# Categorial Type Logics and Italian Corpora

# RAFFAELLA BERNARDI FREE UNIVERSITY OF BOLZANO-BOZEN

Joint work with: A. Bolognesi, S. Romagnoli, C. Seidenari, L. Surace, F. Tamburini

#### Contents

1	Project: Italian Corpus Annotation
2	PoS tagging 4
3	Comparison
4	Distributional Method: Words
5	Distributional Method: Tags 7
6	Distributional Method: Structures
7	Proposal
8	Inducing and Clustering CTAs
9	Which linguistic information can we exploit? 11
10	From Treebank to PoS Classification
11	Turin University Treebank (TUT)
12	TUT representation format
13	TUT example
14	Grammatical Relation
15	Functor Argument (F-A) structures 17
16	Multimodal Composition
17	TUT simplified trees

18	Multimodal F-A structures	20
19	Type Resolution	21
20	Clustering	22
21	Further Research	23
22	Questions	24

▶ **Project** carried out at the University of Bologna (CILTA);

- Project carried out at the University of Bologna (CILTA);
- ► Corpus 100-million-words synchronic corpus of contemporary Italian (CORIS);

- Project carried out at the University of Bologna (CILTA);
- **Corpus** 100-million-words synchronic corpus of contemporary Italian (CORIS);
- Deliverables part-of-speech tagging for the complete corpus, and (possibly) in a later stage syntactic analysis for a subcorpus;

- Project carried out at the University of Bologna (CILTA);
- **Corpus** 100-million-words synchronic corpus of contemporary Italian (CORIS);
- Deliverables part-of-speech tagging for the complete corpus, and (possibly) in a later stage syntactic analysis for a subcorpus;
- **Period** 3 year project. Start of the linguistic annotation task: January 2004.

- Project carried out at the University of Bologna (CILTA);
- ► Corpus 100-million-words synchronic corpus of contemporary Italian (CORIS);
- Deliverables part-of-speech tagging for the complete corpus, and (possibly) in a later stage syntactic analysis for a subcorpus;
- **Period** 3 year project. Start of the linguistic annotation task: January 2004.

Corpora

- Project carried out at the University of Bologna (CILTA);
- ► Corpus 100-million-words synchronic corpus of contemporary Italian (CORIS);
- Deliverables part-of-speech tagging for the complete corpus, and (possibly) in a later stage syntactic analysis for a subcorpus;
- **Period** 3 year project. Start of the linguistic annotation task: January 2004.

Corpora

Beauty Real data vs. linguists'data;

- Project carried out at the University of Bologna (CILTA);
- ► Corpus 100-million-words synchronic corpus of contemporary Italian (CORIS);
- Deliverables part-of-speech tagging for the complete corpus, and (possibly) in a later stage syntactic analysis for a subcorpus;
- **Period** 3 year project. Start of the linguistic annotation task: January 2004.

Corpora

- Beauty Real data vs. linguists'data;
- Essential tool for any study on Natural Languages to provide empirical support to theories and applications.

► Aim Part to Speech (PoS) tagging of CORIS.

- ► Aim Part to Speech (PoS) tagging of CORIS.
- ▶ Question Which PoS classification should we use?

- ► Aim Part to Speech (PoS) tagging of CORIS.
- ▶ Question Which PoS classification should we use?
- ► Other Projects

- ▶ Aim Part to Speech (PoS) tagging of CORIS.
- ▶ Question Which PoS classification should we use?

#### ► Other Projects

- Xerox, Grenoble (France)
- Delmonte, Venezia (Italy)
- ▷ TUT, Torino (Italy)

- ▶ Aim Part to Speech (PoS) tagging of CORIS.
- ▶ Question Which PoS classification should we use?

#### Other Projects

- Xerox, Grenoble (France)
- Delmonte, Venezia (Italy)
- ▷ TUT, Torino (Italy)
- **Standards** EAGLES project, guidelines by Monachini.

- ▶ Aim Part to Speech (PoS) tagging of CORIS.
- Question Which PoS classification should we use?

#### Other Projects

- Xerox, Grenoble (France)
- Delmonte, Venezia (Italy)
- ▷ TUT, Torino (Italy)
- **Standards** EAGLES project, guidelines by Monachini.
- Question How much do these classifications depend on linguistic-theories? Would the tagging satisfy the original purpose of Corpus annotation (to provide empirical support to NL applications)?

► Agreement on the main PoS tags: nouns, verbs, adjectives, determiners, articles, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, numerals, interjections, punctuation and a class of residual items.

- ► Agreement on the main PoS tags: nouns, verbs, adjectives, determiners, articles, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, numerals, interjections, punctuation and a class of residual items.
- Disagreement on the classification within the main PoS tags. For instance, "molti luoghi diversi" - many different places- "molti" (many) is considered

- Agreement on the main PoS tags: nouns, verbs, adjectives, determiners, articles, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, numerals, interjections, punctuation and a class of residual items.
- Disagreement on the classification within the main PoS tags. For instance, "molti luoghi diversi" - many different places- "molti" (many) is considered
  - ▷ an Indefinite DETERMINER in Monachini

- Agreement on the main PoS tags: nouns, verbs, adjectives, determiners, articles, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, numerals, interjections, punctuation and a class of residual items.
- Disagreement on the classification within the main PoS tags. For instance, "molti luoghi diversi" - many different places- "molti" (many) is considered
  - ▷ an Indefinite DETERMINER in Monachini
  - ▷ a Plural QUANTIFIER in Xerox, and

- Agreement on the main PoS tags: nouns, verbs, adjectives, determiners, articles, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, numerals, interjections, punctuation and a class of residual items.
- Disagreement on the classification within the main PoS tags. For instance, "molti luoghi diversi" - many different places- "molti" (many) is considered
  - ▷ an Indefinite DETERMINER in Monachini
  - ▷ a Plural QUANTIFIER in Xerox, and
  - ▷ Indefinite ADJECTIVE in Delmonte and TUT.

- Agreement on the main PoS tags: nouns, verbs, adjectives, determiners, articles, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, numerals, interjections, punctuation and a class of residual items.
- Disagreement on the classification within the main PoS tags. For instance, "molti luoghi diversi" - many different places- "molti" (many) is considered
  - ▷ an Indefinite DETERMINER in Monachini
  - ▷ a Plural QUANTIFIER in Xerox, and
  - ▷ Indefinite ADJECTIVE in Delmonte and TUT.
- Proposal To follow a bottom-up approach and deduce the PoS classification from empirical data by considering the distributional behavior of words.

Aim To examine the distributional behaviour of some target words we can compare the lexical distribution of their contexts [Harris (1951), Kiss (1973), Brill (1993)]:

Aim To examine the distributional behaviour of some target words we can compare the lexical distribution of their contexts [Harris (1951), Kiss (1973), Brill (1993)]:

 	il	babbo	gioca	 dad plays
 macchina	del	babbo		 car of dad

Aim To examine the distributional behaviour of some target words we can compare the lexical distribution of their contexts [Harris (1951), Kiss (1973), Brill (1993)]:

 	il	babbo	gioca	 dad plays
 macchina	del	babbo		 car of dad
 	il	nonno	gioca	 grandfather plays
 macchina	del	nonno		 car of grandfather

Aim To examine the distributional behaviour of some target words we can compare the lexical distribution of their contexts [Harris (1951), Kiss (1973), Brill (1993)]:

 	il	babbo	gioca	 dad plays
 macchina	del	babbo		 car of dad
 	il	nonno	gioca	 grandfather plays
 macchina	del	nonno		 car of grandfather

 Result Using this method on Italian four different categories are obtained: Verbs (V), Nouns (N), Adjectives (Adj) and Grammatical Words (GW). [Tamburini et. ali (2000)]

► Aim To examine the distributional behaviour of some target words we can compare the lexical distribution of their contexts [Harris (1951), Kiss (1973), Brill (1993)]:

 	il	babbo	gioca	 dad plays
 macchina	del	babbo		 car of dad
 	il	nonno	gioca	 grandfather plays
 macchina	del	nonno		 car of grandfather

- Result Using this method on Italian four different categories are obtained: Verbs (V), Nouns (N), Adjectives (Adj) and Grammatical Words (GW). [Tamburini et. ali (2000)]
- **Drawback** sparse data problem which inflates the GW category.

▶ First Solution To solve this problem Tamburini et ali. (2002) applied Brill's method on tags, obtaining a more fine-grained analysis of GW. [Brown, P. et. ali (1992)]

- ▶ First Solution To solve this problem Tamburini et ali. (2002) applied Brill's method on tags, obtaining a more fine-grained analysis of GW. [Brown, P. et. ali (1992)]
  - ... non vedo mai nessuno ... I never see anyone

- ▶ First Solution To solve this problem Tamburini et ali. (2002) applied Brill's method on tags, obtaining a more fine-grained analysis of GW. [Brown, P. et. ali (1992)]
  - ...nonvedomainessunoInever see anyone...vedosemprequalcunoIalways see someone

▶ First Solution To solve this problem Tamburini et ali. (2002) applied Brill's method on tags, obtaining a more fine-grained analysis of GW. [Brown, P. et. ali (1992)]

	V		GW	
 non	vedo	mai	nessuno	 I never see anyone
 	vedo	sempre	qualcuno	 I always see someone

Relying on limited distributional contexts (± 2 words), the method fails to manage linguistic phenomena involving larger chunks of language such as conjunctions.

▶ Relying on limited distributional contexts (± 2 words), the method fails to manage linguistic phenomena involving larger chunks of language such as conjunctions.

GW N GW N la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo...... (the) mum wraps the gift for (the) dad

Relying on limited distributional contexts (± 2 words), the method fails to manage linguistic phenomena involving larger chunks of language such as conjunctions.

GW N GW N la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo ... ... (the) mum wraps the gift for (the) dad la mamma incarta il regalo e il babbo scrive il biglietto (the) mum wraps the gift and (the) dad writes the greetings card

▶ Relying on limited distributional contexts (± 2 words), the method fails to manage linguistic phenomena involving larger chunks of language such as conjunctions.

GW NGW Nla mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo...(the) mum wraps the gift for (the) dadla mamma incarta il regalo eil babbo scrive il biglietto(the) mum wraps the gift and (the) dad writes the greetings card

Hence

Relying on limited distributional contexts (± 2 words), the method fails to manage linguistic phenomena involving larger chunks of language such as conjunctions.

GW N GW N la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo ... ... (the) mum wraps the gift for (the) dad la mamma incarta il regalo e il babbo scrive il biglietto (the) mum wraps the gift and (the) dad writes the greetings card

Hence

▷ With limited context "e" seems to act as "per"
#### 6. Distributional Method: Structures

Relying on limited distributional contexts (± 2 words), the method fails to manage linguistic phenomena involving larger chunks of language such as conjunctions.

GW N GW N la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo ... ... (the) mum wraps the gift for (the) dad la mamma incarta il regalo e il babbo scrive il biglietto (the) mum wraps the gift and (the) dad writes the greetings card

#### Hence

- ▷ With limited context "e" seems to act as "per"
- ▷ Conjunctions may be clustered with prepositions.

#### 6. Distributional Method: Structures

Relying on limited distributional contexts (± 2 words), the method fails to manage linguistic phenomena involving larger chunks of language such as conjunctions.

GW N GW N la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo ... ... (the) mum wraps the gift for (the) dad la mamma incarta il regalo e il babbo scrive il biglietto (the) mum wraps the gift and (the) dad writes the greetings card

#### Hence

- ▷ With limited context "e" seems to act as "per"
- ▷ Conjunctions may be clustered with prepositions.
- ▶ Tags carrying structural information could help overcome this problem.

We propose to exploit the structural information carried out by Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs).

We propose to exploit the structural information carried out by Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs).

For example, in the sentence:

We propose to exploit the structural information carried out by Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs).

For example, in the sentence:

la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo - mum wraps the gift for dad

We propose to exploit the structural information carried out by Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs).

For example, in the sentence:

la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo - mum wraps the gift for dad

per is a functor (head) which has the type pp/np

We propose to exploit the structural information carried out by Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs).

For example, in the sentence:

la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo - mum wraps the gift for dad

per is a functor (head) which has the type pp/np In the sentence:

We propose to exploit the structural information carried out by Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs).

For example, in the sentence:

la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo - mum wraps the gift for dad

per is a functor (head) which has the type pp/npIn the sentence:

la mamma incarta il regalo e il babbo scrive il biglietto mum wraps the gift and dad writes the greetings card

We propose to exploit the structural information carried out by Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs).

For example, in the sentence:

la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo - mum wraps the gift for dad

per is a functor (head) which has the type pp/npIn the sentence:

la mamma incarta il regalo e il babbo scrive il biglietto mum wraps the gift and dad writes the greetings card

e is a functor which has the type  $(s\backslash s)/s$ 

We propose to exploit the structural information carried out by Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs).

For example, in the sentence:

la mamma incarta il regalo per il babbo - mum wraps the gift for dad

per is a functor (head) which has the type pp/npIn the sentence:

la mamma incarta il regalo e il babbo scrive il biglietto mum wraps the gift and dad writes the greetings card

e is a functor which has the type  $(s\backslash s)/s$ 

Therefore, categorial types clustering will properly distinguish prepositions from conjunction.

We need to

▶ Induce Categorial Type Assignments from "raw" data

We need to

- ▶ Induce Categorial Type Assignments from "raw" data
- ▶ Or better, from data enriched with linguistically neutral information

We need to

- ▶ Induce Categorial Type Assignments from "raw" data
- ▶ Or better, from data enriched with linguistically neutral information
- ▶ Apply the clustering algorithm on the obtained CTAs.

We need to

- ▶ Induce Categorial Type Assignments from "raw" data
- ▶ Or better, from data enriched with linguistically neutral information
- ▶ Apply the clustering algorithm on the obtained CTAs.

Note, a rather small number of highly frequent words should suffice for the present task [Brill (1993)].

▶ The only PoS tags could be the ones clustered via of the distributional approach.

- ▶ The only PoS tags could be the ones clustered via of the distributional approach.
- The grammatical relations that are less theory-driven are Head-Dependent (H-D) and Functor-Argument (F-A) relations.

- ▶ The only PoS tags could be the ones clustered via of the distributional approach.
- The grammatical relations that are less theory-driven are Head-Dependent (H-D) and Functor-Argument (F-A) relations.
- They way H-D and F-A relate can be used to identify different modes of composition. In particular, we have founded the following main classes of dependents

- ▶ The only PoS tags could be the ones clustered via of the distributional approach.
- The grammatical relations that are less theory-driven are Head-Dependent (H-D) and Functor-Argument (F-A) relations.
- They way H-D and F-A relate can be used to identify different modes of composition. In particular, we have founded the following main classes of dependents
  - 1. Arguments (ARG), H-D coincides with F-A;

- ▶ The only PoS tags could be the ones clustered via of the distributional approach.
- The grammatical relations that are less theory-driven are Head-Dependent (H-D) and Functor-Argument (F-A) relations.
- They way H-D and F-A relate can be used to identify different modes of composition. In particular, we have founded the following main classes of dependents
  - 1. Arguments (ARG), H-D coincides with F-A;
  - 2. Modifiers (RMOD), H-D does not coincide with F-A. RMOD are optional -they return the same category they compose with;

- ▶ The only PoS tags could be the ones clustered via of the distributional approach.
- The grammatical relations that are less theory-driven are Head-Dependent (H-D) and Functor-Argument (F-A) relations.
- They way H-D and F-A relate can be used to identify different modes of composition. In particular, we have founded the following main classes of dependents
  - 1. Arguments (ARG), H-D coincides with F-A;
  - 2. Modifiers (RMOD), H-D does not coincide with F-A. RMOD are optional -they return the same category they compose with;
  - 3. Auxiliaries (AUX), H-D does not coincide with F-A. AUX are indispensable for grammaticality since they modify the head verb;

- ▶ The only PoS tags could be the ones clustered via of the distributional approach.
- The grammatical relations that are less theory-driven are Head-Dependent (H-D) and Functor-Argument (F-A) relations.
- They way H-D and F-A relate can be used to identify different modes of composition. In particular, we have founded the following main classes of dependents
  - 1. Arguments (ARG), H-D coincides with F-A;
  - 2. Modifiers (RMOD), H-D does not coincide with F-A. RMOD are optional -they return the same category they compose with;
  - 3. Auxiliaries (AUX), H-D does not coincide with F-A. AUX are indispensable for grammaticality since they modify the head verb;
  - 4. Coordination (COORD), they are polymorphic ternary relations.

- ▶ The only PoS tags could be the ones clustered via of the distributional approach.
- The grammatical relations that are less theory-driven are Head-Dependent (H-D) and Functor-Argument (F-A) relations.
- They way H-D and F-A relate can be used to identify different modes of composition. In particular, we have founded the following main classes of dependents
  - 1. Arguments (ARG), H-D coincides with F-A;
  - 2. Modifiers (RMOD), H-D does not coincide with F-A. RMOD are optional -they return the same category they compose with;
  - 3. Auxiliaries (AUX), H-D does not coincide with F-A. AUX are indispensable for grammaticality since they modify the head verb;
  - 4. Coordination (COORD), they are polymorphic ternary relations.
- Based on these observations, information on H-D and F-A can be extracted from (dependency) treebanks.

Given an Italian treebank

1. H-D relations: we extract only the linguistically-neutral information on the Heads and their Dependents (ARG, RMOD, AUX, COORD);

- 1. H-D relations: we extract only the linguistically-neutral information on the Heads and their Dependents (ARG, RMOD, AUX, COORD);
- 2. F-A structures we extract the functor-argument (F-A) structures;

- 1. H-D relations: we extract only the linguistically-neutral information on the Heads and their Dependents (ARG, RMOD, AUX, COORD);
- 2. F-A structures we extract the functor-argument (F-A) structures;
- 3. **Types** we apply the Type Resolution algorithm proposed in [van Emden 88] and [Buszkowski, Penn 90] obtaining Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs);

- 1. H-D relations: we extract only the linguistically-neutral information on the Heads and their Dependents (ARG, RMOD, AUX, COORD);
- 2. F-A structures we extract the functor-argument (F-A) structures;
- 3. **Types** we apply the Type Resolution algorithm proposed in [van Emden 88] and [Buszkowski, Penn 90] obtaining Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs);
- 4. **Clusters** we apply a distributional-syntactic clustering method on CTAs, obtaining empirical suggestions to PoS TAG sets.

- 1. H-D relations: we extract only the linguistically-neutral information on the Heads and their Dependents (ARG, RMOD, AUX, COORD);
- 2. F-A structures we extract the functor-argument (F-A) structures;
- 3. **Types** we apply the Type Resolution algorithm proposed in [van Emden 88] and [Buszkowski, Penn 90] obtaining Categorial Type Assignments (CTAs);
- 4. **Clusters** we apply a distributional-syntactic clustering method on CTAs, obtaining empirical suggestions to PoS TAG sets.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathsf{Treebank} & \to_{meta-data}^{extraction \ of} \to & \mathsf{Meta-Treebank} & \to^{conversion} \to & \mathsf{F-A \ structures} \\ & & \downarrow^{typeresolution} \\ & & \mathsf{TAG \ set} & \leftarrow_{clustering} \leftarrow & \mathsf{Categorial \ Types} \end{array}$$

The only available Italian Treebank is TUT.

The only available Italian Treebank is TUT.

It is a collection of syntactically annotated Italian sentences;

The only available Italian Treebank is TUT.

- ▶ It is a collection of syntactically annotated Italian sentences;
- ▶ it's rather small. It consists of 38,653 words and 1,500 sentences;

The only available Italian Treebank is TUT.

- ▶ It is a collection of syntactically annotated Italian sentences;
- ▶ it's rather small. It consists of 38,653 words and 1,500 sentences;
- ▶ it's a dependency treebank.

The only available Italian Treebank is TUT.

- ▶ It is a collection of syntactically annotated Italian sentences;
- ▶ it's rather small. It consists of 38,653 words and 1,500 sentences;
- ▶ it's a dependency treebank.

The only available Italian Treebank is TUT.

- ▶ It is a collection of syntactically annotated Italian sentences;
- ▶ it's rather small. It consists of 38,653 words and 1,500 sentences;
- ▶ it's a dependency treebank.

- ▶ It's a multi-layered corpus, annotated at the syntactic and lexico-semantic levels;
- ▶ it has a user interface to explore the corpus;

The only available Italian Treebank is TUT.

- ▶ It is a collection of syntactically annotated Italian sentences;
- ▶ it's rather small. It consists of 38,653 words and 1,500 sentences;
- ▶ it's a dependency treebank.

- ▶ It's a multi-layered corpus, annotated at the syntactic and lexico-semantic levels;
- it has a user interface to explore the corpus;
- ▶ it counts 305,547 word tokens. But

The only available Italian Treebank is TUT.

- It is a collection of syntactically annotated Italian sentences;
- ▶ it's rather small. It consists of 38,653 words and 1,500 sentences;
- ▶ it's a dependency treebank.

- ▶ It's a multi-layered corpus, annotated at the syntactic and lexico-semantic levels;
- it has a user interface to explore the corpus;
- ▶ it counts 305,547 word tokens. But
- ▶ it's not (freely) available.
In TUT trees:

In TUT trees:

each node is labelled by a word;

In TUT trees:

- each node is labelled by a word;
- ▶ each arch is labelled by a grammatical relation.

In TUT trees:

- each node is labelled by a word;
- each arch is labelled by a grammatical relation.

The information concerning a single node word is given as below:

In TUT trees:

- each node is labelled by a word;
- each arch is labelled by a grammatical relation.

The information concerning a single node word is given as below:

 $n \text{ word } (f_1 \ f_2 \ldots f_n) [H; MORPH - SYNT - SEM]$ 

In TUT trees:

- each node is labelled by a word;
- each arch is labelled by a grammatical relation.

The information concerning a single node word is given as below:

 $n \text{ word } (f_1 \ f_2 \ldots f_n) [H; MORPH - SYNT - SEM]$ 

 $\blacktriangleright$  *n* is the number of the linear order of the word occurrence;

In TUT trees:

- each node is labelled by a word;
- each arch is labelled by a grammatical relation.

The information concerning a single node word is given as below:

 $n \text{ word } (f_1 \ f_2 \ldots f_n) [H; MORPH - SYNT - SEM]$ 

- $\blacktriangleright$  *n* is the number of the linear order of the word occurrence;
- $\blacktriangleright$   $f_i$  are morphological features associated with the word itself;

In TUT trees:

- each node is labelled by a word;
- each arch is labelled by a grammatical relation.

The information concerning a single node word is given as below:

 $n \text{ word } (f_1 \ f_2 \ldots f_n) [H; MORPH - SYNT - SEM]$ 

- $\blacktriangleright$  *n* is the number of the linear order of the word occurrence;
- $f_i$  are morphological features associated with the word itself;
- ► MORPH-SYNT-SEM are the grammatical relations concerning the dependency edge linking the word with its syntactic head (H).

#### 13. TUT example

I (IL ART DEF M PL) 1 [6:VERB-SUBJ] primi (PRIMO ADJ ORDIN M PL) 2 [3; ADJC+ORDIN-RMOD] approcci (APPROCCIO NOUN COMMON M PL) 3 [1; DET+DEF-ARG] non (NON ADV NEG) 4 [6:ADVB-RMOD] 5 sono (ESSERE VERB AUX IND PRES INTR 3 PL) [6; AUX+TENSE] stati (ESSERE VERB MAIN PART PAST INTR PL M) 6 [0;TOP-VERB] esaltanti (ESALTANTE ADJ QUALIF ALLVAL PL) 7 [6; VERB-PREDCOMPL+SUBJ] 8 .  $(\# \land PUNCT)$  [6; END]

## 14. Grammatical Relation

Aim We want to extract from TUT only (as far as possible) linguistically neutral information.

## 14. Grammatical Relation

- Aim We want to extract from TUT only (as far as possible) linguistically neutral information.
- Basic H-D relation We can focus on the SYNT (functional-syntactic) component of the TUT annotation.

## 14. Grammatical Relation

- Aim We want to extract from TUT only (as far as possible) linguistically neutral information.
- Basic H-D relation We can focus on the SYNT (functional-syntactic) component of the TUT annotation.
- Hierarchy of Dependents Dependents are divided into a hierarchy reducing to a few main ones. ARG (e.g. sublabels: SUBJ, OBJ, INDOBJ, INDCOMPL, PREDCOMPL) and RMOD on the one hand, and AUX, COORD [see Bosco 2003].

We want to convert the meta-treebank into F-A structures [Buszkowski, Penn '90].

We want to convert the meta-treebank into F-A structures [Buszkowski, Penn '90].

▶ F-A structures are binary branching trees;

We want to convert the meta-treebank into F-A structures [Buszkowski, Penn '90].

- ▶ F-A structures are binary branching trees;
- ▶ The leaf nodes are labelled by lexical expressions (words);

We want to convert the meta-treebank into F-A structures [Buszkowski, Penn '90].

- ▶ F-A structures are binary branching trees;
- ▶ The leaf nodes are labelled by lexical expressions (words);
- ► The internal nodes are labelled by < (for structures with the functor as the left daughter) or ▷ (for structures with the functor as the right daughter).</p>

# 16. Multimodal Composition

Following [Moortgat and Morrill (1991)] we treat functor-argument and head-dependency relations as orthogonal dimensions of linguistic composition and use different modes.

### 16. Multimodal Composition

Following [Moortgat and Morrill (1991)] we treat functor-argument and head-dependency relations as orthogonal dimensions of linguistic composition and use different modes.



#### 17. TUT simplified trees



Figure 1: MOD and AUX: Functors as Dependents

From TUT trees we obtain

From TUT trees we obtain

- Allen ► (mangia ◄ (la ◄ mela)

From TUT trees we obtain

- Allen ► (mangia ◄ (la ◄ mela)
- Allen ► (mangia ◄ (la ◄ (mela ▷ rossa))

From TUT trees we obtain

- Allen ► (mangia ◄ (la ◄ mela)
- Allen ► (mangia ◄ (la ◄ (mela ▷ rossa))
- Allen  $\blacktriangleright$  ((ha  $\triangleleft$  mangiato)  $\triangleleft$  (la  $\triangleleft$  mela))

### 19. Type Resolution

To adapt the type resolution algorithm to the multimodal system is rather straightforward.

## 19. Type Resolution

- To adapt the type resolution algorithm to the multimodal system is rather straightforward.
- ▶ In the above example, fixing the goal type for these examples as *s* and using as only clustered set the ones of NOUN (*n*), we obtain the following type assignments:

## 19. Type Resolution

- To adapt the type resolution algorithm to the multimodal system is rather straightforward.
- ▶ In the above example, fixing the goal type for these examples as *s* and using as only clustered set the ones of NOUN (*n*), we obtain the following type assignments:

Allan	A
mangia	$(A - \bullet s) \bullet - B$
la	$B \bullet - n$
mela	n
rossa	n - n
ha	$((A - \bullet s) \bullet - B) \circ - D$
mangiato	D

CTAs are trees. To cluster them we can apply a Tree Pattern Matching Algorithm [Shasha and Zhang '97]

CTAs are trees. To cluster them we can apply a Tree Pattern Matching Algorithm [Shasha and Zhang '97]

CTAs are trees. To cluster them we can apply a Tree Pattern Matching Algorithm [Shasha and Zhang '97]

► Tree-rewriting:

Renaming;

CTAs are trees. To cluster them we can apply a Tree Pattern Matching Algorithm [Shasha and Zhang '97]

- Renaming;
- Deletion;

CTAs are trees. To cluster them we can apply a Tree Pattern Matching Algorithm [Shasha and Zhang '97]

- Renaming;
- Deletion;
- ⊳ Edit.

CTAs are trees. To cluster them we can apply a Tree Pattern Matching Algorithm [Shasha and Zhang '97]

- Renaming;
- ▷ Deletion;
- ⊳ Edit.
- ▶ Which is the weight of each operation?

CTAs are trees. To cluster them we can apply a Tree Pattern Matching Algorithm [Shasha and Zhang '97]

- Renaming;
- ▷ Deletion;
- ⊳ Edit.
- ▶ Which is the weight of each operation?
  - ▷ Renaming: Changing H-D relation cost more than changing F-A order;

CTAs are trees. To cluster them we can apply a Tree Pattern Matching Algorithm [Shasha and Zhang '97]

- Renaming;
- ▷ Deletion;
- ▷ Edit.
- Which is the weight of each operation?
  - ▷ Renaming: Changing H-D relation cost more than changing F-A order;
  - ▷ Renaming: Replacing Variables/Constants, Con/Con, Var/Var;

CTAs are trees. To cluster them we can apply a Tree Pattern Matching Algorithm [Shasha and Zhang '97]

- Renaming;
- ▷ Deletion;
- ⊳ Edit.
- Which is the weight of each operation?
  - ▷ Renaming: Changing H-D relation cost more than changing F-A order;
  - ▷ Renaming: Replacing Variables/Constants, Con/Con, Var/Var;
  - Deletion and Edit: deleting (editing) a connective costs is tied to deleting (editing) a con/var. But

CTAs are trees. To cluster them we can apply a Tree Pattern Matching Algorithm [Shasha and Zhang '97]

- ► Tree-rewriting:
  - ▶ Renaming;
  - ▷ Deletion;
  - ⊳ Edit.
- Which is the weight of each operation?
  - ▷ Renaming: Changing H-D relation cost more than changing F-A order;
  - ▷ Renaming: Replacing Variables/Constants, Con/Con, Var/Var;
  - Deletion and Edit: deleting (editing) a connective costs is tied to deleting (editing) a con/var. But
  - ▷ Deletion and Edit: How do they relate to renaming?
► On the conversion from TUT:

▷ TUT uses traces. Should we remove them? How much would the resulting clusters differ?

- ► On the conversion from TUT:
  - ▷ TUT uses traces. Should we remove them? How much would the resulting clusters differ?
  - ▷ In TUT anything can be a Top-formula. Should we leave it like this?

- ▷ TUT uses traces. Should we remove them? How much would the resulting clusters differ?
- ▷ In TUT anything can be a Top-formula. Should we leave it like this?
- ▷ What is the role of Higher Order Types in this procedure? Can we use them to see how long distance dependency triggers gather together?

► On the conversion from TUT:

- ▷ TUT uses traces. Should we remove them? How much would the resulting clusters differ?
- ▷ In TUT anything can be a Top-formula. Should we leave it like this?
- ▷ What is the role of Higher Order Types in this procedure? Can we use them to see how long distance dependency triggers gather together?

▶ On the Clustering:

- ▷ TUT uses traces. Should we remove them? How much would the resulting clusters differ?
- ▷ In TUT anything can be a Top-formula. Should we leave it like this?
- ▷ What is the role of Higher Order Types in this procedure? Can we use them to see how long distance dependency triggers gather together?
- On the Clustering:
  - ▷ Does the tree clustering algorithm reduce to weight structural rules?

- ▷ TUT uses traces. Should we remove them? How much would the resulting clusters differ?
- ▷ In TUT anything can be a Top-formula. Should we leave it like this?
- ▷ What is the role of Higher Order Types in this procedure? Can we use them to see how long distance dependency triggers gather together?
- On the Clustering:
  - ▷ Does the tree clustering algorithm reduce to weight structural rules?
  - Can derivability relations among types help cleaning up clusters and reach the right level of similarity trees?

- ▷ TUT uses traces. Should we remove them? How much would the resulting clusters differ?
- ▷ In TUT anything can be a Top-formula. Should we leave it like this?
- ▷ What is the role of Higher Order Types in this procedure? Can we use them to see how long distance dependency triggers gather together?
- ▶ On the Clustering:
  - ▷ Does the tree clustering algorithm reduce to weight structural rules?
  - Can derivability relations among types help cleaning up clusters and reach the right level of similarity trees?
  - Elementary trees of TAG have been induced by TUT [A. Mazzei]. Would it make sense to compare clustering of TAGs trees and CTAs?

- ▷ TUT uses traces. Should we remove them? How much would the resulting clusters differ?
- ▷ In TUT anything can be a Top-formula. Should we leave it like this?
- What is the role of Higher Order Types in this procedure? Can we use them to see how long distance dependency triggers gather together?
- ► On the Clustering:
  - ▷ Does the tree clustering algorithm reduce to weight structural rules?
  - Can derivability relations among types help cleaning up clusters and reach the right level of similarity trees?
  - ▷ Elementary trees of TAG have been induced by TUT [A. Mazzei]. Would it make sense to compare clustering of TAGs trees and CTAs?
  - ▷ Is the rather small size of the treebank a limit for this study?

On the approach:

Can this study help reaching a further understanding of structural rules in natural language analysis?

- Can this study help reaching a further understanding of structural rules in natural language analysis?
- Can this study help investigating the role of surface vs. deep structures? (vd. traces)

- Can this study help reaching a further understanding of structural rules in natural language analysis?
- Can this study help investigating the role of surface vs. deep structures? (vd. traces)
- ▶ How much are the result still empirically founded?

- Can this study help reaching a further understanding of structural rules in natural language analysis?
- Can this study help investigating the role of surface vs. deep structures? (vd. traces)
- ▶ How much are the result still empirically founded?
- ▶ What would we really learn from this study at the end?