

Natural Language Understanding and Computational Semantics

DS-GA/LING-GA 1012

Homework 4: Due April 17th

Yusu Qian

Question 1 (35 pts) Find the predicate logic denotations for sentences 1–7. You will be using symbols for conjunction (\wedge), disjunction (\vee), existential quantification (\exists), universal quantification (\forall), implication (\rightarrow), and negation (\neg). You can ignore inflection on the verb.

1. [[Something barks]]

$\exists x \text{ Barks}(x)$

2. [[Something that is a dog barks]]

$\text{Dog}(x) \wedge \text{Barks}(x)$

3. [[Some dog barks]]

$\exists x[\text{Dog}(x) \wedge \text{Barks}(x)]$

4. [[Some dog barks or growls]]

$\exists x[\text{Dog}(x) \wedge [\text{Barks}(x) \vee \text{Growls}(x)]]$

5. [[Some dog does not bark]]

$\exists x[\text{dog}(x) \wedge \neg \text{Barks}(x)]$

6. [[No dog barks]]

$\forall x[\text{dog}(x) \rightarrow \neg \text{Barks}(x)]$ (my answer is this one, but I also think the second one has the same meaning. I'm confused lol)

$\neg \exists x[\text{dog}(x) \wedge \text{Barks}(x)]$

7. [[Every dog barks]]

$\forall x[\text{dog}(x) \rightarrow \text{Barks}(x)]$

Question 2 (30 pts) Derive the meaning of “John or Mary talks” from the meaning of its parts, i.e. provide denotations for 1–6 using lambda predicate logic. For each denotation, give its type.

1. [[John]]

John

Real-world individual

Type e

2. [[or]] Hint: A disjunction of individuals is not well-formed. In other words, the meaning of "or" is cannot be $\lambda x.\lambda y. x \vee y$ where x and y are individuals. Find a more complex meaning of "or" that avoids this problem.

$\lambda x.\lambda y. (x \vee y) \wedge \neg(x \wedge y)$

type t

3. [[Mary]]

Mary

Real-world individual

Type e

4. [[talks]]

$\lambda x.e. \text{ talks}(x)$

Type $\langle e, t \rangle$

5. [[John or Mary]]

$(\lambda y.\lambda z. (y \vee z) \wedge \neg(y \wedge z)) (\text{John}, \text{Mary})$

$= (\text{John} \vee \text{Mary}) \wedge \neg(\text{John} \wedge \text{Mary})$

Type t

6. [[John or Mary talks]]

$\lambda x.e. \text{ talks}(x) [(\lambda y.\lambda z. (y \vee z) \wedge \neg(y \wedge z))]$

$= \text{talks}((\text{John} \vee \text{Mary}) \wedge \neg(\text{John} \wedge \text{Mary}))$

Type t

Question 3 (20 pts) Provide Neo-Davidsonian event semantic denotations for the following sentences. Make sure you use thematic functions agent and theme.

1. [[Susan ate]]

$\exists e. \text{ ate}(e) \wedge \text{agent}(e, \text{Susan})$

2. [[Susan ate the apple]]

$\exists e. \text{ ate}(e) \wedge \text{agent}(e, \text{Susan}) \wedge \text{theme}(e, \text{apple})$

3. [[The apple was eaten by Susan]]

$\exists e. \text{ eaten}(e) \wedge \text{agent}(e, \text{Susan}) \wedge \text{theme}(e, \text{apple})$

4. [[The apple was eaten]]

$\exists e. \text{ eaten}(e) \wedge \text{theme}(e, \text{apple})$

Question 4 (15 pts) Consider the sentence "Every dog loves some cat." This sentence is ambiguous. Give the predicate logic denotations for each of the two meanings of the sentence. Explain in one sentence the difference between these two meanings.

$\forall x[\text{dog}(x) \rightarrow \exists y[\text{cat}(y) \wedge \text{loves}(x, y)]]$

It means every dog has cats they love but different dogs might love different cats.

$\exists y[\text{cat}(y) \wedge \forall x[\text{dog}(x) \rightarrow \text{loves}(x,y)]]$

It means there are some cats that every dog loves.