

COMP550 Natural Language Processing

Assignment 3

Jonathan Guymont

November 8, 2018

Question 1

(a)

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\lambda x.xx)(\lambda y.yx)z &= (\lambda y.yx)(\lambda y.yx)z \\
 &= (\lambda y.yx)xz \\
 &= xxz
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\lambda uvw.wvu)aa(\lambda pq.q)z &= (\lambda pq.q)aa \\
 &= a
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 [(\lambda v.vv)(\lambda u.u)][(\lambda v.v)(\lambda v.w)] &= [(\lambda u.u)(\lambda u.u)](\lambda v.w) \\
 &= (\lambda u.u)(\lambda v.w) \\
 &= (\lambda v.w)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3}$$

(b)

DET -> no

V -> hates

The word *no* is used to say none of the object with characteristic *P* have the attribute *Q* (e.g. no tomatoes are pink, there is no human on mars,...). So it can be read has *for all x such that x is P, x is not Q*.

$$\lambda P.\lambda Q.\forall x.P(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x)$$

When the verb *hates* is used, there is an event *e: something is hated*, the event need a *hater* *z*, and a *hatee* *x*

$$\lambda w.\lambda z.w[\forall x.\exists e \text{ hates}(e) \wedge \text{hater}(e, z) \wedge \text{hatee}(e, x)]$$

Parsing tree.

Let $A \equiv \lambda z. \exists e. \text{hates}(e) \wedge \text{hater}(e, z) \wedge \text{hatee}(e, \text{COMP550})$

The semantis of S is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [\lambda Q. \forall x. \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x)](A) \\
 & = \lambda Q. \forall x. \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \neg A(x) \\
 & = \lambda Q. \forall x. \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \neg [\lambda z. \exists e. \text{hates}(e) \wedge \text{hater}(e, z) \wedge \text{hatee}(e, \text{COMP550})](x) \\
 & = \lambda Q. \forall x. \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \neg [\exists e. \text{hates}(e) \wedge \text{hater}(e, X) \wedge \text{hatee}(e, \text{COMP550})]
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

$S < \lambda Q. \forall x. \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \neg \exists e. \text{hates}(e) \wedge \text{hater}(e, X) \wedge \text{hatee}(e, \text{COMP550}) >$

$S \rightarrow NP \ VP$

$NP < \lambda P. \lambda Q. \forall x. \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x) >$

$NP \rightarrow DET \ N$

$DET < \lambda P. \lambda Q. \forall x. P(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x) >$

$DET \rightarrow no$

$N < \lambda x. \text{student}(x) >$

$N \rightarrow student$

$VP < \lambda z. \exists e. \text{hates}(e) \wedge \text{hater}(e, z) \wedge \text{hatee}(e, \text{COMP550}) >$

$VP \rightarrow V \ PN$

$V < \lambda w. \lambda z. w[\forall x. \exists e \text{hates}(e) \wedge \text{hater}(e, z) \wedge \text{hatee}(e, x)] >$

$V \rightarrow hates$

$PN < \lambda X. x(\text{COMP550}) >$

$PN \rightarrow \text{COMP550}$

(c) The representation of wants is

$$\exists e \text{wants}(e) \wedge \text{wanter}(e, s_1) \wedge \text{wantee}(e, s_2)$$

First interpretation: Start with the predicate *there is an exam y that is wanted by s_1* and then *for each student x negate this predicate over s_1*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\lambda Q. \exists y. \text{exam}(y) \wedge Q(y))(\lambda s_2. \exists e. \text{wants}(e) \wedge \text{wanter}(e, s_1) \wedge \text{wantee}(e, s_2)) \\
 & = \exists y. \text{exam}(y) \wedge \exists e. \text{want}(e) \wedge \text{wanter}(e, s_1) \wedge \text{wantee}(e, y)
 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\lambda Q. \forall x. \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x))(\lambda s_1. \exists y. \text{exam}(y) \wedge \exists e. \text{want}(e) \wedge \text{wanter}(e, s_1) \wedge \text{wantee}(e, y)) \\
 & = \forall x. \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \neg [\lambda s_1. \exists y. \text{exam}(y) \wedge \exists e. \text{want}(e) \wedge \text{wanter}(e, s_1) \wedge \text{wantee}(e, y)](x) \\
 & = \forall x. \text{student}(x) \rightarrow \neg \exists y. \text{exam}(y) \wedge \exists e. \text{want}(e) \wedge \text{wanter}(e, x) \wedge \text{wantee}(e, y)
 \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Interpretation 1: There is no exam anywhere that any students want.

Second interpretation: Start with *There is an object s_2 that is not wanted by any student x* and then replace this object by an exam y that can have the property Q (of not being wanted in that case).

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda Q. \forall x. student(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x)) (\lambda s_1. \exists e. want(e) \wedge wanter(e, s_1) \wedge wantee(e, s_2)) \\ & = \forall x. student(x) \rightarrow \neg (\exists e. want(e) \wedge wanter(e, x) \wedge wantee(e, s_2)) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda Q. \exists y. exam(y) \wedge Q(y)) (\lambda s_2. \forall x. student(x) \rightarrow \neg (\exists e. want(e) \wedge wanter(e, x) \wedge wantee(e, s_2))) \\ & = (\exists y. exam(y)) \wedge [\forall x. student(x) \rightarrow \neg (\exists e. want(e) \wedge wanter(e, x) \wedge wantee(e, y))] \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Interpretation 2: There is a particular exam that no student want.