

Semantic Analysis and Semantic Roles

Ling 571

Deep Processing Techniques for NLP

February 10, 2016

Roadmap

- Semantic Analysis
 - Semantic attachments
 - Extended example
 - Quantifier scope
 - Earley Parsing and Semantics
- Semantic role labeling (SRL):
 - Motivation:
 - Between deep semantics and slot-filling
 - Thematic roles
 - Thematic role resources
 - PropBank, FrameNet
 - Automatic SRL approaches

NP Attachments

- Noun \rightarrow restaurant $\{ \lambda x. \text{Restaurant}(x) \}$
- Nom \rightarrow Noun $\{ \text{Noun.sem} \}$
- Det \rightarrow Every $\{ \lambda P. \lambda Q. \forall x P(x) \Rightarrow Q(x) \}$
- NP \rightarrow Det Nom $\{ \text{Det.sem}(\text{Nom.sem}) \}$

$$\lambda Q. \forall x \text{Restaurant}(x) \Rightarrow Q(x)$$

Simple VP Representation

- Verb \rightarrow close $\{\lambda x.\exists e \text{Closed}(e) \wedge \text{ClosedThing}(e, x)\}$
- VP \rightarrow Verb $\{\text{Verb.sem}\}$
- S \rightarrow NP VP $\{\text{NP.sem}(\text{VP.sem})\}$

$\lambda Q.\forall x \text{Restaurant}(x) \Rightarrow Q(x)(\lambda y.\exists e \text{Closed}(e) \wedge \text{ClosedThing}(e, y))$

$\forall x \text{Restaurant}(x) \Rightarrow \exists e \text{Closed}(e) \wedge \text{ClosedThing}(e, x)$

Extending Attachments

- ProperNoun \rightarrow Maharani
- What should semantics look like in this style?
 - Needs to produce correct form when applied to VP.sem
 - As in “Maharani closed” \rightarrow

$\exists e \text{Closed}(e) \wedge \text{ClosedThing}(e, \text{Maharani})$

- Correct form: $\lambda x.x(\text{Maharani})$
 - Applies predicate to Maharani

More Attachments

- Determiner

- Det \rightarrow a $\quad \{ \lambda P. \lambda Q. \exists x P(x) \wedge Q(x) \}$

- a restaurant $\quad \lambda Q. \exists x \text{Restaurant}(x) \wedge Q(x)$

- Transitive verb:

- VP \rightarrow Verb NP $\quad \{ \text{Verb.sem}(\text{NP.sem}) \}$

- Verb \rightarrow opened

$$\lambda w. \lambda z. w(\lambda x. \exists e \text{Opened}(e) \wedge \text{Opener}(e, z) \wedge \text{OpenedThing}(e, x))$$

Strategy for Semantic Attachments

- General approach:
 - Create complex lambda expressions with lexical items
 - Introduce quantifiers, predicates, terms
 - Percolate up semantics from child if non-branching
 - Apply semantics of one child to other through lambda
 - Combine elements, but don't introduce new

Matthew opened a restaurant

- Proper_Noun \rightarrow Matthew $\{ \lambda x.x(\text{Matthew}) \}$
- VP \rightarrow Verb NP $\{ \text{Verb.sem}(\text{NP.sem}) \}$

$\lambda w.\lambda z.w(\lambda x.\exists e \text{Opened}(e) \wedge \text{Opener}(e, z) \wedge \text{OpenedThing}(e, x))$

- $(\lambda Q.\exists y \text{Restaurant}(y) \wedge Q(y))$

$\lambda z.(\lambda Q.\exists y \text{Restaurant}(y) \wedge Q(y))$

$(\lambda x.\exists e \text{Opened}(e) \wedge \text{Opener}(e, z) \wedge \text{OpenedThing}(e, x))$

$\lambda z.\exists y \text{Restaurant}(y) \wedge$

$\exists e \text{Opened}(e) \wedge \text{Opener}(e, z) \wedge \text{OpenedThing}(e, y)$

Matthew opened a restaurant

- Proper_Noun \rightarrow Matthew $\{ \lambda x.x(\text{Matthew}) \}$
- S \rightarrow NP VP $\{ \text{NP.sem}(\text{VP.sem}) \}$
- $\lambda x.x(\text{Matthew})$

$(\lambda z.\exists y \text{Restaurant}(y) \wedge$

$\exists e \text{Opened}(e) \wedge \text{Opener}(e, z) \wedge \text{OpenedThing}(e, y))$

$(\lambda z.\exists y \text{Restaurant}(y) \wedge$

$\exists e \text{Opened}(e) \wedge \text{Opener}(e, z) \wedge \text{OpenedThing}(e, y))(\text{Matthew})$

Matthew opened a restaurant

$(\lambda z. \exists y \text{Restaurant}(y) \wedge$

$\exists e \text{Opened}(e) \wedge \text{Opener}(e, z) \wedge \text{OpenedThing}(e, y))(Matthew)$

$\exists y \text{Restaurant}(y) \wedge$

$\exists e \text{Opened}(e) \wedge \text{Opener}(e, Matthew) \wedge \text{OpenedThing}(e, y)$

Sample Attachments

Grammar Rule	Semantic Attachment
$S \rightarrow NP VP$	$\{NP.sem(VP.sem)\}$
$NP \rightarrow Det Nominal$	$\{Det.sem(Nominal.sem)\}$
$NP \rightarrow ProperNoun$	$\{ProperNoun.sem\}$
$Nominal \rightarrow Noun$	$\{Noun.sem\}$
$VP \rightarrow Verb$	$\{Verb.sem\}$
$VP \rightarrow Verb NP$	$\{Verb.sem(NP.sem)\}$
$Det \rightarrow every$	$\{\lambda P.\lambda Q.\forall xP(x) \Rightarrow Q(x)\}$
$Det \rightarrow a$	$\{\lambda P.\lambda Q.\exists xP(x) \wedge Q(x)\}$
$Noun \rightarrow restaurant$	$\{\lambda r.Restaurant(r)\}$
$ProperNoun \rightarrow Matthew$	$\{\lambda m.m(Matthew)\}$
$ProperNoun \rightarrow Franco$	$\{\lambda f.f(Franco)\}$
$ProperNoun \rightarrow Frasca$	$\{\lambda f.f(Frasca)\}$
$Verb \rightarrow closed$	$\{\lambda x.\exists eClosed(e) \wedge ClosedThing(e,x)\}$
$Verb \rightarrow opened$	$\{\lambda w.\lambda z.w(\lambda x.\exists eOpened(e) \wedge Opener(e,z) \wedge Opened(e,x))\}$

Semantics Learning

- Zettlemoyer & Collins, 2005, 2007, etc; Mooney 2007
- Given semantic representation and corpus of parsed sentences
 - Learn mapping from sentences to logical form
 - Structured perceptron
 - Applied to ATIS corpus sentences
- Similar approaches to: learning instructions from computer manuals, game play from walkthroughs, robocup/soccer play from commentary

Quantifier Scope

- Ambiguity:

- *Every restaurant has a menu*

$\forall x \text{Restaurant}(x) \Rightarrow \exists y(\text{Menu}(y) \wedge (\exists e \text{Having}(e) \wedge \text{Haver}(e, x) \wedge \text{Had}(e, y)))$

- Readings:
 - all have a menu;
 - all have same menu
- Only derived one

$\exists y \text{Menu}(y) \wedge \forall x(\text{Restaurant}(x) \Rightarrow \exists e \text{Having}(e) \wedge \text{Haver}(e, x) \wedge \text{Had}(e, y))$

- Potentially $O(n!)$ scopings ($n = \#$ quantifiers)

- There are approaches to describe ambiguity efficiently and recover all alternatives.

Earley Parsing with Semantics

- Implement semantic analysis
 - In parallel with syntactic parsing
 - Enabled by compositional approach
- Required modifications
 - Augment grammar rules with semantic field
 - Augment chart states with meaning expression
 - Completer computes semantics
 - Can also fail
 - Blocks semantically invalid parses
 - Can impose extra work

Semantic Analysis

- Applies principle of compositionality
 - Rule-to-rule hypothesis
 - Links semantic attachments to syntactic rules
 - Incrementally ties semantics to parse processing
 - Lambda calculus meaning representations
 - Most complexity pushed into lexical items
 - Non-terminal rules largely lambda applications