

# LING 364: Introduction to Formal Semantics

Lecture 16

March 7th

# Administrivia

- **Homework 2**
  - returned
  - if you didn't get email, let me know
- **Homework 3**
  - should get it back sometime this week

# Administrivia

- **New Handout**
  - Chapter 5: Complexities of Referring Expressions
  - read it for next time (Quiz 4)
- **Thursday's Class**
  - in the computer lab (SS 224)
  - exercises based on Chapter 5
  - no homework (*upcoming Spring break*)

# Today's Class

- **Two topics**
  1. Homework 3 Review
  2. Start looking at Chapter 5

# Part 1: Homework 3 Review

# Homework 3 Review

- **Phrase Structure Grammar (PSG)**
  - $sbar(sbar(NP,S)) \rightarrow wh\_np(NP), s(S).$
  - $sbar(sbar(S)) \rightarrow s(S).$
  - $s(s(VP)) \rightarrow vp(VP).$
  - $s(s(NP,VP)) \rightarrow np(NP), vp(VP).$
  - $wh\_np(np(who)) \rightarrow [who].$
  - $np(np(john)) \rightarrow [john].$
  - $np(np(pete)) \rightarrow [pete].$
  - $np(np(mary)) \rightarrow [mary].$
  - $np(np(Det,N)) \rightarrow det(Det), n(N).$
  - $np(np(Neg,NP)) \rightarrow neg(Neg), np(NP).$
  - $np(np(NP1,Conj,NP2)) \rightarrow np(NP1), conj(Conj), np(NP2).$
  - $neg(neg(not)) \rightarrow [not].$
  - $conj(conj(and)) \rightarrow [and].$
  - $vp(vp(V,NP)) \rightarrow v(V), np(NP).$
  - $v(v(is)) \rightarrow [is].$
  - $det(det(a)) \rightarrow [a].$
  - $n(n(student)) \rightarrow [student].$
  - $n(n(baseball\_fan)) \rightarrow [baseball,fan].$
- **Meaning Grammar (MG)**
  - $saturate1((P1,P2),X) :- !, saturate1(P1,X), saturate1(P2,X).$
  - $saturate1((\lplus P),X) :- !, saturate1(P,X).$
  - $saturate1(P,X) :- arg(1,P,X).$
  - $sbar(P) \rightarrow wh\_np(X), s(P), \{saturate1(P,X)\}.$
  - $sbar(P) \rightarrow s(P).$
  - $s(P) \rightarrow vp(P).$
  - $s(P) \rightarrow np(X), vp(P), \{saturate1(P,X)\}.$
  - $np(john) \rightarrow [john].$
  - $np(pete) \rightarrow [pete].$
  - $np(mary) \rightarrow [mary].$
  - $np(P) \rightarrow det(a), n(P).$
  - $np(\lplus P) \rightarrow neg, np(P).$
  - $np((P1,P2)) \rightarrow np(P1), conj(and), np(P2).$
  - $wh\_np(_X) \rightarrow [who].$
  - $neg \rightarrow [not].$
  - $conj(and) \rightarrow [and].$
  - $vp(P) \rightarrow v(copula), np(P).$
  - $v(copula) \rightarrow [is].$
  - $det(a) \rightarrow [a].$
  - $n(student(_X)) \rightarrow [student].$
  - $n(baseball\_fan(_X)) \rightarrow [baseball,fan].$

# Exercise 1

- Modify the PSG to handle
  - (1) Shelby is small
  - (2) Shelby is a dog
  - (3) Hannibal is a dog

- Phrase structure:

[<sub>S<sub>bar</sub></sub> [S [<sub>NP</sub> Shelby]] [<sub>VP</sub> [V is] [<sub>AP</sub> [A small]]]]]  
AP = adjectival phrase, A = adjective

- **NP rules**

- np(np(john)) --> [john].
- n(n(student)) --> [student].
- add:
- np(np(shelby)) --> [shelby].
- np(np(hannibal)) --> [hannibal].
- n(n(dog)) --> [dog].

- **AP rules**

- ap(ap(A)) --> a(A).
- a(a(small)) --> [small].

- **VP rule**

- vp(vp(V,NP)) --> v(V), np(NP).
- add:
- vp(vp(V,AP)) --> v(V), ap(AP).

# Exercise 1

- **The order matters (NP is recursive)**
  - sbar(sbar(NP,S)) --> wh\_np(NP), s(S).
  - sbar(sbar(S)) --> s(S).
  - s(s(VP)) --> vp(VP).
  - s(s(NP,VP)) --> np(NP), vp(VP).
  - wh\_np(np(who)) --> [who].
  - np(np(john)) --> [john].
  - np(np(pete)) --> [pete].
  - np(np(mary)) --> [mary].
  - **np(np(shelby)) --> [shelby].**
  - **np(np(hannibal)) --> [hannibal].**
  - np(np(Det,N)) --> det(Det), n(N).
  - np(np(Neg,NP)) --> neg(Neg), np(NP).
  - np(np(NP1,Conj,np2)) --> np(NP1), conj(Conj), np(NP2).
  - neg(neg(not)) --> [not].
  - conj(conj(and)) --> [and].
  - **vp(vp(V,AP)) --> v(V), ap(AP).**
  - vp(vp(V,NP)) --> v(V), np(NP).
  - v(v(is)) --> [is].
  - det(det(a)) --> [a].
  - n(n(student)) --> [student].
  - n(n(baseball\_fan)) --> [baseball,fan].
  - **n(n(dog)) --> [dog].**
  - ap(ap(A)) --> a(A).
  - a(a(small)) --> [small].

- **NP rules**

- np(np(john)) --> [john].
- n(n(student)) --> [student].
- add:
- np(np(shelby)) --> [shelby].
- np(np(hannibal)) --> [hannibal].
- n(n(dog)) --> [dog].

- **AP rules**

- ap(ap(A)) --> a(A).
- a(a(small)) --> [small].

- **VP rule**

- vp(vp(V,NP)) --> v(V), np(NP).
- add:
- **vp(vp(V,AP)) --> v(V), ap(AP).**

# Exercise 1

- Modify the MG to handle
  - (1) Shelby is small
  - (2) Shelby is a dog
  - (3) Hannibal is a dog
- Phrase structure:  
 $[S_{bar} [S [NP Shelby]] [VP [V is] [AP [A small]]]]]$   
AP = adjectival phrase, A = adjective

```
?- sbar(X,[hannibal,is,a,dog],[]).  
X = dog(hannibal) ?  
yes  
| ?- sbar(X,[shelby,is,small],[]).  
X = small(shelby) ?  
yes  
| ?- sbar(X,[shelby,is,a,dog],[]).  
X = dog(shelby) ?  
yes
```

- **NP rules**
  - np(john) --> [john].
  - n(student(\_X)) --> [student].
  - add:
  - np(shelby) --> [shelby].
  - np(hannibal) --> [hannibal].
  - n(dog(\_X)) --> [dog].

- **AP rules**
  - ap(P) --> a(P).
  - a(small(\_X)) --> [small].
- **VP rule**
  - vp(P) --> v(**copula**), np(P).
  - add:
  - vp(P) --> v(**copula**), ap(P).

# Exercise 2

- **Possible worlds**
- Part A: using assert with exercise 1 facts
- Part B: Modify MG to handle:
  - (4a) Who is small and a dog?
  - (4b) Who is a dog and not small?
  - **Note:** you need to handle the semantics for “*not small*”

**Note:** looks like we’re conjoining dissimilar categories, e.g. AP (*small*) and NP (*a dog*) or can view it as a reduced form of sentential conjunction, e.g. (4a') [<sub>sbar</sub> Who is small ] and [<sub>sbar</sub> who is a dog] or that we’re conjoining semantically similar types: i.e. predicates with one saturated argument

- **Negation rule**

- $\text{np}(\text{(\text{!+ } P)}) \rightarrow \text{neg}, \text{np}(P).$
- add
- $\text{ap}(\text{(\text{!+ } P)}) \rightarrow \text{neg}, \text{ap}(P).$

- **Conjunction rules (simplest way)**

- $\text{np}((P1,P2)) \rightarrow \text{np}(P1), \text{conj}(\text{and}), \text{np}(P2).$
- add:
- $\text{np}((P1,P2)) \rightarrow \text{ap}(P1), \text{conj}(\text{and}), \text{np}(P2).$
- $\text{np}((P1,P2)) \rightarrow \text{np}(P1), \text{conj}(\text{and}), \text{ap}(P2).$

```
?- sbar(X,[who,is,small,and,a,dog],[]).  
X = small(_A),dog(_A) ?  
| ?- sbar(X,[who,is,a,dog,and,not,small],[]).  
X = dog(_A),\+small(_A) ?
```

(**same variable:** enforced from `saturate1/2`)

# Exercise 3

- **Relative Clauses**
- Modify PSG and MG to parse:
  - (5) Shelby saw Hannibal
  - (6) Hannibal is who Shelby saw
- Need to handle transitive verbs
- Need to decide on some phrase structure for NP “who Shelby saw”
- e.g.
- $[_{NP} [_{NP} \text{who}] [_{S} [_{NP} \text{Shelby}] [_{VP} [_{V} \text{saw}]]]]$
- **V rule**
  - $\text{vp}(\text{vp}(V, AP)) \rightarrow v(V), ap(AP).$
  - $\text{vp}(\text{vp}(V, NP)) \rightarrow v(V), np(NP).$
  - $v(v(is)) \rightarrow [is].$
  - add:
  - $v(v(saw)) \rightarrow [saw].$
  - (allows \**Shelby saw small* as well)
- **NP rule**
  - $\text{np}(\text{np}(WH, S)) \rightarrow wh\_np(WH), s(S).$
- **VP rule (not worrying about empty categories or overgeneration)**
  - $\text{vp}(\text{vp}(V, NP)) \rightarrow v(V), np(NP).$
  - add:
  - $\text{vp}(\text{vp}(V)) \rightarrow v(V).$

# Exercise 3

- **Order matters**

- bar(sbar(NP,S)) --> wh\_np(NP), s(S).
- sbar(sbar(S)) --> s(S).
- s(s(VP)) --> vp(VP).
- s(s(NP,VP)) --> np(NP), vp(VP).
- wh\_np(np(who)) --> [who].
- np(np(john)) --> [john].
- np(np(pete)) --> [pete].
- np(np(mary)) --> [mary].
- np(np(shelby)) --> [shelby].
- np(np(hannibal)) --> [hannibal].
- np(np(Det,N)) --> det(Det), n(N).
- np(np(Neg,NP)) --> neg(Neg), np(NP).
- **np(np(WH,S)) --> wh\_np(WH), s(S).**
- np(np(NP1,Conj,NP2)) --> np(NP1), conj(Conj), np(NP2).
- neg(neg(not)) --> [not].
- conj(conj(and)) --> [and].
- vp(vp(V,AP)) --> v(V), ap(AP).
- **vp(vp(V)) --> v(V).**
- vp(vp(V,NP)) --> v(V), np(NP).
- v(v(is)) --> [is].
- **v(v(saw)) --> [saw].**
- det(det(a)) --> [a].
- n(n(student)) --> [student].
- n(n(baseball\_fan)) --> [baseball,fan].
- n(n(dog)) --> [dog].
- ap(ap(A)) --> a(A).
- a(a(small)) --> [small].

- **V rule**

- vp(vp(V,AP)) --> v(V), ap(AP).
- vp(vp(V,NP)) --> v(V), np(NP).
- v(v(is)) --> [is].
- add:
- v(v(saw)) --> [saw].
- (allows \*Shelby saw small as well)

- **NP rule**

- np(np(WH,S)) --> wh\_np(WH), s(S).

- **VP rule (not worrying about empty categories or overgeneration)**

- vp(vp(V,NP)) --> v(V), np(NP).
- add:
- vp(vp(V)) --> v(V).

# Exercise 3

- **Relative Clauses**
- Modify MG to parse:
  - (5) Shelby saw Hannibal
  - (6) Hannibal is who Shelby saw
  - we have only `saturate1/2` here

## (Lecture 7) Meaning DCG:

```
sentence(P) --> np(NP1), vp(P),  
{saturate1(P,NP1)}.  
vp(P) --> v(P), np(NP2), {saturate2(P,NP2)}.  
v(likes(X,Y)) --> [likes].  
np(john) --> [john].  
np(mary) --> [mary].  
saturate1(P,A) :- arg(1,P,A).  
saturate2(P,A) :- arg(2,P,A).
```

## Transfer new PS rules to MG

- **V rule**
  - $v(v(saw)) \rightarrow [saw]$ .
  - transfer:
  - $v(saw(_X,_Y)) \rightarrow [saw]$ .
- **NP rule (for object relative clause)**
  - $np(np(WH,S)) \rightarrow wh\_np(WH), s(S)$ .
  - transfer:
  - $np(P) \rightarrow wh\_np(WH), s(P), \{saturate2(P,WH)\}$ .
- **VP rules**
  - $vp(P) \rightarrow v(copula), np(P)$ .
  - add:
  - $vp(P) \rightarrow v(P), np(Y), \{saturate2(P,Y)\}$ .
  - $vp(vp(V)) \rightarrow v(V)$ .
  - transfer:
  - $vp(P) \rightarrow v(P)$ .

# Exercise 3

- **Relative Clauses**
  - (6) Hannibal is who Shelby saw
- Doesn't work perfectly
- Why?
- **Steps:**
  - Hannibal is who Shelby saw
  - Hannibal is who Shelby saw( $X, Y$ )
  - Hannibal is who saw(shelby,  $Y$ )
  - Hannibal is saw(shelby,  $Y$ )
  - Hannibal saw(shelby,  $Y$ )

$s(P) \rightarrow np(X), vp(P), \{saturate1(P, X)\}.$

## Transfer new PS rules to MG

- **V rule**
  - $v(v(saw)) \rightarrow [saw].$
  - transfer:
  - $v(saw(_X, _Y)) \rightarrow [saw].$
- **NP rule (for object relative clause)**
  - $np(np(WH, S)) \rightarrow wh\_np(WH), s(S).$
  - transfer:
  - $np(P) \rightarrow wh\_np(WH), s(P), \{saturate2(P, WH)\}.$
- **VP rules**
  - $vp(P) \rightarrow v(copula), np(P).$
  - add:
  - $vp(P) \rightarrow v(P), np(Y), \{saturate2(P, Y)\}.$
- $vp(vp(V)) \rightarrow v(V).$
- transfer:
- $vp(P) \rightarrow v(P).$

# Exercise 3

- **Relative Clauses**
    - (6) Hannibal is who Shelby saw
  - Doesn't work perfectly
  - Why?
  - **Steps:**
    - Hannibal is who Shelby saw
    - Hannibal is who Shelby saw( $X, Y$ )
    - Hannibal is who saw(shelby,  $Y$ )
    - Hannibal is saw(shelby,  $Y$ )
    - Hannibal saw(shelby,  $Y$ )
- $s(P) \rightarrow np(X), vp(P), \{saturate1(P, X)\}.$
- **Quick and Dirty Fix**
    - $s(P) \rightarrow np(X), vp(P), \{saturate1(P, X)\}.$
    - $s(P) \rightarrow np(X), vp(P), \{saturate1(P, X); saturate2(P, X)\}.$
  - **Perhaps a better fix**
    - use the lambda calculus
    - *idea: semantics of who is  $\lambda x$*
    - Hannibal is who saw(shelby,  $Y$ )
    - Hannibal is  $\lambda y, \text{saw}(\text{shelby}, y)$
    - then saturate/1 works
  - **Rule change:**
    - $np(P) \rightarrow wh\_np(WH), s(P), \{saturate2(P, WH)\}.$
    - adjust to:
      - $np(\lambda y, P) \rightarrow wh\_np(Y), s(P), \{saturate2(P, Y)\}.$

# Exercise 4

- **Adjectives (Intersective interpretation)**
- Modify PSG and MG:
  - (7) Ossie is a bird  
bird(ossie) .
  - (8) Ossie is tall  
tall(ossie) .
    - *tall*: predicative adjective
  - (9) Ossie is a tall bird
    - use the **intersective interpretation**
    - i.e. tall( $X$ ),bird( $X$ )
    - *a tall bird*
    - [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>Det</sub> a][<sub>N</sub> [<sub>A</sub> tall][<sub>N</sub> bird]]]]
- **PSG**
- Step 1:
  - np(np(ossie)) --> [ossie].
  - n(n(bird)) --> [bird].
  - a(a(tall)) --> [tall].
- Step 2:
  - n(n(A,N)) --> a(A), n(N).
- **MG**
- np(ossie) --> [ossie].
- n(bird(\_X)) --> [bird].
- a(tall(\_X)) --> [tall].
- n((P1,P2)) --> a(P1), n(P2),  
{saturate1(P1,X),saturate1(P2,X)}.

# Part 2

- Chapter 5: Complexities of Referring Expressions
- (start this today,
- quiz on Thursday in lab class)

# Definite NPs

- Semantic differences between:
  - a dog
  - the dog
- Shelby is a dog
- Shelby is the dog

# Definite NPs

- Definite NP
  - begin with a definite article (“the”)
  - refer or “point” to some entity (in some world)
- Examples
  - the dog
  - the old man
  - the picture of Mary
  - the woman who Susan knows I met

# Definite NPs

- Imagine a world
  - Shelby is the only dog which lives at Paul's house
- Then same truth conditions for:
  - (1) Shelby is cute
  - (2) The dog which lives at Paul's house is cute
- Predicates:
  - cute:       $\text{cute}(X)$ .                  or       $\lambda x.x \text{ cute}$
  - dog:       $\text{dog}(X)$ .                  or       $\lambda x.x \text{ a dog}$
- What is the role played by “the”?
  - **The** dog is cute
  - cf. \*dog is cute

# Definite NPs

- Predicates:
  - cute:       $\text{cute}(X)$ .    or       $\lambda x.x \text{ cute}$
  - dog:         $\text{dog}(X)$ .         or         $\lambda x.x \text{ a dog}$
- What is the role played by “the”?
  - $\text{The dog is cute}$     cf. \* $\text{dog is cute}$
- Idea:
  - “the” is a function (a **robot** in Chapter 5’s terms)
  - takes a property, e.g.  $\text{dog}(X)$ .
  - and picks out something individual in the world, e.g.  $\text{dog42}$
- Example
  - $\text{The dog is cute}$
  - $\text{The dog}(X) \text{ is cute}(Y)$
  - $\text{dog42} \text{ is cute}(Y)$
  - $\text{cute}(\text{dog42})$ .