522 Assignment #1 Jan. 26
due Wed. Feb 9th

1. Jackendoff 1992, p. 20, contrasts several different uses of the verb *look*:
   a. Max looked at the insects.
   b. Max looked for the insects.
   c. Max looked smart.
   d. It looked as though we should leave.

We can add a few more that might seem connected:
   e. John looked up the information
   f. Sue looked around and decided to stay.
   g. The book orders are a real problem — I'll look into it.
   h. She looked over the file during her lunch break.

Are these all a single verb *look*, or two or more homophonous verbs *look*? In particular, consider whether or not they pattern together syntactically, whether or not differences in meaning can be explained by appeal to differences in the surrounding material. Use any tests that occur to you: ones we have seen in papers, or ones you come up with on your own. If you can think of any other uses of *look*, feel free to include them in your discussion. If you can see evidence for any particular meaning/structure correspondence, or a "semantic primitive" of some sort, explicate it.

No more than 1 1/2 pages, please!

2. Jackendoff 1992 p. 27, proposes a "semantic correspondence rule" to account for the entailment intuition between (i) "John went to the store" and (ii) "John was at the store": if one is true then the other must be as well. The inference rule, "independent of semantic field" explains this intuition for any *go to/be at* pair of sentences:

a. *Inference rule:* At the termination of $[_{\text{Event}}$ GO ([X], $[_{\text{Path}}$ TO ([Y])])], it is the case that $[_{\text{State}}$ BE ([X], $[_{\text{Place}}$ AT ([Y])])]

Jackendoff notes that the inference rule applies across semantic fields, and that it's pragmatic or world-knowledge which lets us know that if we say "John went to the store" he is no longer at the location from which he started, say ,the house, but if we say "The data went to the hard drive", it is not entailed that the data is no longer in its origianl location, say, on a diskette.

Consider: what if the structure of the concept associated with the verb "go" is not as in the left half of the inference rule above, but is rather that indicated below:

b. $[_{\text{Event}}$ COME TO ($[_{\text{State}}$ BE ([X], $[_{\text{Place}}$ AT ([Y])])])]

Is a separate rule of inference still necessary? What problems, if any, do you forsee for a proposal which associates the conceptual structure in b. with the verb *go*?

No more than 1/2 a page, please!

3. Jackendoff (1993) draws a principled line between semantic information that can show syntactic reflexes and semantic information that cannot in proposing two linked semantic representations: the conceptual structure (whose elements are explictly related to syntactic inforation via correspondence rules) and the 3-D model. Information contained only within the 3-D model cannot affect syntactic representation whatsoever.

He proposes to distinguish between *run, lope* and *jog* (which distinguish manners of running) and *throw*, *toss* and *lob* (which distinguish manners of throwing) purely in the 3-D structure. What does this proposal entail in terms of the lexical entry of *run* and *throw*, given the data below? (Try to distinguish between semantic infelicity and syntactic ill-formedness; they're both indicated with a * below).

a. Jane ran/loped/jogged to the store.
b. Jane ran/*loped/??jogged the horse around the track.
c. Jane ran/*loped/*jogged the company very competently.
d. Jane ran/*loped/*jogged up a huge tab at the pub.
e. Jane ran/*loped/*jogged out of money.
f. Jane ran/?loped/jogged every morning at 8:00 am.

a. Jane threw/tossed/lobbed the ball to Bill.
b. Jane threw/tossed/?lobbed the rope up to the deck.
c. Jane threw/%tossed/*lobbed up her dinner.
d. Jane threw/*tossed/*lobbed the match.
e. Judoka Jane threw/*tossed/*lobbed her opponent to the mat.

No more than a page, please!!