

Overall goal

Montagovian semantics for Computer Scientists, or
Derivation calculators for Semanticists

Derivations and normalizations are boring, let the computer do it

Gains

- ▶ for NL researchers: a helpful tool
- ▶ for PL researchers: an interesting application to build tools for

Beginning of a beautiful friendship
(or, collaboration, or at least mutual comprehension)

<http://okmij.org/ftp/gengo/NASLLI10/>

Grand goal

NL researchers will

- ▶ gain rational reconstruction of Montagovian tricks
- ▶ import developed CS ideas:
side effects, continuations, regions, staging, dependent types

PL researchers will

- ▶ export developed CS ideas:
side effects, continuations, regions, staging, dependent types
- ▶ build theories of **programming language competence**

All would benefit from connections with logic and probability theory

Plan

June 18

- ▶ Making (intuitive) sense of our metalanguage (Haskell)
- ▶ CFG: writing and (*re-*)interpreting derivations
overall: how to embed (object) languages and represent (grammar/type) derivations

June 19 Denotations and truth conditions: LLF

- ▶ Propositional logic
- ▶ STLC (STT)
- ▶ Simplifying formulas:
teaching computer simple logical inferences

June 20

- ▶ Simple language fragments and interpreters
- ▶ Quantifiers, in two ways
- ▶ Question: quantifiers and scope ambiguity

Plan, cont

June 21

- ▶ Pronouns. Donkey anaphora
- ▶ Dynamic semantics: sentence as an imperative program
- ▶ *Extending* previous language fragments, interpreters and STT to account for information “update”
- ▶ A compositional semantics of donkey anaphora

June 22

- ▶ Scope and inverse linking in continuation semantics

Main ideas

- ▶ *Calcuemus*: yields, denotations
- ▶ *Many* fragments, languages, interpretations
- ▶ Growing fragments and languages
- ▶ Interactivity
- ▶ Montagovian tradition

The look of Haskell

- ▶ GHCi prompt
- ▶ Arithmetic, Logic, Strings
- ▶ Abstractions and applications
- ▶ Types, type annotations, type errors
- ▶ Definitions, parametrized definitions

Exercises 1

$\text{twice} = \lambda f \rightarrow \lambda x \rightarrow f (f x)$

- ▶ How else we can write this definition?
- ▶ Does this term reminds us something from lambda-calculus?
- ▶ How to quickly verify that?

Exercises 2

1. Write Church numeral for 0
2. Write increment `incr`. How to test it?
3. Write addition, multiplication, exponentiation, decrement

Further look at Haskell

Pairs (products)

introduction, elimination, pattern-matching in definitions

Sums (co-products)

introduction, elimination, defining by clauses

Why pairs are called products and why Either is called a sum or a co-product?

Polymorphic types

Exercises 3

Write functions of these types:

$((), a) \rightarrow a$

$a \rightarrow ((), a)$

Either $a \ b \rightarrow (a \rightarrow c) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow c$

$((a, b) \rightarrow c) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c)$

$(a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow ((a, b) \rightarrow c)$

$a \rightarrow ((a \rightarrow f) \rightarrow f)$

$((((a \rightarrow f) \rightarrow f) \rightarrow f) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow f))$

$(\text{Either } a \ b \rightarrow f) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow f, b \rightarrow f)$

$((a, b) \rightarrow f) \rightarrow (((\text{Either } (a \rightarrow f) (b \rightarrow f)) \rightarrow f) \rightarrow f)$

- ▶ what do these functions do?
- ▶ What do these types remind you of?
- ▶ What do the terms you wrote signify?

Exercises 4

1. How polymorphic types relate to universals?
2. Why existentials in Haskell look the way they do?

Exercises 5

1. Define the data type of Pizzas
The datatype describes which baked thing can be considered a pizza and which cannot.
2. Define a data type for burrito

Exercises 6

Think about representing the derivation of, and computing yield and truth values of two sample sentences from the Semantics boot camp:

- ▶ Rick Perry is conservative
- ▶ Rick Perry is in Texas

Map

