

Ling 566
Sept 30, 2008
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)

Chomsky Hierarchy



Context-Free Grammar

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

A Toy Grammar

RULES

$S \longrightarrow NP VP$

$NP \longrightarrow (D) A^* N PP^*$

$VP \longrightarrow V (NP) (PP)$

$PP \longrightarrow P NP$

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 $A \rightarrow X$, 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

$S \rightarrow NP \ VP$

$NP \rightarrow D \ N$


$VP \rightarrow V \ NP$

D: *the*

V: *chased*

N: *dog, cat*


Trees and Rules



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

C_n, \dots, C_n

are well-formed trees, and



$C_0 \rightarrow C_1 \dots C_n$

is a grammar rule.

Bottom-up Tree Construction

D: *the*

V: *chased*

N: *dog, cat*

D

|

the

V

|

chased

N

|



dog

N


|

cat


$NP \longrightarrow D \ N$



$VP \longrightarrow V \ NP$




$S \rightarrow NP VP$




Top-down Tree Construction


$S \longrightarrow NP \ VP$




$NP \longrightarrow D \ N$



$VP \longrightarrow V \ NP$






D
|
the

V
|
chased

N
|
dog

N
|
cat



Weaknesses of CFG

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

$VP \longrightarrow P \ NP$

$NP \longrightarrow VP \ S$

- 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 $f(\text{SG})$:

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

- Let r be the regular language $wa^*b^*xc^*d^*y$
- $f(\text{SG}) \cap r = wa^mb^nc^md^ny$
- $wa^mb^nc^md^ny$ 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