

# Grammar files, PRED values, clause types, illocutionary force

---

Ling 567

May 7, 2019

# Overview

---

- tdl details:
  - Grammar files, instances v. types
  - PRED values
  - Tdl style
- Illocutionary force
- Embedded clauses
- Non-verbal predicates
- Lab 6 overview
- Trigger rules

# Grammar files

- matrix.tdl, head-types.tdl: Type files (core grammar)
- my\_language.tdl: Type file (language specific)
- rules.tdl: Instance file for phrase structure rules
- irules.tdl: Instance file for spelling changing lexical rules
- lrules.tdl: Instance file for non-spelling changing (no affix) lexical rules
- lexicon.tdl: Instance file for lexical entries
- roots.tdl: Instance file for root condition(s)
- labels.tdl: Instance file for node labels
- trigger.mtr: Instance file for trigger rules for generation
- my\_langauge-pet.tdl: Grammar spec file for compilation with 'flop'
- lkb/, ace/, pet/: Directories of files for lkb/ace/pet interaction

# Roots, Labels

- Why do we sometimes see ADJ or CP as the label on the root node?

```
adj-label := label &  
  [ SYNSEM.LOCAL[ CAT.HEAD adj,  
    COORD-STRAT "" ],  
  LABEL-NAME "ADJ" ].
```

```
cp-label := label &  
  [ SYNSEM.LOCAL.CAT [ HEAD comp,  
    VAL.COMPS < > ],  
  LABEL-NAME "CP"].
```

# Types v. instances

- Types define the feature geometry, possibilities for unification, and constraints inherited by instances.
- Instances are what the LKB actually uses to parse and generate.
- Types can have multiple supertypes.
- Instances can only inherit from one type.
- Types and instances exist in separate name spaces.

# Features and types

- Features can only be “declared” for one type. Any type mentioning that feature must inherit from the declaring supertype.
- Features can only be “declared” at the outermost level.

- Good: 

```
type1 := supertype &
  [ FEATURE BOOL ].
```

```
type2 := type1 &
  [ FEATURE + ].
```

- Bad:

```
type2 := supertype &
  [ FEATURE + ].
```

```
type3 := type1 &
  [ PATH.NEW-FEAT + ].
```

# PRED values

- For the MT exercise, we need to coordinate on pred values.
- Convention is `_English+lemma_pos_rel`, where pos is drawn from {n, v, q, a, p}
- Abstract (grammatical) preds don't have leading underscore: `exist_q_rel`
- Featural information isn't replicated in PRED values: `*_went_v_rel`, `*_the_q_rel`

# Tdl style: Bad

---

```
demonstrative-determiner-lex := determiner-lex-supertype &
  [ SYNSEM.LOCAL.CONT.RELS
    <!
      [ PRED "exist_q_rel" ],
        #altkeyrel & arg1-ev-relation &
      [ LBL #lbl,
        ARG1 #index ]
    !>,
  SYNSEM.LKEYS.ALTKEYREL #altkeyrel,
  SYNSEM.LOCAL.CAT.VAL.SPEC.FIRST.LOCAL.CONT.HOOK[ INDEX #index &
    [ COG-ST acti+fam ]
    LTOP #lbl ] ].
```

# Tdl style: Good

---

```
demonstrative-determiner-lex := determiner-lex-supertype &
  [ SYNSEM [ LOCAL [ CONT.RELS <! [ PRED "exist_q_rel" ],
    #altkeyrel & arg1-ev-relation &
    [ LBL #lbl,
      ARG1 #index ] !>,
    CAT.VAL.SPEC.FIRST.LOCAL.CONT.HOOK [ INDEX #index &
      [ COG-ST activ+fam ],
      LTOP #lbl ]],
  LKEYS.ALTKEYREL #altkeyrel ]].
```

# Overview

---

- tdl details:
  - Grammar files, instances v. types
  - PRED values
  - Tdl style
- Illocutionary force
- Embedded clauses
- Non-verbal predicates
- Lab 6 overview
- Trigger rules

# Illocutionary force: Why clausal semantics?

- Illocutionary force correlates with syntactic form.
- MRS representations should include all semantic information that is syntactically marked.

# Aside: Perlocutionary, Locutionary, Illocutionary

- Locutionary act: The act of saying something
- Illocutionary act: The act of asking, asserting, commanding, etc. by saying something
- Perlocutionary act: The act of getting someone to do or believe something by asking, asserting, etc. something.

# Overview

---

- tdl details:
  - Grammar files, instances v. types
  - PRED values
  - Tdl style
- Illocutionary force
- Embedded clauses
- Non-verbal predicates
- Lab 6 overview
- Trigger rules

# What's a clause?

- Syntactically complete
- Expresses some illocutionary force
- Contrasts with fragments, some of which can also carry illocutionary force
- Marking of illocutionary force is often associated with either the clause as a whole or with its head verb
- Clauses can be matrix or embedded
- Embedded clauses can be modifiers or arguments
- Embedded clauses can carry illocutionary force, too

# Our general strategy

- Represent illocutionary force with a feature of events called 'SF'.
- Possible values of SF: comm, prop-or-ques, prop, ques
- For Matrix clauses, non-branching rules at the top of the tree set SF depending on syntactic features.
  - OR: Subject attaching rules constrain SF.
  - OR: Other characteristic rules/lex items constrain SF.
- For embedded clauses, elements higher up the tree (complementizers, selecting verbs) or unary constructions constrain SF.

# Marking of embedded clauses

- Just like matrix clauses
  - Special verbal inflection
  - Complementizers
  - Different word order
  - ... others?
- 
- The feature [MC bool] can be helpful here

# Overview

---

- tdl details:
  - Grammar files, instances v. types
  - PRED values
  - Tdl style
- Illocutionary force
- Embedded clauses
- Non-verbal predicates
- Lab 6 overview
- Trigger rules

# Non-verbal predicates

- This section deals with sentences that have a “copula” verb in some languages and no verb at all in others.
- APs/PPs have a semantic role available
  - Required copula: Treat it as a raising verb
  - No copula: Let the APs/PPs be heads in the head-subj rule
- NPs are semantically saturated
  - Required copula: Different lex entry that introduces `_be_v_id_rel`
  - No copula: Non-branching rule that introduces `_be_v_id_rel` and the subject requirement

# Non-verbal predicates

- Some languages have a copula variably:
  - Across all contexts
  - Only with NPs, but not APs/PPs (etc)
  - Only in certain tenses
- First two can be handled with just appropriate combinations of the strategies discussed
- To get restriction to certain tenses, need to add constraints to the copula and/or the lexical or phrase structure rules involved in licensing verbless clauses.

# Non-verbal predicates

- Locative NPs
  - Some languages use NPs inflected with a particular case where others use PPs (as both modifiers and predicates)
  - The strategy we'll take involves a non-headed unary rule that builds a PP out of a [ CASE loc ] NP.
    - Why non-headed?
    - Why not do this with a lexical rule?

# Overview

---

- tdl details:
  - Grammar files, instances v. types
  - PRED values
  - Tdl style
- Illocutionary force
- Embedded clauses
- Non-verbal predicates
- Lab 6 overview
- Trigger rules

# Lab 6

- Extend your testsuite to cover examples of non-verbal predicates
- Report initial testsuite & test corpus run
- Implement NP, AP, and PP (or locative NP) predicates
- Implement PP (or locative NP) modifiers
- Test generation with the LKB
- Get parsing and generation working with ace

# Lab 6 reminders

- Your write up should illustrate each analysis with IGT examples *that parse with the grammar you turn in*.
- You should test your grammar both with individual sentences one at a time in the LKB and with [incr tsdb()] processing of the whole test suite & test corpus.
- Use [incr tsdb()] to see which examples are ambiguous according to the grammar, and check to see if the ambiguity is justified.
- Incremental development: If you have lots of similar items to enter, get one working first, then enter the rest.

# Overview

---

- tdl details:
  - Grammar files, instances v. types
  - PRED values
  - Tdl style
- Illocutionary force
- Embedded clauses
- Non-verbal predicates
- Lab 6 overview
- Trigger rules

# Trigger rules

---

- Semantically empty lexical entries cause headaches on generation
- Let them all in as often as the parser wants them: exploded search space
- Keep them all out: somethings won't parse
- Solution: trigger rules (trigger.mtr)
- The LKB tells you which items need trigger rules, but the suggested rules don't actually ever fire.
- <http://moin.delph-in.net/LkbGeneration>