their interactions (the presupposition binding problem).

The denotations we assign are computations, which incur some effects until they yield some value. We assign to sentences computations that yield simple propositions (i.e., truth values). These computations can incur side effects that account for their potential to, e.g., interact with the anaphoric context or trigger presuppositions. We write the grammar not by positing what meaning should look like, rather we state what it should do. In this way, we obtain a contrast between the final value, which is all about truthiness and which falls straight into the domain of semantics, and the effects yielded by the interpretation, which include pragmatic phenomena such as discourse anaphora and presuppositions. This distinction could thus be seen as a formal incarnation of Stalnaker's distinction between content and context [5].

References

- [1] Philippe de Groote. Towards a montagovian account of dynamics. In *Proceedings of SALT*, volume 16, 2006.
- [2] Ekaterina Lebedeva. *Expression de la dynamique du discours à l'aide de continuations*. PhD thesis, Université de Lorraine, 2012.
- [3] Eugenio Moggi. *An abstract view of programming languages*. University of Edinburgh, Department of Computer Science, Laboratory for Foundations of Computer Science, 1990.

¹By presuppositions, we mean the kind of conditions that must be true in order for an utterance to be judgeable as either true or false (e.g., the presupposition of France having a king in the phrase *the king of France is bald*). We haven't covered implicatures in our prototype.

- [4] Gordon D Plotkin and Matija Pretnar. Handling algebraic effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.1399*, 2013.
- [5] Robert Stalnaker. Pragmatic presuppositions. In Robert Stalnaker, editor, *Context and Content*, pages 47–62. Oxford University Press, 1974.