## Semantic Theory 2025: Exercise 3

Due by: Wednesday, May 14 at 10:00 am (before class)

## Question 1

Translate the following into  $\lambda$ -expressions. Use subscripts to indicate the types of the  $\lambda$ -bound variables (e.g.  $\lambda x_e.P(x)$  for an e-type x).

- a.  $pink_{\langle (e,t), (e,t) \rangle}$  (as in "Jumbo is a <u>pink</u> elephant"; the expression should have  $pink_{\langle e,t \rangle}^*$  as the underlying first-order predicate)
- b.  $and_{\langle e, \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle \rangle}$  (as in "John <u>and</u> Suzy danced"; the expression should incorporate  $\wedge$  as the underlying operator)
- c.  $not_{\langle\langle e,t\rangle,\langle e,t\rangle}$  (as in "Mark did <u>not</u> like the party"; the expression should incorporate  $\neg$  as the underlying operator)

## Question 2

Translate the following sentences into  $\lambda$ -expressions, assuming the syntactic structure indicated by the brackets. Then use lambda conversions ( $\beta$ -/ $\eta$ -/ $\alpha$ -conversion) to reduce to  $\lambda$ -free terms.

Use the terms you derived for pink, and, and not in Question 1. If you weren't able to derive those terms, you can simply use the predicates pink', and', and not' (with the types indicated in Question 1).

Ignore the contribution of past/plural morphology, "is"/"are"/"did", and "a".

- a. Jumbo [is a [pink elephant]]
- b. [John and Suzy] danced
- c. Mark did [not [like the party]]
- d. [Tim [and Mary]] are [not [pink elephants]]