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. Treat

   – *this subject* like *the subject*, and
   – *Semantics* as a proper name.

2. Apply the binding and accommodation rules from the lecture, to arrive at an intuitively adequate fully resolved DRS. Assume that "he" in the second sentence refers to "a student."

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 that the resulting DRS is not correct, i.e. does not correctly represent the meaning of T_2. What's wrong with the analysis?

3. Try to specify a fully resolved resolved DRS for T_2, which provides a more adequate representation of the sentence meaning.

   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" (in the example, "belongs-to" or "part-of"). Assume that there is a resolution rule that allows to pick an appropriate relation.

   Try to formulate this new resolution rule for bridging, and specify its relation to the two rules of binding and acommodation.

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. Give the appropriate DRS, and explain how it can be derived 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, 10:15