

LING 130: Guide to Problem Set 3

James Pustejovsky

March 10, 2010

1 Keeping Track of Substitution Values

Recall that the method of *Quantifier Substitution* has two components to it.

- (1) a. Quantifier Substitution
- b. Substitution Application

The first rule applies when a functional expression, α , is requesting an argument of a certain type, and the potential argument expression is not of that type. For example, if α is looking for an entity type, e , but the other expression, β is a generalized quantifier, $(e \rightarrow t) \rightarrow t$, then perform a substitution of β with a constant C , that satisfies the type requested by α ; $[C/\beta]$. Generally, this rule is stated as follows:

- (2) Quantifier Substitution:

For every expression, γ , in a sentence, we associate a body, α , and the set of quantifier substitutions, Σ , where $\Sigma = \{[C_1/Q_1]_{\sigma_1}, [C_2/Q_2]_{\sigma_2}, \dots, [C_n/Q_n]_{\sigma_n}\}$
 $\gamma = \alpha\{\Sigma\}$

The second part of the method is a rule called *Substitution Application*. This applies to each substitution, σ_i in Σ , and it performs the following operation:

- (3) $\alpha\{\sigma_u\} \implies \sigma_u(\lambda u \alpha[u])$

Let's see how this method works when the sentence has more than one QNP in it, such as those in (4)-(5) below.

- (4) a. A judge sentenced every prisoner.
 b. $\forall x[\text{prisoner}(x) \rightarrow \exists y[\text{judge}(y) \wedge \text{sentence}(y, x)]]$
 c. $\exists y[\text{judge}(y) \wedge \forall x[\text{prisoner}(x) \rightarrow \text{sentence}(y, x)]]$
- (5) a. Every dog ate a bone.
 b. $\forall x[\text{dog}(x) \rightarrow \exists y[\text{bone}(y) \wedge \text{eat}(x, y)]]$
 c. $\exists y[\text{bone}(y) \wedge \forall x[\text{dog}(x) \rightarrow \text{eat}(x, y)]]$

Here's how to think about this problem. How many quantifier NPs are there? For each one, you will need a substitution. Since they are independent of one another (e.g., there's no embedded quantifiers), we can picture how each one gets substituted by the QS method. Consider the two quantifiers in (4).

- (6) a. ⟨“every prisoner”, $(e \rightarrow t) \rightarrow t$, $\lambda P\forall x[\text{prisoner}(x) \rightarrow P(x)]$ ⟩
 b. QS: ⟨ “every prisoner”, e , C_1 ⟩, $[C_1/\lambda P\forall x[\text{prisoner}(x) \rightarrow P(x)]]_{\sigma_1}$
- (7) a. ⟨“a judge”, $(e \rightarrow t) \rightarrow t$, $\lambda P\exists x[\text{judge}(x) \wedge P(x)]$ ⟩
 b. QS: ⟨ “a judge”, e , C_2 ⟩, $[C_2/\lambda P\exists x[\text{judge}(x) \wedge P(x)]]_{\sigma_2}$

So now, let’s go through each interpretation in (4), starting with the wide-scope on a *judge*. That is, there is one judge that sentenced all the prisoners.

- (8) STEP-BY-STEP:
- a. A judge sentenced every prisoner.
 b. sentence: $\lambda x\lambda y[\text{sentence}(y, x)]$
 c. Quantifier Substitution (QS): $C_1 : e$, $[C_1/\lambda P\forall x[\text{prisoner}(x) \rightarrow P(x)]]_{\sigma_1}$
 d. Function Application: $\lambda x\lambda y[\text{sentence}(y, x)] : e \rightarrow (e \rightarrow t)$, $C_1 : e \implies \lambda y[\text{sentence}(y, C_1)]\{\sigma_1\} : e \rightarrow t$
 e. Quantifier Substitution (QS): $C_2 : e$, $[C_2/\lambda P\exists x[\text{judge}(x) \wedge P(x)]]_{\sigma_2}$
 f. Function Application: $\lambda y[\text{sentence}(y, C_1)]\{\sigma_1\} : e \rightarrow t$, $C_2 : e \implies [\text{sentence}(C_2, C_1)]\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} : t$
 g. Substitution Application on σ_1 : $\lambda P\forall x[\text{prisoner}(x) \rightarrow P(x)]\{\sigma_2\}(\lambda z[\text{sentence}(C_2, z)])$
 h. Function Application: $\forall x[\text{prisoner}(x) \rightarrow \text{sentence}(C_2, x)]\{\sigma_2\}$
 i. Substitution Application on σ_2 : $\lambda P\exists y[\text{judge}(y) \wedge P(y)](\lambda w\forall x[\text{prisoner}(x) \rightarrow \text{sentence}(w, x)])$
 j. Function Application: $\exists y[\text{judge}(y) \wedge \forall x[\text{prisoner}(x) \rightarrow \text{sentence}(y, x)]]$
 o. ☺

The other reading starts with the above derivation at (9f), and applies SA on σ_2 first, then moves on to SA for σ_1 .

- (9) STEP-BY-STEP:
- a. A judge sentenced every prisoner.
 ...
 f. Function Application: $\lambda y[\text{sentence}(y, C_1)]\{\sigma_1\} : e \rightarrow t$, $C_2 : e \implies [\text{sentence}(C_2, C_1)]\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} : t$
 g. Substitution Application on σ_2 : $\lambda P\exists x[\text{judge}(x) \wedge P(x)]\{\sigma_1\}(\lambda z[\text{sentence}(z, C_1)])$
 h. Function Application: $\exists x[\text{judge}(x) \wedge \text{sentence}(x, C_1)]\{\sigma_1\}$
 i. Substitution Application on σ_1 : $\lambda P\forall y[\text{prisoner}(y) \rightarrow P(y)](\lambda w\exists x[\text{judge}(x) \wedge \text{sentence}(x, w)])$
 j. Function Application: $\forall y[\text{prisoner}(y) \rightarrow \exists x[\text{judge}(x) \wedge \text{sentence}(x, y)]]$
 o. ☺