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## Overview

- What we're trying to do
- The pieces of our grammar
- Two extended examples
- Reflection on what we've done, what we still have to do
- Reading questions


## What We're Trying To Do

- Objectives
- Develop a theory of knowledge of language
- Represent linguistic information explicitly enough to distinguish well-formed from ill-formed expressions
- Be parsimonious, capturing linguistically significant generalizations.
- Why Formalize?
- To formulate testable predictions
- To check for consistency
- To make it possible to get a computer to do it for us


## How We Construct Sentences

- The Components of Our Grammar
- Grammar rules
- Lexical entries
- Principles
- Type hierarchy (very preliminary, so far)
- Initial symbol (S, for now)
- We combine constraints from these components.
- Q: What says we have to combine them?


## An Example

## A cat slept.

- Can we build this with our tools?
- Given the constraints our grammar puts on well-formed sentences, is this one?


## Lexical Entry for $a$



- Is this a fully specified description?
- What features are unspecified?
- How many word structures can this entry license?


## Lexical Entry for cat



- Which feature paths are abbreviated?
- Is this a fully specified description?
- What features are unspecified?
- How many word structures can this entry license?


## Effect of Principles: the SHAC



## Description of Word Structures for cat



## Description of Word Structures for $a$

| [word |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\left[\right.$ HEAD $\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { det } \\ \text { AGR } \\ \text { COUNT }+\end{array}\right][]$ |
| SYN | VAL $\left.\left[\begin{array}{ll}\operatorname{COMPS} & \rangle \\ \operatorname{SPR} & \rangle \\ \operatorname{MOD} & \rangle\end{array}\right]\right]$ |
|  | $\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { MODE } \\ \text { INDEX }\end{array}\right.$ |
| SEM | $\left\langle\operatorname{RESTR}\left\langle\left[\begin{array}{ll}\operatorname{RELN} & \mathrm{a} \\ \operatorname{BV} & j\end{array}\right]\right\rangle\right.$ |

## Building a Phrase



## Constraints Contributed by Daughter Subtrees



## Constraints Contributed by the Grammar Rule



## A Constraint Involving the SHAC



## Effects of the Valence Principle



## Effects of the Head Feature Principle



## Effects of the Semantic Inheritance Principle



## Effects of the Semantic Compositionality Principle



## Is the Mother Node Now Completely Specified?



## Lexical Entry for slept



## Another Head-Specifier Phrase



Key



## Is this description fully specified?

| [phrase |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SYN | $\left[\begin{array}{lll} \text { HEAD } & \boxed{11} & \\ \text { VAL } & {\left[\begin{array}{lr} \text { SPR } & \rangle \\ \text { COMPS } & \mathbf{1 2} \\ \text { MOD } & \boxed{13} \end{array}\right]} \end{array}\right]$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | [MODE 10 prop |
| SEM | INDEX $s_{1}$ |
|  | RESTR A $\oplus$ B $\oplus$ |



## Does the top node satisfy the initial symbol?



## RESTR of the $S$ node

$\left\langle\left[\begin{array}{ll}\text { RELN } & \mathrm{a} \\ \text { BV } & k\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{ll}\text { RELN } & \text { cat } \\ \text { INST } & k\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{ll}\text { RELN } & \text { sleep } \\ \text { SIT } & s_{1} \\ \text { SLEEPER } & k\end{array}\right], \ldots\right\rangle$

## Another Example



## Head Features from Lexical Entries



## Head Features from Lexical Entries, plus HFP



## Valence Features: Lexicon, Rules, and the Valence Principle



## Required Identities: Grammar Rules
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## Two Semantic Features: the Lexicon \& SIP



## RESTR Values and the SCP
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What's wrong with this sentence?

## An Ungrammatical Example



What's wrong with this sentence?
So what?

## An Ungrammatical Example

## The Valence Principle



## An Ungrammatical Example

## Head Specifier Rule



## Exercise in Critical Thinking

- Our grammar has come a long way since Ch 2 , as we've added ways of representing different kinds of information:
- generalizations across categories
- semantics
- particular linguistic phenomena: valence, agreement, modification
- What else might we add? What facts about language are as yet unrepresented in our model?


## Overview

- What we're trying to do
- The pieces of our grammar
- Two extended examples
- Reflection on what we've done, what we still have to do
- Reading questions
- Next time: Catch up \& review


## Reading Questions

- In what way does the actual meaning of the two structures assigned to this sentence differ?
- We sent two letters to Lee.
- Are they really both grammatical?
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$\left[\begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { group } \\ \text { INST } & i\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { speaker } \\ \text { INST } & l\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { member } \\ \text { SET } & i \\ \text { ELEMENT } & l\end{array}\right]$,
$\left[\begin{array}{ll}\text { RELN } & \text { send } \\ \text { SIT } & s_{7} \\ \text { SENDER } & i \\ \text { SENDEE } & j \\ \text { SENT } & k\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { two } \\ \text { BV } & k\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { letter } \\ \text { INST } & k \\ \text { ADDRESSEE } & m\end{array}\right]$,
$\left[\begin{array}{ll}\text { RELN } & \text { name } \\ \text { NAME } & \text { Lee } \\ \text { NAMED } & j\end{array}\right]$
$\left[\begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { group } \\ \text { INST } & i\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { speaker } \\ \text { INST } & l\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { member } \\ \text { SET } & i \\ \text { ELEMENT } & l\end{array}\right]$,
$\left.\left[\begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { send } \\ \text { SIT } & s_{7} \\ \text { SENDER } & i \\ \text { SENDEE } & j \\ \text { SENT } & k\end{array}\right], \begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { two } \\ \text { BV } & k\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{lc}\text { RELN } & \text { letter } \\ \text { INST } & k \\ \text { ADDRESSEE } & m\end{array}\right]$,
$\left[\begin{array}{ll}\text { RELN } & \text { name } \\ \text { NAME } & \text { Lee } \\ \text { NAMED } & m\end{array}\right]$


## Reading Questions

- How do we know what features to put into a predication?
- Would letters as in letters of the alphabet have the same lexical entry as letters like what's usually sent in the mail?
- How do we represent the difference in meaning between send and sent?


## Reading Questions

- How do we get enough different INDEX values for a whole dictionary?
- Why sometimes $s$ and sometimes $s_{n}$, and not $t, u, v$ ?
- How can to be semantically empty and still have a meaningful INDEX value?
- How can the head of a phrase be semantically empty?
- Why does letter share its INDEX with it's SPR?


## Reading Questions

- Does set of well-formed structures correspond exactly to the set of well-formed English sentences?
- Do we have to understand the squiggly bits?
- Why bother formalizing?
- Don't these feature structures get ridiculously large?


## Reading Questions

- Does English have dative case?
- Is it redundant to have a feature CASE for English given that we mostly use prepositions to mark 'case'?
- English nouns (other than pronouns) are underspecified for CASE. How do we figure out their particular CASE values when they are used in a tree?


## Reading Questions

- Is position alone enough to tell whether something is SPR or COMPS?
- Will this approach work for morphologically complex languages as well?
- What ever happened to NOM?
- Is it worth memorizing the rules now?
- Why aren't we using NumP?


## Reading Questions

- Is top-down or bottom-up more efficient in actual processing?
- How can we possibly do "simultaneous satisfaction" of all constraints?
- What are the best practices for writing trees going bottom-up (order of things to put in)?


## Reading Questions

- Does not having to realize semantic roles mean we can license semantically weird sentences?
- Can we build a grammar that works with more than one sentence at a time? (I.e., paragraphs)

