Ling 566
Oct 8, 2020

Feature Structures
Headed Rules, Trees

Overview

- Review: problems with CFG, modeling
- Feature structures, unification (pizza)
- Features for linguistic description
- Reformulate grammar rules
- Notion of head/headedness
- Licensing of trees
- Reading questions

Our Goals

- Descriptive, generative grammar
  - Describing English (in this case)
  - Generating all possible well-formed sentences (and no ill-formed ones)
    - Assigning appropriate structures
- Design/discover an appropriate *type* of model (through incremental improvement)
- Create a particular model (grammar fragment) for English

Problems with Context-Free Grammar (atomic node labels)

- Potentially arbitrary rules
- Gets clunky quickly with cross-cutting properties
- Not quite powerful enough for natural languages

Solution: Replace atomic node labels with feature structures.

Cross-cutting Grammatical Properties

	3rd singular subject	plural subject
direct object NP	*denies*	*deny*
no direct object NP	*disappears*	*disappear*

Two Kinds of Language Models

- Speakers' internalized knowledge (their grammar)
- Set of sentences in the language

Things Involved in Modeling Language

- Real world entities (utterance types)
- Models (fully specified trees)
- Descriptions of the models (rules, principles, lexical entries)

Feature Structure Descriptions

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{FEATURE}_1 & \text{VALUE}_1 \\ \text{FEATURE}_2 & \text{VALUE}_2 \\ \ldots & \\ \text{FEATURE}_n & \text{VALUE}_n \end{bmatrix}$$

A Pizza Type Hierarchy



TYPE	FEATURES/VALUES	IST
pizza-thing		
pizza	$\begin{bmatrix} \text{CRUST} & \{\text{thick, thin, stuffed}\} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \textit{topping-set} \end{bmatrix}$	*pizza-thing*
topping-set	$\begin{bmatrix} \text{OLIVES} & \{+, -\} \\ \text{ONIONS} & \{+, -\} \\ \text{MUSHROOMS} & \{+, -\} \end{bmatrix}$	*pizza-thing*
vegetarian		*topping-set*
non-vegetarian	$\begin{bmatrix} \text{SAUSAGE} & \{+, -\} \\ \text{PEPPERONI} & \{+, -\} \\ \text{HAM} & \{+, -\} \end{bmatrix}$	*topping-set*

Type Hierarchies

A type hierarchy....

- ... states what kinds of objects we claim exist (the types)
- ... organizes the objects hierarchically into classes with shared properties (the type hierarchy)
- ... states what general properties each kind of object has (the feature and feature value declarations).

Pizza Descriptions and Pizza Models

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} & \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \textit{vegetarian} & \\ \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{ONIONS} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

How many pizza models (by definition, fully resolved) satisfy this description?

Answer: 2

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} & \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \textit{vegetarian} & \\ \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{ONIONS} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

{<CRUST , thick> , <TOPPINGS , { <OLIVES , + > , <ONIONS, +> , <MUSHROOMS, –>}>}

{<CRUST , thick> , <TOPPINGS , { <OLIVES , + > , <ONIONS, +> , <MUSHROOMS, +>}>}

Pizza Descriptions and Pizza Models

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} & \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \textit{vegetarian} & \\ \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{ONIONS} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

How many pizzas-in-the-world do the pizza models correspond to?

Answer: A large, constantly-changing number.

Pizza Descriptions and Pizza Models

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} & \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \textit{vegetarian} & \\ \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{ONIONS} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

‘type’/‘token’ distinction
applies to sentences as well

Combining Constraints

$$\begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{HAM} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \;\&\; \begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{ONIONS} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Combining Constraints

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} & \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{ONIONS} & + \\ \text{HAM} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Combining Constraints

$$\begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{HAM} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \;\&\; \begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thin} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{ONIONS} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \phi$$

Combining Constraints

$$\begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{HAM} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \;\&\; \begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & vegetarian \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \phi$$

Combining Constraints

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{OLIVES} & + \\ \text{HAM} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \;\&\; \begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thick} \\ \text{TOPPINGS} & \textit{vegetarian} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \phi$$

A New Theory of Pizzas

$$pizza: \begin{bmatrix} \text{CRUST} & \{\text{thick , thin , stuffed}\} \\ \text{ONE-HALF} & \textit{topping-set} \\ \text{OTHER-HALF} & \textit{topping-set} \end{bmatrix}$$

Combining Constraints

$$\begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{ONE-HALF} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{ONIONS} & + \\ \text{OLIVES} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \;\&\; \begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{OTHER-HALF} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{ONIONS} & - \\ \text{OLIVES} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$=$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{ONE-HALF} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{ONIONS} & + \\ \text{OLIVES} & - \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{OTHER-HALF} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{ONIONS} & - \\ \text{OLIVES} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Identity Constraints (tags)

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} & \\ \text{CRUST} & \text{thin} \\ \text{ONE-HALF} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{OLIVES} & \boxed{1} \\ \text{ONIONS} & \boxed{2} \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{OTHER-HALF} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{OLIVES} & \boxed{1} \\ \text{ONIONS} & \boxed{2} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Combining Constraints

$$\begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{ONE-HALF} & \boxed{1}\begin{bmatrix}\text{ONIONS} & + \\ \text{OLIVES} & -\end{bmatrix} \\ \text{OTHER-HALF} & \boxed{1} \end{bmatrix} \;\&\; \begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ \text{OTHER-HALF} & \begin{bmatrix}\text{MUSHROOMS} & - \\ \text{OLIVES} & -\end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$=$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} pizza \\ & \begin{bmatrix}\text{ONIONS} & + \\ \text{OLIVES} & - \\ \text{MUSHROOMS} & -\end{bmatrix} \\ \text{ONE-HALF} & \boxed{1} \\ \text{OTHER-HALF} & \boxed{1} \end{bmatrix}$$

Note

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} & \\ \text{ONE-HALF} & \boxed{1}\begin{bmatrix} \text{ONIONS} & + \\ \text{OLIVES} & - \\ \text{MUSHROOMS} & - \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{OTHER-HALF} & \boxed{1} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$=$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} & \\ \text{ONE-HALF} & \boxed{1} \\ \text{OTHER-HALF} & \boxed{1}\begin{bmatrix} \text{ONIONS} & + \\ \text{OLIVES} & - \\ \text{MUSHROOMS} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Combining Constraints

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} & \\ \text{ONE-HALF} & \boxed{1}\begin{bmatrix} \text{ONIONS} & + \\ \text{OLIVES} & + \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{OTHER-HALF} & \boxed{1}\ \textit{vegetarian} \end{bmatrix} \;\&\; \begin{bmatrix} \textit{pizza} & \\ \text{ONE-HALF} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{SAUSAGE} & + \\ \text{HAM} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \phi$$

Poll!

Why combine constraints?

- The pizza example illustrates how unification can be used to combine information from different sources.
- In our grammar, information will come from lexical entries, grammar rules, and general principles.

Linguistic Application of Feature Structures: Making the Mnemonic Meaningful

What do these CFG categories have in common?

NP & VP:	are both phrases
N & V:	are both words
NP & N:	are both ‘nouny’
VP & V:	are both ‘verby’

The Beginnings of Our Type Hierarchy



A Feature for Part of Speech

$$\text{NP} = \begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} & \\ \text{HEAD} & \textit{noun} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\left\langle \text{bird} \ , \ \begin{bmatrix} \textit{word} & \\ \text{HEAD} & \textit{noun} \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle$$

Type Hierarchy for Parts of Speech I



Type Hierarchy for Parts of Speech II



A Feature for Valence

$$\text{IV} = \begin{bmatrix} \textit{word} & \\ \text{HEAD} & \textit{verb} \\ \text{VAL} & [\text{COMPS} \quad \text{itr}] \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{TV} = \begin{bmatrix} \textit{word} & \\ \text{HEAD} & \textit{verb} \\ \text{VAL} & [\text{COMPS} \quad \text{str}] \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{DTV} = \begin{bmatrix} \textit{word} & \\ \text{HEAD} & \textit{verb} \\ \text{VAL} & [\text{COMPS} \quad \text{dtr}] \end{bmatrix}$$

Underspecification

$$\mathrm{V} = \begin{bmatrix} word & \\ \mathrm{HEAD} & verb \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathrm{VP} = \begin{bmatrix} phrase & \\ \mathrm{HEAD} & verb \end{bmatrix}$$

$$[\mathrm{HEAD} \quad verb\ ]$$

Another Valence Feature

$$\text{NP} = \begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} & \\ \text{HEAD} & \textit{noun} \\ \text{VAL} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{NOM} = \begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} & \\ \text{HEAD} & \textit{noun} \\ \text{VAL} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

SPR and Verbs

$$\mathrm{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} & \\ \mathrm{HEAD} & \textit{verb} \\ \mathrm{VAL} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{COMPS} & \mathrm{itr} \\ \mathrm{SPR} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathrm{VP} = \begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} & \\ \mathrm{HEAD} & \textit{verb} \\ \mathrm{VAL} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{COMPS} & \mathrm{itr} \\ \mathrm{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

S and NP

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{VAL} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

- We created a monster
- our creation of a monster

Type Hierarchy So Far



Reformulating the Grammar Rules I
Which Ch 2 rules do these correspond to?

Head-Complement Rule 1:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbf{H} \begin{bmatrix} \textit{word} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Head Complement Rule 2:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbf{H} \begin{bmatrix} \textit{word} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{str} \\ \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \text{ NP}$$

Head Complement Rule 3:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbf{H} \begin{bmatrix} \textit{word} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{dtr} \\ \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \text{ NP NP}$$

Reformulating the Grammar Rules II

Head-Specifier Rule 1:

$$\begin{bmatrix} phrase \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \overset{\text{NP}}{\begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{AGR} \quad \boxed{1} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}} \quad \mathbf{H} \begin{bmatrix} phrase \\ \text{HEAD} \quad \begin{bmatrix} verb \\ \text{AGR} \quad \boxed{1} \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Head-Specifier Rule 2:

$$\begin{bmatrix} phrase \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{D} \quad \mathbf{H} \begin{bmatrix} phrase \\ \text{HEAD} & noun \\ \text{VAL} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Reformulating the Grammar Rules III

Non-Branching NP Rule

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbf{H} \begin{bmatrix} \textit{word} \\ \text{HEAD} \quad \textit{noun} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{SPR} & + \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Head-Modifier Rule

$$\begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbf{H} \begin{bmatrix} \textit{phrase} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \text{PP}$$

Coordination Rule

$$\boxed{1} \rightarrow \boxed{1}^{+} \begin{bmatrix} \textit{word} \\ \text{HEAD} \quad \textit{conj} \end{bmatrix} \boxed{1}$$

Advantages of the New Formulation

- Subject-verb agreement is stipulated only once (where?)
- Common properties of verbs with different valences are expressed by common features (for example?)
- Parallelisms across phrase types are captured (for example?)

Disadvantages of the New Formulation

- We still have three head complement rules
- We still have two head specifier rules
- We only deal with three verb valences (Which ones? What are some others?)
- The non-branching rule doesn't really do any empirical work
- Others?

Heads

- Intuitive idea: A phrase typically contains a word that determines its most essential properties, including
  - where it occurs in larger phrases, and
  - what its internal structure is
- This is called the head
- The term “head” is used both for the head word in a phrase and for all the intermediate phrases containing that word
- NB: Not all phrases have heads

Formalizing the Notion of Head

- Expressions have a feature HEAD
- HEAD's values are of type *pos*
- For HEAD values of type *agr-pos*, HEAD's value also includes the feature AGR
- Well-formed trees are subject to the Head Feature Principle

The Head Feature Principle

- Intuitive idea: Key properties of phrases are shared with their heads
- The HFP: In any headed phrase, the HEAD value of the mother and the head daughter must be identical.
- Sometimes described in terms of properties "percolating up" or "filtering down", but this is just metaphorical talk

A Tree is Well-Formed if …

- It and each subtree are licensed by a grammar rule or lexical entry
- All general principles (like the HFP) are satisfied.
- NB: Trees are part of our model of the language, so all their features have values (even though we will often be lazy and leave out the values irrelevant to our current point).

Question:

Do phrases that are not headed have HEAD features?

Which rule licenses each node?



Note the three separate uses of DAGs

A Question:

Since the lexical entry for swim below has only [NUM pl] as the value of AGR, how did the tree on the previous slide get [PER 3rd] in the AGR of swim?

$$\left\langle \text{swim} \ , \begin{bmatrix} word & & \\ \text{HEAD} & \begin{bmatrix} verb & \\ \text{AGR} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{NUM} & \text{pl} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{VAL} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{COMPS} & \text{itr} \\ \text{SPR} & - \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle$$

Overview

- Review: problems with CFG
- Modeling
- Feature structures, unification (pizza)
- Features for linguistic description
- Reformulate grammar rules
- Notion of head/headedness
- Licensing of trees
- Next time: Valence and agreement

Reading Questions

- Why treat the VP as the head of S?
- Why does S need AGR features?

The Parallelism between S and NP

- Motivation:
  - pairs like *Chris lectured about syntax* and *Chris's lecture about syntax*.
  - both S and NP exhibit agreement

    *The bird sings/*sing* vs. *The birds sing/ *sings*

    *this/*these bird* vs. *these/*this birds*
- So we treat NP as the saturated category of type *noun* and S as the saturated category of type *verb*.

Question: Is there any other reason to treat V as the head of S?

- In mainstream American English, sentences must have verbs. (How about other varieties of English or other languages?)
- Verbs taking S complements can influence the form of the verb in the complement:

  *I insist/*recall (that) you be here on time*.
- Making V the head of S helps us state such restrictions formally

Reading Questions

- The types and their associated features contribute to a linguistic ontology. Is this related to how ontologies are created in NLP systems, in regards to syntactic structure?

- I don't fully understand how the type hierarchy is structured and its relation to how the nodes are structured. For example, the type *agr-cat* is a daughter of *feat-struc* in the type hierarchy, but is the value of VAL within the expression type in the node structure. What aspects of the type determine where it falls in the type hierarchy, and how is that related to its position within a node structure?

- Why are ‘constraints’ called constraints and not properties or descriptions of the features?

- I am confused about the distinction between 'types' and 'entities’ It seems they sometimes overlap. For example, in valence features, is the *val-cat* a type or an entity?

Reading Questions

- The HFP wants the HEAD value of the mother and daughters to be identical, but it is hard to understand the "identical" requirement, do we look at the HEAD's AGR or COMPS, and do we only need make sure one of them is the same to meet to the requirement or more? In short, what is the degree required to meet the requirement?

Reading Questions

- Why have COMPS on nouns and determiners, especially if (most?) nouns are [COMPS itr]? Seems kind of redundant?
- Could you explain more about why we couldn't make COMPS as a verb's feature, like AUX feature?

Reading Questions

- Would VAL for the imperative verb be [SPR +]?
- What do [SPR -] and [SPR +] mean?
- Am I correct in generalizing that SPR indicates something that is required (or not) to the left, while COMPS indicates something that is required to the right?
- How did people come up with the idea of COMPS/SPR?

Reading Questions

- "Note that the head daughter of this rule is unspecified for COMPS. In fact, all of the categories of type phrase licensed by our grammar are [COMPS itr], so specifying a COMPS value on the head daughter in addition to giving its type as phrase would be redundant "

- By the same logic, why would we need the [COMPS itr] on the mother if its type is already given as phrase?

- Is there a difference between "underspecification" and "overgeneration"? The interpretation of the former term is "an unspecified description (or constraint) always picks out a larger class of feature structures than a fully specified one." I feel like the former term has a positive connotation while the latter one has more of a negative connotation.

Reading Questions

- My question is about the COMPS feature, which is always present in the VAL boxes and labeled as itr for nouns. In other entries where features are not relevant, they tend to be left underspecified. Why is it important to always specify COMPS for entries for which they aren't relevant?

- Underspecification was confusing to me. How can we in simple words, and via a contrasting example, show that 'underspecification' is a good choice of constraint to lead to a more general grammar rule?

Reading Questions

- How were the rules were created and how do they relate to/contrast with the grammar we discussed in chapter 2?

Reading Questions

- In the lexical entry (63b) for 'swim', the text said that it is underspecified for person. So how come the structure for 'swim' in (64b) now has an entry for person? I know it was added to be compatible with the other structure, but why was it left out in 63b?

Which rule licenses each node?



Note the three separate uses of DAGs