

Ex. 1

1. Let's suppose that the sentence (1a) has the semantic representation (1b).
Making in addition the following assumptions, propose a “decorated tree” for (1a).
 - We assume a syntax *à la* X-bar, with binary trees.
 - We assume that the semantic contribution of the preposition is void.
 - We assume that *PPs* have a semantic contribution of the same type as that of *NPs*.
 - We assume (for this first question), that *NPs* are of type *e*.
 2. Assuming now that *NPs* contribute a generalised quantifier, propose a decorated tree for the sentence (1c).
 3. Propose now a new decorated tree for the sentence (1a), assuming this time that *NPs* contribute a generalised quantifier.
 4. We are now interested in the construction illustrated in (1d). Assuming that the grammar comprises a rule $S \rightarrow S \text{ and } S$, propose a decorated tree for this sentence. Since the tree is not binary, make sure you specify the semantic composition rule that is associated with this syntactic rule.
 5. Considering (1e), let's assume that a “trace” is produced by a syntactic rule and that it receives a copy of the λ -term that is associated with its coindexed antecedent (as if the ellipsis was resolved in deep structure, before a compositional computation occurs). Propose a complete fragment to account for that case.
 6. Extend the previous fragment to (1f), assuming the most natural antecedent for the trace.
 7. How could the alternative interpretation presented in (1g) be taken into account. Which previous assumptions would have to be challenged?
- (1)
- a. Ann introduces Bob to Cham.
 - b. $Pabc$ — or $((P)a)b)c$
 - c. A man talks to Bob.
 - d. Joe eats and Mo drinks.
 - e. Joe $[eats]_i$ and Mo t_i too.
 - f. Ann introduces Bob to Cham, and t Donald to Elyah.
 - g. Ann introduces Bob to Cham, and Donald t to Elyah.