

# English Syntax and Context Free Grammars

COMP-599

Oct 8, 2015

# Outline

---

What is Syntax

English Syntax

Context Free Grammars

# Syntax

---

How words can be arranged together to form a **grammatical** sentence.

- *This is a valid sentence.*
- *\*A sentence this valid is.*

An asterisk is used to indicate **ungrammaticality**.

One view of syntax:

Generate all and exactly those sentences of a language which are grammatical

# The First Grammarian

Panini (Pāṇini) from the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C. developed a grammar for Sanskrit.

51. The affixes ktvâ, क्त and क्तवतु optionally get इट् after पू ॥

As पूत्वा or पवित्र्वा, सोमोत्तिपूतः, सोमोत्तिपवितः पूतवान् or पवितवान् ॥ This allows option where by VII. 2. 11 there would have been prohibition. See I. 2. 22.

वसतिश्रुधोरिट् ॥ ५२ ॥ पदानि ॥ वसति, श्रुधोः, इट् ॥  
वृत्तिः ॥ वसतेः श्रुधेश्च क्तवानिष्ठयोरिडागमो भवति ।

52. The affix ktvâ, क्त्वा and क्तवतु always receive the augment इट् after वस् (वसति) and श्रुध् ॥

As उषित्वा, उषितः and उषितवान्, क्षुधित्वा, क्षुधितः, क्षुधितवान् ॥ The वस् of the Adâdi class will get इट् as it is enumerated in the list of सेट् roots. The repetition of इट् shows that the rule is invariable, the 'optionally' of the preceding sūtra does not affect it.

अञ्चेः पूजायाम् ॥ ५३ ॥ पदानि ॥ अञ्चेः, पूजायाम् ॥  
वृत्तिः ॥ अञ्चेः पूजायामर्थे क्तवानिष्ठयोरिडागमो भवति ।


Source: <https://archive.org/details/ashtadhyayitrans06paniuoft>

# What We Don't Mean by Grammar

---

Rules or guides for how to write properly

e.g.,



These style guides are **prescriptive**. We are concerned with **descriptive** grammars of naturally occurring language.

# Basic Definitions Terms

---

- grammaticality
- prescriptivism vs descriptivism
- constituency
- grammatical relations
- subcategorization

# Constituency

---

A group of words that behave as a unit

Noun phrases:

- *computational linguistics, it, Stephen Harper, three people on the bus, “Jean-Claude Van Damme, the Muscles from Brussels”*

Adjective phrases:

- *blue, purple, very good, ridiculously annoying and tame*

# Tests for Constituency

---

1. They can appear in similar syntactic environments.

*I saw ...*

*it*

*Jean-Claude Van Damme, the Muscles from Brussels*

*three people on the bus*

*\*Van*

*\*on the*



# Tests for Constituency

---

2. They can be placed in different positions or replaced in a sentence as a unit.

*[Jean-Claude Van Damme, the Muscles from Brussels], beat me up.*

*It was [Jean-Claude Van Damme, the Muscles from Brussels], who beat me up.*

*I was beaten up by [Jean-Claude Van Damme, the Muscles from Brussels].*

*He beat me up. (i.e., J-C V D, the M from B)*

# Tests for Constituency

---

3. It can be used to answer a question.

*Who beat you up?*

*[Jean-Claude Van Damme, the Muscles from Brussels]*

*\*[the Muscles from]*

# Grammatical Relations

---

Relationships between different constituents

Subject

- *Jean-Claude Van Damme relaxed.*
- *The wallet was stolen by a thief.*

(Direct) object

- *The boy kicked the ball.*

Indirect object

- *She gave him a good beating.*

There are many other grammatical relations.

# Subcategorization

---

Notice that different verbs seem to require a different number of **arguments**:

|        |   |                  |
|--------|---|------------------|
| relax  | 1 | subj             |
| steal* | 2 | subj, dobj       |
| kick   | 2 | subj, dobj       |
| give   | 3 | subj, iobj, dobj |

\*the passive changes the subcategorization of the verb

# More Subcategorization

---

Some other possibilities:

want        2        subj, inf. clause

- *I want to learn about computational linguistics.*

apprise     3        subj, obj, pobj with of

- *The minister apprised him of the new developments.*

different   2        subj, pobj with from/than/to

- *This course is different [from/than/to] what I expected.*

# Short Exercise

---

Identify the prepositional phrase in the following sentence. Give arguments for why it is a constituent.

*The next assignment is due on Tuesday, October 20th.*

# Formal Grammars

---

Since we are computational linguists, we will use a formal computational model of grammar to account for these and other syntactic concerns.

## Formal grammar

Rules that generate a set of strings that make up a **language**.

(In this context, language simply refers to a set of strings.)

## Why?

- Formal understanding lets us develop appropriate algorithms for dealing with syntax.
- Implications for cognitive science/language learning

# FSA and Regular Grammars

---

We've already seen examples of languages defined by formal grammars before this class!

FSA to describe aspects of English morphology

- An FSA generates a **regular language**
- FSAs correspond to a class of formal grammars called **regular grammars**

To describe the syntax of natural languages (with multiple constituents, subcategorization, etc.), we need a more powerful class of formal grammars – **context free grammars (CFGs)**.



# Context Free Grammars (CFG)s

---

Rules that describe what possible sentences are:

$S \rightarrow NP VP$

$NP \rightarrow \text{this}$

$VP \rightarrow V$

$V \rightarrow \text{is} \mid \text{kicks} \mid \text{jumps} \mid \text{rocks}$

# Constituent Tree



Trees (and sentences) generated by the previous rules:

$S \rightarrow NP VP$

$NP \rightarrow this$

$VP \rightarrow V$

$V \rightarrow is \mid rules \mid jumps \mid rocks$



# Formal Definition of a CFG

---

A 4-tuple:

$N$  set of **non-terminal** symbols

$\Sigma$  set of **terminal** symbols

$R$  set of **rules** or **productions** in the form  $A \rightarrow (\Sigma \cup N)^*$ ,  
and  $A \in N$

$S$  a designated **start symbol**,  $S \in N$

# Extended Example

---

Let's develop a CFG that can account for verbs with different subcategorization frames:

|                    |                    |   |                  |
|--------------------|--------------------|---|------------------|
| intransitive verbs | <i>relax</i>       | 1 | subj             |
| transitive verbs   | <i>steal, kick</i> | 2 | subj, dobj       |
| ditransitive verbs | <i>give</i>        | 3 | subj, iobj, dobj |

# Undergeneration and Overgeneration

Problems with above grammar:

**Undergeneration:** misses valid English sentences

- *The boy kicked the ball softly.*
- *The thief stole the wallet with ease.*

**Overgeneration:** generates ungrammatical sentences

- *\*The boy kick the ball.*
- *\*The thieves steals the wallets.*

# Extension 1

---

Let's add adverbs and prepositional phrases to our grammar

# Recursion

---

Consider the following sentences:

- *The dog barked.*
- *I know that the dog barked.*
- *You know that I know that the dog barked.*
- *He knows that you know that I know that the dog barked.*
- ...

In general:

**S** -> NP VP

VP -> V<sub>intr</sub>

V<sub>intr</sub> -> *barked*

VP -> V<sub>that</sub> S<sub>that</sub>

V<sub>that</sub>-> *know*

S<sub>that</sub> -> *that S*

# Recursion

---

This recursion in the syntax of English means that sentences can be infinitely long (theoretically).

- For a given sentence  $S$ , you can always make it longer by adding [I/you/he know(s) that  $S$ ].

In practice, the length is limited because we have limited attention span/memory/processing power.



# Exercise

---

Let's try to fix the subject-verb agreement issue:

Present tense:

Singular third-person subject -> verb has affix of -s or -es

Otherwise -> base form of verb

(*to be* is an exception, along with other irregular verbs)

# Dependency Grammar

---

Grammatical relations induce a **dependency relation** between the words that are involved.


*The student studied for the exam.*

Each phrase has a **head word**.

- the student studied for the exam
- the student
- for the exam
- the exam

# Dependency Grammar

We can represent the grammatical relations between phrases as directed edges between their heads.



This lets us get at the relationships between words and phrases in the sentence more easily.

Who/what are involved in the studying event?

- student, for the exam

# Converting between Formalisms

---

Dependency trees can be converted into a standard constituent tree deterministically (if the dependency edges don't cross each other).

Constituent trees can be converted into a dependency tree, if you know what is the **head** of the constituent.

Let's convert some of our previous examples...

# Crossing Dependencies

---

Yes, there can be crossing dependencies.

Especially if the language has **freer word order**:

*Er hat mich versucht zu erreichen.*

*Er hat versucht mich zu erreichen.*

*He tried to reach me.*

These have the same literal meaning.

# Crossing Dependencies Example

What would the dependency edges be in these cases?

*Er hat versucht, mich zu erreichen.*

HE HAS TRIED ME TO REACH

*Er hat mich versucht zu erreichen.*

HE HAS ME TRIED TO REACH

Notice the discontinuous constituent that results in the second case.