

Grammar files, PRED values, clause types, illocutionary force

Ling 567

February 9, 2016

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 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?

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}`
- Grammar types 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)
 - We'll only worry about the predicative use (for now)
 - 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

- Check that matrix polar questions are working, and debug as necessary
- Add sentential complement verbs
- Get sentences with NP, PP, and AP predicates working
- Make sure MRSs are correct, and debug as necessary
- Make sure your grammar can *generate* (as well as parse), and debug as necessary

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.
- 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>