

## 1 Presupposition projection

Consider the following text  $T_1$ :

*Peter studies semantics. If a student writes a seminar-paper on this subject, he gives it to his lecturer.*

- (a) Give a proto-DRS for  $T_1$  that contains  $\alpha$ -DRSs. It is not necessary to construct the DRS explicitly. Represent
  - personal pronouns as  $\alpha x [x]$
  - possessive constructions as on the slides
  - *this subject* like *the subject*
- (b) Show how a DRS that is a correct semantic representation of  $T_1$  can be derived from the proto-DRS by application of the binding and accommodation rules from the lecture.

## 2 Bridging

Consider the following sentence  $T_2$ :

*If Peter builds a house, he paints the door green.*

This sentence is interesting because the definite NP “the door” actually means “the door of the house” i.e., it is related to its antecedent not by identity as an ordinary bound definite would be, but by a belongs-to relation. Such NPs are called *bridging anaphors*.

- (a) Give a (standard) DRS that represents  $T_2$ . You don’t need to construct the DRS explicitly.
- (b) Give a reasonable proto-DRS that represents  $T_2$  before resolution of the presuppositions. You don’t need to construct the proto-DRS explicitly.
- (c) Argue that it is not possible to derive the DRS (a) from the proto-DRS (b) using the binding and accommodation rules from the lecture.
- (d) Propose a new resolution rule for presuppositions that makes it possible to resolve bridging definites (for instance, this could be a modified version of the binding rule). You can assume that the relation  $R$  which relates the anaphor and the antecedent (in the example, “belongs-to”) is given (e.g., it could have been determined by the anaphora resolution module).

### 3 Constraints on accommodation

Consider the following sentence  $T_3$ :

*Either the house doesn't have a bathroom, or the bathroom is-in-a-strange-place.*

(a) Give the proto-DRS and the two resolved DRSES that are in principle possible for this sentence.

(b) One of these readings is excluded by “Gricean” consistency/Informativity constraints, according to van der Sandt’s presupposition theory. Explain why.

(You can find a more detailed description in Rob van der Sandt (1992). Presupposition projection as anaphora resolution. *Journal of Semantics* 9:223–267)