Ling 566
Oct 2, 2007

Context-Free Grammar

Overview

- Formal definition of CFG
- Constituency, ambiguity, constituency tests
- Central claims of CFG
- Order independence
- Weaknesses of CFG
- If time: Work through Chapter 2, Problem 1

Review

- Grammars as lists of sentences:
  - Runs afoul of creativity of language
- Grammars as finite-state machines:
  - No representation of dependencies between parts of a sentence
  - No notion of constituents
- Next attempt: Context-free grammar (CFG)

Context-Free Grammar

- A quadruple: $< C, \Sigma, P, S >$
  - C: set of categories
  - Σ: set of terminals (vocabulary)
  - P: set of rewrite rules $\alpha \rightarrow \beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_n$
  - S in C: start symbol
  - For each rule $a \rightarrow \beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_n \in P$
    $a \in C;\ \beta_i \in C \cup \sigma;\ 1 \leq i \leq n$

A Toy Grammar

RULES

S ⟶ NP VP

NP ⟶ (D) A* N PP*

VP ⟶ V (NP) (PP)

PP ⟶ P NP

LEXICON

D: the, some

A: big, brown, old

N: birds, fleas, dog, hunter, I

V: attack, ate, watched

P: for, beside, with

Structural Ambiguity

I saw the astronomer with the telescope.

Structure 1: PP under VP



Structure 1: PP under NP



Constituency Tests

- Recurrent Patterns

  The quick brown fox with the bushy tail jumped over the lazy brown dog with one ear.

- Coordination

  The quick brown fox with the bushy tail and the lazy brown dog with one ear are friends.

- Sentence-initial position

  The election of 2000, everyone will remember for a long time.

- Cleft sentences

  It was a book about syntax they were reading.

General Types of Constituency Tests

- Distributional
- Intonational
- Semantic
- Psycholinguistic

... but they don’t always agree.

Central claims implicit in CFG formalism:

1. Parts of sentences (larger than single words) are linguistically significant units, i.e. phrases play a role in determining meaning, pronunciation, and/or the acceptability of sentences.

2. Phrases are contiguous portions of a sentence (no discontinuous constituents).

3. Two phrases are either disjoint or one fully contains the other (no partially overlapping constituents).

4. What a phrase can consist of depends only on what kind of a phrase it is (that is, the label on its top node), not on what appears around it.

- Claims 1-3 characterize what is called ‘phrase structure grammar’

- Claim 4 (that the internal structure of a phrase depends only on what type of phrase it is, not on where it appears) is what makes it ‘context-free’.

- There is another kind of phrase structure grammar called ‘context-sensitive grammar’ (CSG) that gives up 4. That is, it allows the applicability of a grammar rule to depend on what is in the neighboring environment. So rules can have the form A→X, in the context of Y_Z.

Possible Counterexamples

- To Claim 2 (no discontinuous constituents):

  A technician arrived who could solve the problem.

- To Claim 3 (no overlapping constituents):

  I read what was written about me.

- To Claim 4 (context independence):

  - *He arrives this morning.*
  - **He arrive this morning.*
  - **They arrives this morning.*
  - *They arrive this morning.*

A Trivial CFG

S $\longrightarrow$ NP VP

NP $\longrightarrow$ D N

VP $\longrightarrow$ V NP

D: *the*

V: *chased*

N: *dog, cat*

Trees and Rules



is a well-formed nonlexical tree if (and only if)



are well-formed trees, and

$C_0 \rightarrow C_1 \ldots Cn$ is a grammar rule.

Bottom-up Tree Construction

D: *the*
V: *chased*
N: *dog, cat*



NP ⟶ D N



VP ⟶ V NP



S $\longrightarrow$ NP VP



Top-down Tree Construction

$S \longrightarrow NP\ \ VP$



$NP \longrightarrow D\ \ N$



(twice)

$VP \longrightarrow V\ \ NP$









Bottom-up and top-down approaches are equivalent for CFG, but can differ for more complex types of grammars

Rules

S ⟶ A B

A ⟶ C D, in the environment __E.

B ⟶ E F, in the environment D__.

Lexicon

C: c

D: d

E: e

F: f

This tree is licensed bottom-up, but not top-down



Weaknesses of CFG

- It doesn't tell us what constitutes a linguistically natural rule

  VP → P NP

  NP → VP S

- Rules get very cumbersome once we try to deal with things like agreement and transitivity.

- It has been argued that certain languages (notably Swiss German and Bambara) contain constructions that are provably beyond the descriptive capacity of CFG.

On the other hand....

- It's a simple formalism that can generate infinite languages and assign linguistically plausible structures to them.
- Linguistic constructions that are beyond the descriptive power of CFG are rare.
- It's computationally tractable and techniques for processing CFGs are well understood.

So.....

- CFG has been the starting point for most types of generative grammar.
- The theory we develop in this course is an extension of CFG.

Chapter 2, Problem 1

$S \rightarrow NP\ VP$
$NP \rightarrow (D)\ NOM$
$VP \rightarrow V\ (NP)\ (NP)$
$NOM \rightarrow N$
$NOM \rightarrow NOM\ PP$
$VP \rightarrow VP\ PP$
$PP \rightarrow P\ NP$
$X \rightarrow X^{+}\ CONJ\ X$

D:	a, the
V:	admired, disappeared, put, relied
N:	cat, dog, hat, man, woman, roof
P:	in, on, with
CONJ:	and, or

Chapter 2, Problem 1

- Well-formed English sentence unambiguous according to this grammar
- Well-formed English sentence ambiguous according to this grammar
- Well-formed English sentence not licensed by this grammar
- String licensed by this grammar that is not a well-formed English sentence
- How many strings does this grammar license?

Shieber 1985

- Swiss German example:

...	mer d'chind	em Hans	es huus	lönd	hälfe	aastriiche
...	we the children-ACC	Hans-DAT	the hous-ACC	let	help	paint
...	we let the children help Hans paint the house					

- Cross-serial dependency:
  - *let* governs case on *children*
  - *help* governs case on *Hans*
  - *paint* governs case on *house*

Shieber 1985

- Define a new language $f(\text{SG})$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl@{\qquad}rcl}
f(\text{d'chind}) & = & \text{a} & f(\text{Jan säit das mer}) & = & \text{w} \\
f(\text{em Hans}) & = & \text{b} & f(\text{es huus}) & = & \text{x} \\
f(\text{lönde}) & = & \text{c} & f(\text{aastriiche}) & = & \text{y} \\
f(\text{hälfe}) & = & \text{d} & f([\text{other}]) & = & \text{z}
\end{array}$$

- Let r be the regular language $wa^*b^*xc^*d^*y$
- $f(\text{SG}) \cap r = wa^m b^n x c^m d^n y$
- $wa^m b^n x c^m d^n y$ is not context free.
- But context free languages are closed under intersection.
- $\therefore$ $f(\text{SG})$ (and by extension Swiss German) must not be context free.

Strongly/weakly CF

- A language is *weakly* context-free if the set of strings in the language can be generated by a CFG.
- A language is *strongly* context-free if the CFG furthermore assigns the correct structures to the strings.
- Shieber's argument is that SW is not *weakly* context-free and *a fortiori* not *strongly* context-free.
- Bresnan et al (1983) had already argued that Dutch is *strongly* not context-free, but the argument was dependent on linguistic analyses.

Overview

- Formal definition of CFG
- Constituency, ambiguity, constituency tests
- Central claims of CFG
- Order independence
- Weaknesses of CFG
- Next time: Feature structures