6.2. Predicates and pronouns

6.2.0. Overview

Glen Helman 18 Oct 2006

6.2.1. Abstracts

In our analyses so far, we have identified the places of a predicate with the blanks remaining when all largest individual terms have been removed. But, while this way of identifying the places of a predicate is best for a full analysis, it is not required by the concept of a predicate. For the greatest flexibility in identifying predicates, we need a notation that will allow us to specify an order for the places of a predicate that is different from the order of blanks in the English and that will allow us to associate a given place with more than one blank. What we will use is an extension of the ordinary algebraic use of variables. It is a simple idea that was used by Frege but it was first studied extensively by the American logician Alonzo Church (1903-1995) in the 1930s.

The usual form of definition for a function—of a polynomial, for example,

$$f(x, y) = x^2 + 3xy + 1$$

gives a name to the function and uses a variable or variables to indicate the input values, with the output specified by some sort of formula. Such definition might be read f is the function which, when given input x and y, yields the output $x^2 + 3xy + 1$. Church's notation, the notation of **lambda abstraction**, provides a symbolic version of the definite description in this English definition. Using this notation, the symbolic definition could be written as

$$f = \lambda xy \, (x^2 + 3xy + 1)$$

That is, the expression "$\lambda xy \, (x^2 + 3xy + 1)$" can be read as the function which, when given input x and y, yields the output $x^2 + 3xy + 1$.

When we define a function by a formula, whether we use the traditional notation or Church's, we are interested in the way the meaning of the formula varies with changes in the reference of certain individual terms. This "way" is more abstract than any particular value the formula has when the reference of these terms is fixed, so the move from the formula to the function is reasonably described as "abstraction." The notation of lambda abstraction identifies a function without immediately introducing a name for it. This idea has been important in the development of computer programming languages and, in that context, the right-hand side of the second equation above would now often be described as an "anonymous function." So, when a defining equation is expressed in the notation of lambda abstraction, it abstracts a function anonymously with "$\lambda xy \, (x^2 + 3xy + 1)$" and then

assigns it the name "f."

Since predicates express functions, the same idea can be applied to them, and it will provide the sort of flexibility we need in identifying predicates. However, our notation for abstraction will be a little different from Church's. We will write the variables that follow the lambda in Church's notation as subscripts on brackets. For example, for the function defined above, we can write

$$[x^2 + 3xy + 1]_{xy}$$

something that might be read as x² + 3xy + 1 as a function of x and y.

As an example of a predicate in this notation, consider the following:

$$[x \text{ introduced } x \text{ to } y]_{xy}$$

If we give this the input Bill and Ann, the output will have Bill in the first and second blanks of the sentence-with-blanks _ introduced _ to _, and it will have Ann in the third. That is, the output will be Bill introduced Bill to Ann—or, more idiomatically, Bill introduced himself to Ann.

That is, the expression,

$$[x \text{ introduced } x \text{ to } y]_{xy} \underline{\text{Bill}} \ \underline{\text{Ann}}$$

provides an alternative analysis of the first example of 6.1.5 . The chief application of this sort of flexibility in analysis will be in later chapters; but this example shows that it captures some aspects of English predications better than the analysis we will most often use. In particular, like the English sentence, this analysis indicates a double reference to Bill without repeating his name. We will look at this aspect of abstraction further in 6.2.3 .

We will call an expression formed with these subscripted brackets **abstract**. We will speak of a **predicate abstract** when the brackets enclose a sentence-with-variables and of a **functor abstract** when they enclose an individual-term-with-blanks. The general form of an abstract with *n* places is

$$[\text{ --- }]_{x_1 \ldots x_n}$$
$$body \quad abstractor$$

It has two parts, a **body**, which specifies the output of the expression, and an **abstractor**, consisting of the brackets and subcripted list of variables. The variables listed in the abstractor may appear in the body in any order and may occur several times. And they need not occur in the body at all. To get the effect of a definition like f(x) = 2, we use an abtract like $[2]_x$ to indicate a function whose output is 2 for any input.

Abraction like this is said to be **vacuous**.

The predicate abstract [x introduced x to y]$_{xy}$ might be read as

what "x introduced x to y" says about x and y

and we will take as our English notation for predicate abstracts an abbreviated form of this reading:

what --- says of $x_1 \ldots x_n$

so the English notation for this predicate would be

what x introduced x to y says of x an' y

(again using the contraction an' to distinguish this use of and from its use in conjunction). The predication that applies this predicate to Ann and Bill then takes the form

what x introduced x to y says of x an' y fits Bill an' Ann

Our English notation for functor abstracts is simply

--- for $x_1 \ldots x_n$

which is a compact version of a reading suggested earlier. The application of $[x^2 + 3xy + 1]_{xy} \ \underline{2} \ \underline{3}$ could be written in this notation as

$$x^2 + 3xy + 1 \text{ for } x \text{ an' } y \text{ applied to } 2 \text{ an' } 3$$

This is a case where the alternative English notation for applying functors works better.

Glen Helman 15 Aug 2006

6.2.2. Bound variables

When a variable in an abstractor does appear in the body, its occurrences in the body are said to be **bound** to the abstractor. If a variable is in the scope of more than one abstractor containing it, it is bound to the one with narrowest scope. When a variable is not in the scope of an abstractor that lists it, it is not bound and is said to be *free*. In particular, when an expression like "x^2 + 3xy + 1" or "x introduced x to y" is considered by itself outside the context of an abstract, all variables in it are free.

Variables have the grammatical status of individual terms but have no definite reference values. In the context of a formula like "x^2 + 3xy + 1," free variables are naturally thought of as variable quantities (hence their name). As they vary in their reference, the value of the formula varies as a result. When variables are bound in an abstract like $[x^2 + 3xy + 1]_{xy}$, there is no longer this sort of variation. The abstract makes a fixed reference to a mathematical object, a polynomial function, that incorporates the variation within itself. Because of this, an older terminology referred to bound variables as "apparent variables."

The notation for predicates and functors used in 6.1 can be thought as a variation on the notation for abstracts that responds to the "apparent" character of bound variables by removing them entirely. We understand a bracketed sentence- or individual-term-with-blanks to represent an abstract in which each of the blanks is filled with a different variable and the variables appear in the same order in the body and the abstractor. So [_ introduced _ to _] would come to the same thing as the abstract

$$[x \text{ introduced } y \text{ to } z]_{xyz}$$

Because the blanks in the English expression correspond one for one and in the same order to the places of the predicate or functor, there is nothing for bound variables to indicate.

Bracketing alone is not sufficient in cases where the places of a predicate do not correspond one for one to the blanks, but a notation clearer than bound variables might replace the misleading appearance variable terms by a more direct indication of the correspondence between blanks and places that the variables mark—e.g., by lines linking places locations in the body with places in the abstractor, as in the following alternative notation for the predicate abstract [x introduced x to y]$_{xy}$.

$$[\text{ introduced } \text{to} \text{ }]$$

Here, lines show how blanks in the body of the abstract correspond to places of the predicate. In the abstract using variables, the same thing is indicated by the correspondence between the variables marking blanks in the body and with the list of variables in the abstractor.

Because bound variables only mark a correspondence between locations in the body of the abstract and the abstactor, the bound variables of different abstracts have no connection with one another. This means that, for example, the following abstracts express the same predicate:

$$[x \text{ introduced } x \text{ to } y]_{xy}$$
$$[y \text{ introduced } y \text{ to } z]_{yz}$$

Each says that for any input terms τ and υ (in that order), the output sentence should be τ introduced τ to υ.

We will refer to as **alphabetic variants** expressions, like these, that use different variables to indicate the same correspondence between blanks in the body and places for input. Not only can alphabetic variants use different variables to express the same meaning, the significance of a given variable will vary from abstract to abstract; and this can happen even when the abstracts are alphabetic variants. For example, although the variable y appears in both of the abstracts above, it would be replaced by a different one of the input terms in each case.

The body of a predicate abstract is grammatically like a sentence even though it may contain free variables. It is standard to speak of an expression as **closed** if any variables it contains are bound and call an expression **open** if it contains free variables. Logicians typically use the term **formula** for any expression that is grammatically like a sentence whether it is open or closed, and reserve the term **sentence** for closed formulas. Since all formulas are grammatically like sentences, the grammatical vocabulary applied to sentences in previous chapters applies to all formulas. For example, formulas can be built from formulas by use of connectives, so formulas can be compound and have components. The label **(individual) term** will be used for both open and closed expressions with the latter distinguished simply as **closed terms**.

It is time to update our notion of atomic sentences or, more generally, **atomic formulas**. Now that we analyze sentences and other formulas into components like predicates and individual terms, the atomic formulas will no longer be simply the unanalyzed sentences though

those will still count as atomic. We will now also count as atomic any predication. Although predications are compound and can even have formulas as components (though not as immediate components), their role in derivations is sufficiently analogous to that of unanalyzed sentences for it to make sense to put them both in the same category. This analogy lies behind our use of capital letters for predicates, and it can be built into our syntactic categories: an unanalyzed sentence can be thought of as a ***zero-place predicate***, one that requires no input to yield a sentence as output.

Glen Helman | 15 Aug 2006

6.2.3. Variables and pronouns

English has devices which function like bound variables. The force of the abstract

$$[\_ \text{ introduced } \_ \text{ to } \_]$$

or the equivalent

$$[x_1 \text{ introduced } x_2 \text{ to } x_3]_{x_1 x_2 x_3}$$

can be captured in English by the expression

what is said about three people by saying that (the first introduced the second to the third)

which uses expressions like the first, the second, and so on, instead of subscripted variables. (Parentheses are used in the English simply to make the comparison easier.) No particular group of people is in question here, and the expressions the first, etc., do not refer to anything outside the sentence. Instead, these expressions function here much like pronouns that have three people as their antecedant. We have used a different word order from the that used in 6.2.1 to read abstracts in English in order to put this antecedent before the "pronouns" that refer to it.

In the case of a one-place predicate abstract the corresponding English can be stated with a genuine pronoun:

$$[\text{Tom bought } x]_x$$

what is said about a thing when it is said that (Tom bought it)

The blank that is marked by x in the body of the symbolic abstract is filled in the English with the pronoun it, which has a thing as its antecedent. Since a thing makes no definite reference, neither does the pronoun; the pronoun "refers back" to its antecedent only in the sense that their references are linked in their indefiniteness and cannot be indefinite in independent ways. The general moral is that the variables used in the bodies of abstracts are like pronouns, and the ones in abstractors are like their antecedents. One consequence of this reiterates a point made in the last subsection: you should not expect variables bound to different abstractors to be linked in their reference any more than you would expect this of pronouns that have different antecedents.

We can also move in the other direction and use abstracts to represent the contribution of pronouns to the logical form of a sentence. We can get a hint of how they might do this by looking at a particular English rendering of the sample predicate abstract discussed in 6.2.1

$$[x \text{ introduced } x \text{ to } y]_{xy}$$

what is said about two people when it is said that (the former introduced the former to the latter)

where we use another common pronoun-like device. Now consider the following restatement:

what is said about two people when it is said that (the former introduced him- or herself to the latter)

The reflexive pronoun in this expression corresponds to the repeated variable in the symbolic abstract.

Of course this English expression was a rather artificial one constructed to correspond to an abstract, but there are ways to apply abstracts more broadly. To see how, let us look at three further English expressions corresponding to the abstracts we have been considering. This time the English expressions are predicates rather than noun phrases referring to the contents of predicates:

____, ____, and ____ are such that (the first introduced the second to the third)
____ is such that (Tom bought it)
____ and ____ are such that (the former introduced the former to the latter)

Of course, these predicates themselves are also artificial, but they represent a device that may be applied to virtually any sentence to restate it in English in a way that corresponds to a symbolic analysis employing an abstract.

Because the first element of a sentence often indicates the topic under discussion, languages have many devices for restating sentences with various elements at the front. One common device in English is the use of passive voice. If we wish to say who wrote a book but focus attention on the book rather than its author, we might say something like *Moby Dick was written by Melville*. He we take the direct object of *Melville wrote Moby Dick* and move it to the front of the sentence by changing the verb from active to passive voice. Passive voice can be used similarly to move more than direct objects to the front, but it has limitations, as do many of the other devices English has for making noun phrases into subjects. The device we will most often use—which we will call **expansion**—allows a great variety and arbitrary number of nouns phrases to be made into a subject by following the subject by the phrase is such that which is itself followed by the result of replacing the noun phrases in the original sentence by pronouns or pronoun-like devices.

For example, Melville wrote *Moby Dick* can be converted into any of

Moby Dick is such that (Melville wrote it)
Melville is such that (he wrote *Moby Dick*)
Melville and *Moby Dick* are such that (the former wrote the latter)

The result of expansion is an **expanded form**, and we will often write it, as has been done here, with the residue of the original sentence in parentheses. When we need to distinguish among alternative ways of expanding a sentence, we will speak of expanding on a particular noun phrase. The opposite of expansion is **reduction**, and we will describe the original sentence as being in **reduced form** relative to that expansion. The idea of reduced form is relative because, in principle, expansion can be applied more than once, and a reduced form may be reduced still further. For example, the first expanded form above is also the result of reducing *Moby Dick* is such that (Melville is such that (he wrote it)). Expansion will serve us in a number of different ways. For now, the fact that it uses pronouns and is analogous to the use of abstracts will help in using abstracts to analyze the role of pronouns in a sentence.

To see how, let us analyze the sentence Bill told Ann his name in a way that employs a predicate abstract to reflect the use of a pronoun.

Bill told Ann his name
Bill is such that (he told Ann his name)
$$[\underline{x} \text{ told } \underline{Ann} \text{ } x\text{'s name }]_x \underline{Bill}$$
$$[[\_ \text{ told } \_ \_] \text{ } x \text{ } \underline{Ann} \text{ } x\text{'s name }]_x \underline{Bill}$$
$$[Txa([\_\text{'s name}]x)]_x \underline{Bill}$$
$$[Txa(nx)]_x b$$

T: [_ told _ _]; n: [_'s name]; a: Ann; b: Bill

Once the sentence as a whole has been analyzed as the predication of an abstract, the formula x told Ann x's name that is the body of the abstract is analyzed in the same way as Bill told Ann Bill's name would be. This second analysis departs from the original sentence in having the equivalents of two pronouns instead of one (as does Bill is such that (he hold Ann his name) but it is like the original in having only a single occurrence of Bill, and it is in this way that it reflects the use of pronouns.

We might also have expanded on both Bill and Ann to get Bill and Ann are such that he told her his name, with the analysis

$$[Txy(nx)]_{xy}ba$$

That would have added no enlightenment in the case of that sentence, but consider the following ambiguous sentence with abbreviated analyses of two interpretations of it. (You can imagine the second concerns a case of amnesia.)

Bill told Al his name
Bill and Al are such that (the former told the latter the former's name)
[x told y x's name]$_{xy}$ Bill Al
$$[Txy(nx)]_{xy}bl$$

Bill told Al his name
Bill and Al are such that (the former told the latter the latter's name)
[x told y y's name]$_{xy}$ Bill Al
$$[Txy(ny)]_{xy}bl$$

T: [_ told _ _]; n: [_'s name]; b: Bill; l: Al

In each of these analyses, the names Bill and Al are separated completely from the abstracts, which show any patterns of coreference using variables. The advantage of this sort of analysis is that it enables us to identify the same ambiguity in sentences that involve different names, such as Barb told Ann her name.

Glen Helman 15 Aug 2006

6.2.4. Expanded and reduced forms

We will use the ideas of expansion and reduction and of expanded and reduced form in connection with symbolic analyses as well as English sentences. (The context will usually indicate which use of the terms is intended but, if necessary, we can speak of symbolic expansion on the one hand or expansion using such that on the other.) As it applies to symbolic analyses, expansion is the process of restating an analysis using an abstract as we did when we moved from the analysis Tbab of Bill told Ann his name to $[Txa(nx)]_{x}b$.

From one point of view, there is no need to use expansion to study the ambiguity of Bill told Al his name. A pair of simple reduced forms like Tba(nb) and Tba(na) is quite sufficient. And even the point that Barb told Ann her name shares the same ambiguity can be captured by referring to a pair of logical forms Tτυ(nτ) and Tτυ(nυ) that are exhibited by each of the two pairs.

Of course, this simpler approach would ignore the fact that the ambiguity lies in the pattern of coreference marked by anaphoric pronouns. Abstracts capture this, but in a rather crude way since they introduce extra pronouns to do so. While the English sentence Bill told Al his name has a single pronoun, our analyses each had three bound variables. The notation could be modified to be more subtle if our main interest was in anaphoric pronouns with individual terms as antecedents. However, the prime application of abstracts will be in later chapters where we will use abstracts in connection with our analysis of quantifier phrases. And one of the key points to be made about abstracts with regard to individual terms is the very fact that they are dispensible.

In order to analyze a sentence as a truth-functional compound, we must be able to identify components that function independently. In particular, a pronoun in one component cannot have its antecedent in another. The approach we have taken so far is to simply replace a pronoun by its antecedent when this is possible and avoid analysis when it is not. Abstracts provide an alternative way of analyzing truth-functional compounds with pronominal coreference between components that brings this analysis closer to the analysis we will give to sentences where pronouns refer to quantifier phrases and cannot be replaced by their antecedents.

For example, consider the sentence Ann visited the class and she spoke to Davie. If we use an abstract to capture the coreference of she and Ann, we can analyze this as follows:

Ann visited the class and she spoke to Davie
Ann is such that (she visited the class and she spoke to Davie)
[_ is such that (she visited the class and she spoke to Davie)] Ann
[x visited the class and x spoke to Davie]$_x$ Ann
[x visited the class ∧ x spoke to Davie]$_x$ Ann
[[_ visited _] x the class ∧ [_ spoke to _] x Davie]$_x$ Ann

$$[Vxc \wedge Sxd]_x a$$

what both Vxc and Sxd says of x fits a

S: [_ spoke to _]; V: [_ visited _]; a: Ann; c: the class; d: Davie

The formula x visited the class and x spoke to Davie can be analyzed as a truth-functional compound because the two occurences of the variable x are independent of each other (though each is bound to the abstractor).

The approach we have been using would have led us to analyze the sentence as the compound Ann visited the class ∧ Ann spoke to Davie in which she is replaced by Ann, and this sentence would receive a symbolic analysis of the form Vac ∧ Sad. Now, if we compare the symbolic analyses

$$[Vxc \wedge Sxd]_x a \qquad Vac \wedge Sad$$

we can see that the second is the result of putting the term a in place of the variable x in the body of the abstract in the first. That is, the second is the reduced form of the first.

When we reduce the predication of an abstract, we take the body of the abstract and put the term of which it is predicated in the blanks marked by the variable. An analogous description applies to the reduction of compound terms formed by applying functor abstracts, and the description can be extended to apply to abstracts on any number of variables. Schematically, the general pattern is as follows:

$$[---x_1---...---x_n---]_{x_1...x_n} \tau_1...\tau_n \qquad ---\tau_1---...---\tau_n---$$

When interpreting the schema, remember that the variables of the abstractor can appear in the body in any order and may each appear any number of times (including not at all). The expression on the right is the result of using each term τ_i to replace all occurrences of the corresponding variable. Care is needed when the body contains abstracts and a term to be substituted contains free variables. The short account of that sort of case is that no free variable should become bound as a result of reduction and that abstracts should be replaced by alphabetic variants as necessary to avoid this happening. However, our use of abstracts will be limited to much simpler situations, so a detailed rule is not important. We will regard reduced and expanded expressions as two ways of writing the same formula or term, so no rule at all is needed as part of our rules for derivations, where sentences will be written only in fully reduced form.

Let us now return to the issue of pronouns and truth-functional connectives. From our present point of view, the fact that pronouns can always be replaced by individual term antecedents can be seen as the result of the fact the reduction is always possible. The analyses of sentences involving quantifier phrases that we will go on to develop in the next couple of chapters will employ predicate abstracts but not by way of predication, so nothing analogous to reduction will be in question. That can be cited as the reason a pronoun often cannot be replaced by a quantifier phrase antecedent—as in A mother visited the class and she spoke to Davie, which is not equivalent to A mother visited the class and a mother spoke to Davie. In cases where replacement by a quantifier phrase antencedent is possible without changing the meaning—as in A mother visited the class or she spoke to Davie on the phone—this will be due to special interactions between the quantifier phrase and other logical constants in the sentence.

Finally, although our focus has been on pronouns, much of what we have seen applies also to sentences containing compound predicates and other compound phrases. The sentence Ann visited the class and spoke to Davie can also be analyzed as $[Vxc \wedge Sxd]_x a$. While this analysis introduced the symbolic analogues pronouns that do not appear in the English, it does capture the form of the English in one respect: it treats it as a predication whose predicate contains the connective. And the possibility of the restating the sentence as Ann visited the class and Ann spoke to Davie can be seen as due to the reduction of this form to Vac ∧ Sad.

Glen Helman 15 Aug 2006

6.2.s. Summary

1 We adapt the notation of lambda abstraction to provide a way of linking the places of a predicate to blanks in an English sentence. An expression formed using our notation—which will have the general form $[... x_1 ... x_n ...]_{x_1 ... x_n}$—is an abstract (in this use, a predicate abstract); it consists of a abstractor applied to a parenthesized body. In English notation, a predicate abstract takes the form what ... x_1... x_n ... says of x_1 ... x_n. Variables in the body of an abstract are bound to the abstractor. (Variables in an abstractor that bind nothing in the body are cases of vacuous abstraction.)

2 Expressions that establish the same patterns of binding using different variables are alphabetic variants. They may be thought of as pronouns whose antecedents are in the abstractor. An expression (such as the body of an abstract) that has variables not bound to any abstractor, is not a sentence in the strict sense, but it does count as a formula. Formulas have many of the syntactic properties of sentences; in particular, they can be built from other formulas using connectives. And we can distinguish as atomic formulas not only unanalyzed sentences but all formulas that are predictions. (Indeed, unanalyzed sentences can be thought of as predications of zero-place predicates.)

3 Many pronouns in English function like the bound variables of the symbolic notation for abstracts, and abstracts can be used to represent the contribution of such pronouns to logical form.

4 Pronouns who antecedents are individual terms can be replaced by their antecedents. The corresponding process for abstracts is reduction. The opposite process, in which we restate sentences by introducing abstracts and bound variables is expansion.

Glen Helman 15 Aug 2006

6.2.x. Exercise questions

1. Expand each of the following in two different ways, (i) on a single occurrence of a single individual term, and (ii) on all terms together. In each case express the expanded form in English using is such that and in a partially symbolic way, as in

$$[x \text{ wrote } Moby\ Dick]_x \text{ Melville}$$

   a. Romney is north of Linden.
   b. Mike gave the package to Nancy.
   c. Tom spoke of Ed to Sue.
   d. Sam traveled to Atlanta by way of Chicago.

2. Analyze each of the following in a way that uses abstracts and variables to represent pronouns. (Since you will not replace pronouns by their antecedents, you should end up with as many occurrences of each individual term in your result as in the original sentence.) Also, restate your symbolic analysis in reduced form.

   a. Ann nominated herself
   b. Ralph tried the motor, and it started
   c. If the alarm is touched, it will go off
   d. Ralph fixed Sam's car, and he drove it back to him
   e. Ann and Bill each left a message for the other

3. Each of the following sentences exhibits an ambiguity involving pronouns that can be indicated by alternative analyses using abstracts. Use abstracts to give two complete analyses of each sentence that express different interpretations of it. You will find it easier to distinguish interpretations if you expand for all term involved in the ambiguity whether or not all have pronouns referring to them on each interpretation (see the last example of 6.2.3).

   In **c**, the word so serves to apply the same predicate to Bill as was applied to Al, so each of your analyses of it should have a repeated abstract.

   a. Al called Bill, and he called Carol.
   b. Sam gave the book to Tom, but he didn't read it.
   c. Al washed his car, and so did Bill.

4. For each of the following abstracts (i) diagram the pattern of

binding using lines rather than variables (in the manner shown in 6.2.2) and (ii) give an alphabetic variant (i.e., abstract which indicates the same pattern of binding using different variables).

In the case of **e**, remember that, as noted in 6.2.2, a bracketed sentence-with-blanks amounts to an abstract whose body has a different variable in each blank and whose abstractor lists the variables in the same order. Also, the lower-case f in **c** means that it is a functor rather than a predicate; but that won't make for any differences in the way you handle it.

a. $[Fx]_x$

b. $[Fz \rightarrow Gz]_z$

c. $[Tyxy]_{xy}$

d. $[fyz]_{zy}$

e. $[S \_ \_ \_]$

f. $[[Rxy]_x a \land Rby]_y$

g. $[[Rcy]_y a \land Rby]_y$

Glen Helman 15 Aug 2006

6.2.xa. Exercise answers

1.

		English	*partial symbolization*
a.	**i.**	Romney is such that (it is north of Linden)	[x is north of Linden]$_x$ Romney
	or	Linden is such that (Romney is north of it)	[Romney is north of x]$_x$ Linden
	ii.	Romney and Linden are such that (the former is north of the latter)	[x is north of y]$_{xy}$ Romney Linden
b.	**i.**	Mike is such that (he gave the package to Nancy)	[x gave the package to Nancy]$_x$ Mike
	or	the package is such that (Mike gave it to Nancy)	[Mike gave x to Nancy]$_x$ the package
	or	Nancy is such that (Mike gave the package to her)	[Mike gave the package to x]$_x$ Nancy
	ii.	Mike, the package, and Nancy are such that (the first gave the second to the third)	[x gave y to z]$_{xyz}$ Mike the package Nancy
c.	**i.**	Tom is such that (he spoke of Ed to Sue)	[x spoke of Ed to Sue]$_x$ Tom
	or	Ed is such that (Tom spoke of him to Sue)	[Tom spoke of x to Sue]$_x$ Ed
	or	Sue is such that (Tom spoke of Ed to her)	[Tom spoke of Ed to x]$_x$ Sue
	ii.	Tom, Ed, and Sue are such that (the first spoke of the second to the third)	[x spoke of y to z]$_{xyz}$ Tom Ed Sue
d.	**i.**	Sam is such that (he traveled to Atlanta by way of Chicago)	[x traveled to Atlanta by way of Chicago]$_x$ Sam
	or	Atlanta is such that (Sam traveled to it by way of Chicago)	[Sam traveled to x by way of Chicago]$_x$ Atlanta
	or	Chicago is such that (Sam traveled to Atlanta by way of it)	[Sam traveled to Atlanta by way of x]$_x$ Chicago

ii. Sam, Atlanta, and Chicago are such that (the first traveled to the second by way of the third)

$[\text{x traveled to y by way of z}]_{xyz}$ <u>Sam</u> <u>Atlanta</u> <u>Chicago</u>

2. **a.** Ann nominated herself

Ann is such that (she nominated herself)

$[\text{x nominated x}]_x$ <u>Ann</u>

$\qquad [\text{Nxx}]_x a$

$\qquad\qquad$ *reduced form:* Naa

N: [_ nominated _]; a: Ann

b. Ralph tried the motor, and it started

the motor is such that (Ralph tried it, and it started)

$[\underline{\text{Ralph}}\text{ tried x and x started}]_x$ <u>the motor</u>

$[\underline{\text{Ralph}}\text{ tried x} \wedge \text{x started}]_x$ m

$\qquad\qquad [\text{Trx} \wedge \text{Sx}]_x m$

$\qquad\qquad$ *reduced form:* Trm ∧ Sm

S: [_ started]; T: [_ tried _]; m: the motor; r: Ralph

The analysis $[\text{Txy} \wedge \text{Sy}]_{xy}$rm is also correct, but a 2-place abstract is not needed in order to analyze pronouns since only the motor has a pronoun referring to it.

c. If the alarm is touched, it will go off

the alarm is such that (if it is touched, it will go off)

$[\text{if x is touched, x will go off}]_x$ <u>the alarm</u>

$[\text{x will be touched} \rightarrow \text{x will go off}]_x$ a

$\qquad\qquad [\text{Tx} \rightarrow \text{Gx}]_x a$

$\qquad\qquad$ *reduced form:* Ta → Ga

T: [_ will be touched]; G: [_ will go off]; a: the alarm

d. Ralph fixed Sam's car, and he drove it back to him

Ralph and Sam are such that (the former fixed the latters's car, and he drove it back to him)

$[\text{x fixed y's car, and x drove y's car back to y}]_{xy}$ <u>Ralph</u> <u>Sam</u>

$[\text{x fixed }\underline{\text{y's car}} \wedge \text{x drove }\underline{\text{y's car}}\text{ back to y}]_{xy}$rs

$[\text{Fx(y's car)} \wedge \text{Dx(y's car)y}]_{xy}$rs

$\qquad\qquad [\text{Fx(cy)} \wedge \text{Dx(cy)y}]_{xy}$rs

$\qquad\qquad$ *reduced form:* Fr(cs) ∧ Dr(cs)s

D: [_ drove _ back to _]; F: [_ fixed _]; c: [_'s car]; r: Ralph; s: Sam

e. Ann and Bill each left a message for the other

Ann and Bill are such that (they each left a message for the other)

$[\text{x and y each left a message for the other}]_{xy}$ <u>Ann</u> <u>Bill</u>

$[\text{x left a message for y} \wedge \text{y left a message for x}]_{xy}$ab

$\qquad\qquad [\text{Mxy} \wedge \text{Myx}]_{xy}$ab

$\qquad\qquad$ *reduced form:* Mab ∧ Mba

M: [_ left a message for _]; a: Ann; b: Bill

The noun phrase a message is a quantifier phrase rather than an individual term so it must be left unanalyzed.

3. **a.** **i.** Al called Bill, and he called Carol

Al and Bill are such that (the former called the latter, and the former called Carol)

$[\text{x called y, and x called Carol}]_{xy}$ <u>Al</u> <u>Bill</u>

$[\text{x called y} \wedge \text{x called }\underline{\text{Carol}}]_{xy}$ab

$\qquad\qquad [\text{Cxy} \wedge \text{Cxc}]_{xy}$ab

ii. Al called Bill, and he called Carol

Al and Bill are such that (the former called the latter, and the latter called Carol)

$[\text{x called y, and y called Carol}]_{xy}$ <u>Al</u> <u>Bill</u>

$[\text{x called y} \wedge \text{y called }\underline{\text{Carol}}]_{xy}$ab

$\qquad\qquad [\text{Cxy} \wedge \text{Cyc}]_{xy}$ab

C: [_ called _]; a: Al; b: Bill; c: Carol

The second interpretation can be indicated in spoken English by emphasizing the pronoun. The first interpretation could be indicated unambiguously by adding too to the end of the sentence.

b. **i.** Sam gave the book to Tom, but he didn't read it

Sam, the book and Tom are such that (the first gave the second to the third, but the first didn't read the second)

$[\text{x gave y to z, but x didn't read y}]_{xyz}$ <u>Sam</u> <u>the book</u> <u>Tom</u>

$[\text{x gave y to z} \wedge \neg \text{ x read y}]_{xyz}$sbt

$\qquad\qquad [\text{Gxyz} \wedge \neg \text{ Rxy}]_{xyz}$sbt

ii. Sam gave the book to Tom, but he didn't read it

Sam, the book and Tom are such that (the first gave the second to the third, but the third didn't read the second)

[x gave y to z, but z didn't read y]$_{xyz}$ <u>Sam</u> <u>the book</u> <u>Tom</u>

[x gave y to z ∧ ¬ z read y]$_{xyz}$sbt

[Gxyz ∧ ¬ Rzy]$_{xyz}$sbt

G: [_ gave _ to _]; R: [_ read _]; b: the book; s: Sam; t: Tom

It is hard to avoid this ambiguity in English without some rewording—e.g., resorting to the former or the latter instead of he or repeating one of the names.

c. **i.** Al washed his car, and so did Bill.

Al and Bill are such that (the former washed his car, and so did the latter).

[x washed his car, and so did y]$_{xy}$ <u>Al</u> <u>Bill</u>

[x is such that (he washed his car) ∧ y is such that (he washed his car)]$_{xy}$ab

[[z washed <u>z's car</u>]$_z$x ∧ [z washed <u>z's car</u>]$_z$y]$_{xy}$ab

[[Wz(z's car)]$_z$x ∧ [Wz(z's car)]$_z$y]$_{xy}$ab

[[Wz(cz)]$_z$x ∧ [Wz(cz)]$_z$y]$_{xy}$ab

ii. Al washed his car, and so did Bill.

Al and Bill are such that (the former washed his car, and so did the latter).

[x washed his car, and so did y]$_{xy}$ <u>Al</u> <u>Bill</u>

[x is such that (he washed x's car) ∧ y is such that (he washed x's car)]$_{xy}$ab

[[z washed <u>x's car</u>]$_z$x ∧ [z washed <u>x's car</u>]$_z$y]$_{xy}$ab

[[Wz(x's car)]$_z$x ∧ [Wz(x's car)]$_z$y]$_{xy}$ab

[[Wz(cx)]$_z$x ∧ [Wz(cx)]$_z$y]$_{xy}$ab

W: [_ washed _]; c: [_'s car]; a: Al; b: Bill

The abstracts here serve two different purposes. The one with largest scope is used to analyze the patterns of co-reference while the two inside its body are designed to capture the function of so did. The ambiguity in the sentence arises because the sameness claimed for Al's and Bill's actions might suggest washing a car related to the washer in the same way (the first interpretation) or, indeed, washing the very same car (the second interpretation). In particular, it's the difference between the idea of washing one's own car—i.e., [Wz(cz)]$_z$—and washing the car of someone, x—i.e., [Wz(cx)]$_z$—someone who, in this case, is the first person to whom the predicate is applied. It is the function of the abstract with wider

scope to capture this idea of a reference to the first person to whom the predicate is applied.

3. Since each abstract has many (indeed, infinitely many) alphabetic variants, the answers **(ii)** below are only examples.

a. **i.** [F ☐] **ii.** [Fy]$_y$

b. **i.** [F ☐ → G ☐] **ii.** [Fx → Gx]$_x$

c. **i.** [T ☐ ☐] **ii.** [Txyx]$_{yx}$

d. **i.** [f ☐ ☐] **ii.** [fzx]$_{xz}$

e. **i.** [S ☐ ☐] **ii.** [Sxyz]$_{xyz}$

f. **i.** [[R ☐ ☐] a ∧ Rb ☐] **ii.** [[Ryx]$_y$a ∧ Rbx]$_x$

g. **i.** [[Rc ☐] a ∧ Rb ☐] **ii.** [[Rcx]$_x$a ∧ Rbz]$_z$

In the original abstract for **(g)**, [[Rcy]$_y$a ∧ Rby]$_y$, the variable y in Rcy falls in the scope of two abstractors for y. It is bound to the one with narrower scope, so the one with wider scope binds only the y in Rby. The pattern in **(i)** shows that the variable in the first abstract is thoroughly "apparent" from the point of view of the abstractor with wider scope: since the latter binds no variables in the first abstract, it does not matter whether that abstract uses the same variable as it does or a different one. In **(f)**, on the other hand, the two abstractors must use different variables since one binds variables in the scope of the other.

Glen Helman 15 Aug 2006