Lexical Semantice - Reading Notes. POLYSEMY. (wunfer 19/20). [1] Cuice, D. A. 1995. Polysemy and related phenonena from a coquifie inpuisfic vienpoint. In P. Saint-Dizzier + E. Viegas (eds), Computational Lexical Semantics, 33-49. Cambridge: Cambondge Unreis / Pren. problem: confirefual variation in perceived meaning 2 explanations: ambiguity located in lex. sem. or in prapinatics (1) The feacher stroked his beaud induspecificatio, -> male feacher. pray (confixt (2) The feacher is on maternity leave resolvet. Ofher kuds of confexfual modulation: meronymy (part / whole). (3)/(4) wach the car [on/ride] / lubricate The car Tengue J. exemplais: (8) an orfrich cannot fly like a bind. compare to genuine polyremy (lex. cem. ambiguity): (11) he moored a boat to the bank (12) I need to go to the bank to cash a chegre. within semantic variation, 2 notions: - district lex enfries OR - district facets of mug.

- degree of dufrictures of readings. polycemy. - separati enfris: polytexy (Q: deff. from homophony?) (11)·(12) - polysemen and polylexic. (13)-(14) polysemic, not polylexic. (13) Hordrud an emelete. 2 Numbug 1979: (14) The enelete left inthout paying. 2 pragmatic. Cucci buf.its systematic. context greens selection from predeferried rauge of alternatives. one voute of eludy/analyeis: - polytexy: minimize dixical enfrir max. role of praym or confertual delection. ause: four on polycemy (fre polycemy). types i degreer of duphopies of mug. variable. nock unich descuters / predicts recurrent parfencis Apresjan (1972), Lehrer (1990), Pustejovsky (1991). [polycemy ii cognific cemanfics: lakof 1907, Taylor 1989, aux 1990]. Antagonistic readings. .. · variants as compety affectatives - one choice excurder ofher's. (15) he frally reached The bank. (1) procesif comfraint on accening both mugs af once. [except for zengma].

compare with book - churicis of meaning, multiple can be pricked out to gether: , both object and myo at once. (16) Mis reading a book. point polycerny & mono servey is a confinemen. bank - feacher more dufnet len dufnet I full ambriquity (a) discutenes. " separable (b) antagonism ~ not muchal. identify companies: (17) Hukus the book, so does S. (both fixt or tone, not one of each). stonger identify comfraint on (18) M. var manga light coat; so vas S. Ly pN: what is the identity in (18)? (Type not tokerbut alteratives?) bueight is colour. identity diagnoses dicutenen! udapendent futh condition and diaprose - light wat - Tol F. diciefenen. "like the book" - One is len bold. antagonicm: puns. (23) I done the banks of The Thames: Bardays, Nafuest zugma (25) ? John I bisding lieuce expired last Thurs. vs. (27) This book is difficult to read and to carry around I (fre, not puny or copricing).

of truly ambiguards.

0.40 - the ambiguity (is induspentication).

- can't uce ufont commetting to 1 sence.

- definitional polyremy" (Geeraerts 1989).
1> need morethan 1 definition.

- it is polyremy, not pue grapm, because you

- o it is polyreny, not que prayon; because you can't generalize:

(30) Luke Infalus, Ind I don't like dogs.

(32) ? I'm glad its a gul - I can't stand children.

semi dufict -> maker anfagorium.

"local cence" on spectrum ance 1986.

mouth - horce's mouth, mouth of bottle,

aufrict mit not to fally reparate

no zengma (34) The cau's month resembled that of abothe.

but there are points that are far apout

of the confena put as her yach fented the month that of the care.

PN: this might be a type / toku or ofherice anaphonic problem, not a sense difficien one.

1, nrei month, can month (not-animal) regis confext.

subsence. - v han suprorduates.

cuflen kunfe (mapon). spoon fork (15. fracher 50). so neufral. "kute" isn't polycemon 4 "get abufe": which kind? uner as truite propose is [d. purfejorskyon aulALIA] elided (removed) elenent syntactic neto nymy is mentable /maniant ls both cases, predictable from confext Mathens (1981). (41) med better stop- I snatching (42) M. is reading (41) - defrute, recordable Ly no spee needed. (cf. Tukul). (45) J. is natchip; so is M - NO IDENTITY. reading patient, aub. realisation of peafrent. Leavy pond. of polycemy emoker, heavy senfence prop: high value on latert scale?

zengma - 1 (52) ? 1's puson suffere 1 the raison the confuence me both hearer fran expected. mlike "nafon", fillig ni gap acety is odd. 153) J. received a heavy prison serface > (" infamo tule). -> impredictable respictions -orlexical, idiosyncrafic. similar: "like" ([. liker brondes/ Lyons 1977 - dams conjunction odd, but is it? Jendi "centr": "Ga leut D'ail" - emels/ tanfer like gaulic. Is probably ambig: (59) | peut centra l'ail; Manie aucci (either both smelly or fasting). but > centi [the count of] and the take cooperate readings. "facets" book TOME, TEXT (a) non-antagonific (b) aufonomous "the x itself" to dufiquestione. · use for entity u only one set a propurer. (c) que nice to idutt comfrants, 1 of map sets of truth conds. (d) multi-facted words arent ambig, but phrases withem can be.

- & some predicates pict out one cence, not the other (e.g. "outficult book").

(e) each facet is undep mi oled in lexical relations! hyponymy, hyponymy, etc.

(4) the different facility of a word form a gestall go fogether.

cettain caus: novel, shop, factory le one facet is more central (?). Eng: a long book Gmu: en layer Brich (ws. " pom au"?).

polycemy + cognific enpurpies. pour / tenet: mogs of expressions acree lia pattemo et concepts i cognite nystem. le concept have cores, + lukajes.

and prototypes!

idia: hyponymy, incompatibility, meronymy, etc-primarily conciptual, they lexical.

problem: explair variable efatur of different mugs.

Rete 1. Aprecijan, J. 1972. Regular polysemy. Injuries 124, 5-39.

- 2. Lemer, A.J. 1990. Polysemy, comenforally, + the stractive of the lexicon. Cognific liquifics 1, 207-246.
- 3. Nunberg. G. 1979. The non-uniqueum of semantic solutions: polysemy. Injuries + philosophy 3, 143-184.
- 4. pustejovsky, J. 1991. The generatie Uxico. computational liquifica 17, 409-441.

[2] Dölling, J. T.A. Systematic polysimy. In L. Matthewson, C. Merer, H. Rullmann, + T.E. Zimmenmann (eds), The Blackwell Companion to Semantics.

Aprecjan (1974) - systematic et regular polycemy.

(b) irregular.

idio syncratic.

sener of terms

6. H drank a gean of vie.

CONTAINER (CONTAINED.

[patterns] a count/man

(Pellefier + Schubert 1989, kufter 1995, Chierduia 1998, Falkum 2010, 11.).

a. ANIMAL/ FOOD.

b. " / FUR.

c. TREE/ WOOD

d. AMT/POPTION CUQUID)

e. KIND/AMT OF MATTER.

f- KIND/INDIVIDUAL (chai).

PN: which is county/MASS varies.

j. EVENT/INFO g. TREE/FRUIT. (lufue) h. CONTAINER/CONTENT E. INST./PHYC-OB). i. PHYS-OBJ/INFO (TOME/TEXT). l. INST/PROCESS. (school). P. FOOD/ PROLESS m. ORG/PLACE. (county). (dinner). 9. PHYS-OB) / APERTURE n. PUBLISHER/PUBLICATION. (door, unidon). EVENT / RESULT-OB) (solution). metonymy vs. eyst. polysemy. Nunkug 79. (19) The ham sandwich is af lable " meaning stuft" say 1981. -o coerción, mismatch effect metonymy: also appl. to expressions patter: OBJ for USER. defluence: metorymy is non diferal ("ham sandwich" ou useR rent a texical enty/ part of one). - o can have me to nyme uses of things that are polycemon. (24) The student was reading Plato.

(metonymic ble not all subsets

of unt by Plato is part of ming.).

variation ulin eysternatic polyserny. vabbit, oak, beer. book, leche, undow onemng is dired. herfher mug "pier" (mae banic). originally metorymic. - r lexicalized or conventionalized (PN: metorymy is potentially productie). lexicalization ~ metouymically notrated golycemy. System. polysemy 1 co-predication co-predication: one use, both muge - if results in zengma (nend or marked), then nord is ambiguous (cure 86). (26)? J. fed and att the chicken. Copestade + Briscoe 1995 - ANIMALIFOOD genuine ambiguity. Dölling: " afternaty meaning polyremy". compan: (27) Moncked up + manfered the book. (Acner + purtijovsky 2006). " nor - afferrating meaning". sometimes not clear: (34) · he took the door off its hinger and walked through. [zeugma]. (35) The door was smalled so many fres 'u- had to be bricked up

all common nouses have type/toku alternation. Acher (2011): not alterating (37) micks lay eggs + are comment to most of twope. [But: bare plural could be confound]. Q: is type or token basic?. ano: annox or type KIND, book. . edition sub-type. copy or token! Atune 1 Chances (03): TYPE ITOKEN co-pred ishit ok. (40) ?? This book revolutionzed the world + is full of coffee spans. (but, point at a p.'copy?). neuspaper examples - pupe object; ul information. (10-pred ok). - periodical or englissere (co-pred odd). - publicher or product (x co-pred). (45)? Thenenspaper is yellon + fred its Is might just be pragmatically bad. compare: (46) The paperhas been affailed by the oppontion + publicly burned. publisHEP, PRODUCT idea: publication might not be copy; but concept (#4) + (50) Paper is yellow + published

. 11

once a neek

(both kinds).

I co-pred u/ relatre dances is more furible. Approaches to syst. polysemy 1. Meaning enumeration (like dictionary). Purtejorcky 95, Acher II: misses connections. nefuort appel (a concept map - latoff 87). 2. Primay meaning strategy, only 1 ming lex. represented. Nunbung 1979. 1 convention, others na pragm fransformations. (PN: so, eystem. connections are part of lexicon/lauf. Enouledge). Lo cometice aufficulto oughe for synchronically lexical nule approach [Copesfaket Poriscoe] simi-productie. system. dence extención. (unreisal grinder, unreisal parkager au nich niles). I might also feat as unduspendid e'g., like "feacher" urt gluddi]. 3. unduspecifiéd meaning approaches single ring - not one of the censes kess (Superordinati) Bienisch 1983. 2 weeks = conceptual structure. enty: "meaning dond" / family of concepts (school) = (55) 7x. PURPOSE(x,W), W = TEACHING-AND-LEARNING.

(56) a. APAX. INST(X) x P(X) conceptual shift BHILDING (X) " PROCESS (X) d. " KIND-OF-INST (x) " { } x. INST(x) A PURPOCE(x, W). problems: defait of mapping blv. levels? Q. hou do me ford "core"? Dölling (1997). parameten-freig approach. no one, ethq. chematic Le stotifor systematic ramation of for polycemy. issue: tightness of connections can vary. 4. Spreamed meaning approaches. sugle enty, efreched for co-pred. facet approach - Cince 1986. purfejorsky 91 - generatie lexicon freory.

"dot objects" - complex types, more than one pos, etc. (related to type empiring and coercion). "book PHYS-OB) · INFO commation, selectional respictions pick (PN: ute rector projection). - doeunt explanico-predication (ellipsis still has identity compaints).

13

agnu + Purfejorsky O6, Asher 11. differentiated type presupps.

Conclusions

- 2 knds of syxt. polysemy. open question about représentation.
- experimentation (?) [pN: ser journal].

see Dölling for references.

· I distribute of his a