Paraconsistency

Anders Schlichtkrull & Jørgen Villadsen, DTU Compute, Denmark

14 December 2021

Abstract

Paraconsistency is about handling inconsistency in a coherent way. In classical and intuitionistic logic everything follows from an inconsistent theory. A paraconsistent logic avoids the explosion. Quite a few applications in computer science and engineering are discussed in the Intelligent Systems Reference Library Volume 110: Towards Paraconsistent Engineering (Springer 2016). We formalize a paraconsistent many-valued logic that we motivated and described in a special issue on logical approaches to paraconsistency (Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics 2005). We limit ourselves to the propositional fragment of the higher-order logic. The logic is based on so-called key equalities and has a countably infinite number of truth values. We prove theorems in the logic using the definition of validity. We verify truth tables and also counterexamples for non-theorems. We prove meta-theorems about the logic and finally we investigate a case study.

Contents

Preface

The present formalization in Isabelle essentially follows our extended abstract [1]. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy has a comprehensive overview of logical approaches to paraconsistency [2]. We have elsewhere explained the rationale for our paraconsistent many-valued logic and considered applications in multi-agent systems and natural language semantics [3, 4, 5, 6].

It is a revised and extended version of our formalization https://github.com/logic-tools/mvl that accompany our chapter in a book on partiality published by Cambridge Scholars Press. The GitHub link provides more information. We are grateful to the editors — Henning Christiansen, M. Dolores Jiménez López, Roussanka Loukanova and Larry Moss — for the opportunity to contribute to the book.

On Paraconsistency

Paraconsistency concerns inference systems that do not explode given a contradiction.

The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy has a survey article on paraconsistent logic.

The following Isabelle theory formalizes a specific paraconsistent many-valued logic.

```
theory Paraconsistency imports Main begin
```

The details about our logic are in our article in a special issue on logical approaches to paraconsistency in the Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics (Volume 15, Number 1, 2005).

Syntax and Semantics

Syntax of Propositional Logic

Only the primed operators return indeterminate truth values.

```
type_synonym id = string

datatype fm = Pro id | Truth | Neg' fm | Con' fm fm | Eql fm fm | Eql' fm fm

abbreviation Falsity :: fm where Falsity ≡ Neg' Truth

abbreviation Dis' :: fm ⇒ fm ⇒ fm where Dis' p q ≡ Neg' (Con' (Neg' p) (Neg' q))

abbreviation Imp :: fm ⇒ fm ⇒ fm where Imp p q ≡ Eql p (Con' p q)

abbreviation Imp' :: fm ⇒ fm ⇒ fm where Imp' p q ≡ Eql' p (Con' p q)

abbreviation Box :: fm ⇒ fm where Box p ≡ Eql p Truth

abbreviation Neg :: fm ⇒ fm where Neg p ≡ Box (Neg' p)

abbreviation Con :: fm ⇒ fm ⇒ fm where Con p q ≡ Box (Con' p q)

abbreviation Dis :: fm ⇒ fm ⇒ fm where Dis p q ≡ Box (Dis' p q)

abbreviation Cla :: fm ⇒ fm where Cla p ≡ Dis (Box p) (Eql p Falsity)

abbreviation Nab :: fm ⇒ fm where Nab p ≡ Neg (Cla p)
```

Semantics of Propositional Logic

There is a countably infinite number of indeterminate truth values.

```
datatype tv = Det bool | Indet nat

abbreviation (input) eval_neg :: tv ⇒ tv
where
  eval_neg x ≡
    (
      case x of
        Det False ⇒ Det True |
        Det True ⇒ Det False |
        Indet n ⇒ Indet n
```

```
    )

fun eval :: (id ⇒ tv) ⇒ fm ⇒ tv
where
  eval i (Pro s) = i s |
  eval i Truth = Det True |
  eval i (Neg' p) = eval_neg (eval i p) |
  eval i (Con' p q) =
    (
      if eval i p = eval i q then eval i p else
      if eval i p = Det True then eval i q else
      if eval i q = Det True then eval i p else Det False
    ) |
  eval i (Eql p q) =
    (
      if eval i p = eval i q then Det True else Det False
    ) |
  eval i (Eql' p q) =
    (
      if eval i p = eval i q then Det True else
        (
          case (eval i p, eval i q) of
            (Det True, _) ⇒ eval i q |
            (_, Det True) ⇒ eval i p |
            (Det False, _) ⇒ eval_neg (eval i q) |
            (_, Det False) ⇒ eval_neg (eval i p) |
            _ ⇒ Det False
        )
    )

lemma eval_equality_simplify: eval i (Eql p q) = Det (eval i p = eval i q)
  ⟨proof⟩

theorem eval_equality:
  eval i (Eql' p q) =
    (
      if eval i p = eval i q then Det True else
      if eval i p = Det True then eval i q else
      if eval i q = Det True then eval i p else
      if eval i p = Det False then eval i (Neg' q) else
      if eval i q = Det False then eval i (Neg' p) else
      Det False
    )
  ⟨proof⟩

theorem eval_negation:
  eval i (Neg' p) =
    (
      if eval i p = Det False then Det True else
      if eval i p = Det True then Det False else
      eval i p
    )
  ⟨proof⟩

corollary eval i (Cla p) = eval i (Box (Dis' p (Neg' p)))
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma double_negation: eval i p = eval i (Neg' (Neg' p))
  ⟨proof⟩
```

Validity and Consistency

Validity gives the set of theorems and the logic has at least a theorem and a non-theorem.

```
definition valid :: fm ⇒ bool
where
  valid p ≡ ∀i. eval i p = Det True

proposition valid Truth and ¬ valid Falsity
```
⟨*proof*⟩

Truth Tables

String Functions

The following functions support arbitrary unary and binary truth tables.

```
definition tv_pair_row :: tv list ⇒ tv ⇒ (tv * tv) list
where
  tv_pair_row tvs tv ≡ map (λx. (tv, x)) tvs

definition tv_pair_table :: tv list ⇒ (tv * tv) list list
where
  tv_pair_table tvs ≡ map (tv_pair_row tvs) tvs

definition map_row :: (tv ⇒ tv ⇒ tv) ⇒ (tv * tv) list ⇒ tv list
where
  map_row f tvtvs ≡ map (λ(x, y). f x y) tvtvs

definition map_table :: (tv ⇒ tv ⇒ tv) ⇒ (tv * tv) list list ⇒ tv list list
where
  map_table f tvtvss ≡ map (map_row f) tvtvss

definition unary_truth_table :: fm ⇒ tv list ⇒ tv list
where
  unary_truth_table p tvs ≡
      map (λx. eval ((λs. undefined)(''p'' := x)) p) tvs

definition binary_truth_table :: fm ⇒ tv list ⇒ tv list list
where
  binary_truth_table p tvs ≡
      map_table (λx y. eval ((λs. undefined)(''p'' := x, ''q'' := y)) p) (tv_pair_table tvs)

definition digit_of_nat :: nat ⇒ char
where
  digit_of_nat n ≡
   (if n = 1 then (CHR ''1'') else if n = 2 then (CHR ''2'') else if n = 3 then (CHR ''3'') else
    if n = 4 then (CHR ''4'') else if n = 5 then (CHR ''5'') else if n = 6 then (CHR ''6'') else
    if n = 7 then (CHR ''7'') else if n = 8 then (CHR ''8'') else if n = 9 then (CHR ''9'') else
      (CHR ''0''))

fun string_of_nat :: nat ⇒ string
where
  string_of_nat n =
      (if n < 10 then [digit_of_nat n] else string_of_nat (n div 10) @ [digit_of_nat (n mod 10)])

fun string_tv :: tv ⇒ string
where
  string_tv (Det True) = ''*'' |
```

```
  string_tv (Det False) = ''o'' |
  string_tv (Indet n) = string_of_nat n

definition appends :: string list ⇒ string
where
  appends strs ≡ foldr append strs []

definition appends_nl :: string list ⇒ string
where
  appends_nl strs ≡ ''↩  '' @ foldr (λs s'. s @ ''↩  '' @ s') (butlast strs) (last strs) @ ''↩''

definition string_table :: tv list list ⇒ string list list
where
  string_table tvss ≡ map (map string_tv) tvss

definition string_table_string :: string list list ⇒ string
where
  string_table_string strss ≡ appends_nl (map appends strss)

definition unary :: fm ⇒ tv list ⇒ string
where
  unary p tvs ≡ appends_nl (map string_tv (unary_truth_table p tvs))

definition binary :: fm ⇒ tv list ⇒ string
where
  binary p tvs ≡ string_table_string (string_table (binary_truth_table p tvs))
```

Main Truth Tables

The omitted Cla (for Classic) is discussed later; Nab (for Nabla) is simply the negation of it.

proposition

```
  unary (Box (Pro ''p'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1] = ''
  *
  o
  o
''
```

⟨*proof*⟩

proposition

```
  binary (Con' (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1, Indet 2] = ''
  *o12
  oooo
  1o1o
  2oo2
''
```

⟨*proof*⟩

proposition

```
  binary (Dis' (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1, Indet 2] = ''
  ****
  *o12
  *11*
  *2*2
''
```

⟨*proof*⟩

proposition

```
  unary (Neg' (Pro ''p'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1] = ''
  o
```

```
  *
  1
''
```
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition
```
  binary (Eql' (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1, Indet 2] = ''
  *o12
  o*12
  11*o
  22o*
''
```
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition
```
  binary (Imp' (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1, Indet 2] = ''
  *o12
  ****
  *1*1
  *22*
''
```
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition
```
  unary (Neg (Pro ''p'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1] = ''
  o
  *
  o
''
```
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition
```
  binary (Eql (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1, Indet 2] = ''
  *ooo
  o*oo
  oo*o
  ooo*
''
```
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition
```
  binary (Imp (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1, Indet 2] = ''
  *ooo
  ****
  *o*o
  *oo*
''
```
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition
```
  unary (Nab (Pro ''p'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1] = ''
  o
  o
  *
''
```
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition
```
  binary (Con (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1, Indet 2] = ''
  *ooo
```

```
  oooo
  oooo
  oooo
''
```
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition
```
  binary (Dis (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1, Indet 2] = ''
  ****
  *ooo
  *oo*
  *o*o
''
```
⟨*proof*⟩

Basic Theorems

Selected Theorems and Non-Theorems

Many of the following theorems and non-theorems use assumptions and meta-variables.

proposition `valid (Cla (Box p))` **and** ¬ `valid (Nab (Box p))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Cla (Cla p))` **and** ¬ `valid (Nab (Nab p))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Cla (Nab p))` **and** ¬ `valid (Nab (Cla p))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Box p)` ⟷ `valid (Box (Box p))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Neg p)` ⟷ `valid (Neg' p)`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Con p q)` ⟷ `valid (Con' p q)`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Dis p q)` ⟷ `valid (Dis' p q)`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql p q)` ⟷ `valid (Eql' p q)`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Imp p q)` ⟷ `valid (Imp' p q)`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition ¬ `valid (Pro ''p'')`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition ¬ `valid (Neg' (Pro ''p''))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition assumes `valid p` **shows** ¬ `valid (Neg' p)`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition assumes `valid (Neg' p)` **shows** ¬ `valid p`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Neg' (Neg' p)) ⟷ valid p`
⟨*proof*⟩

theorem `conjunction: valid (Con' p q) ⟷ valid p ∧ valid q`
⟨*proof*⟩

corollary assumes `valid (Con' p q)` **shows** `valid p` **and** `valid q`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition assumes `valid p` **and** `valid (Imp p q)` **shows** `valid q`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition assumes `valid p` **and** `valid (Imp' p q)` **shows** `valid q`
⟨*proof*⟩

Key Equalities

The key equalities are part of the motivation for the semantic clauses.

proposition `valid (Eql p (Neg' (Neg' p)))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql Truth (Neg' Falsity))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql Falsity (Neg' Truth))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql p (Con' p p))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql p (Con' Truth p))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql p (Con' p Truth))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql Truth (Eql' p p))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql p (Eql' Truth p))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql p (Eql' p Truth))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql (Neg' p) (Eql' Falsity p))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Eql (Neg' p) (Eql' p Falsity))`
⟨*proof*⟩

Further Non-Theorems

Smaller Domains and Paraconsistency

Validity is relativized to a set of indeterminate truth values (called a domain).

definition domain :: nat set ⇒ tv set
where
  domain U ≡ {Det True, Det False} ∪ Indet ‘ U

theorem universal_domain: domain {n. True} = {x. True}
⟨*proof*⟩

definition valid_in :: nat set ⇒ fm ⇒ bool
where
  valid_in U p ≡ ∀i. range i ⊆ domain U ⟶ eval i p = Det True

abbreviation valid_boole :: fm ⇒ bool **where** valid_boole p ≡ valid_in {} p

proposition valid p ⟷ valid_in {n. True} p
  ⟨*proof*⟩

theorem valid_valid_in: **assumes** valid p **shows** valid_in U p
  ⟨*proof*⟩

theorem transfer: **assumes** ¬ valid_in U p **shows** ¬ valid p
  ⟨*proof*⟩

proposition valid_in U (Neg’ (Neg’ p)) ⟷ valid_in U p
  ⟨*proof*⟩

theorem conjunction_in: valid_in U (Con’ p q) ⟷ valid_in U p ∧ valid_in U q
  ⟨*proof*⟩

corollary **assumes** valid_in U (Con’ p q) **shows** valid_in U p **and** valid_in U q
  ⟨*proof*⟩

proposition **assumes** valid_in U p **and** valid_in U (Imp p q) **shows** valid_in U q
  ⟨*proof*⟩

proposition **assumes** valid_in U p **and** valid_in U (Imp’ p q) **shows** valid_in U q
  ⟨*proof*⟩

abbreviation (input) Explosion :: fm ⇒ fm ⇒ fm
where
  Explosion p q ≡ Imp’ (Con’ p (Neg’ p)) q

proposition valid_boole (Explosion (Pro ’’p’’) (Pro ’’q’’))
  ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma explosion_counterexample: ¬ valid_in {1} (Explosion (Pro ’’p’’) (Pro ’’q’’))
⟨*proof*⟩

theorem explosion_not_valid: ¬ valid (Explosion (Pro ’’p’’) (Pro ’’q’’))
  ⟨*proof*⟩

proposition ¬ valid (Imp (Con’ (Pro ’’p’’) (Neg’ (Pro ’’p’’))) (Pro ’’q’’))
  ⟨*proof*⟩

Example: Contraposition

Contraposition is not valid.

abbreviation (input) Contraposition :: fm ⇒ fm ⇒ fm
where
  Contraposition p q ≡ Eql’ (Imp’ p q) (Imp’ (Neg’ q) (Neg’ p))

proposition valid_boole (Contraposition (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q''))
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition valid_in {1} (Contraposition (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q''))
⟨*proof*⟩

lemma contraposition_counterexample: ¬ valid_in {1, 2} (Contraposition (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q''))
⟨*proof*⟩

theorem contraposition_not_valid: ¬ valid (Contraposition (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q''))
⟨*proof*⟩

More Than Four Truth Values Needed

Cla3 is valid for two indeterminate truth values but not for three indeterminate truth values.

lemma ranges: **assumes** range i ⊆ domain U **shows** eval i p ∈ domain U
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition
unary (Cla (Pro ''p'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1] = ''
*
*
o
''
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition valid_boole (Cla p)
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition ¬ valid_in {1} (Cla (Pro ''p''))
⟨*proof*⟩

abbreviation (input) Cla2 :: fm ⇒ fm ⇒ fm
where
Cla2 p q ≡ Dis (Dis (Cla p) (Cla q)) (Eql p q)

proposition
binary (Cla2 (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) [Det True, Det False, Indet 1, Indet 2] = ''
****
****
***o
**o*
''
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition valid_boole (Cla2 p q)
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition valid_in {1} (Cla2 p q)
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition ¬ valid_in {1, 2} (Cla2 (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q''))
⟨*proof*⟩

abbreviation (input) Cla3 :: fm ⇒ fm ⇒ fm ⇒ fm
where
Cla3 p q r ≡ Dis (Dis (Cla p) (Dis (Cla q) (Cla r))) (Dis (Eql p q) (Dis (Eql p r) (Eql q r)))

proposition `valid_boole (Cla3 p q r)`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid_in {1} (Cla3 p q r)`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid_in {1, 2} (Cla3 p q r)`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition ¬ `valid_in {1, 2, 3} (Cla3 (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'') (Pro ''r''))`
⟨*proof*⟩

Further Meta-Theorems

Fundamental Definitions and Lemmas

The function props collects the set of propositional symbols occurring in a formula.

```
fun props :: fm ⇒ id set
where
  props Truth = {} |
  props (Pro s) = {s} |
  props (Neg' p) = props p |
  props (Con' p q) = props p ∪ props q |
  props (Eql p q) = props p ∪ props q |
  props (Eql' p q) = props p ∪ props q
```

lemma `relevant_props:` **assumes** `∀s ∈ props p. i1 s = i2 s` **shows** `eval i1 p = eval i2 p`
⟨*proof*⟩

```
fun change_tv :: (nat ⇒ nat) ⇒ tv ⇒ tv
where
  change_tv f (Det b) = Det b |
  change_tv f (Indet n) = Indet (f n)
```

lemma `change_tv_injection:` **assumes** `inj f` **shows** `inj (change_tv f)`
⟨*proof*⟩

```
definition
  change_int :: (nat ⇒ nat) ⇒ (id ⇒ tv) ⇒ (id ⇒ tv)
where
  change_int f i ≡ λs. change_tv f (i s)
```

lemma `eval_change:` **assumes** `inj f` **shows** `eval (change_int f i) p = change_tv f (eval i p)`
⟨*proof*⟩

Only a Finite Number of Truth Values Needed

Theorem valid_in_valid is a kind of the reverse of valid_valid_in (or its transfer variant).

```
abbreviation is_indet :: tv ⇒ bool
where
  is_indet tv ≡ (case tv of Det _ ⇒ False | Indet _ ⇒ True)

abbreviation get_indet :: tv ⇒ nat
where
  get_indet tv ≡ (case tv of Det _ ⇒ undefined | Indet n ⇒ n)
```

theorem valid_in_valid: **assumes** card U ≥ card (props p) **and** valid_in U p **shows** valid p
⟨*proof*⟩

theorem reduce: valid p ⟷ valid_in {1..card (props p)} p
⟨*proof*⟩

Case Study

Abbreviations

Entailment takes a list of assumptions.

abbreviation (input) Entail :: fm list ⇒ fm ⇒ fm
where
Entail l p ≡ Imp (if l = [] then Truth else fold Con' (butlast l) (last l)) p

theorem entailment_not_chain:
¬ valid (Eql (Entail [Pro ''p'', Pro ''q''] (Pro ''r''))
(Box ((Imp' (Pro ''p'') (Imp' (Pro ''q'') (Pro ''r'')))))))
⟨*proof*⟩

abbreviation (input) B0 :: fm **where** B0 ≡ Con' (Con' (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) (Neg' (Pro ''r''))

abbreviation (input) B1 :: fm **where** B1 ≡ Imp' (Con' (Pro ''p'') (Pro ''q'')) (Pro ''r'')

abbreviation (input) B2 :: fm **where** B2 ≡ Imp' (Pro ''r'') (Pro ''s'')

abbreviation (input) B3 :: fm **where** B3 ≡ Imp' (Neg' (Pro ''s'')) (Neg' (Pro ''r''))

Results

The paraconsistent logic is usable in contrast to classical logic.

theorem classical_logic_is_not_usable: valid_boole (Entail [B0, B1] p)
⟨*proof*⟩

corollary valid_boole (Entail [B0, B1] (Pro ''r''))
⟨*proof*⟩

corollary valid_boole (Entail [B0, B1] (Neg' (Pro ''r'')))
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition ¬ valid (Entail [B0, B1] (Pro ''r''))
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition valid_boole (Entail [B0, Box B1] p)
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition ¬ valid (Entail [B0, Box B1, Box B2] (Neg' (Pro ''p'')))
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition ¬ valid (Entail [B0, Box B1, Box B2] (Neg' (Pro ''q'')))
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition ¬ valid (Entail [B0, Box B1, Box B2] (Neg' (Pro ''s'')))
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition valid (Entail [B0, Box B1, Box B2] (Pro ''r''))

⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Entail [B0, Box B1, Box B2] (Neg' (Pro ''r'')))`
⟨*proof*⟩

proposition `valid (Entail [B0, Box B1, Box B2] (Pro ''s''))`
⟨*proof*⟩

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the Isabelle developers for making a superb system and for always being willing to help.

end — Paraconsistency file

References

[1] A. S. Jensen and J. Villadsen. *Paraconsistent Computational Logic.* In P. Blackburn, K. F. Jørgensen, N. Jones, and E. Palmgren, editors, 8th Scandinavian Logic Symposium: Abstracts, pages 59–61, Roskilde University, 2012.

[2] G. Priest, K. Tanaka and Z. Weber. *Paraconsistent Logic.* In E. N. Zalta et al., editors, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Online Entry http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-paraconsistent/ Spring Edition, 2015.

[3] J. Villadsen. *Supra-logic: Using Transfinite Type Theory with Type Variables for Paraconsistency.* Logical Approaches to Paraconsistency, Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics, 15(1):45–58, 2005.

[4] J. Villadsen. *Infinite-Valued Propositional Type Theory for Semantics.* In J.-Y. Béziau and A. Costa-Leite, editors, Dimensions of Logical Concepts, pages 277–297, Unicamp Coleç. CLE 54, 2009.

[5] J. Villadsen. *Nabla: A Linguistic System Based on Type Theory.* Foundations of Communication and Cognition (New Series), LIT Verlag, 2010.

[6] J. Villadsen. *Multi-dimensional Type Theory: Rules, Categories and Combinators for Syntax and Semantics.* In P. Blache, H. Christiansen, V. Dahl, D. Duchier, and J. Villadsen, editors, Constraints and Language, pages 167–189, Cambridge Scholars Press, 2014.