

‘Propositional attitudes’ taxonomy.

(B stands for ‘believing’, ‘knowing’, etc.)

Ch / ι is an agent; $a \rightarrow \iota$, or $a \rightarrow \iota_{\tau\omega}$ is a subject of the attitude;

$P \rightarrow (\circ\iota)_{\tau\omega}$ is a construction of the property ascribed to a .

I. Implicit (propositional) attitudes: $B \rightarrow (\circ\iota\circ_{\tau\omega})_{\tau\omega}$

a. *De dicto*: Ch Bs that a is P.

b. *De re*:

i. a is B-ed by Ch to be a P.

passive variant

ii. Ch Bs of a that **he** (namely a) is a P.

*active variant with
anaphoric reference he*

II. Explicit (hyper-propositional) attitudes: $B^* \rightarrow (\circ\iota^*_n)_{\tau\omega}$

c. *De dicto*: Ch B*s that a is P.

d. *De re*:

i. a is B*-ed by Ch to be a P.

passive variant

ii. Ch B*s of a that **he** (namely a) is a P.

*active variant with
anaphoric reference he*

III. Analytic schemes.

If a is a construction of an ι -office, $a \rightarrow \iota_{\tau\omega}$, the analytic schemes are as follows:

Ad I) Implicit (propositional) attitudes

I. a. *de dicto*: $\lambda w\lambda t [B_{wt} \circ Ch \lambda w\lambda t [P_{wt} a_{wt}]]$

I. b. i.) *de re passive variant*

First, $BCP / (\circ\iota)_{\tau\omega}$ – the property of being B-ed by Ch to be a P, $x \rightarrow \iota$:

$${}^0BCP = \lambda w\lambda t [\lambda x [B_{wt} \circ Ch \lambda w\lambda t [P_{wt} x]]]$$

Second, a course-grained analysis: $\lambda w\lambda t [{}^0BCP_{wt} a_{wt}]$

Third, the best literal analysis of **I.b.i**):

$$\lambda w\lambda t [[\lambda w\lambda t [\lambda x [B_{wt} \circ Ch \lambda w\lambda t [P_{wt} x]]]]_{wt} a_{wt}],$$

Which can be β_i -reduced to:

$$\lambda w\lambda t [\lambda x [B_{wt} \circ Ch \lambda w\lambda t [P_{wt} x]] a_{wt}].$$

Further ‘syntactic’ β -reduction is not possible, because we would substitute the *de re* occurrence of a_{wt} for x into the *de dicto* context of $\lambda w\lambda t [P_{wt} x]$, which is not an equivalent transformation due to partiality (but it is not the problem of collision of variables).

I. b. ii.) *de re active variant*

First, a coarse-grained analysis:

$$\lambda w \lambda t [{}^0B\text{-of}_{wt} {}^0Ch a_{wt} \lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} he]]; B\text{-of} / (oi\iota o_{\tau\omega})_{\tau\omega}, he \rightarrow \iota.$$

Second, we have to define *B-of* (*x-who*, *y-whom*)-*that-he=whom-P*:

$$[{}^0B\text{-of}_{wt} x y \lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} he]] = [{}^0B_{wt} x {}^2[{}^0Sub [{}^0Tr y] {}^0he {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} he]]]]; \\ x, y, \rightarrow \iota.$$

Third, the best literal analysis of **II.b.ii.)** is obtained by substituting *⁰Ch* for *x*, *a_{wt}* for *y*:

$$\lambda w \lambda t [{}^0B_{wt} {}^0Ch {}^2[{}^0Sub [{}^0Tr a_{wt}] {}^0he {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} he]]]].$$

Ad II) Explicit (hyper-propositional) attitudes

II. a. *de dicto* $\lambda w \lambda t [B^*_{wt} {}^0Ch {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} a_{wt}]]]$

II. b. i.) *de re passive variant*

First, *B*CP* / (oi)_{τ_ω} – the property of being B*-ed by Ch to be a P, *x* → *ι*:

$${}^0B^*CP = \lambda w \lambda t [\lambda x [B^*_{wt} {}^0Ch [{}^0Sub [{}^0Tr x] {}^0x {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} x]]]]]$$

Second, a course-grained analysis: $\lambda w \lambda t [{}^0B^*CP_{wt} a_{wt}]$

Third, the best literal analysis of **II.b.i)**:

$$\lambda w \lambda t [\lambda w \lambda t [\lambda x [B^*_{wt} {}^0Ch [{}^0Sub [{}^0Tr x] {}^0x {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} x]]]]]_{wt} a_{wt}],$$

Which can be β_i-reduced to:

$$\lambda w \lambda t [\lambda x [B^*_{wt} {}^0Ch [{}^0Sub [{}^0Tr x] {}^0x {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} x]]]] a_{wt}].$$

Further ‘syntactic’ β-reduction is an equivalent transformation. However, performing it we obtain the active variant ad II.b. II):

$$\lambda w \lambda t [B^*_{wt} {}^0Ch [{}^0Sub [{}^0Tr a_{wt}] {}^0x {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} x]]]].$$

⇔ *de re active variant*

II. b. ii.) *de re active variant*

First, a coarse-grained analysis:

$$\lambda w \lambda t [B^*\text{-of}_{wt} {}^0Ch a_{wt} {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} he]]]; B\text{-of} / (oi\iota^*_{\tau\omega})_{\tau\omega}, he \rightarrow \iota.$$

Second, we have to define *B*-of* (*x-who*, *y-whom*)-*that-he=whom-P*:

$$[B^*\text{-of}_{wt} x y {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} he]]] = [B^*_{wt} x [Sub [{}^0Tr y] {}^0he {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} he]]]]; \\ x, y, \rightarrow \iota.$$

Third, the best literal analysis of **II.b.ii.)** is obtained by substituting *⁰Ch* for *x*, *a_{wt}* for *y*:

$$\lambda w \lambda t [B^*_{wt} {}^0Ch [Sub [{}^0Tr a_{wt}] {}^0he {}^0[\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} he]]]].$$

III. Remark:

If a is a *rigid designator* of an individual, i.e., $a \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$ and a is *not v-improper in any w, t* , the *de dicto* and *de re* attitudes are equivalent; proof in section 4.9.:

I. Implicit propositional attitudes:

$$\lambda w \lambda t [B_{wt} {}^0 Ch \lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} a]] =$$

$$\lambda w \lambda t [\lambda x [B_{wt} {}^0 Ch \lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} x]] a] =$$

$$\lambda w \lambda t [B_{wt} {}^0 Ch {}^2 [{}^0 Sub [{}^0 Tr a] {}^0 x {}^0 [\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} x]]]]$$

II. Explicit hyper-propositional attitudes:

$$\lambda w \lambda t [B_{wt}^* {}^0 Ch {}^0 [\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} a]]] =$$

$$\lambda w \lambda t [\lambda x [B_{wt}^* {}^0 Ch [{}^0 Sub [{}^0 Tr x] {}^0 x {}^0 [\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} x]]] a] =$$

$$\lambda w \lambda t [B_{wt}^* {}^0 Ch [{}^0 Sub [{}^0 Tr a] {}^0 x {}^0 [\lambda w \lambda t [P_{wt} x]]]]$$