Semantics

Consider the following abstract syntax together with its associated Montaguelike semantics:

```
: NP
ALAN
              : NP
KURT
logician : N
{\rm BRITISH} \quad : \ N \to N
              : N \rightarrow (NP \rightarrow S) \rightarrow S
А
              : NP \rightarrow NP \rightarrow S
\mathbf{IS}
              : S \rightarrow S
NOT
[NP]
         = e
[N]
         = e \rightarrow t
[S]
         = t
ALAN
                 = alan
[KURT]
                 = kurt
[LOGICIAN] = logician
[BRITISH]
                 = \lambda px. (\mathbf{british} x) \wedge (px)
[A]
                 = \lambda pq. \exists y. (py) \land (qy)
[IS]
                 = \lambda xy. x = y
[NOT]
                 = \lambda p. \neg p
```

where:

- 1. Compute the semantic representations of the following three sentences:
 - (1) Kurt is a logician
 - (2) Alan is a British logician
 - (3) Kurt is not a British logician

whose abstract syntactic representations are respectively:

```
(1) A LOGICIAN (IS KURT)
```

- (2) A(BRITISH LOGICIAN)(IS ALAN)
- (3) NOT (A (BRITISH LOGICIAN) (IS KURT))

2. Consider a model whose set of entities is $\{a, k\}$ and where the object constant **alan** is interpreted by a and the object constant **kurt** is interpreted by k. Complete this model by giving an interpretation of **logician** and **british** that makes the semantic representations of sentences (1), (2), and (3) true.