### Semantic Theory 2014 – Exercise sheet 3

### Manfred Pinkal

Exercises are due on Tuesday, May 13, 10:15 a.m.

# 3.1 Type-Theoretic Model Structure

The diagram graphically represents a model structure  $M = \langle U, V \rangle$  with a universe consisting of John, Bill, and Mary. (We take j, b, m to be the entities/persons in the model structure, j\*, b\*, m\* the individual constants referring to the respective entities, and john', bill', mary' the type-raised



proper names. The dashed line indicates the set of students, the arrow the helping relation.

Give the interpretation function  $V_M$  of the following constants by explicitly specifying the mappings.

- (a)  $j^* \in CON_e$
- (b) student'  $\in CON_{(e,t)}$
- (c) help'  $\in$  CON<sub>(e, (e,t))</sub>
- (d) john'  $\in CON_{(e,t), t}$
- (e) everyone'  $\in \text{CON}_{(e,b, t)}$

Give the denotations for (b), (c), and (d) also in set notation.

Hint: The domains of the higher-order functions tend to become large. You may skip the explicit specification for some of the argument-value pairs of (d) and (e), and instead just point out the pattern for the remaining cases.

# 3.2 Type-theoretic interpretation

Compute the denotations of the following type-theoretic formulas in model structure M from Exercise 3.1:

- (a) john'(student')
- (b)  $\forall x(help'(x)(x) \rightarrow \neg student'(x))$
- (c) someone'(help'(j\*))

Compute the truth-conditions for the following type-theoretic formulas (taken from the slides of Lecture 3:

- (d)  $\exists G \text{ (hair_colour'}(G) \land G (b^*) \land G (j^*))$
- (e)  $\forall F \forall a(sadist(a) \land F(a) \rightarrow F(santa^*))$

# 3.3 Meaning postulates

(a) The interpretation function must observe the following constraint for typeraised proper names:

 $V_M(john') = \{S \subseteq U_M \mid j \in S\}, \text{ for some specific entity } j \in U_M$ 

Express this constraint as a meaning postulate (Hint: make use of  $j^* \in CON_e$ ).

(b) An interesting sub-class of attributive adjectives are those ones denoting restrictive modifiers. In Lecture 5, you have seen a meaning postulate for the restrictive adjective *poor*. Try to formulate a meaning postulate that expresses the restrictiveness property of predicate modifiers in a general way. Use RMOD  $\in$  CON $\langle\langle\langle e,t \rangle, \langle e,t \rangle\rangle$ , t $\rangle$  as a constant expressing the higher-order predicate "is a restrictive modifier", and give a type-logical definition (a meaning postulate in terms of a universal equivalence statement) for RMOD.

(c) For any restrictive predicate modifier (such as *poor*) the effect of applying the degree particle *very* is another predicate modifier (such as *very poor*), which is even more restrictive: *very poor piano-player* entails *poor piano-player*, which in turn entails *piano-player*. Formulate this semantic effect of *very* as a meaning postulate. Hint: The correct formula will be a universally quantified type-logical implication, with "RMOD" occurring in the antecedent clause.

(b) and (c) are difficult. I do not expect everyone to come up with a correct solution, but try and comment!