

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.

1. Give a proto-DRS for T_1 that contains α -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*
2. 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 buys a car, he checks the battery.

1. Give a reasonable proto-DRS that represents T_2 before resolution of the presuppositions. You don’t need to construct the proto-DRS explicitly.
2. Resolve the DRS by using the resolution rules from the lecture. You will see the the resulting DRS is not correct, i.e. does not correctly represent the meaning of T_2 . What’s wrong with the analysis?
3. Give a correct DRS for T_2 and propose a new resolution rule that makes it possible to derive the correct DRS from the proto-DRS in part 1.

Hint: The definite NP in T_2 is a *bridging anaphor*, which is related to its antecedent “a car” not by identity (as an ordinary bound definite would be), but by a “bridging relation.” You can assume that the relation R which relates the anaphor and the antecedent (in the example, “belongs-to” or “part-of”) 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 there is no bathroom, or the bathroom is in a strange place.

This sentence does not presuppose that there is a bathroom. Explain how this can be modelled in van der Sandt’s presupposition theory. You will need to use the (local) consistency and/or informativity constraints.

To be turned in by Tuesday, June 26, 11:15