

HG2002: Solution to Tutorial 9

Componential Analysis

Francis Bond <bond@ieee.org>

1. Using semantic components, analyze the following words:

son, daughter, child, mother, father, parent, grandfather, grandmother, grandparent

Discuss whether a binary format would be an advantage here.

You may use two place relations in your descriptions (e.g. [SIBLING-OF[X,Y]]).

If you speak a language that makes additional distinctions in this area, also describe them (e.g. maternal grandmother, ...).

- child(x,y): +CHILD-OF(x,y)
- son(x,y): +MALE(x) +CHILD-OF(x,y)
- daughter(x,y): -MALE(x) +CHILD-OF(x,y)
- parent(x,y): +CHILD-OF(y,x)
- father(x,y): +MALE(x) +CHILD-OF(y,x)
- mother(x,y): -MALE(x) +CHILD-OF(y,x)
- grandparent(x,z): +CHILD-OF(y,x) +CHILD-OF(y,z)
- grandfather(x,z): +MALE(x) +CHILD-OF(y,x) +CHILD-OF(y,z)
- grandmother(x,z): -MALE(x) +CHILD-OF(y,x) +CHILD-OF(y,z)
- 兄 (x,y) *ani* "older brother [of y]": +MALE(x) +CHILD-OF(x,z) +CHILD-OF(y,z) +OLDER(x,y)
- 弟 (x,y) *otouto* "younger brother [of y]": +MALE(x) +CHILD-OF(x,z) +CHILD-OF(y,z) +OLDER(y,x)

We could replace +CHILD-OF(x,y) with +PARENT-OF(y,x);

we could replace +MALE with -FEMALE and -MALE with +FEMALE

2. Which of the following participate in the **causative/inchoative alternation**.

Note: your judgements may be different from mine

- (1) *The goalkeeper bounced the ball.*
Y: *The ball bounced*
- (2) *The assassin murdered the general.*
N: **The general murdered "died"*
- (3) *The waiter melted the chocolate.*
Y: *The chocolate melted*
- (4) *Charlie built the new swimming pool.*
N: *The new swimming pool built*
- (5) *The people lowered the boat.*
N: **The boat lowered.*
- (6) *Kim worried Sandy.*
Y: *Sandy worried.*
- (7) *The censors destroyed the film.*
N: **The film destroyed.*

- (8) *Jo dried the clothes.*
 Y: *The clothes dried.*

For those verbs that do undergo the alternation, translate them into a language of your choice and report on whether the translations undergo a similar alternation.

3. Levin and Rapaport Hovav (1995: 102–5) argue that transitive verbs which do not undergo the **causative/inchoative alternation** need an intentional and volitional Agent. In contrast, verbs that undergo this alternation should also allow a non-Agent subject:

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| (a) <i>John broke the window with a rock</i> | Agent Subject |
| (b) <i>The rock broke the window</i> | Non-Agent (Instrument) Subject |
| (c) <i>The window broke</i> | Inchoative Alternation |

Test this hypothesis on the sentences from Question 2.

- (9) ?? *The wall bounced the ball.*
 (10) *The heat melted the chocolate.*
 (11) *The news worried Sandy.*
 (12) *The heat dried the clothes.*

It generally seems to be true, but not always

4. Consider the following semantic and syntactic tests for countability:

- Semantic: Can it be divided and still use the same name (**divisibility**):
 - Mass: *half some gold is gold*
 - Count: *half a dog is not a dog*
- Syntactic: does it co-occur with *much* or *many* (**enumerability**):
 - Mass: *I don't have much gold*
 - Count: *I don't have many dogs*

Classify the following nouns using these tests:

monkey, program, software, chair, furniture, beer, icecream, curry, chocolate, chicken, salmon, potato, rice, oats, mink

Do the tests always give unique results? If not, why not?

Word	Divisible	Enumerable	Countable	Comment
monkey	–	+	+	
program	–	+	+	
software	+	–	–	
chair	–	+	+	
furniture	+	–	+	
beer	+	+	–	enumeration gives a kind reading
icecream	+	+	–	enumeration gives a kind reading
curry	+	+	–	enumeration gives a kind reading
chocolate	+	+	–	enumeration gives a kind reading
chicken	+	–	+	meat
chicken	–	+	+	bird
salmon	+	–	+	meat
salmon	–	+	+	fish
potato	–	+	–	the vegetable
potato	+	–	–	mashed potato
rice	+	–	–	
oats	+	–	–	
mink	+	–	–	fur
mink	–	+	+	animal

Acknowledgments These questions are partially based on exercises from Saeed (2003).