

Let's explore this example before we get started. Set aside the ϕ -features of the pronoun.

- (1) *No actress pays herself.*

It's common to write out the LF of such expressions linearly, with x already replacing the variable. The scope of the λ -operator is often in brackets.

No actress λ_1 [pays x_1]

No actress λx [pays x]

Oddly enough, this isn't quite right, since we've moved the quantified DP and left a trace. The actual LF ought to be:

No actress λ_1 [x_1 pays x_1]

No actress λx [x pays x]

Chalk this difference up to yet another shortcut taken in the literature.

Now for the actual exercise

1. For each of the following ambiguous sentences, write out the LF for each of its readings, either linearly or as a tree.

Then, paraphrase the truth-conditions (basically, write the sentence more formally).

Or, create a context (or draw one out with circles) for each reading. For example:

- (2) *Every tenor loves his voice.*

Anaphoric reading:

paraphrase: There's this one guy who's got a voice that every tenor loves.

LF : Every tenor λ_1 [x_1 loves x_2 's voice]

For possessives, use x_i 's NP, where i is an index.

Covariant reading:

paraphrase: Tenor A loves Tenor A's voice, Tenor B loves Tenor B's, and so on.

LF : Every tenor λ_1 [x_1 loves x_1 's voice]

- (3) *None of the girls thinks she runs the place.*

- (4) *Every mother likes her parenting.*

This works in other languages, too. Figure out the two readings of the following sentence:

- (5) *Chaque patissier a réussi son gateau.*
each pastry chef has succeeded x's cake
'Each pastry chef nailed their cake.'

(French)