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On the Semantic Representations of
Strike and Impress
Seiji Iwata

In this talk, I presented an analysis of strike and impress within the framework of Cognitive Semantics proposed in Jackendoff (1983, 87). Although it has been customary in the literature to treat the strike in (1a) as totally unrelated to the strike in (1b), a careful look at other languages suggests that it is not rare for a psychological verb and a verb of physical impact to have the same morphology (e.g., frapper (French), colpire (Italian), utsu (Japanese)).

(1) a. He struck me with a hammer.
    b. He struck me as odd.

Thus, I analyzed the psychological strike on the assumption that it is a metaphorical extension of the spatial strike.

The spatial strike has two basic uses as in (2).

(2) a. A bullet struck the fence.
    b. He struck the fence.

When we focus on the thematic relations, (2a,b) can be paraphrased as "A bullet came to the fence," "He gave an impact to the fence," respectively (These analyses get support in parallel syntactic behavior with hit and paint). This means that the strike in (2a) is a GO-verb, while that in (2b) instantiates a CAUSE with a GO embedded as its second argument.

Turning our eyes to the psychological strike, we find the following three uses.

(3) a. An idea struck me (=An idea occurred to me).
b. The idea strikes me (=The idea is striking to me).

c. He strikes me as being honest.

These *strikes* turn out to have essentially the same thematic relations as those found in (2). (3a) can be paraphrased as "An idea came to my mind," while (3b) as "The idea gives a mental impact to my mind." Furthermore, (3c) may well be analyzed as "He causes a mental object to come to my mind to the effect that he is honest." Hence I related (3a) to (2a) and (3b,c) to (2b) and posited the following representations based on the parallelism with the spatial *strike*.

\[(4)\]

a. An idea struck me (=An idea occurred to me).

\[\text{[GO ([[IDEA]],[TO([I])])]}\]

b. The idea strikes me (=The idea is striking to me).

\[\text{[CAUSE ([[IDEA]],[GO ([[IMPACT]],[TO([I])])])]}\]

c. He strikes me as being honest.

\[\text{[CAUSE ([[HE]],[GO ([i HONEST],[TO([I])])])]}\]

By applying the insights gained for *strike* to *impress*, I got the following representations.

\[(5)\]

a. Tom impresses me as being honest.

\[\text{[CAUSE ([[TOM:]],[GO ([i HONEST],[TO([I])])])]}\]

b. The scene impressed me.

\[\text{[CAUSE ([[SCENE]],[GO ([[ADMIRATION]],[TO([I])])])]}\]

In (5b) the incorporated argument is *ADMIRATION* this time, which serves to explain the fact that the subject must denote something to be favourable and admirable.