

An Abstract Machine for Unification Grammars

with Applications to an HPSG Grammar for Hebrew

Research Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Science

Shalom Wintner

Submitted to the Technion – Israel Institute of Technology

The work described herein was supervised by Prof. Nissim Francez Under the Auspices of the Faculty of Computer Science

Acknowledgments

This work could never have been what it is without the support I received from my advisor, Nissim Francez. I am grateful to Nissim for introducing me to this subject, leading and advising me throughout the project, bearing with me when I messed things up and encouraging me all along the way.

Many thanks are due to the members of my Thesis Committee: Bob Carpenter, Michael Elhadad, Alon Itai, Uzzi Ornan and Mori Rimon. I am especially indebted to Bob for his major help, mostly in the preliminary stages of this project. I also want to thank Uzzi for replacing Nissim when he was on sabbatical.

While working on this thesis I spent a fruitful summer in the University of Tübingen, Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft, during which I learned a lot from many discussions. I wish to thank Paul King for his generosity and his wisdom. Thanks are also due to Erhard Hinrichs, Dale Gerdemann, Thilo Götze, Detmar Meurers, John Griffith and Frank Morawietz. I am grateful to Evgeniy Gabrilovich for many fruitful discussions and for going over my code.

Special thanks to Holger Maier and Katrine Kirk for their hospitality and their company. Finally, I want to thank Yifat and Galia for being there when I needed it.

The generous financial help of the Minerva Stipendien Komitee and Intel Israel Ltd. is gratefully acknowledged. The research was supported by a grant from the Israeli Ministry of Science: “Programming Languages Induced Computational Linguistics” and by the Fund for the Promotion of Research in the Technion. The project was carried out under the auspices of the Laboratory for Computational Linguistics of the Technion.

Contents

Abstract	1
1 Introduction	3
1.1 Motivation	3
1.2 Literature Survey	4
1.2.1 Grammatical Formalisms	4
1.2.2 The Current Role of HPSG	5
1.2.3 Abstract Machine Techniques	6
1.2.4 Processing HPSG	7
1.2.5 Computational Grammars for Hebrew	8
1.3 Achievements of the Thesis	9
1.4 Structure of this Document	10
2 Parsing with Typed Feature Structures	11
2.1 Theory of Feature Structures	11
2.2 Subsumption	14
2.3 Well-Foundedness of Subsumption	14
2.4 Abstract Feature Structures	15
2.5 Unification	19
2.6 A Linear Representation of Feature Structures	21
2.7 Multi-rooted Structures	23
2.8 Rules and Grammars	27
2.9 Parsing as Operational Semantics	32
2.10 Proof of Correctness	34
2.10.1 Soundness	35
2.10.2 Completeness	36
2.10.3 Subsumption Check	37
2.10.4 Termination	37
3 <i>AMACTA</i> – An Abstract Machine for Linguistic Applications	40
3.1 The Input Language	40
3.1.1 Type Specification	40
3.1.2 Rules and Grammars	41
3.2 A TFS Unification Engine	41
3.2.1 First-Order Terms vs. Feature Structures	41
3.2.2 Processing Scheme	42

3.2.3	Memory Representation of Feature Structures	43
3.2.4	Flattening Feature Structures	43
3.2.5	Processing of a Query	44
3.2.6	Compilation of the Type Hierarchy	45
3.2.7	Processing of a Program	47
3.3	Parsing	49
3.3.1	A Parsing Algorithm	50
3.3.2	Data Structures	52
3.3.3	Compilation	52
3.3.4	Effect of the Machine Instructions	54
3.4	Optimizations and Extensions	58
3.4.1	Lazy Evaluation of Feature Structures	58
3.4.2	Partial Descriptions	59
3.4.3	Empty Categories	60
3.4.4	Lexical Ambiguity	60
3.4.5	Functional Attachments	61
3.5	Implementation	61
4	An HPSG-based Grammar for Hebrew	63
4.1	Phrase Structure Schemata	63
4.2	The Structure of Noun Phrases in Hebrew	64
4.3	The Status of the Definite Article in Hebrew	67
4.3.1	The Data	68
4.3.2	HPSG Approach	68
4.3.3	An Analysis of Hebrew Definites	69
4.4	Noun-Noun Constructs	71
5	Conclusion	74
A	List of Machine Instructions	76
B	The Hebrew Grammar	77
	Bibliography	85

List of Figures

2.1	A feature structure	12
2.2	An infinite decreasing sequence of TFSs	16
2.3	An abstract feature structure	18
2.4	A graph- and AVM- representation of a MRS	24
2.5	An example grammar	28
2.6	Strong derivation	30
2.7	A leftmost derivation	31
3.1	An example type hierarchy	41
3.2	An example grammar in ALE format	42
3.3	Heap representation of the TFS $b(b(\mathbb{1}d, \mathbb{1}), d)$	43
3.4	Feature structures as sets of equations	44
3.5	The effect of the <code>put</code> instructions – <code>put</code>	44
3.6	Compiled code for the query $b(b(\mathbb{1}d, \mathbb{1}), d)$	45
3.7	Type unification tables	45
3.8	<code>unify_type[a, b]</code>	46
3.9	The effect of the type unification instructions	47
3.10	Compiled code for the program $a(\mathbb{3}d1, \mathbb{3})$	47
3.11	Implementation of the <code>get/unify</code> instructions	48
3.12	The code of the <code>unify</code> function	49
3.13	Parsing – informal description	51
3.14	The effect of the <code>proceed</code> instruction	53
3.15	The effect of <code>put_rule</code>	53
3.16	Compiled rule	54
3.17	Compiled code for a grammar with k rules	55
3.18	Compiled code obtained for the example grammar	56
3.19	The effect of the key-manipulation instructions	57
3.20	The effect of the edge traversal instructions	57
3.21	The effect of the <code>call</code> instruction	58
3.22	The effect of the <code>copy</code> instructions	58
3.23	The <code>fail</code> function	59
3.24	Performance comparison of <i>AMACTA</i> and ALE	62
4.1	Subject-Head schema	65
4.2	Head-Complement schema	65
4.3	Head-Marker schema	66

4.4	Head-Adjunct schema	66
4.5	The lexical entry of the noun <i>sepr</i>	67
4.6	The effect of the Definite Lexical Rule	70
4.7	The effect of the ‘nismak’ lexical rule	72

Abstract

Contemporary linguistic formalisms have become so rigorous that it is now possible to view them as very high level declarative programming languages. Consequently, *grammars* for natural languages can be viewed as *programs*; this view enables the application of various methods and techniques that were proved useful for programming languages to the study of natural languages.

One of the most successful implementation techniques for logic programming languages involves the use of an abstract machine. In this approach one defines an abstract machine with the following properties: it is close enough to the high-level language, thus allowing efficient compilation to the abstract machine language; and it is sufficiently low-level to allow efficient interpretation of the machine instructions on a variety of host architectures. Abstract machines were used for processing procedural and functional languages, but they gained much popularity for logic programming languages since the introduction of the Warren Abstract Machine (WAM). Most current implementations of Prolog, as well as other logic languages, are based on abstract machines. The incorporation of such techniques usually leads to very efficient compilers in terms of both space and time requirements.

In this work we have designed and implemented an abstract machine, *AMACIA*, for the linguistic formalism ALE, which is based on typed feature structures. This formalism is one of the most widely accepted in computational linguistics and has been used for designing grammars in various linguistic theories, most notably HPSG. *AMACIA* is composed of data structures and a set of instructions, augmented by a compiler from the grammatical formalism to the abstract instructions, and a (portable) interpreter of the abstract instructions. The effect of each instruction is defined using a low-level language that can be executed on ordinary hardware.

The advantages of the abstract machine approach are twofold. From a theoretical point of view, the abstract machine gives a well-defined operational semantics to the grammatical formalism. This ensures that grammars specified using our system are endowed with well defined meaning. It enables, for example, to formally verify the correctness of a compiler for HPSG, given an independent definition. From a practical point of view, *AMACIA* is the first system that employs a direct compilation scheme for unification grammars that are based on typed feature structures. The use of *AMACIA* results in a much improved performance over existing systems.

In order to test the machine on a realistic application, we have developed a small-scale, HPSG-based grammar for a fragment of the Hebrew language, using *AMACIA* as the development platform. This is the first application of HPSG to a Semitic language.

List of Abbreviations

AFS	Abstract Feature Structure
ALE	Attribute Logic Engine
<i>AMALTA</i>	Abstract MACHine for LInguistic Applications
AMRS	Abstract Multi-rooted Feature Structure
AVM	Attribute Value Matrix
DLR	Definite Lexical Rule
FOT	First Order Term
GUI	Graphical User Interface
HPSG	Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar
LFG	Lexical-Functional Grammar
LUB	Least Upper Bound
MRS	Multi-rooted Feature Structure
NL	Natural Language
NLR	'Nismak' Lexical Rule
NP	Noun Phrase
PT	Pre-terminal
REF	REFerence
STR	STRucture
TFS	Typed Feature Structure
WAM	Warren Abstract Machine

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Research in linguistics has traditionally been aimed at describing the structure of Natural Languages (NLs). Since the 1950s, however, the focus has shifted from attempts to provide such descriptions to the definition of the right way in which to stipulate them. During the past few decades many such formalisms were devised. A ‘good’ model, according to Shieber (1986), is linguistically felicitous, expressive and computationally effective. It must be powerful enough to capture the wealth and diversity of NLs, yet it must be computationally tractable to allow for computational processing.

Contemporary linguistic formalisms such as LFG (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982) or HPSG (Pollard and Sag, 1994) have become so rigorous that it is now possible to view them as very high level declarative programming languages. In this metaphor a *grammar* for a natural language, formally specified using one of the modern frameworks described above, can be viewed as a *program*. The execution of a grammar on an input sentence yields an output which represents the sentence’s structure. This view enables the application of various methods and techniques that were proved useful for programming languages to the study of natural languages.

Historically, many computational fields of research originated from the study of natural languages: important aspects the theory of formal languages are due to Chomsky, for example; and more recently, Prolog originated out of an attempt to provide a language for description of natural languages. Today, however, much progress was achieved in the area of programming languages. Tools and techniques were developed that enable efficient processing of such languages and, more importantly, formal propositions to be made and proved over languages in general and specific programs in particular. These advances are now being incorporated into the realm of natural languages. Grammars for natural languages are specified more precisely; their properties can be mathematically stated; and their processing becomes more efficient. For a survey of some such approaches, see (Shieber, 1986); for examples of the advantages of regarding natural language formalisms as programming languages, see (Barton, Berwick, and Ristad, 1987; Manaster-Ramer, 1987).

This work introduces such an application: an implementation technique that is common for logic programming languages, namely the use of an *abstract machine*, is applied to (a subset of) the ALE formalism (Carpenter, 1992a), originally designed for specifying feature-structure based phrase-structure grammars. Abstract machines were used for processing procedural and functional

languages, but they gained much popularity for logic programming languages since the introduction of the Warren Abstract Machine (WAM – see (Warren, 1983) and a tutorial in (Ait-Kaci, 1991)). Most current implementations of Prolog, as well as other logic languages, are based on abstract machines. The incorporation of such techniques usually leads to very efficient compilers in terms of both space and time requirements.

AMAZIA is an abstract machine, specifically tailored for processing ALE grammars. It is composed of data structures and a set of instructions, augmented by a compiler from the grammatical formalism to the abstract instructions, and a (portable) interpreter of the abstract instructions. The effect of each instruction is defined using a low-level language that can be executed on ordinary hardware. The advantages of the abstract machine approach are twofold. From a theoretical point of view, the abstract machine gives a well-defined operational semantics to the grammatical formalism. This ensures that grammars specified using our system are endowed with well defined meaning. It enables, for example, to formally verify the correctness of a compiler for HPSG, given an independent definition. From a practical point of view, *AMAZIA* is the first system that employs a direct compilation scheme for unification grammars that are based on typed feature structures. The use of *AMAZIA* results in a much improved performance over existing systems (in particular, ALE itself).

1.2 Literature Survey

1.2.1 Grammatical Formalisms

Much of the recent research in computational linguistics has been directed towards defining a good model in which natural languages would be naturally describable. Having its roots in the study of formal languages, this endeavor started with considering the computational power needed for describing natural languages in general; context free grammars were thus ruled out quite early. But even if one did believe that natural language were, indeed, within the scope of context free languages, one had to admit that context free grammars were not the ideal framework in which to develop grammars for the natural languages. It was understood that the weak generation properties of a grammar in a given formalism (i.e., its ability to recognize all and only the sentences of a language) are not sufficient – there is a need in providing syntactic descriptions that cohere with the way linguists capture the language.

The resulting trend in computational linguistics was to use unification-based formalisms to obtain these two goals. While many such frameworks were developed (see (Shieber, 1986) for a good review), some notions are common to most of them. They are all based on a context free skeleton, where non-terminal symbols are replaced with structured, more complex entities; and the basic operation on these structures is unification. Among these frameworks are Functional Unification Grammar (Kay, 1983), Lexical Functional Grammar (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982), Generalized Phrase-Structure Grammar (Gazdar et al., 1985) and many others.

A unification-based grammar formalism is a meta-language for describing grammars for (natural) languages. The basic entity of such formalisms is the *feature structure* – a data structure consisting of a set of feature-value pairs. While different frameworks define feature structures differently, they can in general be captured as directed graphs, where the arcs are labeled with feature names and an f -labeled arc connects nodes v and u if and only if the value of the feature f in the feature structure associated with v is the feature structure associated with u . For a good, informal survey of feature structures and their properties refer to Shieber (1986).

Feature structures can be thought of as an extension of first order terms (see (Carpenter, 1991;

Ait-Kaci and Podelski, 1993)), where the sub-terms are coded by feature names rather than by positions. They extend first order terms in that they are in general graphs, whereas first order terms are trees, with possibly shared leaves. Hence, a term might be a common part of more than one sub-term. Some grammatical formalisms decorate feature structures with *types*, or *sorts*, that can be captured by labels on the nodes of the graph. Feature structures are used by grammatical formalisms to represent linguistic concepts such as words, phrases and sometimes even grammatical rules.

The basic operation on feature structures is *unification*. Being very much like first-order term unification, this operation combines the information that is encoded by two feature structures and produces a result that contains the unified information, provided that the two arguments don't contain contradicting information. If the arguments are inconsistent, unification is said to *fail*.

In this work we are mainly concerned with *typed* feature structures (TFSs), as described in (Carpenter, 1992b). As their name suggests, each such structure has a type, drawn from a pre-defined, partially ordered set of types. The *type hierarchy* helps the grammar writer to organize linguistic knowledge in a similar way to common knowledge representation languages. The hierarchy is accompanied by an *appropriateness specification* that associates features with types; for example, the 'case' feature might be defined to be appropriate for feature structures of type 'noun' but not for structures of type 'verb'. Moreover, appropriateness is inherited: if a feature is appropriate for a type *t*, then it is appropriate for all the sub-types of *t* as well. This property is reminiscent of object-oriented systems; in particular, multiple inheritance is supported in this framework.

It is important to note that while some of the above-mentioned formalisms were designed as computational frameworks for developing grammars, others were linguistically oriented in the sense that a grammatical theory was encoded within them in one way or another. Obviously, any such formalism defines at least the expressive power of grammars that can be stipulated within it. But many other linguistic considerations and generalizations can be, and actually are, hard-wired into some formalisms.

1.2.2 The Current Role of HPSG

Recently HPSG has become prominent among the various unification-based formalisms. HPSG (Pollard and Sag, 1987; Pollard and Sag, 1994) was developed by Pollard and Sag as a variant of GPSG and Categorical Grammar, but immediately gained a position of a well-founded, promising formalism for the description of natural languages. It incorporates the notion of *typed* feature structures, where types are partially ordered according to a defined hierarchy, thus enabling very concise, general rules to be stipulated. Much of the information carried by linguistic entities is stored in the lexicon; as a result, grammar rules become few and very general. HPSG defines a set of linguistically plausible schemas, or universal principles, that are said to hold for all natural languages and are part of every grammar. In addition, language specific rules can be specified in any given grammar.

Due to its generality and elegance, HPSG has gained a lot of popularity. It enables the designing of grammars for various, linguistically different, languages: work has been done on HPSG grammars for English, German (Nerbonne, Netter, and Pollard, 1994), French, Japanese (JPSG Working Group, In Preparation), Korean and many other languages (see a bibliography in (Calcagno, Kathol, and Pollard, 1993) and an electronic bibliography in (Müller, 1996)). HPSG principles were used to describe not only the syntax and semantics of languages, but also their morphology (e.g., (Nerbonne, 1992)) and phonology (e.g., (Bird, 1990; Bird, 1992)). It seems that linguists find this kind of typed-feature-structures based formalism, with lexical rules and a small set of very

general grammatical rules, very convenient.

In spite of the interest that HPSG invokes, no formal definition of the formalism exists. Both (Pollard and Sag, 1987) and (Pollard and Sag, 1994) are rather linguistically oriented, in the sense that no mathematical definitions are given for the language of HPSG itself. King (1989; 1992) gives a logical formalization of Pollard and Sag (1987); it is an attempt to provide a logical framework within which both the elementary entities of HPSG, such as feature structures and types, and the principles and the rules, can be described. While King (1989) encompasses Pollard and Sag (1987) in its entirety, it does not provide a characterization of all possible HPSG grammars, nor does it describe the current formulation of the theory as expressed in Pollard and Sag (1994). A similar drawback can be found in (Pollard and Moshier, 1990): while it gives a denotational semantics for a typed feature structures system, it is not directed specifically towards HPSG, and no formulation of the properties of HPSG grammars is given.

A different work is described in (Carpenter, 1992b); a wide, concise theory of the logic of typed feature structures is presented, with many variations and applications. Carpenter (1992b) serves as the main reference point for any attempt to define such formalisms; however, as it is not concentrated on HPSG per se, no formal definition for it can be found there either.

Not only a denotational semantics for HPSG is required; operational semantics of the formalism is missing, too. While some compilers for HPSG were developed (see section 1.2.4), they all rely on (Pollard and Sag, 1987) and (Pollard and Sag, 1994) as their source for interpreting the formalism, and as we mentioned above, both references are not formal enough. Since HPSG is not defined formally enough, we opted in this work to implement ALE (see below), which is the most common platform for designing HPSG grammars.

1.2.3 Abstract Machine Techniques

High-level programming languages, especially ones with dynamic structures, have always been hard to develop compilers for. A common technique for overcoming the problems involves the notion of an **abstract machine**. It is a machine that, on one hand, captures the essentials of the high-level language in its architecture and its instruction set, such that a compiler from the source language to the (abstract) machine language becomes relatively simple to design. On the other hand, the architecture must be simple enough for the machine language to be easily interpretable by common, Von-Neumann machine languages. This attitude also enables the design of portable front ends for the compilers: as the machine language is abstract, it can be easily interpreted by different (concrete) machine languages.

The design of such an abstract architecture must be careful enough to compromise the two, usually conflicting, requirements: the closer the machine architecture is to common architectures, the harder it is to develop compilers for it; and on the other hand, if such a machine is too complex, then while a compiler for it is easier to produce, it becomes more complicated to execute its language on normal architectures.

Abstract machines were used for various kinds of languages: they date back to the P-Code for Pascal. Starting from Landin's SECD (Landin, 1964), many compilers for functional languages were designed this way. When logic programming languages appeared, such techniques were applied to them as well. While Prolog has gained a recognition as a practical implementation of the idea of programming in logic, a method for interpreting the declarative logical statements was needed for such an implementation to be well-founded. In 1983 David Warren designed an abstract machine for the execution of Prolog, consisting of a memory architecture and a set of instructions (Warren, 1983; Ait-Kaci, 1991). Even though there were prior attempts to construct both interpreters and

compilers for Prolog, it was the Warren Abstract Machine (WAM) that gave Prolog not only a good, efficient compiler, but, perhaps more importantly, an elegant operational semantics.

The WAM consists of an architecture of the machine, augmented by a compiler from Prolog to the instruction set of the abstract machine. The operational semantics of each instruction is defined using a low-level language that can be trivially mapped to any ordinary hardware. In fact, there is even a formal verification of the correctness of the WAM compiler (Russinoff, 1992). The WAM captures in an elegant way the substantial elements of Prolog. First-order term unification is supported by special data structures and instructions of the machine architecture. Several instructions that deal with control issues implement the backtracking mechanism.

The WAM immediately became the starting point for many compiler designs for Prolog. The techniques it delineates serve not only for Prolog proper, but also for constructing compilers for related languages. To list just a few examples, abstract machine techniques were used for a parallel Prolog compiler (Hermenegildo, 1986), for variants of Prolog that use different resolution methods (Swift and Warren, 1993), extend Prolog with types (Beierle and Meyer, 1994) or with record structures (Smolka and Treinen, 1994), and for a general theorem prover (Schumann, 1991). There have even been attempts to construct a methodology for the design of abstract machines for logic programming languages (Kursawe, 1987; Nilsson, 1993).

1.2.4 Processing HPSG

Linguistic formalisms provide means for describing the structure of natural languages; they do not specify methods for determining whether a given string is indeed a member of the language defined by a grammar; nor do they prescribe ways for computing the structure that the grammar assigns to the permissible strings. These tasks are performed by *parsing* algorithms. Different parsing algorithms exist for various classes of languages, both formal (see (Aho and Ullman, 1972) for a survey) and natural (see, e.g., (Gazdar and Mellish, 1989; Sikkel, 1993; Pereira and Warren, 1983)). In this work we implement a simple *chart* parsing algorithm; such parsers were first introduced by (Kaplan, 1973; Kay, 1973) and are widely used nowadays.

Various parsers for HPSG have been designed in the past, some of which compile their input grammars into an executable program. The first work is described in (Prudian and Pollard, 1985); it is an implementation of a very early version of HPSG. For instance, most of the features are limited to accommodate only a small set of atomic values. Rules are specified in a way reminiscent of GPSG rules. This work cannot be considered as reflecting HPSG today.

Franz has implemented an HPSG parser in LISP (Franz, 1990). This parser was designed in accord with Pollard and Sag (1987), and doesn't cover the modifications introduced by Pollard and Sag (1994). It is rather limited, for example by allowing only tree-shaped type hierarchies to be defined – no multiple inheritance is permitted. While a specific HPSG grammar for English is a part of this implementation, the system can be used as a framework for developing different grammars. According to Franz's reports, the parser is very slow, even when used on a limited grammar and short inputs: example sentences were parsed in 12-65 seconds.

A different implementation is HPSG-PL (Popowich and Vogel, 1991; Kodrič, Popowich, and Vogel, 1992). This system allows more complex type hierarchies to be defined; it enables the definition of grammar rules, principles and lexical rules, and an HPSG grammar for English is supplied, based on Pollard and Sag (1987). It incorporates a chart parser where the parsing algorithm makes specific use of some grammar features (e.g., HEAD-DTR), and thus the stipulation of rules does not involve explicit phrase structure. The grammar is compiled into a Prolog program where each feature structure is transformed to a fixed-arity list. Yet the performance of the parser

is rather low: according to (Popowich and Vogel, 1991), simple sentences take 1-25 seconds of CPU time to parse.

Another system that was adapted for HPSG is Unicorn (Gerdemann and Hinrichs, 1988). Originated as a generalization of a Context-Free parser, this system uses Shieber's extension to Earley's algorithm, thus enabling the definition of various augmented context-free grammars. An HPSG grammar was defined in terms of the Unicorn framework, with some divergence from Pollard and Sag (1994), by Russell (1993). The most important aspect in which Unicorn differs from the above mentioned parsers is that it doesn't incorporate a typing system for feature structures at all. This system was not specifically designed with HPSG implementation in mind, and the grammar was not intended to be complete in any sense, as it was used only as part of a more complex project. We have no reports on the results of this parser for HPSG.

It is important to note that HPSG falls naturally into the class of general constraint systems, and thus the problem of providing the correct structure for an input sentence can be naturally reduced to the problem of solving a constraint system. Many general constraint solvers have been developed recently that were used for linguistic applications, including some for which HPSG grammars were designed. A typical representative is ALE (Carpenter, 1992a). Not being specifically designed for HPSG, this system is a general Attribute Logic Engine incorporating a chart parser with a formalism for specifying relations among typed feature structures in a way that enables encoding of HPSG grammars in a very natural manner. In fact, an HPSG grammar for English has been constructed in this framework by Penn (1993) that covers most of Pollard and Sag (1994). Compilation of ALE programs generates a rather efficient Prolog code.

A very similar project is Troll (Gerdemann, 1993). It is a framework for processing typed feature structures, much in the same way as ALE does, albeit with a slightly different underlying theory. As Troll is still in preliminary phases, not much is reported regarding its use. Another work, aiming at covering as many as possible of the extensions to simple unification formalisms, is CUF (Dörre and Dorna, 1993). This system is still under development. Two more general systems that were used for developing HPSG grammars are TFS (Zajac, 1992), which is a general constraint solver, and PROFIT (Erbach, 1994), which simply compiles TFS based specifications to Prolog.

1.2.5 Computational Grammars for Hebrew

The Hebrew language poses some interesting problems for the grammar designer. The Hebrew script¹ is highly ambiguous, a fact that results in many part-of-speech tags for almost every word (Ornan, 1994). Another problem of the script is that short prepositions, articles and conjunctions are usually attached to the words that immediately succeed them, which makes it harder to parse the input sentences. In addition to these two features, the Hebrew morphology is very rich. A noun base form might have over fifteen different derivations, and a verb base form – more than thirty. All these call for some pre-processing of the input to the parser. Disambiguation of the script, as well as morphological analysis, were covered by different works (Bentur, Angel, and Segev, 1992; Choueka and Ne'eman, 1995; Ornan and Katz, 1995); some major decisions have to be taken, including the representation of the Hebrew script and the treatment of morphological analysis. As the current trend is to use constraint-based formalisms for tasks other than syntax and semantics, this is the approach we choose.

¹We refer here to the non-vocalized script which is in everyday use, and not to the vocalized script that is used for special purposes (such as poems or children books) only.

At the syntactic level, Hebrew exhibits a rather free constituent order, although many constraints are placed on the order of words within constituents. The use of agreement features in Hebrew is more extensive than, say, English. For example, nouns and adjectives must agree on number, gender and definiteness. Agreement checking becomes more complicated in coordinated constructs (see (Wintner, 1991)) and much thought must be given to the correct treatment of agreement.

There have been some attempts to provide a computational grammar for (the syntax of) the Hebrew language. The first work was done by Cohen (1984), who had written a special software system for performing both the morphological and the syntactic analysis of Hebrew sentences. This work was very preliminary and its coverage was limited. Another preliminary work is described in (Nirenburg and Ben-Asher, 1984): it is a small-scale ATN for Hebrew, capable of recognizing very limited structures. A transformation-based grammar is suggested in (Chayen and Dror, 1976).

Unification-based formalisms were used for developing Hebrew grammars only recently. A very limited experiment was done using PATR-II (Wintner, 1992) but was later extended (Wintner and Ornan, 1991; Wintner and Ornan, 1996) to a reasonable subset of the language, on a more convenient platform: Tomita's LR Parser/Compiler, which is based on LFG. The grammar is capable of recognizing sentences of rather wide variety and complexity, but produces only the syntactic structures of the input sentences. See (Wintner, 1991) for a detailed discussion. A different work along the same lines is (Yizhar, 1993): it uses the same framework but concentrates on the syntax of NPs in Hebrew, employing ideas from different linguistic theories. All in all, no broad-coverage, efficient, concise computational grammar for Hebrew exists.

1.3 Achievements of the Thesis

The main objective of this work was to formally define an operational semantics for a unification-based grammar formalism, suitable for specifying HPSG grammars, through the use of an abstract machine. To this end we have first conducted a theoretical investigation into the properties of such formalisms. The main contributions of this endeavor are:

- Formalization and explication of the notion of multi-rooted feature structures (MRSs) that are used implicitly in the computational linguistics literature;
- Concise definitions of a TFS-based linguistic formalism, based on abstract MRSs;
- Algebraic specification of a *parsing step* operator, $T_{G,w}$, that induces algebraic semantics for this formalism;
- Treatment of parsing as a model for computation, assigning operational semantics to the linguistic formalism;
- Specification and correctness proofs for parsing in this framework;
- A new definition for *off-line parsability*, less strict than the existing one, and termination proof for off-line parsable grammars.

This more theoretical work was presented as (Wintner and Francez, 1995b). The off-line parsability result is presented in (Wintner and Francez, to appear).

Once the theoretical background was set, we have designed *AMALTA*, an abstract machine for unification-based grammars. This is the first application of abstract machine techniques to

a linguistic formalism. The core engine of the machine was presented in (Wintner and Francez, 1995a), and a more detailed presentation is in preparation. The machine is accompanied by a compiler from the ALE specification language to the machine instructions, an interpreter for the machine instructions and a debugger for machine language programs. The abstract machine endows natural language grammars with an operational meaning; furthermore, its use results in highly efficient processing: the compiled grammars are executed much faster than with the existing ALE processor. Some tests we have conducted showed a speed-up of a factor of 20 in compilation time, and a factor of 5-15 in execution time.

In order to test the machine on a realistic application, we have developed a small-scale, HPSG-based grammar for a fragment of the Hebrew language, using *AMALIA* as the development platform. This is the first application of HPSG to a Semitic language.

Another track of research we are exploring (with Evgeniy Gabrilovich) is the adaptation of *AMALIA* to perform natural language *generation*, as opposed to parsing. Based upon the algorithm of (Samuelsson, 1995), a characterization of generation with unification based grammars can be found in (Gabrilovich, In preparation). A separate compiler is constructed, based upon *AMALIA*'s compiler, that transforms a grammar to an inverted, normalized form, more suited for generation. To execute the inverted grammar on *AMALIA*, very few modifications in the machine are needed. Once this project is completed, *AMALIA* will become a unified framework for processing grammars, supporting both parsing and generation.

1.4 Structure of this Document

In chapter 2 a theory of parsing with typed feature structures is presented. We start in a survey of the theory of TFSs, along the lines of Carpenter (1992b), but we extend it to multi-rooted structures in section 2.7. In particular, we discuss the computational properties of TFS-based grammars and show in section 2.10.4 a condition on grammars that guarantees termination of parsing.

Chapter 3 describes the abstract machine itself, starting with its core, aimed at unifying two feature structures. In section 3.3 this engine is enveloped with control structures to accommodate for *parsing*. We conclude this chapter with a discussion of some implementation details (section 3.5).

Chapter 4 describes the HPSG-based grammar for Hebrew. Conclusions and suggestions for further research are given in chapter 5. Appendix A lists all the machine instructions, and the Hebrew grammar is listed in appendix B.

Chapter 2

Parsing with Typed Feature Structures

This chapter provides the theoretical background for the design of the machine: we discuss below the theory of typed feature structures and the details of parsing with grammars that are based upon them. Section 2.1 outlines the theory of TFSs of (Carpenter, 1991; Carpenter, 1992b). We repeat it here in order to make this document as self contained as possible. However, the well-foundedness result (section 2.3) is an original contribution. We deviate from the presentation of Carpenter (1992b) in section 2.4, where we emphasize *abstract typed feature structures* (AFSs). Encoding the essential information of TFSs, AFSs were introduced by Moshier (1988) but we use a different presentation that is suited for *typed* feature structures. Unification is defined over AFSs rather than TFSs. Section 2.7 introduces an explicit construct of *multi-rooted feature structures* (MRSs) that naturally extend TFSs, used to represent phrasal signs as well as grammar rules. Abstraction is extended to MRSs and the mathematical foundations needed for manipulating them is given. The concepts of grammars and the languages they generate are formally defined in section 2.8, and the TFS-based formalism is thus acquired a denotational semantics. In section 2.9 a model for computation, corresponding to bottom-up chart parsing for the formalism, is presented. The TFS-based formalism is thus endowed with an *operational* semantics. Next, we prove that both semantics coincide. Finally, we discuss the class of grammars for which computations terminate. We give a more relaxed definition for off-line parsability and prove that termination is guaranteed for off-line parsable grammars. The presentation is accompanied by a running example of a grammar and the parsing process it induces.

2.1 Theory of Feature Structures

The first part of this section summarizes some preliminary notions along the lines of (Carpenter, 1992b). For the following discussion we fix non-empty, finite, disjoint sets `TYPES` and `FEATS` of types and feature names, respectively. We assume that the set `FEATS` is totally ordered. We also fix an infinite set `NODES` of nodes, disjoint of `TYPES` and `FEATS`, each member of which is decorated by a type from `TYPES` through a fixed typing function $\theta : \text{NODES} \rightarrow \text{TYPES}$. The set `NODES` is ‘rich’ in the sense that for every $t \in \text{TYPES}$, the set $\{q \in \text{NODES} \mid \theta(q) = t\}$ is infinite.

Below, the metavariable T ranges over subsets of types, t – over types, f – over features and q

– over nodes. When dealing with partial functions the notation ‘ $F(x) \downarrow$ ’ means that F is defined for the value x and the symbol ‘ \uparrow ’ means undefinedness. Whenever the result of an application of a partial function is used as an operand, it is meant that the function is defined for its arguments.

Definition 2.1.1 (Type hierarchy) A partial order \sqsubseteq over $\text{TYPES} \times \text{TYPES}$ is a **type hierarchy** (or **inheritance hierarchy**) if it is bounded complete, i.e., if every up-bounded subset T of TYPES has a (unique) least upper bound, $\sqcup T$, referred to as the **unification** of the types in T .

If $t_1 \sqsubseteq t_2$ we say that t_1 **subsumes**, or is **more general than**, t_2 ; t_2 is a **subtype** of (more specific than) t_1 .

Let $\perp = \sqcup \emptyset$ be the most general type. Let the most specific type be $\top = \sqcup \text{TYPES}$. If $\sqcup T = \top$ we say that T is **inconsistent**. Let $\sqcap T = \sqcup \{t' \mid t' \sqsubseteq t \text{ for every } t \in T\}$ be the greatest lower bound of the set T .

Definition 2.1.2 (Feature structures) A (typed) **feature structure** (TFS) is a directed, connected, labeled graph consisting of a finite, nonempty set of nodes $Q \subseteq \text{NODES}$, a root $\bar{q} \in Q$, and a partial function $\delta : Q \times \text{FEATS} \rightarrow Q$ specifying the arcs such that every node $q \in Q$ is accessible from \bar{q} .

The nodes of a feature structure are thus labeled by types while the arcs are labeled by feature names. The root \bar{q} is a distinguished node from which all other nodes are reachable. A feature structure is of type t when $\theta(\bar{q}) = t$. When we say that a feature structure A *exists* we mean that no node of A is typed \top .

Let FS be the collection of all feature structures over the given FEATS and TYPES. We use upper-case letters (with or without tags, subscripts etc.) to refer to feature structures. We use Q, \bar{q}, δ (with the same tags or subscripts) to refer to constituents of feature structures. Figure 2.1 depicts an example feature structure, represented both as an Attribute-Value Matrix (AVM) and as a graph.




Figure 2.1: A feature structure

Note that all feature structures are, by definition, graphs. Some grammatical formalisms used to have a special kind of feature structures, namely *atoms*; atoms are represented in our framework as nodes with no outgoing edges. For a discussion regarding the implications of such an approach, refer to (Carpenter, 1992b, Chapter 8).

Definition 2.1.3 (Appropriateness) An **appropriateness specification** over the type hierarchy and the set FEATS is a partial function $Approp : FEATS \times TYPES \rightarrow TYPES$, such that:

- let $T_f = \{t \in TYPES \mid Approp(f, t) \downarrow\}$; then for every $f \in FEATS$, $T_f \neq \emptyset$ and $\cap T_f \in T_f$.
- if $Approp(f, t_1) \downarrow$ and $t_1 \sqsubseteq t_2$ then $Approp(f, t_2) \downarrow$ and $Approp(f, t_1) \sqsubseteq Approp(f, t_2)$.

i.e., every feature is introduced by some most general type, and is appropriate for all its subtypes; and if the appropriate type for a feature in t_1 is some type t , then the appropriate type of the same feature in t_2 , which is a subtype of t_1 , must be at least as specific as t .

If $Approp(f, t) \downarrow$ we say that f is appropriate for t and that $Approp(f, t)$ is the appropriate type for the feature f in the type t . The set of features appropriate for some type is ordered (since FEATS is ordered).

Definition 2.1.4 (Well-typed feature structures) A feature structure (Q, \bar{q}, δ) is **well typed** iff for every $q \in Q$, $\theta(q) \neq \top$ and for all $f \in FEATS$ and $q \in Q$, if $\delta(q, f) \downarrow$ then $Approp(f, \theta(q)) \downarrow$ and $Approp(f, \theta(q)) \sqsubseteq \theta(\delta(q, f))$.

i.e., if an arc labeled f connects two nodes, then f is appropriate for the type of the source node; and the appropriate type for f in the type of the source node subsumes the type of target node.

Definition 2.1.5 (Total well-typedness) A feature structure is **totally well-typed** iff it is well typed and for all $f \in FEATS$ and $q \in Q$, if $Approp(f, \theta(q)) \downarrow$ then $\delta(q, f) \downarrow$.

i.e., every feature which is appropriate for the type labeling some node labels an outgoing arc from that node.

Definition 2.1.6 (Appropriateness loops) The appropriateness specification contains a **loop** if there exist $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n \in TYPES$ such that for every i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, there is a feature $f_i \in FEATS$ such that $Approp(f_i, t_i) = t_{i+1}$, where $t_{n+1} = t_1$.

Definition 2.1.7 (Paths) A **path** is a finite sequence of feature names, and the set $PATHS = FEATS^*$ is the collection of paths. We use π, α (with or without subscripts) to refer to paths. ϵ is the empty path. The definition of δ is extended to paths in the natural way:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(q, \epsilon) &= q \\ \delta(q, f\pi) &= \delta(\delta(q, f), \pi) \end{aligned}$$

The paths of a feature structure A are $\Pi(A) = \{\pi \mid \pi \in PATHS \text{ and } \delta(\bar{q}_A, \pi) \downarrow\}$.

Definition 2.1.8 (Cycles) A feature structure $A = (Q, \bar{q}, \delta)$ is **cyclic** if there exist a non-empty path $\alpha \in PATHS$ and a node $q \in Q$ such that $\delta(q, \alpha) = q$. It is **acyclic** otherwise.

Definition 2.1.9 (Path values) The **value** of a path π in a feature structure $A = (Q, \bar{q}, \delta)$, denoted by $val(A, \pi)$, is **non-trivial** if and only if $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi) \downarrow$, in which case it is a feature structure $A' = (Q', \bar{q}', \delta')$, where:

- $\bar{q}' = \delta(\bar{q}, \pi)$

- $Q' = \{q' \mid \text{there exists a path } \pi' \text{ such that } \delta(\bar{q}', \pi') = q'\}$ (Q' is the set of nodes reachable from \bar{q}')
- for every feature f and for every $q' \in Q'$, $\delta'(q', f) = \delta(q', f)$ (δ' is the restriction of δ to Q')

If $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi) \uparrow$, $\text{val}(A, \pi)$ is defined to be a single node whose type is \top .

Definition 2.1.10 (Reentrancy) A feature structure A is **reentrant** iff there exist two different paths π_1, π_2 such that $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi_1) = \delta(\bar{q}, \pi_2)$. In this case the two paths are said to share the same value.

2.2 Subsumption

Definition 2.2.1 (Subsumption) $A_1 = (Q_1, \bar{q}_1, \delta_1)$ **subsumes** $A_2 = (Q_2, \bar{q}_2, \delta_2)$ (denoted by $A_1 \sqsubseteq A_2$) iff there exists a total function $h : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_2$, called a **subsumption morphism**, such that

- $h(\bar{q}_1) = \bar{q}_2$
- for every $q \in Q_1$, $\theta(q) \sqsubseteq \theta(h(q))$
- for every $q \in Q_1$ and for every f such that $\delta_1(q, f) \downarrow$, $h(\delta_1(q, f)) = \delta_2(h(q), f)$.

$A_1 \sqsubset A_2$ iff $A_1 \sqsubseteq A_2$ and $A_1 \neq A_2$.

h associates with every node in Q_1 a node in Q_2 with at least as specific a type; moreover, if an arc labeled f connects q with q' , then such an arc connects $h(q)$ with $h(q')$. If $A \sqsubseteq B$ then every path defined in A is defined in B , and if two paths are reentrant in A they are reentrant in B .

Lemma 2.2.2 If $A \sqsubseteq B$ then $\Pi(A) \subseteq \Pi(B)$.

Lemma 2.2.3 If $A \sqsubseteq B$ then for every $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi(A)$, $\delta_A(\bar{q}_A, \pi_1) = \delta_A(\bar{q}_A, \pi_2)$ implies that $\delta_B(\bar{q}_B, \pi_1) = \delta_B(\bar{q}_B, \pi_2)$.

2.3 Well-Foundedness of Subsumption

Definition 2.3.1 A partial order \succ on D is **well-founded** iff there exists no infinite decreasing sequence $d_0 \succ d_1 \succ d_2 \succ \dots$ of elements of D .

We prove below that subsumption of TFSs is well-founded iff they are acyclic.

Lemma 2.3.2 A TFS A is cyclic iff $\Pi(A)$ is infinite.

Proof: If A is cyclic, there exist a node $q \in Q$ and a non-empty path α that $\delta(q, \alpha) = q$. Let π be such that $q = \delta(\bar{q}, \pi)$, then the infinite set of paths $\{\pi\alpha^i \mid i \geq 0\}$ is contained in $\Pi(A)$. If $\Pi(A)$ is infinite then since Q is finite, there exists a node $q \in Q$ that $\delta(q, \pi_i) \downarrow$ for an infinite number of different paths π_i . Since FEATS is finite, the out-degree of every node in Q is finite; hence q must be part of a cycle.

Definition 2.3.3 (Rank) Let $r : \text{TYPES} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a total function such that $r(t) < r(t')$ if $t \sqsubset t'$. For an acyclic TFS A , let $\Delta(A) = |\Pi(A)| - |Q_A|$ and let $\Theta(A) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi(A)} r(\theta(\delta(\bar{q}, \pi)))$. Define a rank for acyclic TFSs: $\text{rank}(A) = \Delta(A) + \Theta(A)$.

By lemma 2.3.2, *rank* is well defined for acyclic TFSs. $\Delta(A)$ can be thought of as the number of reentrancies in A , or the number of different paths that lead to the same node in A . For every acyclic TFS A , $\Delta(A) \geq 0$ and hence $\text{rank}(A) \geq 0$.

Lemma 2.3.4 If $A \sqsubset B$ and both are acyclic then $\text{rank}(A) < \text{rank}(B)$.

Proof: Assume $A \sqsubset B$ and both are acyclic; hence by lemma 2.2.2, $\Pi(A) \subseteq \Pi(B)$ and by lemma 2.3.2 both are finite. Let $h : Q_A \rightarrow Q_B$ be a subsumption morphism.

1. If $\Pi(A) = \Pi(B)$ then $|\Pi(A)| = |\Pi(B)|$. $A \sqsubset B$, hence either there exists a node $q \in Q_A$ that $\theta(q) \sqsubset \theta(h(q))$, and hence $\Theta(A) < \Theta(B)$ (while $\Delta(A) \leq \Delta(B)$); or (by lemma 2.2.3) there exist two paths π_1, π_2 that $\delta_A(\bar{q}_A, \pi_1) \neq \delta_A(\bar{q}_A, \pi_2)$, but $\delta_B(\bar{q}_B, \pi_1) = \delta_B(\bar{q}_B, \pi_2)$, in which case $\Delta(A) < \Delta(B)$ (while $\Theta(A) \leq \Theta(B)$). In any case, $\text{rank}(A) < \text{rank}(B)$.
2. If $\Pi(A) \subset \Pi(B)$ then $|\Pi(A)| < |\Pi(B)|$; as above, $\Theta(A) < \Theta(B)$. However, it might be the case that $|Q_A| < |Q_B|$. But for every node $q \in Q_B$ that is not the image of any node in Q_A , there exists a path π such that $\delta(\bar{q}_B, \pi) = q$ and $\pi \notin \Pi(A)$. Hence $|\Pi(A)| - |Q_A| \leq |\Pi(B)| - |Q_B|$, and $\text{rank}(A) < \text{rank}(B)$.

Theorem 2.3.5 *Subsumption of TFSs is not well-founded.*

Proof: Consider the infinite sequence of TFSs A_0, A_1, \dots depicted graphically in figure 2.2. For every $i \geq 0$, $A_i \sqsupset A_{i+1}$: to see that consider the morphism h that maps \bar{q}_{i+1} to \bar{q}_i and $\delta_{i+1}(q, f)$ to $\delta_i(h(q), f)$ (i.e., the first $i + 1$ nodes of A_{i+1} are mapped to the first $i + 1$ nodes of A_i , and the additional node of A_{i+1} is mapped to the last node of A_i). Thus there exists a decreasing infinite sequence of cyclic TFSs and subsumption is not well-founded.

Theorem 2.3.6 *Subsumption of acyclic TFSs is well-founded.*

Proof: For every acyclic TFS A , $\text{rank}(A)$ is finite and $\text{rank}(A) \geq 0$. By lemma 2.3.4, if $A \sqsubset B$ then $\text{rank}(A) < \text{rank}(B)$. If an infinite decreasing sequence of acyclic TFSs existed, *rank* would have mapped them to an infinite decreasing subsequence of \mathbb{N} , which is a contradiction. Hence subsumption is well-founded.

2.4 Abstract Feature Structures

The essential properties of a feature structure, excluding the identities of its nodes, can be captured by three components: the set of paths, the type that is assigned to every path, and the sets of paths that lead to the same node. In this section we elaborate on ideas presented in (Moshier and Rounds, 1987; Moshier, 1988); in contrast to the approach pursued in (Carpenter, 1992b), we first define abstract feature structures and then show their relation to concrete ones. The representation of graphs as sets of paths is inspired by works on the semantics of concurrent programming languages, and the notion of fusion-closure is due to (Emerson, 1983).




Figure 2.2: An infinite decreasing sequence of TFSs

Definition 2.4.1 (Alphabetic variants) *Two feature structures A and B are alphabetic variants ($A \sim B$) iff $A \sqsubseteq B$ and $B \sqsubseteq A$.*

Alphabetic variants have exactly the same structure, and corresponding nodes have the same types. Only the identities of the nodes distinguish them.

Definition 2.4.2 (Abstract feature structures) *A pre-abstract feature structure (pre-AFS) is a triple $\langle \Pi, \Theta, \approx \rangle$, where*

- $\Pi \subseteq \text{PATHS}$ is a non-empty set of paths
- $\Theta : \Pi \rightarrow \text{TYPES}$ is a total function, assigning a type to every path
- $\approx \subseteq \Pi \times \Pi$ is a relation specifying reentrancy.

An **abstract feature structure (AFS)** is a pre-AFS A for which the following requirements hold:

- Π is prefix-closed: if $\pi\alpha \in \Pi$ then $\pi \in \Pi$ (where $\pi, \alpha \in \text{PATHS}$)
- A is fusion-closed: if $\pi\alpha \in \Pi$ and $\pi'\alpha' \in \Pi$ and $\pi \approx \pi'$ then $\pi\alpha' \in \Pi$ (as well as $\pi'\alpha \in \Pi$) and $\pi\alpha' \approx \pi'\alpha'$ (as well as $\pi'\alpha \approx \pi\alpha$)
- \approx is an equivalence relation with a finite index (with $[\approx]$ the set of its equivalence classes)
- Θ respects the equivalence: if $\pi_1 \approx \pi_2$ then $\Theta(\pi_1) = \Theta(\pi_2)$.

An AFS $\langle \Pi, \Theta, \approx \rangle$ is *well-typed* if $\Theta(\pi) \neq \top$ for every $\pi \in \Pi$ and if $\pi f \in \Pi$ then $Approp(f, \Theta(\pi)) \downarrow$ and $Approp(f, \Theta(\pi)) \sqsubseteq \Theta(\pi f)$. It is *totally well typed* if, in addition, for every $\pi \in \Pi$, if $Approp(f, \Theta(\pi)) \downarrow$ then $\pi f \in \Pi$.

Abstract features structures can be related to concrete ones in a natural way: If $A = (Q, \bar{q}, \delta)$ is a TFS then $Abs(A) = \langle \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle$ is defined by:

- $\Pi_A = \{\pi \mid \delta(\bar{q}, \pi) \downarrow\}$
- $\Theta_A(\pi) = \theta(\delta(\bar{q}, \pi))$
- $\pi_1 \approx_A \pi_2$ iff $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi_1) = \delta(\bar{q}, \pi_2)$.

Lemma 2.4.3 *If A is a feature structure then $Abs(A)$ is an abstract feature structure.*

Proof:

1. Π is prefix-closed: $\Pi = \{\pi \mid \delta(\bar{q}, \pi) \downarrow\}$. If $\pi\alpha \in \Pi$ then $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi\alpha) \downarrow$ and by the definition of δ , $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi) \downarrow$, too.
2. $Abs(A)$ is fusion-closed: Suppose that $\pi\alpha \in \Pi$, $\pi'\alpha' \in \Pi$ and $\pi \approx \pi'$. Then $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi) = \delta(\bar{q}, \pi')$. Hence $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi\alpha) \downarrow$ (therefore $\pi\alpha \in \Pi$), and $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi\alpha) = \delta(\bar{q}, \pi'\alpha')$, therefore $\pi\alpha \approx \pi'\alpha'$. In the same way, $\pi'\alpha \in \Pi$ and $\pi'\alpha \approx \pi'\alpha'$.
3. \approx is an equivalence relation with a finite index: $\pi_1 \approx \pi_2$ iff $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi_1) = \delta(\bar{q}, \pi_2)$, namely iff π_1 and π_2 lead to the same node (from \bar{q}) in A . Hence \approx is an equivalence relation and since Q is finite, \approx has a finite index.
4. Θ respects the equivalence: $\Theta(\pi) = \theta(\delta(\bar{q}, \pi))$ and if $\pi_1 \approx \pi_2$ then $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi_1) = \delta(\bar{q}, \pi_2)$, hence $\Theta(\pi_1) = \Theta(\pi_2)$.

For the reverse direction, consider an AFS $A = \langle \Pi, \Theta, \approx \rangle$. First construct a ‘pseudo-TFS’, $Conc(A) = (Q, \bar{q}, \delta)$, that differs from a TFS only in that its nodes are not drawn from the set NODES. Let $Q = \{q_{[\pi]} \mid [\pi] \in [\approx]\}$, making use of the fact that ‘ \approx ’ is of finite index. Let $\theta(q_{[\pi]}) = \Theta(\pi)$ for every node – since A is an AFS, Θ respects the equivalence and therefore θ is representative-independent. Let $\bar{q} = q_{[e]}$ and $\delta(q_{[\pi]}, f) = q_{[\pi f]}$ for every node $q_{[\pi]}$ and feature f . Since A is fusion-closed, δ is representative-independent. By injecting Q into NODES, making use of the richness of NODES, a concrete TFS $Conc(A)$ is obtained, representing the equivalence class of alphabetic variants that can be obtained that way. We abuse the notation $Conc(A)$ in the sequel to refer to this set of alphabetic variants. Figure 2.3 depicts the abstraction of the example feature structure of figure 2.1.

Theorem 2.4.4 *If $A' \in Conc(A)$ then $Abs(A') = A$.*

Proof: Let $A = \langle \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle$, $A' = (Q, \bar{q}, \delta)$, $Abs(A') = \langle \Pi, \Theta, \approx \rangle$. If $A' \in Conc(A)$ then Q can be mapped by a one-to-one function to the set of equivalence classes of \approx_A and δ determines the paths in Π_A . By the definition of Abs , $\Pi = \Pi_A$. Given a path $\pi \in \Pi_A$, $\Theta(\pi) = \theta(\delta(\bar{q}, \pi)) = \theta(q_{[\pi]}) = \Theta_A(\pi)$. If $\pi_1 \approx_A \pi_2$ then $\delta(\bar{q}, \pi_1) = \delta(\bar{q}, \pi_2)$ (since A is fusion-closed) and hence $\pi_1 \approx \pi_2$.

AFSs can be partially ordered: $\langle \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle \preceq \langle \Pi_B, \Theta_B, \approx_B \rangle$ iff $\Pi_A \subseteq \Pi_B$, $\approx_A \subseteq \approx_B$ and for every $\pi \in \Pi_A$, $\Theta_A(\pi) \sqsubseteq \Theta_B(\pi)$. This order corresponds to the subsumption ordering on TFSs, as the following theorems show.

$$\Pi = \{\epsilon, \text{SYN}, \text{SUBJ}, \text{SUBJ AGR}, \text{HEAD}, \text{HEAD AGR}\}$$

\approx	ϵ	SYN	SUBJ	SUBJ AGR	HEAD	HEAD AGR	Θ
ϵ	+						phrase
SYN		+					s
SUBJ			+				head
SUBJ AGR				+		+	agr
HEAD					+		head
HEAD AGR				+		+	agr

Figure 2.3: An abstract feature structure

Theorem 2.4.5 $A \sqsubseteq B$ iff $Abs(A) \preceq Abs(B)$.

Proof: Let $Abs(A) = \langle \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle$, $Abs(B) = \langle \Pi_B, \Theta_B, \approx_B \rangle$. Assume that $A \sqsubseteq B$, that is, a subsumption morphism $h : Q_A \rightarrow Q_B$ exists. If $\pi \in \Pi_A$ then (from the definition of $Abs(A)$) $\delta_A(\bar{q}_A, \pi) \downarrow$, that is, there exists a sequence q_0, q_1, \dots, q_n of nodes and a sequence f_1, \dots, f_n of features such that for every i , $0 \leq i < n$, $\delta_A(q_i, f_{i+1}) = q_{i+1}$, $q_0 = \bar{q}_A$ and $\pi = f_1 \cdots f_n$. Due to the subsumption morphism, there exists a sequence of nodes $h(q_0), \dots, h(q_n)$ such that $\delta_B(h(q_i), f_{i+1}) = h(q_{i+1})$ for every i , $0 \leq i < n$, and $h(q_0) = \bar{q}_B$. Hence $\pi \in \Pi_B$. Moreover, since $A \sqsubseteq B$, for every node q , $\theta(q) \sqsubseteq \theta(h(q))$. In particular, $\theta(q_n) \sqsubseteq \theta(h(q_n))$ and thus $\Theta_A(\pi) \sqsubseteq \Theta_B(\pi)$. Now suppose that two paths π_1, π_2 are reentrant in A . By the definition of subsumption, π_1 and π_2 are reentrant in B , too. Therefore $\approx_A \subseteq \approx_B$.

If $Abs(A) \preceq Abs(B)$, construct a function $h : Q_A \rightarrow Q_B$ such that $h(\bar{q}_A) = \bar{q}_B$ and for every $q \in Q_A$, $h(\delta_A(q, f)) = \delta_B(h(q), f)$. Trivially, h is total and $h(\bar{q}_A) = \bar{q}_B$. Also, if $\delta_A(q, f) \downarrow$ then $h(\delta_A(q, f)) = \delta_B(h(q), f)$. To show that $\theta(q) \sqsubseteq \theta(h(q))$ for every q , consider a path π leading from \bar{q}_A to q . Since $Abs(A) \preceq Abs(B)$, $\Theta_A(\pi) \sqsubseteq \Theta_B(\pi)$ and hence $\theta(q) \sqsubseteq \theta(h(q))$. Hence h is a subsumption morphism.

Theorem 2.4.6 For every $A \in Conc(A')$, $B \in Conc(B')$, $A \sqsubseteq B$ iff $A' \preceq B'$.

Proof: Select some $A \in Conc(A')$, $B \in Conc(B')$. If $A \sqsubseteq B$ then, by theorem 2.4.5, $Abs(A) \preceq Abs(B)$. By the definition of $Conc$, $Abs(A) = A'$ and $Abs(B) = B'$, so that $A' \preceq B'$.

If $A' \preceq B'$, construct a function $h : Q_A \rightarrow Q_B$ as follows: First, let $h(\bar{q}_A) = \bar{q}_B$. Then, perform a depth-first search on the graph A and for every node $q' = \delta_A(q, f)$ encountered, if $h(q') \uparrow$ set $h(q') = \delta_B(h(q), f)$. The order of the search is irrelevant: since $A' \preceq B'$, $\approx_{A'} \subseteq \approx_{B'}$ and therefore if $\pi_1 \approx_{A'} \pi_2$ then $\pi_1 \approx_{B'} \pi_2$. Since $A' \preceq B'$, $\Pi_{A'} \subseteq \Pi_{B'}$ and hence $\delta_B(h(q), f)$ is defined whenever $\delta_A(q, f)$ is defined. Hence h is total and $h(\bar{q}_A) = \bar{q}_B$. For every node $q \in Q_A$, some path π exists that leads from \bar{q}_A to q and from \bar{q}_B to $h(q)$. $\Theta_A(\pi) \sqsubseteq \Theta_B(\pi)$, and therefore $\theta(q) \sqsubseteq \theta(h(q))$. Hence h is a subsumption morphism.

Corollary 2.4.7 $A \sim B$ iff $Abs(A) = Abs(B)$.

Proof: Immediate from theorem 2.4.5.

Corollary 2.4.8 $Conc(A) \sim Conc(B)$ iff $A = B$.

Proof: Immediate from theorem 2.4.6.

2.5 Unification

As there exists a one to one correspondence between abstract feature structures and (alphabetic variants of) concrete ones, we define unification directly over AFSs. This leads to a simpler definition that captures the essence of the operation better than the traditional definition. We use the term ‘unification’ to refer to both the operation and its result.

Lemma 2.5.1 *If $A = \langle \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle$ is a pre-AFS then there exists a pre-AFS $B = \langle \Pi_B, \Theta_B, \approx_B \rangle$ such that B is the least extension of A to a fusion-closed structure and $\Theta_B(\pi) = \Theta_A(\pi)$ for every $\pi \in \Pi_A$.*

Lemma 2.5.2 *If $A = \langle \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle$ is a pre-AFS then there exists a pre-AFS $B = \langle \Pi_B, \Theta_B, \approx_B \rangle$ such that $\Pi_A = \Pi_B, \Theta_A = \Theta_B$ and \approx_B is the least extension of \approx_A to an equivalence relation.*

Definition 2.5.3 (Closure operations) *Let Cl be a fusion-closure operation on pre-AFSs: $Cl(A) = A'$, where A' is the least extension of A to a fusion-closed structure. Let $Eq(\langle \Pi, \Theta, \approx \rangle) = \langle \Pi, \Theta, \approx' \rangle$ where \approx' is the least extension of \approx to an equivalence relation. Let $Ty(\langle \Pi, \Theta, \approx \rangle) = \langle \Pi, \Theta', \approx \rangle$ where $\Theta'(\pi) = \bigsqcup_{\pi' \approx \pi} \Theta(\pi)$.*

Definition 2.5.4 (Unification) *The unification $A \sqcup B$ of two AFSs $A = \langle \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle$ and $B = \langle \Pi_B, \Theta_B, \approx_B \rangle$ is the AFS $C' = Ty(Eq(Cl(C)))$, where:*

- $C = \langle \Pi_C, \Theta_C, \approx_C \rangle$
- $\Pi_C = \Pi_A \cup \Pi_B$
- $\Theta_C(\pi) = \begin{cases} \Theta_A(\pi) \sqcup \Theta_B(\pi) & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi_A \text{ and } \pi \in \Pi_B \\ \Theta_A(\pi) & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi_A \text{ only} \\ \Theta_B(\pi) & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi_B \text{ only} \end{cases}$
- $\approx_C = \approx_A \cup \approx_B$

The unification fails if there exists a path $\pi \in \Pi_{C'}$ such that $\Theta_{C'}(\pi) = \top$.

Lemma 2.5.5 *Cl preserves prefixes: If A is a prefix-closed pre-AFS and $A' = Cl(A)$ then A' is prefix-closed.*

Proof: Let π be a path in Π' . If $\pi \in \Pi$ then every prefix of π is in Π , since Π is prefix-closed and Cl only adds paths. Suppose that $\pi \in \Pi' \setminus \Pi$. Then there exist $\pi_1, \pi_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \text{PATHS}$ such that $\pi_1\alpha_1 \in \Pi$ and $\pi_2\alpha_2 \in \Pi$ and $\pi_1 \approx \pi_2$ and $\pi = \pi_1\alpha_2$ (otherwise, π can be removed from Π' , in contradiction to the minimality of Cl). If π' is a prefix of π then either π' is a prefix of π_1 , in which case $\pi' \in \Pi$ since Π is prefix-closed, or $\pi' = \pi_1\alpha'$ for some α' that is a prefix of α . Since Π is prefix-closed, $\pi_1\alpha' \in \Pi$ and $\pi_2\alpha' \in \Pi$. Therefore, as $\pi_1 \approx \pi_2$, $\pi_1\alpha'$ is added to Π' by the closure operation.

Lemma 2.5.6 *Eq preserves prefixes and fusions: If A is a prefix- and fusion-closed pre-AFS and $A' = Eq(A)$ then A' is prefix- and fusion-closed.*

Proof: Eq extends \approx to an equivalence relation. Since only \approx is modified, prefix-closure is trivially maintained. Select a pair $(\pi_1, \pi_2) \in \approx' \setminus \approx$. Then either (1) $\pi_2 = \pi_1$; (2) $\pi_2 \approx \pi_1$; or (3) there exists a path π_3 such that $\pi_1 \approx \pi_3$ and $\pi_3 \approx \pi_2$. Trivially, (1) and (2) preserve the closure properties. In the case of (3), to show that fusion-closure is maintained we have to show that if $\pi_1\alpha_1 \in \Pi'$ and $\pi_2\alpha_2 \in \Pi'$ then $\pi_1\alpha_2 \in \Pi'$ and $\pi_1\alpha_2 \approx' \pi_2\alpha_2$. Since $\Pi = \Pi'$, $\pi_1\alpha_1 \in \Pi$ and $\pi_2\alpha_2 \in \Pi$. Since Π is fusion-closed and $\pi_2 \approx \pi_3$, $\pi_3\alpha_2 \in \Pi$ and $\pi_3\alpha_2 \approx \pi_2\alpha_2$. Since $\pi_1 \approx \pi_3$, $\pi_1\alpha_2 \in \Pi$ and $\pi_1\alpha_2 \approx \pi_3\alpha_2$, too. \approx' is an extension of \approx to an equivalence relation, and thus $\pi_1\alpha_2 \approx' \pi_2\alpha_2$.

Corollary 2.5.7 *If A and B are AFSs, then so is $A \sqcup B$.*

Proof: If A and B are AFSs then the pre-AFS C , defined as in 2.5.4, is prefix-closed (since A and B are). $Cl(C)$ is prefix- and fusion-closed, as is $Eq(Cl(C))$ in which, additionally, \approx is an equivalence relation. $Ty(Eq(Cl(C)))$ is an AFS, since Ty only modifies Θ such that it respects the equivalences.

C' is the smallest AFS that contains Π_C and \approx_C . Since Π_A and Π_B are prefix-closed, so is Π_C . However, Π_C and \approx_C might not be fusion-closed. This is why Cl is applied to them. As a result of its application, new paths and equivalence classes might be added. By lemma 2.5.5, if a path is added all its prefixes are added, too, so the prefix-closure is preserved. Then, Eq extends \approx to an equivalence relation, without harming the prefix- and fusion-closure properties (by lemma 2.5.6). Finally, Ty sees to it that Θ respects the equivalences.

Lemma 2.5.8 *Unification is commutative: $A \sqcup B = B \sqcup A$.*

Proof: Observe that unification is defined using set union (\cup) and type unification (\sqcup) which are commutative. Therefore, the unification is commutative, too.

Lemma 2.5.9 *Unification is associative: $(A \sqcup B) \sqcup C = A \sqcup (B \sqcup C)$.*

Proof: as above.

The result of a unification can differ from any of its arguments in three ways: paths that were not present can be added; the types of nodes can become more specific; and reentrancies can be added, that is, the number of equivalence classes of paths can decrease. Consequently, the result of a unification is always more specific than any of its arguments.

Theorem 2.5.10 *If $C' = A \sqcup B$ then $A \preceq C'$.*

Proof: $\Pi_C = \Pi_A \cup \Pi_B$ and hence $\Pi_A \subseteq \Pi_C$. $\approx_C = \approx_A \cup \approx_B$ and hence $\approx_A \subseteq \approx_C$. If $\pi \in \Pi_A$ then $\Theta_C(\pi) = \Theta_A(\pi)$ or $\Theta_C(\pi) = \Theta_A(\pi) \sqcup \Theta_B(\pi)$, and in any case $\Theta_A(\pi) \sqsubseteq \Theta_C(\pi)$. Cl and Eq cannot remove paths or equivalences and Ty only makes types more specific, and therefore $A \preceq C'$.

Theorem 2.5.11 *$A \sqcup B = A$ iff $B \preceq A$.*

Proof: Suppose $B \preceq A$. Then $\Pi_B \subseteq \Pi_A$, $\approx_B \subseteq \approx_A$ and for every $\pi \in \Pi_B$, $\Theta_B(\pi) \sqsubseteq \Theta_A(\pi)$. $A \sqcup B = Ty(Eq(Cl(C)))$ where $C = \langle \Pi_C, \Theta_C, \approx_C \rangle$ and

- $\Pi_C = \Pi_A \cup \Pi_B = \Pi_A$
- $\Theta_C(\pi) = \begin{cases} \Theta_A(\pi) \sqcup \Theta_B(\pi) & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi_A \text{ and } \pi \in \Pi_B \\ \Theta_A(\pi) & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi_A \text{ only} \\ \Theta_B(\pi) & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi_B \text{ only} \end{cases} = \Theta_A(\pi)$

- $\approx_C = \approx_A \cup \approx_B = \approx_A$

Hence $A = C$ and therefore $A \sqcup B = A$.

Suppose $A \sqcup B = A$ and assume toward a contradiction that $B \not\subseteq A$. Then at least one of the following cases holds:

- $\Pi_B \not\subseteq \Pi_A$. Then there exists $\pi \in \Pi_B \cup \Pi_A$ that $\pi \notin \Pi_A$ and hence $A \sqcup B \neq A$.
- There exists some π such that $\Theta_B(\pi) \not\subseteq \Theta_A(\pi)$. Then $\Theta_A(\pi) \sqcup \Theta_B(\pi) \neq \Theta_A(\pi)$ and hence $A \sqcup B \neq A$.
- $\approx_B \not\subseteq \approx_A$. Then there exist π_1, π_2 such that $(\pi_1 \approx_B \pi_2)$ but not $(\pi_1 \approx_A \pi_2)$. Hence $(\approx_A \cup \approx_B) \neq \approx_A$ and $A \sqcup B \neq A$.

TFSs (and therefore AFSs) can be seen as a generalization of first-order terms (FOTs) (see (Carpenter, 1991)). Accordingly, AFS unification resembles FOT unification; however, the notion of *substitution* that is central to the definition of FOT unification is missing here, and as far as we know, no analog to substitutions in the domain of feature structures was ever presented.

2.6 A Linear Representation of Feature Structures

Representing feature structures as either graphs or attribute-value matrices is cumbersome; we now define a linear representation for feature structures, based upon Ait-Kaci's ψ -terms (though the order relation we use is reversed).

Definition 2.6.1 (Arity) *The arity of a type t is the number of features appropriate for it, i.e. $|\{f \mid \text{Approp}(f, t)\downarrow}\}|$.*

Note that in every totally well-typed feature structure of type t the number of edges leaving the root is exactly the arity of t . Consequently, we use the term 'arity' for (totally well-typed) feature structures: the arity of a feature structure of type t is defined to be the arity of t .

In order to define the set of well-formed linear terms over FEATS and TYPES, we assume that the feature names are ordered in a fixed order.

Let $\{\boxplus \mid i \text{ is a natural number}\}$ be the set of **tags**.

Definition 2.6.2 (Terms) *A term τ of type t is an expression of the form $\boxplus t(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$ where \boxplus is a tag, $n \geq 0$ and every τ_i is a term of some type.*

Definition 2.6.3 (Totally well-typed terms) *A term $\tau = \boxplus t(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$ of type t is **totally well-typed** iff:*

- t is a type of arity n ;
- the appropriate features for the type t are f_1, \dots, f_n , in this order;
- for every i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\text{Approp}(f_i, t) = t_i$;
- for every i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, if τ_i is a term of type t'_i then either $t_i \sqsubseteq t'_i$ or $t'_i = \perp$

We distinguish tags that appear in terms according to the type they are attached to: if a sub-term consists of a tag and the type \perp , we say that the tag is **independent**. Otherwise, the tag is **dependent**. We will henceforth consider only terms for which the following proposition holds:

Definition 2.6.4 (Normal terms) *A totally well-typed term $\psi = \boxed{t}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$ is **normal** iff:*

- $t \neq \top$;
- if a tag \boxed{t} appears in ψ then its first (leftmost) occurrence might be dependent. If it appears more than once, its other occurrences are independent.
- τ_1, \dots, τ_n are normal terms.

We use terms to represent feature structures. We define below an algebra over which terms are to be interpreted. The denotation of a normal term is a totally well-typed feature structure.

Definition 2.6.5 (Feature structure algebra) *A feature structure algebra is a structure $\mathcal{A} = \langle D_{\mathcal{A}}, \{\sqcup_{\mathcal{A}} \mid \sqcup \in \text{TYPES}\}, \{\{\mathcal{A} \mid \{\in \text{FEATS}\}\} \}$, such that:*

- $D_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a non-empty set, the **domain** of \mathcal{A} ;
- for each $t \in \text{TYPES}$, $t_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq D_{\mathcal{A}}$ and, in particular:
 - $\top_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$;
 - $\perp_{\mathcal{A}} = D_{\mathcal{A}}$;
 - if $t_1 \sqcup t_2 = t$ then $t_{1\mathcal{A}} \cap t_{2\mathcal{A}} = t_{\mathcal{A}}$
- for each $f \in \text{FEATS}$, $f_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a total function $f_{\mathcal{A}} : D_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow D_{\mathcal{A}}$

Let D_G be the domain of all typed feature structures over TYPES and FEATS . The interpretation of t_G over this domain is the set of feature structures whose roots have the type t ; the interpretation of $f_G : D_G \rightarrow D_G$ is the function that, given a feature structure A , returns $val(A, f)$.

We associate a normal term ψ with a totally well-typed feature structure A in the following way:

- if $\psi = \boxed{t}()$ then $A = (\{\boxed{t}\}, \boxed{t}, \delta, \theta_t)$ where δ is undefined for every input and $\theta_t(q) = t$ if $q = \boxed{t}$ and undefined otherwise;
- if $\psi = \boxed{t}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$ then $A = (Q, \boxed{t}, \delta, \theta)$ where $\theta(\boxed{t}) = t$ and for every j , if f_j is the j -th appropriate feature of the type t , then $\delta(\boxed{t}, f_j) = q_j$ and q_j is the root of the feature structure associated with τ_j .

Conversely, associate a feature structure $A = (Q, \bar{q}, \delta, \theta)$ with a normal term $\psi = \boxed{t}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$, where:

- $\boxed{t} = \bar{q}$;
- $\theta(\bar{q}) = t$;
- n is the number of outgoing edges from \bar{q} ;
- for every j , $1 \leq j \leq n$, τ_j is the term associated with $\delta(\bar{q}, f_j)$ where f_j is the j -th appropriate feature of t ;

- if the tag $\boxed{\text{f}}$ occurs elsewhere in τ_1, \dots, τ_n , we replace the term that $\boxed{\text{f}}$ depends on with the term $\perp()$, making this occurrence of $\boxed{\text{f}}$ independent.

To summarize, there is a one-to-one correspondence between totally well-typed feature structures and normal terms.

Note that the tags are only a means of encoding reentrancy in feature structures. Therefore, when displaying a term in which a tag $\boxed{\text{f}}$ appears just once in a term, we will sometimes omit the tag for the sake of compactness. Then, we sometimes omit the type of independent tags, which are implicitly typed by \perp , and display them as tags only.

2.7 Multi-rooted Structures

To be able to represent complex linguistic information, such as phrase structure, the notion of feature structures is usually extended. There are two different approaches for representing phrase structure in feature structures: by adding special, designated features to the FSs themselves; or by defining an extended notion of FSs. The first approach is employed by HPSG: special features, such as DTRS (daughters), encode trees in TFSs as lists. This makes it impossible to directly access a particular daughter. Shieber (1992) uses a variant of this approach, where a denumerable set of special features, namely $0, 1, \dots$, are added to encode the order of daughters in a tree. In a typed system such as ours, this method would necessitate the addition of special types as well; in general, no bound can be placed on the number of features and types necessary to state rules (see (Carpenter, 1992b, p. 194)).


As a more coherent, mathematically elegant solution, we adopt below the other approach: a new notion of *multi-rooted feature structures*, suggested by (Sikkel, 1993), is being defined to naturally extend TFSs. These structures provide a means to represent phrasal signs and grammar rules. They are used implicitly in the computational linguistics literature, but to the best of our knowledge no explicit, formal theory of these structures and their properties was formulated before.

Definition 2.7.1 (Multi-rooted structures) *A multi-rooted feature structure (MRS) is a pair $\langle \bar{Q}, G \rangle$ where $G = \langle Q, \delta \rangle$ is a finite, directed, labeled graph consisting of a set $Q \subseteq \text{NODES}$ of nodes and a partial function $\delta : Q \times \text{FEATS} \rightarrow Q$ specifying the arcs, and where \bar{Q} is an ordered, (repetition-free) list of distinguished nodes in Q called **roots**. G is not necessarily connected, but the union of all the nodes reachable from all the roots in \bar{Q} is required to yield exactly Q . The **length** of a MRS is the number of its roots, $|\bar{Q}|$. λ denotes the empty MRS, where $Q = \emptyset$.*

Meta-variables σ, ρ range over MRSs, and δ, Q and \bar{Q} over their constituents. If $\langle \bar{Q}, G \rangle$ is a MRS and \bar{q}_i is a root in \bar{Q} then \bar{q}_i naturally induces a feature structure $Pr(\bar{Q}, i) = (Q_i, \bar{q}_i, \delta_i)$, where Q_i is the set of nodes reachable from \bar{q}_i and $\delta_i = \delta|_{Q_i}$.

One can view a MRS $\langle \bar{Q}, G \rangle$ as an ordered sequence $\langle A_1, \dots, A_n \rangle$ of (not necessarily disjoint) feature structures, where $A_i = Pr(\bar{Q}, i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Note that such an ordered list of feature structures is not a sequence in the mathematical sense: removing an element from the list may effect the other elements (due to reentrancy among elements). Nevertheless, we can think of a MRS as a sequence where a subsequence is obtained by taking a subsequence of the roots and considering only the feature structures they induce. We use the two views interchangeably. Figure 2.4 depicts a MRS and its view as a sequence of feature structures. The shaded nodes (ordered from left to right) constitute \bar{Q} .

A MRS is well-typed if all its constituent feature structures are well-typed, and is totally well-typed if all its constituents are. Subsumption is extended to MRSs as follows:



$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{phrase} \\ \text{SYN} : \quad [n] \\ \text{HEAD} : \quad [1] \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head} \\ \text{AGR} : \quad [3] [agr] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{CASE} : \quad [nom] \end{array} \right] \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{phrase} \\ \text{SYN} : \quad [v] \\ \text{HEAD} : \quad [2] \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head} \\ \text{AGR} : \quad [3] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT} : \quad [elist] \end{array} \right] \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{phrase} \\ \text{SYN} : \quad [s] \\ \text{SUBJ} : \quad [1] \\ \text{HEAD} : \quad [2] \end{array} \right]$$

Figure 2.4: A graph- and AVM- representation of a MRS

Definition 2.7.2 (Subsumption of multi-rooted structures) A MRS $\sigma = \langle \bar{Q}, G \rangle$ subsumes a MRS $\sigma' = \langle \bar{Q}', G' \rangle$ (denoted by $\sigma \sqsubseteq \sigma'$) if $|\bar{Q}| = |\bar{Q}'|$ and there exists a total function $h : Q \rightarrow Q'$ such that:

- for every root $\bar{q}_i \in \bar{Q}$, $h(\bar{q}_i) = \bar{q}'_i$
- for every $q \in Q$, $\theta(q) \sqsubseteq \theta'(h(q))$
- for every $q \in Q$ and $f \in \text{FEATS}$, if $\delta(q, f) \downarrow$ then $h(\delta(q, f)) = \delta'(h(q), f)$

We define abstract multi-rooted structures in an analog way to abstract feature structures.

Definition 2.7.3 (Abstract multi-rooted structures) A pre-abstract multi rooted structure (pre-AMRS) is a quadruple $A = \langle \text{Ind}, \Pi, \Theta, \approx \rangle$, where:

- Ind , the **indices** of A , is the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ for some n
- $\Pi \subseteq \text{Ind} \times \text{PATHS}$ is a set of indexed paths, such that for each $i \in \text{Ind}$ there exists some $\pi \in \text{PATHS}$ that $(i, \pi) \in \Pi$.
- $\Theta : \Pi \rightarrow \text{TYPES}$ is a total type-assignment function
- $\approx \subseteq \Pi \times \Pi$ is a relation

An **abstract multi-rooted structure** (AMRS) is a pre-AMRS A for which the following requirements, naturally extending those of AFSs, hold:

- Π is prefix-closed: if $(i, \pi\alpha) \in \Pi$ then $(i, \pi) \in \Pi$
- A is fusion-closed: if $(i, \pi\alpha) \in \Pi$ and $(i', \pi'\alpha') \in \Pi$ and $(i, \pi) \approx (i', \pi')$ then $(i, \pi\alpha') \in \Pi$ (as well as $(i', \pi'\alpha) \in \Pi$), and $(i, \pi\alpha') \approx (i', \pi'\alpha')$ (as well as $(i', \pi'\alpha) \approx (i, \pi\alpha)$)
- \approx is an equivalence relation with a finite index
- Θ respects the equivalence: if $(i_1, \pi_1) \approx (i_2, \pi_2)$ then $\Theta(i_1, \pi_1) = \Theta(i_2, \pi_2)$

An AMRS $\langle Ind, \Pi, \Theta, \approx \rangle$ is well-typed if for every $(i, \pi) \in \Pi$, $\Theta(i, \pi) \neq \top$ and if $(i, \pi f) \in \Pi$ then $Approp(f, \Theta(i, \pi)) \downarrow$ and $Approp(f, \Theta(i, \pi)) \sqsubseteq \Theta(i, \pi f)$. It is totally well typed if, in addition, for every $(i, \pi) \in \Pi$, if $Approp(f, \Theta(i, \pi)) \downarrow$ then $(i, \pi f) \in \Pi$. The **length** of an AMRS A is $len(A) = |Ind_A|$. We use λ to denote the empty AMRS, too, where $Ind_\lambda = \emptyset$ and $\Pi_\lambda = \emptyset$ (so that $len(\lambda) = 0$).

The closure operations Cl and Eq are naturally extended to AMRSs: If A is a pre-AMRS then $Cl(A)$ is the least extension of A that is prefix- and fusion-closed, and $Eq(A)$ is the least extension of A to a pre-AMRS in which \approx is an equivalence relation. In addition, $Ty(\langle Ind, \Pi, \Theta, \approx \rangle) = \langle Ind, \Pi, \Theta', \approx \rangle$ where $\Theta'(i, \pi) = \bigsqcup_{(i', \pi') \approx (i, \pi)} \Theta(i', \pi')$. The partial order \preceq is extended to AMRSs: $\langle Ind_A, \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle \preceq \langle Ind_B, \Pi_B, \Theta_B, \approx_B \rangle$ iff $Ind_A = Ind_B$, $\Pi_A \subseteq \Pi_B$, $\approx_A \subseteq \approx_B$ and for every $(i, \pi) \in \Pi_A$, $\Theta_A(i, \pi) \sqsubseteq \Theta_B(i, \pi)$. In the rest of this chapter we overload the symbol ' \sqsubseteq ' so that it denotes subsumption of AMRSs as well as MRSs.

AMRSs, too, can be related to concrete ones in a natural way: If $\sigma = \langle \bar{Q}, G \rangle$ is a MRS then $Abs(\sigma) = \langle Ind_\sigma, \Pi_\sigma, \Theta_\sigma, \approx_\sigma \rangle$ is defined by:

- $Ind_\sigma = \{1, \dots, |\bar{Q}|\}$
- $\Pi_\sigma = \{(i, \pi) \mid \delta(\bar{q}_i, \pi) \downarrow\}$
- $\Theta_\sigma(i, \pi) = \theta(\delta(\bar{q}_i, \pi))$
- $(i, \pi_1) \approx_\sigma (j, \pi_2)$ iff $\delta(\bar{q}_i, \pi_1) = \delta(\bar{q}_j, \pi_2)$

It is easy to see that $Abs(\sigma)$ is an AMRS. In particular, notice that for every $i \in Ind_\sigma$ there exists a path π such that $(i, \pi) \in \Pi_\sigma$ since for every $i, \delta(\bar{q}_i, \epsilon) \downarrow$. The reverse operation, $Conc$, can be defined in a similar manner.

AMRSs are used to represent ordered collections of AFSs. However, due to the possibility of value sharing among the constituents of AMRSs, they are not sequences in the mathematical sense, and the notion of sub-structure has to be defined in order to relate them to AFSs.

Definition 2.7.4 (Sub-structures) Let $A = \langle Ind_A, \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle$; let Ind_B be a finite (contiguous) subset of Ind_A ; let $n + 1$ be the index of the first element of Ind_B . The **sub-structure** of A induced by Ind_B is an AMRS $B = \langle Ind_B, \Pi_B, \Theta_B, \approx_B \rangle$ such that:

- $(i - n, \pi) \in \Pi_B$ iff $i \in Ind_B$ and $(i, \pi) \in A$
- $\Theta_B(i - n, \pi) = \Theta_A(i, \pi)$ if $i \in Ind_B$
- $(i_1 - n, \pi_1) \approx_B (i_2 - n, \pi_2)$ iff $i_1 \in Ind_B, i_2 \in Ind_B$ and $(i_1, \pi_1) \approx_A (i_2, \pi_2)$

A sub-structure of A is obtained by selecting a subsequence of the indices of A and considering the structure they induce. Trivially, this structure is an AMRS. We use $A^{j..k}$ to refer to the sub-structure of A induced by $\{j, \dots, k\}$. If $Ind_B = \{i\}$, $A^{i..i}$ can be identified with an AFS, denoted A^i .

The notion of concatenation has to be defined for AMRSs, too. Notice that by definition, concatenated AMRSs cannot share elements between them.

Definition 2.7.5 (Concatenation) *The concatenation of $A = \langle Ind_A, \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle$ and $B = \langle Ind_B, \Pi_B, \Theta_B, \approx_B \rangle$ of lengths n_A, n_B , respectively (denoted by $A \cdot B$), is an AMRS $C = \langle Ind_C, \Pi_C, \Theta_C, \approx_C \rangle$ such that*

- $Ind_C = \{1, \dots, n_A + n_B\}$
- $\Pi_C = \Pi_A \cup \{(i + n_A, \pi) \mid (i, \pi) \in \Pi_B\}$
- $\Theta_C(i, \pi) = \begin{cases} \Theta_A(i, \pi) & \text{if } i \leq n_A \\ \Theta_B(i - n_A, \pi) & \text{if } i > n_A \end{cases}$
- $\approx_C = \approx_A \cup \{((i_1 + n_A, \pi_1), (i_2 + n_A, \pi_2)) \mid (i_1, \pi_1) \approx_B (i_2, \pi_2)\}$

As usual, $A \cdot \lambda = \lambda \cdot A = A$.

We now extend the definition of unification to AMRSs: we want to allow the unification of two AMRSs, according to a specified set of indices. Therefore, one operand is a pair consisting of an AMRS and a set of indices, specifying some elements of it. The second operand is either an AMRS or an AFS, considered as an AMRS of length 1. Recall that due to reentrancies, other elements of the first AMRS can be affected by this operation. Therefore, the result of the unification is a new AMRS. We refer to AMRS unification as “unification in context” in the sequel to emphasize the effect that the operation might have on elements that are not directly involved in it.

Definition 2.7.6 (Unification of AMRSs) *Let $A = \langle Ind_A, \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle$ be an AMRS. Let $B = \langle Ind_B, \Pi_B, \Theta_B, \approx_B \rangle$ be an AMRS (if B is an AFS it is interpreted as an AMRS of length 1). Let J be a set of indices such that $J \subseteq Ind_A$. Let $f(i) = i$ if B is an AMRS, $f(i) = 1$ if B is an AFS. $(A, J) \sqcup B$ is defined if B is an AMRS and $J \subseteq Ind_B$, or if B is an AFS and $|J| = 1$; in any case, it is the AMRS $C' = Ty(Eq(Cl(\langle Ind_C, \Pi_C, \Theta_C, \approx_C \rangle)))$, where*

- $Ind_C = Ind_A$
- $\Pi_C = \Pi_A \cup \{(i, \pi) \mid i \in J \text{ and } (f(i), \pi) \in \Pi_B\}$
- $\Theta_C(i, \pi) = \begin{cases} \Theta_A(i, \pi) & \text{if } i \notin J \\ \Theta_A(i, \pi) \sqcup \Theta_B(f(i), \pi) & \text{if } i \in J \text{ and } (i, \pi) \in \Pi_A \text{ and } (f(i), \pi) \in \Pi_B \\ \Theta_A(i, \pi) & \text{if } i \in J \text{ and } (i, \pi) \in \Pi_A \text{ and } (f(i), \pi) \notin \Pi_B \\ \Theta_B(f(i), \pi) & \text{if } i \in J \text{ and } (i, \pi) \notin \Pi_A \text{ and } (f(i), \pi) \in \Pi_B \end{cases}$
- $\approx_C = \approx_A \cup \{((i_1, \pi_1), (i_2, \pi_2)) \mid i_1, i_2 \in J \text{ and } (f(i_1), \pi_1) \approx_B (f(i_2), \pi_2)\}$

The unification fails if there exists some pair $(i, \pi) \in \Pi_{C'}$ such that $\Theta_{C'}(i, \pi) = \top$.

Many of the properties of AFSs, proven in the previous section, hold for AMRSs, too. In particular, if A, B are AMRSs then so is $(A, J) \sqcup B$ if it is defined, $len((A, J) \sqcup B) = len(A)$ and $(A, J) \sqcup B \sqsupseteq A$. Also, for every two AMRSs A, B , $(A, \{1 \dots len(A)\}) \sqcup B = A$ iff $B^{1..len(A)} \sqsubseteq A$.

The linear representation of TFSs, suggested in section 2.6, is naturally extended to MRSs: a multi-term is a sequence of terms, where the scope of tags is extended to the entire sequence.

2.8 Rules and Grammars

We define rules and grammars over a fixed set WORDS of words (in addition to the fixed sets FEATS and TYPES). We use w to refer to elements of WORDS, w_i to refer to strings over WORDS. We assume that the lexicon associates with every word w_i a set of feature structures $Cat(w_i)$, its **category**,¹ so we can ignore the terminal words and consider only their categories. The input for the parser, therefore, is a sequence² of sets of TFSs rather than a string of words.

Definition 2.8.1 (Pre-terminals) Let $w = w_1 \dots w_n \in \text{WORDS}^*$. $PT_w(j, k)$ is defined iff $1 \leq j, k \leq n$, in which case it is the set of AMRSs $Abs(\langle A_j, A_{j+1}, \dots, A_k \rangle)$ where $A_i \in Cat(w_i)$ for $j \leq i \leq k$. If $j > k$ then $PT_w(j, k) = \{\lambda\}$. We omit the subscript w when it is clear from the context.

Lemma 2.8.2 If $w = w_1 \dots w_n$, $1 \leq i \leq j \leq k \leq n$, $A \in PT_w(i, j)$ and $B \in PT_w(j + 1, k)$ then $A \cdot B \in PT_w(i, k)$.

Proof: An immediate corollary of the definition.

Definition 2.8.3 (Rules) A **rule** is a MRS of length $n > 0$ with a distinguished last element. If $\langle A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}, A_n \rangle$ is a rule then A_n is its **head**³ and $\langle A_1, \dots, A_{n-1} \rangle$ is its **body**.⁴ We write such a rule as $\langle A_1, \dots, A_{n-1} \Rightarrow A_n \rangle$. In addition, every category of a lexical item is a rule (with an empty body). We assume that such categories don't head any other rule.

Notice that the definition supports ϵ -rules, i.e., rules with null bodies.

Definition 2.8.4 (Grammars) A **grammar** $G = (\mathcal{R}, A_s)$ is a finite set of rules \mathcal{R} and a **start symbol** A_s that is a TFS.

Figure 2.5 depicts an example grammar (we use AVM notation for this rule; tags such as \square denote reentrancy). While this example grammar has no linguistic pretensions, it might be viewed as generating simple sentences in which the predicates are headed by transitive and intransitive verbs. The type hierarchy on which the grammar is based is omitted here. A discussion of the methodological status of the start symbol appears later on in this section, prior to the definition of *languages*.

For the following discussion we fix a particular grammar $G = (\mathcal{R}, A_s)$. We define a *derivation* relation over AMRSs as the basis for defining the *language* of TFS-based grammars. Checking whether two given AMRSs A and B stand in the derivation relation is accomplished by the following steps: first, an element of A has to be selected; this element has to unify with the head of some rule ρ ; then, a sub-structure of B is selected; this substructure has to unify with the body of ρ . All unifications are done in context, so that other components of the AMRSs involved may be affected, too. Moreover, there must be some way to record the effects of successive unifications; to this end, derivation is defined only for pairs of AMRSs that are already “as specific as needed”; that is to say, if the rule adds any information to the AMRSs, this information already has to be recorded in them in order for them to be related by derivation. This is why, in the definition below, we use

¹ $Cat(w_i)$ is a singleton if w_i is unambiguous.

²We assume that there is no reentrancy among lexical items.

³This use of *head* must not be confused with the linguistic one, the core features of a phrase.

⁴Notice that the traditional direction is reversed and that the head and the body need not be disjoint.

Initial symbol:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{phrase} \\ \text{CAT} : \text{ [s]} \end{array} \right]$$

Lexicon:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{John} & \text{her} & \text{loves} \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{word} \\ \text{CAT} : \text{ [n]} \\ \text{agr} \\ \text{AGR} : \text{ [PER : [3rd] } \\ \text{NUM : [sg] } \\ \text{sem} \\ \text{SEM} : \text{ [PRED : [john] } \end{array} \right] & \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{word} \\ \text{CAT} : \text{ [n]} \\ \text{CASE} : \text{ [acc]} \\ \text{agr} \\ \text{AGR} : \text{ [PER : [3rd] } \\ \text{NUM : [sg] } \\ \text{sem} \\ \text{SEM} : \text{ [PRED : [she] } \end{array} \right] & \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{word} \\ \text{CAT} : \text{ [v]} \\ \text{agr} \\ \text{AGR} : \text{ [PER : [3rd] } \\ \text{NUM : [sg] } \\ \text{sem} \\ \text{SEM} : \text{ [PRED : [love] } \end{array} \right] \end{array}$$

Rules:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sign} \\ \text{CAT} : \text{ [n]} \\ \text{CASE} : \text{ [nom]} \\ \text{AGR} : \text{ [1]} \\ \text{SEM} : \text{ [sem } \\ \text{PRED : [3]} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sign} \\ \text{CAT} : \text{ [v]} \\ \text{AGR} : \text{ [1]} \\ \text{SEM} : \text{ [2]} \end{array} \right] & \longrightarrow & \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{phrase} \\ \text{CAT} : \text{ [s]} \\ \text{AGR} : \text{ [1]} \\ \text{SEM} : \text{ [2]} \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sem} \\ \text{ARG1 : [3]} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \quad (2.1) \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sign} \\ \text{CAT} : \text{ [v]} \\ \text{AGR} : \text{ [1]} \\ \text{SEM} : \text{ [2]} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sign} \\ \text{CAT} : \text{ [n]} \\ \text{CASE} : \text{ [acc]} \\ \text{sem} \\ \text{SEM} : \text{ [PRED : [3]} \end{array} \right] & \longrightarrow & \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{phrase} \\ \text{CAT} : \text{ [v]} \\ \text{AGR} : \text{ [1]} \\ \text{SEM} : \text{ [2]} \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sem} \\ \text{ARG2 : [3]} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \quad (2.2) \end{array}$$

Figure 2.5: An example grammar

an AMRS R that is *at least as specific as* some rule ρ , and not ρ itself, to guide the derivation. This is also why the definition requires that all the unifications do not add information. *strong derivation* is the relation that holds between such AMRSs; another relation, *derivation*, relaxes that requirement by allowing two AMRSs to be related even if they contain only part of the information that is required for strong derivation to hold.

Since elements of AMRSs involve indices that denote their linear position in the sequence of roots, the operation of *replacing* some element in one AMRS with a sub-structure, whose length might be greater than one, becomes notationally complicated. Conceptually, though, it resembles very much the replacement of some symbol with a sequence of symbols in context-free derivation, or the replacement of the selected goal (that unifies with the head of some rule) with the body of the rule, in Prolog SLD-resolution. One main difference in our definition is that we do not carry substitutions through sequences of derivations; rather, we treat all the pairs in a derivation sequence as if the appropriate substitutions have already been applied to them (recall that members of these pairs are “as specific as needed”).

Definition 2.8.5 (Strong Derivation) *An AMRS $A = \langle \text{Ind}_A, \Pi_A, \Theta_A, \approx_A \rangle$ whose length is k strongly derives an AMRS B (denoted $A \rightarrow B$) iff*

- *there exist a rule $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ and an AMRS $R \sqsupseteq \text{Abs}(\rho)$ (with $\text{len}(R) = n$), such that:*
- *some element of A unifies with the head of R , and some sub-structure of B unifies with the body of R ; namely, there exist $j \in \text{Ind}_A$ and $i \in \text{Ind}_B$ such that:*

$$\begin{aligned} A &= (A, \{j\}) \sqcup R^n, & B^{i\dots i+n-2} &= (B, \{i\dots i+n-2\}) \sqcup R^{1\dots n-1}, \\ R &= (R, \{n\}) \sqcup A^j, & R &= (R, \{1\dots n-1\}) \sqcup B^{i\dots i+n-2} \end{aligned}$$

- B is the replacement of the j -th element of A with the body of R ; namely, let

$$f(i) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } 1 \leq i < j \\ i+n-2 & \text{if } j < i \leq k \end{cases}, \quad g(i) = i+j-1 \text{ if } 1 \leq i < n$$

then $B = \text{Ty}(\text{Eq}(\text{Cl}(\langle \text{Ind}_{B'}, \Pi_{B'}, \Theta_{B'}, \approx_{B'} \rangle)))$, where

- $\text{Ind}_{B'} = \langle 1, \dots, k+n-2 \rangle$
- $(i, \pi) \in \Pi_{B'}$ iff $\begin{cases} i = f(i') & \text{and } (i', \pi) \in \Pi_A \\ i = g(i') & \text{and } (i', \pi) \in \Pi_R \end{cases}$ or
- $\Theta_{B'}(i, \pi) = \begin{cases} \Theta_A(i', \pi) & \text{if } i = f(i') \\ \Theta_R(i', \pi) & \text{if } i = g(i') \end{cases}$
- $(i_1, \pi_1) \approx_{B'} (i_2, \pi_2)$ if
 - * $i_1 = f(i'_1)$ and $i_2 = f(i'_2)$ and $(i'_1, \pi_1) \approx_A (i'_2, \pi_2)$, or
 - * $i_1 = g(i'_1)$ and $i_2 = g(i'_2)$ and $(i'_1, \pi_1) \approx_R (i'_2, \pi_2)$, or
 - * $i_1 = f(i'_1)$ and $i_2 = g(i'_2)$ and there exist π_1, π_2, π_3 such that $(i'_1, \pi_1) \approx_A (j, \pi_3)$ and $(n, \pi_3) \approx_R (i'_2, \pi_2)$, or
 - * $i_1 = g(i'_1)$ and $i_2 = f(i'_2)$ and there exist π_1, π_2, π_3 such that $(i'_1, \pi_1) \approx_R (j, \pi_3)$ and $(n, \pi_3) \approx_A (i'_2, \pi_2)$

The reflexive transitive closure of ' \rightarrow ', denoted ' $\xrightarrow{*}$ ', is defined as follows: $A \xrightarrow{*} A''$ if $A = A''$ or if there exists A' such that $A \rightarrow A'$ and $A' \xrightarrow{*} A''$.

Intuitively, A strongly derives B through some AFS A^j in A , if some rule $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ licenses the derivation. A^j is unified with the head of the rule, and if the unification succeeds, the (possibly modified) body of the rule replaces A^j in B . The definition is graphically demonstrated in figure 2.6.

Lemma 2.8.6 *If $A \rightarrow B$ and $A \sqsubseteq A'$ then there exists B' such that $B \sqsubseteq B'$ and $A' \rightarrow B'$.*

Proof: $A \rightarrow B$, therefore there exists a rule $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, an AMRS $R \sqsupseteq \text{Abs}(\rho)$ and an index j such that A unifies with the head of R , and B is obtained by replacing A^j with the body of R . A and B are already “as specific as needed”; thus, since $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and $A = (A, \{j\}) \sqcup R^n$, $A' = (A', \{j\}) \sqcup R^n$. Hence there exists $R' \sqsupseteq R$ such that $R' = (R', \{n\}) \sqcup A'^j$, A' unifies with its head and B' is obtained by replacing the j -th element of A' with its body.

Lemma 2.8.7 *If $A \xrightarrow{*} B$ and $A \sqsubseteq A'$ then there exists B' such that $B \sqsubseteq B'$ and $A' \xrightarrow{*} B'$.*

Proof: By induction on the derivation sequence and lemma 2.8.6.

Lemma 2.8.8 *If $A^{1\dots k} \xrightarrow{*} B$ and $A^{k+1} \xrightarrow{*} C$ then $A^{1\dots k+1} \xrightarrow{*} B \cdot C$.*

Proof: The derivation is obtained by applying first the derivation steps that derive B from $A^{1\dots k}$ and then those that derive C from A^{k+1} . Since $A^{1\dots k} \xrightarrow{*} B$, A is “as specific as needed” and the application of the derivation steps from A to B does not affect the applicability of the derivations step to C .




Figure 2.6: Strong derivation

Lemma 2.8.9 *If $A \sqsupseteq \text{Abs}(\rho)$ for some $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ of length n then $A^n \rightarrow A^{1\dots n-1}$.*

Proof: Immediate from the definition of derivation.

There are various definitions in the literature for the *language* that is defined by a grammar G expressed in a unification-based grammar formalism. For example, (Shieber, 1985; Shieber, 1992) do not include a start symbol in the grammar at all, and define $L(G)$ as the set of strings derivable from *some* feature structure. In (Shieber, Schabes, and Pereira, 1994) a start symbol is defined (notated *goal axiom*), and $L(G)$ is defined as the set of strings that are derivable from some generalization of the start symbol, i.e., from some feature structure that subsumes it. (Sikkel, 1993), on the other hand, assumes that a specific feature *cat* is present in every feature structure (the value of which simulates non-terminals in a context-free “underlying” grammar), and uses this feature to single out the start symbol: $L(G)$ is the set of strings that are derivable from some feature structure in which the *cat* feature is S (the start symbol of the underlying context-free grammar). A similar definition is given by (Haas, 1989): $L(G)$ is the set of strings derivable from the start symbol, where the start symbol is a *constant* (that is, an atomic feature structure).

There is a good motivation to employ a start symbol: the grammar writer might want to specify a certain criterion for the permissible strings in the language, for example, that they are all *sentences*. Moreover, it makes sense to include in the language such strings that are not derived directly by the start symbol, but rather by a TFS that is related to the start symbol. For example, the grammar writer might state that only TFSs with a *cat* feature valued S are permissible, meaning that every TFS that *is subsumed* by the start symbol (that is, contains all the information it encodes) is a sentence. However, such a definition prevents the incorporation of *subsumption test* (see section 2.10.3 below) into the parsing, since the correctness of the computation can not be maintained.

Due to these consideration we chose a relaxed condition on the start symbol in our definition of languages. We define a derivation relation between AMRSs in a way that allows the initial symbol of the grammar to derive a sequence of lexical entries even if the actual (strong) derivation is between a TFS that unifies with the start symbol and a more specific instance of the pre-terminals.

Definition 2.8.10 (Derivation) *An AMRS A derives an AMRS B ($A \rightsquigarrow B$) iff there exist AMRSs A', B' such that $(A, \{1, \dots, \text{len}(A)\}) \sqcup A' \neq \top$, $B \sqsubseteq B'$ and $A' \xrightarrow{*} B'$.*

Definition 2.8.11 (Language) *The language of a grammar G is $L(G) = \{w = w_1 \dots w_n \in \text{WORDS}^* \mid \text{Abs}(A_s) \rightsquigarrow B \text{ for some } B \in \text{PT}_w(1, n)\}$.*

Figure 2.7 depicts a derivation of the string “John loves her” with respect to the example grammar. The scope of reentrancy tags is limited to one MRS, of course, but we use the same tags across different MRSs to emphasize the flow of information during derivation. This example shows that the sentence “John loves her” is in the language of the example grammar, since the derivation starts with a TFS that is more specific than the initial symbol and ends in a specification of the lexical entries of the sentences’ words.




Figure 2.7: A leftmost derivation

2.9 Parsing as Operational Semantics

Parsing is the process of determining whether a given string belongs to the language defined by a given grammar, and assigning a structure to the permissible strings. Various parsing algorithms exist for various classes of grammars. In this section we formalize and explicate some of the notions of (Carpenter, 1992b, chapter 13). We give direct definitions for rules, grammars and languages, based on our new notion of AMRSs. This presentation is more adequate to current TFS-based systems than (Haas, 1989; Shieber, Schabes, and Pereira, 1994), that use first-order terms. Moreover, it does not necessitate special, ad-hoc features and types for encoding trees in TFSs as (Shieber, 1992) does. We don't assume any explicit context-free backbone for the grammars, as do (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982) or (Sikkel, 1993).

The parsing algorithm we describe is a pure bottom-up one that makes use of a chart to record edges. The formalism we presented is aimed at being a platform for specifying grammars in HPSG, which is characterized by employing a few very general rules (or rule schemata); selecting the rules that are applicable in every step of the process requires unification anyhow. Therefore we choose a particular parsing algorithm that does not make use of top down predictions but rather assumes that every rule might be applied in every step. This assumption is realized by initializing the chart with predictive edges for every rule, in every position.

As is well known (see, e.g., (Lloyd, 1987)), the meaning of a logic program P can be specified algebraically as the least fix-point (lfp) of the *immediate consequence* operator T_P of the program. A similar approach can be applied to a context-free grammar G , such that $L(G)$ equals (a projection of) the least fix-point of an analogous *immediate derivation* operator, T_G . Let $G = (V, T, P, S)$ be a context-free grammar.⁵ Let $I \subseteq V \times T^*$. Define $T_G(I) = \{\langle A, w \rangle \mid A \rightarrow w \in P, w \in T\} \cup \{\langle A, w_1 \dots w_k \rangle \mid A \rightarrow A_1 \dots A_k \in P, \langle A_i, w_i \rangle \in I, 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. Then the least fix-point of T_G is the union over $A \in V$ of $\{\langle A, w \rangle \mid w \in L_A(G)\}$.

In a sense, computing the lfp of T_G corresponds to computing the language generated by G . Parsing, then, amounts to checking if the input w is in the language. This process induces an inherently inefficient computation: since w is given, it can be used to optimize the computation. This is achieved by defining $T_{G,w}$, a *parsing step* operator, which is dependent on the input sentence w . The set of items I has to be extended, too: an item is a triple $[i, A, j]$ where $0 \leq i, j, \leq n$ (n being the length of w) and $A \in V$. Informally, an item $[i, A, j]$ represents the existence of a derivation for the symbol A to a substring of w , namely $w_i \dots w_j$. $w \in L_S(G)$ if and only if $[1, S, n] \in \text{lfp}(T_{G,w})$, so that parsing now amounts to computing the least fixed point of $T_{G,w}$, which is more efficient, and then checking whether the appropriate item is in the lfp.

We now return to TFS-based formalisms and define $T_{G,w}$ for a TFS-based grammar G , thus providing means for defining the meaning of G . A computation is triggered by some input string of words $w = w_1 \dots w_n$ of length $n \geq 0$. For the following discussion we fix a particular grammar $G = (\mathcal{R}, A_s)$ and a particular input string w of length n . A *state* of the computation is a set of *items*, and states are related by a transition relation. The presentation below corresponds to a pure bottom-up parsing algorithm, as it is both simple and efficient.

Definition 2.9.1 (Items) *An item is a four-tuple $[i, A, j, c]$, where $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \leq j$, A is an AMRS and c is either ACT, in which case the item is **active**, or COMP, in which case it is **complete**. Let ITEMS be the collection of all items.*

If $[i, A, j, c]$ is an item, we say that A *spans* the input from position $i + 1$ to position j (inclusive). A can be seen as a representation of a *dotted rule*, or *edge*: during parsing all generated items

⁵We assume a normal form, where for $A \rightarrow \alpha \in P$, either $\alpha \in T$ or $\alpha \in V^*$.

are such that A is (possibly more specific than) a prefix of some grammar rule. The notion of items usually employs edges that contain entire rules, whereas we only use prefixes of rules. This difference is not essential, and in an actual implementation of a parser that is induced by $T_{G,w}$, edges indeed include a reference to the rule on which they rely.

In what follows we define $T_{G,w}$, a parsing operator that corresponds to (bottom-up) chart parsing. However, it is possible to characterize algebraic operators that correspond to other parsing schemas as well.

Definition 2.9.2 Let $T_{G,w} : 2^{\text{ITEMS}} \rightarrow 2^{\text{ITEMS}}$ be a transformation on sets of items, where for $I \in \text{ITEMS}, x \in T_{G,w}(I)$ iff either

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exists \rho \in \mathcal{R}, \text{Abs}(\rho) = R = A_1, \dots, A_{m-1} \Rightarrow A_m, m > 1 \\
& \exists k < m - 1 \\
& \exists \alpha \in I, \alpha = [i_\alpha, A_\alpha, j_\alpha, \text{ACT}], \text{len}(A_\alpha) = k \\
& \exists \beta \in I, \beta = [i_\beta, A_\beta, j_\beta, \text{COMP}], \text{len}(A_\beta) = 1 \\
& j_\alpha = i_\beta \\
& B = (R, \{1 \dots k\}) \sqcup A_\alpha \\
& C = (B, \{k + 1\}) \sqcup A_\beta \\
& x = [i_\alpha, C^{1 \dots k+1}, j_\beta, \text{ACT}]
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exists \rho \in \mathcal{R}, \text{Abs}(\rho) = R = A_1, \dots, A_{m-1} \Rightarrow A_m, m > 1 \\
& \exists \alpha \in I, \alpha = [i_\alpha, A_\alpha, j_\alpha, \text{ACT}], \text{len}(A_\alpha) = m - 1 \\
& C = (R, \{1 \dots m - 1\}) \sqcup A_\alpha \\
& x = [i_\alpha, C^m, j_\alpha, \text{COMP}]
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exists i, 0 \leq i \leq n \\
& x = [i, \lambda, i, \text{ACT}]
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exists \rho \in \mathcal{R}, \text{len}(\rho) = 1 \\
& \exists i, 0 \leq i \leq n \\
& x = [i, \text{Abs}(\rho), i, \text{COMP}]
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}
& w = w_1, \dots, w_n, n \geq 1 \\
& \exists i, 0 < i \leq n \\
& x = [i - 1, \text{Abs}(A_i), i, \text{COMP}], A_i \in \text{Cat}(w_i)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Cases 2.1 and 2.2 perform the operation known as *completion*: 2.1 moves the dot one position along the body of a rule, and 2.2 creates a complete item once the dot reaches the end of the body. Case 2.3 corresponds to the *prediction* operation, whereas case 2.5 corresponds to *scanning*. Case 2.4 handles ϵ -rules, i.e., rules with null bodies, and creates complete items that span a null substring of the input sentence. Notice that cases 2.3 and 2.4 are independent of the argument I and therefore add the same items in every application of $T_{G,w}$. Case 2.5 is also independent of the argument, but is dependent on the input sentence w .

The operator $T_{G,w}$, on which the algebraic semantics of TFS-based grammars is based, naturally induces an operational semantics for such formalisms: once the operator is shown to be continuous, a computational process that corresponds to the iterative application of $T_{G,w}$ computes the set of items in the least fix-point of the operator. This process can be thought of as an analog of bottom-up, chart-based parsing: the chart is initialized with predictions for every rule in every

position (by operation 2.3) and with complete edges for every input word (by operation 2.5). Then, operations 2.1 and 2.2 are used to apply the grammar rules using the chart, in an unspecified order. We prove below that the process is indeed analogous to parsing w with respect to G .

Theorem 2.9.3 $T_{G,w}$ is monotone: if $I_1 \subseteq I_2$ then $T_{G,w}(I_1) \subseteq T_{G,w}(I_2)$.

Proof: Suppose $I_1 \subseteq I_2$. If $x \in T_{G,w}(I_1)$ then x was added by one of the five operations; operations 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 add the same items every time $T_{G,w}$ is applied, and thus $x \in T_{G,w}(I_2)$, too. If x was added by operation 2.1, then there exist items α, β in I_1 to which this operation applies. Since $I_1 \subseteq I_2$, α, β are in I_2 , too, and hence $x \in T_{G,w}(I_2)$, too. The same applies for operation 2.2. In any case, $x \in T_{G,w}(I_2)$ and hence $T_{G,w}(I_1) \subseteq T_{G,w}(I_2)$.

Theorem 2.9.4 $T_{G,w}$ is continuous: if $I_i, i \geq 0$ is a chain, then $T_{G,w}(\bigcup_i I_i) = \bigcup_i T_{G,w}(I_i)$.

Proof: First, $T_{G,w}$ is monotone. Second, let $I = I_0 \subseteq I_1 \subseteq \dots$ be a chain of items. If $x \in T_{G,w}(\bigcup_{i \geq 0} I_i)$ then there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \bigcup_{i \geq 0} I_i$ as required, due to which x is added. Then there exist i, j such that $\alpha \in I_i$ and $\beta \in I_j$. Let k be the maximum of i, j . Then $\alpha, \beta \in I_k$, $x \in T_{G,w}(I_k)$ and hence $x \in \bigcup_{i \geq 0} T_{G,w}(I_i)$.

If $x \in \bigcup_{i \geq 0} T_{G,w}(I_i)$ then there exists some i that $x \in T_{G,w}(I_i)$. $I_i \subseteq \bigcup_{i \geq 0} I_i$ and since $T_{G,w}$ is monotone, $T_{G,w}(I_i) \subseteq T_{G,w}(\bigcup_{i \geq 0} I_i)$, and hence $x \in T_{G,w}(\bigcup_{i \geq 0} I_i)$. Therefore $T_{G,w}$ is continuous.

Corollary 2.9.5 The least fix-point of $T_{G,w}$ can be obtained by iteratively computing $I_{m+1} = T_{G,w}(I_m)$, starting from $I_0 = \emptyset$ and stopping when a fix-point is reached.

Proof: By Tarski-Knaster theorem, the lfp exists since $T_{G,w}$ is monotone; By Kleene's theorem, since $T_{G,w}$ is continuous, the lfp can be obtained by applying the operator iteratively, starting from \emptyset .

Definition 2.9.6 (Algebraic meaning) The meaning of a grammar G with respect to an input sentence w is the least fix-point of the operator $T_{G,w}$.

Definition 2.9.7 (Computation) The w -computation triggered by $w \in \text{WORDS}^*$ is the infinite sequence of sets of items $I_i, i \geq 0$, such that $I_0 = \emptyset$ and for every $m \geq 0$, $I_{m+1} = T_{G,w}(I_m)$. The computation is **terminating** if there exists some $m \geq 0$ for which $I_m = I_{m+1}$ (i.e., a fix-point is reached in finite time). The computation is **successful** if there exists some m such that $[0, A, n, \text{COMP}] \in I_m$, where $\text{len}(A) = 1$ and $A \sqcup \text{Abs}(A_s) \neq \top$; otherwise, the computation fails.

Notice that we check whether the generated items are *unifiable* with the initial symbol, in accordance with the definition of *languages*. If the initial symbol of the grammar is interpreted differently when languages are defined, a corresponding modification has to be made in the condition for *success*.

2.10 Proof of Correctness

In this section we show that parsing, as defined above, is (partially) correct. First, the algorithm is *sound*: a w -computation succeeds only if $w \in L(G)$; second, it is *complete*: if $w \in L(G)$, it triggers a successful w -computation. Computations are not guaranteed to terminate, but we show that termination is assured for a certain subset of the grammars that are *off-line parsable*. We discuss off-line parsability in section 2.10.4.

2.10.1 Soundness

In what follows we fix a particular w -computation I_0, I_1, \dots , triggered by some input $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$.

Lemma 2.10.1 *If $[i, A, j, \text{COMP}] \in I_l$ for some l then $\text{len}(A) = 1$.*

Proof: By definition of $T_{G,w}$, complete items are generated by operations 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. All these operations add items in which the AMRS is of length 1.

Lemma 2.10.2 *If $[i, A, j, \text{ACT}] \in I_l$ for some l and $\text{len}(A) = k > 0$ then there exists $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $\text{Abs}(\rho)^{1\dots k} \sqsubseteq A$.*

Proof: By induction on l . If $l = 0$ then $I_l = \emptyset$ and the proposition holds vacuously. Assume that the proposition holds for every $l' < l$. Suppose that $x = [i, A, j, \text{ACT}] \in I_l$ and $A \neq \lambda$. Then x must have been added by operation 2.1 (dot movement). Then $x = [i_\alpha, C^{1\dots k+1}, j_\beta, \text{ACT}]$ where $C = ((R, \{1 \dots k\}) \sqcup A_\alpha, \{k+1\}) \sqcup A_\beta$, namely $C \sqsupseteq R$ and thus $C^{1\dots k+1} \sqsupseteq R^{1\dots k+1}$.

Theorem 2.10.3 (Parsing invariant (a)) *If $[i, A, j, c] \in I_l$ and $i < j$ then there exist $B \in PT_w(i+1, j)$ and $A' \sqsupseteq B$ such that $A \xrightarrow{*} A'$. If $i = j$ then $A \xrightarrow{*} \lambda$.*

Proof: By induction on l .

If $l = 0$ then $I_l = \emptyset$ and the proposition holds vacuously.

Assume that the proposition holds for every $l' < l$. Suppose that $x = [i, A, j, c] \in I_l$. Then x must have been added by one of the operations. Consider each case separately:

2.1. dot movement: $x = [i_\alpha, C^{1\dots k+1}, j_\beta, \text{ACT}]$ where there exist $\alpha, \beta \in I_{l-1}$ as required and $C = (B, \{k+1\}) \sqcup A_\beta$, $B = (R, \{1 \dots k\}) \sqcup A_\alpha$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist A'_α, B_α such that $A_\alpha \xrightarrow{*} A'_\alpha$ and $A'_\alpha \sqsupseteq B_\alpha \in PT(i_\alpha+1, j_\alpha)$. Also, there exist A'_β, B_β such that $A_\beta \xrightarrow{*} A'_\beta$ and $A'_\beta \sqsupseteq B_\beta \in PT(j_\alpha+1, j_\beta)$. $B^{1\dots k} = (R, \{1 \dots k\}) \sqcup A_\alpha$; if $k > 0$, $A_\alpha \neq \lambda$ and by lemma 2.10.2 $A_\alpha \sqsupseteq R$, hence $B^{1\dots k} = A_\alpha$. If $k = 0$, $B^{1\dots k} = \lambda = A_\alpha$. Hence $B^{1\dots k} \xrightarrow{*} A'_\alpha$. $C^{1\dots k} \sqsupseteq B^{1\dots k}$, and by lemma 2.8.7 there exists $A''_\alpha \sqsupseteq A'_\alpha$ such that $C^{1\dots k} \xrightarrow{*} A''_\alpha$. In the same way, there exists $A''_\beta \sqsupseteq A'_\beta$ such that $C^{k+1} \xrightarrow{*} A''_\beta$. By lemma 2.8.8, $C^{1\dots k+1} \xrightarrow{*} A''_\alpha \cdot A''_\beta$. But $A''_\alpha \cdot A''_\beta \sqsupseteq A'_\alpha \cdot A'_\beta \sqsupseteq B_\alpha \cdot B_\beta$, and since $B_\alpha \in PT(i_\alpha+1, j_\alpha)$ and $B_\beta \in PT(j_\alpha+1, j_\beta)$, by lemma 2.8.2 $B_\alpha \cdot B_\beta \in PT(i_\alpha+1, j_\beta)$. The cases in which $i_\alpha = j_\alpha$ or $i_\beta = j_\beta$ are trivial.

2.2. completion: $x = [i_\alpha, C^m, j_\alpha, \text{COMP}]$ where $C = (R, \{1 \dots m-1\}) \sqcup A_\alpha$ and there exist an abstract rule R and an item $\alpha \in I_{l-1}$ as required, and (by lemma 2.10.2) $A_\alpha^{1\dots m-1} \sqsupseteq R^{1\dots m-1}$. If $i_\alpha < j_\alpha$ then by the induction hypothesis, there exist A'_α, B_α such that $A_\alpha \xrightarrow{*} A'_\alpha$ and $A'_\alpha \sqsupseteq B_\alpha \in PT(i_\alpha+1, j_\alpha)$. $C = (R, \{1 \dots m-1\}) \sqcup A_\alpha$, hence $C^{1\dots m-1} = A_\alpha$ and thus $C^{1\dots m-1} \xrightarrow{*} A_\alpha$. From lemma 2.8.9, $C^m \rightarrow C^{1\dots m-1}$, and thus $C^m \xrightarrow{*} A'_\alpha$. If $i_\alpha = j_\alpha$ then $A_\alpha \xrightarrow{*} \lambda$ and hence $C^m \xrightarrow{*} \lambda$.

2.3. prediction: $x = [i, \lambda, i, \text{ACT}]$ and $PT(i+1, i) = \emptyset$.

2.4. ϵ -rules: $x = [i, \text{Abs}(\rho), i, \text{COMP}]$ and $PT(i+1, i) = \emptyset$.

2.5. scanning: $x = [i-1, \text{Abs}(A_i), i, \text{COMP}]$ where $A_i \in \text{Cat}(w_i)$, and $\text{Abs}(A_i) \xrightarrow{*} \text{Abs}(A_i)$ trivially. $\text{Abs}(A_i) \in PT(i+1, j)$ by definition.

Theorem 2.10.4 *If a computation, triggered by w , is successful, then $w \in L(G)$.*

Proof: If a computation is successful then there exists some $m \geq 0$ such that $x = [0, A, n, \text{COMP}] \in I_m$ where $\text{len}(A) = 1$ and $A \sqcup \text{Abs}(A_s) \neq \top$. By the parsing invariant, $A \xrightarrow{*} A'$ for some $A' \sqsupseteq B \in PT_w(1, n)$. Hence $\text{Abs}(A_s) \rightsquigarrow B$ and $w \in L(G)$.

2.10.2 Completeness

The following theorem shows that one derivation step, licensed by a rule $\text{Abs}(\rho)$ of length r , corresponds to $r+1$ applications of $T_{G,w}$, starting with an item that predicts the rule and advancing the dot r times, until a complete item for that rule is generated.

Theorem 2.10.5 (Parsing invariant (b)) *If $A \xrightarrow{*} A'$ and $A' \sqsupseteq B \in PT_w(i+1, j)$ then for every k , $0 < k \leq \text{len}(A)$, there exists l_k such that $[i_k, C_k, j_k, \text{COMP}] \in I_{l_k}$, where $C_k \sqsubseteq A^k$, $i_1 = i$, $j_{\text{len}(A)} = j$ and $j_k = i_{k+1}$ if $k < \text{len}(A)$.*

Proof: By induction on l , the number of derivation steps from A to A' :

If $l = 0$, $A = A' \sqsupseteq B$. Since $B \in PT_w(i+1, j)$, $B = \text{Abs}(A_{i+1}) \cdot \dots \cdot \text{Abs}(A_j)$ where $A_k \in \text{Cat}(w_k)$ for $i+1 \leq k \leq j$. The scanning operation (2.5) of $T_{G,w}$ adds appropriate items whenever it is applied.

Assume that $A \rightarrow D \xrightarrow{*} B \sqsupseteq PT_w(i+1, j)$ and the proposition holds for D and B . By the induction hypothesis, for every k , $0 < k \leq \text{len}(D)$, there exists l_k such that $[i_k, C_k, j_k, \text{COMP}] \in I_{l_k}$, where $C_k \sqsubseteq A^k$. Suppose that $A \rightarrow D$ through a rule ρ of length r by expanding A^y to $D^{x \dots x+r-1}$. Then the following sequence of items is generated, where for every m , $C_{1 \dots m} \sqsubseteq D^{x \dots x+m-1}$, and $C_r \sqsubseteq A^y$:

$[i, \lambda, i, \text{ACT}]$	$\in I_1$	by prediction (2.3)
$[i_1, C_1, j_1, \text{COMP}]$	$\in I_{l_1}$	by the induction hypothesis
$[i, C_1, j_1, \text{ACT}]$	$\in I_{l_1}$	by dot movement (2.1)
$[i_2, C_2, j_2, \text{COMP}]$	$\in I_{l_2}$	by the induction hypothesis
$[i, C_{1 \dots 2}, j_2, \text{ACT}]$	$\in I_{\max(l_1, l_2)}$	by dot movement (2.1)
\vdots		
$[i, C_{1 \dots r-1}, j_{r-1}, \text{ACT}]$	$\in I_{\max(l_1, \dots, l_{r-1})}$	by dot movement (2.1)
$[i, C_r, j, \text{COMP}]$	$\in I_{\max(l_1, \dots, l_{r-1})+1}$	by completion (2.2)

Items are generated by the dot movement (2.1) operation since the conditions for its application obtain: it is easy to see that the indices (i, j) match; in addition, if for some m , $C_{1 \dots m} \sqsubseteq D^{x \dots x+m-1}$, and for every k , $C_k \sqsubseteq A^k$, then there exists $C_{1 \dots m+1}$ that is obtained by unifying some $R \sqsupseteq \text{Abs}(\rho)$ first with $C_{1 \dots m}$ and then with C^{m+1} , such that $C_{1 \dots m+1} \sqsubseteq D^{x \dots x+m}$ as required. Therefore, by induction on m it can be shown that all the items that result from dot movement are indeed generated. Finally, the completion (2.2) operation is applicable and (since $A \rightarrow D$) we have $C_r \sqsubseteq A^y$.

Theorem 2.10.6 *If $w \in L(G)$ then the computation triggered by w is successful.*

Proof: $w \in L(G)$, hence $\text{Abs}(A_s) \rightsquigarrow B$, where $B \in PT_w(1, n)$. Hence there exist A', B' such that $A' \sqcup \text{Abs}(A_s) \neq \top$, $B' \sqsupseteq B$ and $A' \xrightarrow{*} B'$. By the parsing invariant, there exists l such that $[0, C, n, \text{COMP}] \in I_l$ where $C \sqsubseteq A'$. Hence $C \sqcup \text{Abs}(A_s) \neq \top$, and therefore the computation is successful.

2.10.3 Subsumption Check

To assure efficient computation and eliminate redundant items, many parsing algorithms employ a mechanism called *subsumption check* (see, e.g., (Shieber, 1992; Sikkil, 1993)) to filter out certain generated items. We introduce this mechanism below and show that it doesn't effect the correctness of the computation.

Define a (partial) order over items: $[i_1, A_1, j_1, c_1] \preceq [i_2, A_2, j_2, c_2]$ iff $i_1 = i_2, j_1 = j_2, c_1 = c_2$ and $A_1 \subseteq A_2$. Modify the ordering on sets of items as follows: $I_1 \preceq I_2$ iff for every $x_1 \in I_1$ there exists $x_2 \in I_2$ such that $x_2 \preceq x_1$. Sets of items are no longer ordered by inclusion, but rather by a weaker condition that only requires the existence of a more general item (in the higher set) for every item (in the lower set).

The subsumption filter is realized by modifying $T_{G,w}$: $x \in T_{G,w}(I)$ only if there does not exist any item $x' \in T_{G,w}(I)$ such that $x' \preceq x$. Namely, for all items that span the same substring and have the same status (ACT or COMP), only the most general one is preserved across successive applications of $T_{G,w}$. Given the new ordering of sets of items, it can be shown that this modification does not harm neither monotonicity nor continuity, and hence every computation is guaranteed to reach a least fix-point. Obviously, the soundness of the computation is also maintained. More interestingly, completeness is preserved, too: recall that the parsing invariant (b) states that if $A \xrightarrow{*} A' \supseteq B$ then for every k some item $[i_k, C_k, j_k, \text{COMP}]$ is generated such that $C_k \subseteq A^k$. Since the subsumption test only leaves out an item if a more general one exists, the invariant still holds and hence the correctness of the computation is guaranteed. Notice that if $L(G)$ would have been defined as the set of strings that are derivable from the start symbol itself, the subsumption check might have removed crucial items, and the computation could cease to be correct.

2.10.4 Termination

It is well-known (see, e.g., (Pereira and Warren, 1983; Johnson, 1988)) that unification-based grammar formalisms are Turing-equivalent, and therefore decidability cannot be guaranteed in the general case. However, for grammars that satisfy a certain restriction, termination of the computation can be proven. We make use of the well-foundedness result (section 2.3) to prove that parsing is terminating for *off-line parsable* grammars.

Off-line parsability was introduced by (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982) and adopted by (Pereira and Warren, 1983), according to which “A grammar is off-line parsable if its context-free skeleton is not infinitely ambiguous”. As (Johnson, 1988) points out, this restriction (defined in slightly different terms) “ensures that the number of constituent structures that have a given string as their yield is bounded by a computable function of the length of that string”. The problem with this definition is demonstrated by (Haas, 1989): “Not every natural unification grammar has a context-free backbone”.

A context-free backbone is inherent in LFG, due to the separation of c-structure from f-structure and the explicit demand that the c-structure be context-free. However, this notion is not well-defined in HPSG, where phrase structure is encoded within feature structures (indeed, HPSG itself is not well-defined in the formal language sense). Such a backbone is certainly missing in Categorical Grammar, as there might be infinitely many categories. (Shieber, 1992) generalizes the concept of off-line parsability but doesn't prove that parsing with off-line parsable grammars is terminating. We use an adaptation of his definition below and provide a proof.

To overcome this problem, (Haas, 1989) uses a different restriction: “A grammar is depth-bounded if for every $L > 0$ there is a $D > 0$ such that every parse tree for a sentential form of L

symbols has depth less than D ". (Shieber, 1992) generalizes it and we use an adaptation of his definition below.

Definition 2.10.7 (Finite-range decreasing functions) *A function $F : D \rightarrow D$, where D is a partially-ordered set, is **finite-range decreasing (FRD)** iff the range of F is finite and for every $d \in D$, $F(d) \preceq d$.*

Definition 2.10.8 (Strong off-line parsability) *A grammar is **strongly off-line parsable** iff there exists an FRD-function F from AMRSs to AMRSs (partially ordered by subsumption) such that for every string w and different AMRSs A, B such that $A \rightarrow B$, if $A \rightarrow PT_w(i+1, j)$ and $B \rightarrow PT_w(i+1, j)$ then $F(A) \neq F(B)$.*

Strong off-line parsability guarantees that any particular sub-string of the input can only be spanned by a finite number of AMRSs: if a grammar is strongly off-line parsable, there can not exist an infinite set S of AMRSs, such that for some $0 \leq i \leq j \leq |w|$, $s \rightarrow PT_w(i+1, j)$ for every $s \in S$. If such a set existed, F would have mapped its elements to the set $\{F(s) \mid s \in S\}$. This set is infinite since S is infinite and F doesn't map two different items to the same image, and thus the finite range assumption on F is contradicted.

As (Shieber, 1992) points out, "there are non-off-line-parsable grammars for which termination holds". We use below a more general notion of this restriction: we require that F produce a different output on A and B only if they are incomparable with respect to subsumption. We thereby extend the class of grammars for which parsing is guaranteed to terminate (although there still remain decidable grammars for which even the weaker restriction doesn't hold).

Definition 2.10.9 (Weak off-line parsability) *A grammar G is **weakly off-line parsable** iff there exists an FRD-function F from AMRSs to AMRSs (partially ordered by subsumption) such that for every string w and different AMRSs A, B such that $A \rightarrow B$, if $A \rightarrow PT_w(i+1, j)$, $B \rightarrow PT_w(i+1, j)$, $A \not\sqsubseteq B$ and $B \not\sqsubseteq A$, then $F(A) \neq F(B)$.*

Clearly, strong off-line parsability implies weak off-line parsability. However, as we show below, the inverse implication does not hold.

We now prove that weakly off-line parsable grammars guarantee termination of parsing in the presence of acyclic AMRSs. We prove that if these conditions hold, only a *finite* number of different items can be generated during a computation. The main idea is the following: if an infinite number of different items were generated, then an infinite number of different items must span the same sub-string of the input (since the input is fixed and finite). By the parsing invariant, this would mean that an infinite number of AMRSs derive the same sub-string of the input. This, in turn, contradicts the weak off-line parsability constraint.

Theorem 2.10.10 *If G is weakly off-line parsable and AMRSs are acyclic then every computation terminates.*

Proof: Fix a computation triggered by w of length n . We claim that there is only a finite number of generated items. Observe that the indices that determine the span of items are bounded: $0 \leq i \leq j \leq n$. It remains to show that only a finite number of AMRSs are generated. Let $x = [i, A, j, c]$ be a generated item. Suppose another item is generated where only the AMRS is different: $x' = [i, B, j, c]$ and $A \neq B$. If $A \sqsubseteq B$, x' will not be preserved because of the subsumption test. There is only a finite number of AMRSs A' such that $A' \sqsubseteq A$ (since subsumption is well-founded for acyclic AMRSs). Now suppose $A \not\sqsubseteq B$ and $B \not\sqsubseteq A$. By the parsing invariant (a) there

exist A', B' such that $A \xrightarrow{*} A' \in PT_w(i+1, j)$ and $B \xrightarrow{*} B' \in PT_w(i+1, j)$. Since G is off-line parsable, $F(A) \neq F(B)$. Since the range of F is finite, there are only finitely many items with equal span that are pairwise incomparable. Since only a finite number of items can be generated and the computation uses a finite number of operations, the least fix-point is reached within a finite number of steps.

The above proof relies on the well-foundedness of subsumption, and indeed termination of parsing is not guaranteed by weak off-line parsability for grammars based on cyclic TFSs. Obviously, cycles can occur during unification even if the unificands are acyclic. However, it is possible (albeit costly, from a practical point of view) to spot them during parsing. Indeed, many implementations of logic programming languages, as well as of unification-based grammars (e.g., ALE (Carpenter, 1992a)) do not check for cycles. If cyclic TFSs are allowed, the more strict notion of strong off-line parsability is needed. Under the strong condition the above proof is applicable for the case of non-well-founded subsumption as well.

To exemplify the difference between strong and weak off-line parsability, consider a grammar G that contains the following single rule:

$$\square \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t} \\ f : \perp \end{array} \right] \Rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t} \\ f : \square \end{array} \right]$$

and the single lexical entry, w_1 , whose category is:

$$Cat(w_1) = \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t} \\ f : \perp \end{array} \right]$$

This lexical entry can be derived by an infinite number of TFSs:

$$\dots \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t} \\ f : \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t} \\ f : \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t} \\ f : \perp \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t} \\ f : \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t} \\ f : \perp \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t} \\ f : \perp \end{array} \right] = Cat(w_1)$$

It is easy to see that no FRD-function can distinguish (in pairs) among these TFSs, and hence the grammar is not strongly off-line parsable. The grammar is, however, *weakly* off-line parsable: since the TFSs that derive each lexical entry form a subsumption chain, the antecedent of the implication in the definition for weak off-line parsability never holds; even trivial functions such as the function that returns the empty TFS for every input are appropriate FRD-functions. Thus parsing is guaranteed to terminate with this grammar.

It might be claimed that the example rule is not a part of any grammar for a natural language. It is unclear whether the distinction between weak and strong off-line parsability is relevant when “natural” grammars are concerned. Still, it is important when the formal, mathematical and computational properties of grammars are concerned. We believe that a better understanding of formal properties leads to a better understanding of “natural” grammars as well. Furthermore, what might be seen un-natural today can be common practice in the future.

Chapter 3

AMALIA – An Abstract Machine for Linguistic Applications

This chapter details the design and implementation of the abstract machine. Section 3.1 presents the formal language in which specifications are input, including the type hierarchy, the grammar and the lexicon. The machine is explained incrementally: section 3.2 describes its core engine, dedicated to the unification of two feature structures. The engine is enveloped with control structures to accommodate for parsing in section 3.3. Optimizations and extensions are discussed in section 3.4, and the actual implementation of the machine, including some comparative performance analyses, are given in section 3.5.

3.1 The Input Language

3.1.1 Type Specification

A program (i.e., a grammar) must specify the type hierarchy and the appropriateness specification. We adopt ALE’s syntax (Carpenter, 1992a) for this specification: it is a sequence of statements of the form:

$$t \text{ sub } [t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n] \text{ intro } [f_1 : r_1, \dots, f_m : r_m].$$

where $t, t_1, \dots, t_n, r_1, \dots, r_m$ are types, f_1, \dots, f_m are features and $n, m \geq 0$. If $m = 0$, the ‘intro’ part is omitted. This statement, which is said to *characterize* t , means that t_1, \dots, t_n are all – and the only – (immediate) subtypes of t (i.e., for every $i, 1 \leq i \leq n, t \sqsupseteq t_i$), and that t has the features f_1, \dots, f_m appropriate for it. Moreover, these features are *introduced* by t , i.e., they are not appropriate for any type t' such that $t' \sqsubset t$. Finally, the statement specifies that $Approp(t, f_i) = r_i$ for every i . Each type (except \top and \perp) must be characterized by exactly one statement. The *arity* of a type t , $Ar(t)$, is the number of features appropriate for it.

The full subsumption relation is the reflexive transitive closure of the immediate relation determined by the characterization statements. If this relation is not a bounded complete partial order, the specification is rendered invalid. The same is true in case it is not an appropriateness specification.

We use the type hierarchy in figure 3.1 as a running example, where **bot** stands for \perp . The type \top is systematically omitted from type specifications.

```

bot sub [g,d].
  g sub [a,b] intro [f3:d].
    a sub [c] intro [f1:bot].
      c sub [] intro [f4:bot].
    b sub [c,e] intro [f2:bot].
      e sub [].
  d sub [d1,d2].
    d1 sub [].
    d2 sub [].

```




Figure 3.1: An example type hierarchy

3.1.2 Rules and Grammars

A *grammar* consists of a non-empty set of *rules* and a set of *lexical entries* which associate a feature structure with every word. Each rule is a sequence of feature structures of length greater than 1, with possible reentrancies among its elements, and a designated (last) element that is the rule's *head*. The rest of the elements in a rule form its *body*. We use multi-terms for representing rules and lexical entries; however, we employ a simple description language in which such terms are expressible, compatible to the ALE input language (Carpenter, 1992a).

ALE's description language for feature structures is based on a logical language developed by Kasper and Rounds (1986), extended to accommodate types, where path sharing is replaced by the notion of variables due to Smolka (1988). A TFS is described as a conjunction of specifications that might include its type, its features, along with their values, or a variable (whose name begins with a capitalized letter) that refers to it. Multiple occurrences of the same variable denote reentrancy. The syntax for specifying rules consists of a rule name, the reserved word 'rule', a description for the rule's head, the reserved symbol '==>' and then the elements of the rule's body, each preceded by the reserved word 'cat>'. Lexical items consist of the word itself, the symbol '--->' and a description. ALE's descriptions can include several other features that are not supported by *AMALTA*, most notably disjunctions and inequations. Refer to Carpenter (1992a) for a formal definition of ALE's input language.

As an example, the specification of the example grammar of figure 2.5 is depicted in figure 3.2 below. Notice that ALE's syntax places the head of rules *before* the body. Comments are preceded by '%'.

3.2 A TFS Unification Engine

3.2.1 First-Order Terms vs. Feature Structures

While TFSs resemble first-order terms (FOTs) in many aspects, it is important to note the differences between them. Most importantly, while FOTs are essentially trees, with possibly shared leaves, TFSs are directed graphs, within which variables can occur anywhere. Moreover, our system doesn't rule out cyclic structures, so that infinite terms can be represented, too. Two FOTs are mutually consistent only if they have the same functor and the same arity. TFSs, on the other hand, can be unified even if their types differ (as long as they have a non-degenerate LUB). Moreover, their arity can differ, and the arity of the unification result can be greater than that of

```

%%%***** Grammar Rules
%grammar

s_np_vp rule
(phrase, cat:s, agr:Agr, sem:(Sem, arg1:SubjSem))
===>
cat> (cat:(n, case:nom), agr:Agr, sem:pred:SubjSem),
cat> (cat:v, agr:Agr, sem:Sem) .

np_v_np rule
(phrase, cat:v, agr:Agr, sem:Sem, sem:arg2:ObjSem)
===>
cat> (cat:v, agr:Agr, sem:Sem),
cat> (cat:(n, case:acc), sem:pred:ObjSem) .

%%%***** Lexical Entries
%lexicon

john --->
(word, cat:n, agr:(per:third, num:sg), sem:pred:john) .

her --->
(word, cat:(n, case:acc), agr:(per:third, num:sg), sem:pred:she) .

loves --->
(word, cat:v, agr:(per:third, num:sg), sem:pred:love) .

```

Figure 3.2: An example grammar in ALE format

any of the unificands. Consequently, many diversions from the original WAM were necessary in our design. In the following sections we try to emphasize the points where such diversions were made. We assume familiarity with basic WAM concepts in this section.

3.2.2 Processing Scheme

AMACLA's engine is designed for unifying two TFSs: a *program* and a *query*. Many queries (representing input Natural Language phrases) can be executed with respect to a given program (the grammar of the Natural Language). The program is compiled only once to produce machine instructions. Each query is compiled before its execution; the resulting code is executed prior to the execution of the compiled program. Execution of the instructions, produced by compiling a query, builds a graph representation of the feature structure denoted by the query in the machine's memory. The processing of a program produces code that, during run-time, unifies the feature structure denoted by the program with a query already resident in memory. The result of the unification is a new TFS, represented as a graph in the machine's memory. In what follows we interleave the description of the machine, the TFS language it is designed for and the compilation of

programs in this language. In section 3.3, queries are extended to sequences of TFSs, representing input strings, and programs are extended to sets of rules, i.e., grammars.

3.2.3 Memory Representation of Feature Structures

The major operation of *AMAZIA*'s engine is feature structure unification; therefore, the major data structure of the machine is aimed at storing feature structures in an efficient way. Following the WAM, we use a global, one-dimensional array of data cells called `HEAP`. A global register `H` points to the top element of `HEAP`. Data cells are tagged: `STR` cells represent nodes, and store their types, while `REF` cells represent arcs, and contain the address of their targets.¹ The number of arcs leaving a node of type t is $Ar(t)$, fixed due to total well-typedness. Hence, we can keep the WAM's convention of storing all the outgoing arcs from a node consecutively following the node. Given a type t and a feature f that is appropriate for t , the position of the arc corresponding to f (f -arc) in any TFS of type t can be statically determined; the value of f can be accessed in one step. This is a major difference from the approach presented in (Ait-Kaci and Di Cosmo, 1993); it leads to a more time-efficient system without harming the elegance of the machine design.

Computations performed on the machine involve TFS unification, during which new structures are built on top of the heap and existing structures might be modified. It is important to note that `STR` cells differ from their WAM analogs in that they can be dereferenced when a type is becoming more specific. In such cases, a chain of `REF` cells leads to the dereferenced `STR` cell. Thus, if a TFS is modified, only its `STR` cell has to be changed in order for all pointers to it to 'feel' the modification automatically. The use of self-referential `REF` cells is different, too: there are no real (Prolog-like) variables in our system, and such cells stand for features whose values are temporarily unknown.

One cell is required for every node and arc, so for representing a graph of n nodes and m arcs, $n + m$ cells are needed. Of course, during unification nodes can become more specific and a chain of `REF` cells is added to the count, but the length of such a chain is bounded by the depth of the type hierarchy and path compression during dereferencing cuts it occasionally. As an example, figure 3.3 depicts a possible heap representation of the TFS $b(b(\boxed{d}, \boxed{}), d)$.

address:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
tag:	STR	REF	REF	STR	REF	REF	STR	STR
contents:	b	4	8	b	7	7	d	d

Figure 3.3: Heap representation of the TFS $b(b(\boxed{d}, \boxed{}), d)$

3.2.4 Flattening Feature Structures

Before processing a TFS, its linear representation is transformed to a set of "equations", each having a flat (nesting free) format, using a set of *registers* $\{X_i\}$ that store *addresses* of TFSs in memory. A register `Reg[j]` is associated with each tag \boxed{j} of a normal term (recall that a term is normal only if all its types are tagged). The flattening algorithm is straight-forward and similar to the WAM's. The order of the equations correspond to a depth-first, postorder search of the term, where new registers are allocated for sub-terms before the sub-terms are processed. Figure 3.4 depicts examples of the equations corresponding to two TFSs.

¹A third tag of heap cells, `VAR`, is introduced in section 3.4.1.

Linear representation:	Set of equations
$a(\boxed{3}d1,\boxed{3})$	$X1 = a(X2, X2)$ $X2 = d1$
$b(b(\boxed{1}d,\boxed{1}),d)$	$X1 = b(X2, X3)$ $X2 = b(X4, X4)$ $X4 = d$ $X3 = d$

Figure 3.4: Feature structures as sets of equations

3.2.5 Processing of a Query

When processing an equation of the form $X_{i_0} = t(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \dots)$, representing part of a query, two different kinds of instructions are generated. The first is `put_node t/n, Xi0`, where $n = Ar(t)$. Then, for every argument X_{i_j} , an instruction of the form `put_arc Xi0, j, Xij` is generated. Execution of the `put_node` instruction creates a representation of a node of type t on top of the heap and stores its address in X_{i_0} ; it also increments H to leave space for the arcs of the newly created node. Execution of the subsequent `put_arc` instructions fills this space with REF cells.

In order for `put_arc` to operate correctly, the registers it uses must be initialized. Since only `put_node` sets the registers, one way of ensuring correctness is having all `put_node` instructions executed before any `put_arc` instruction is. Hence, the machine maintains two separate streams of instructions, one for `put_node` and one for `put_arc`, and executes all elements of the first before moving to the other. This compilation scheme is called for by the cyclic character of TFSs: as explained in (Aït-Kaci and Di Cosmo, 1993), the original single-streamed WAM scheme would fail on cyclic terms.

The effect of the two instructions is given in figure 3.5. We use syntax similar to that of (Aït-Kaci, 1991) for describing the effect of instructions; in particular, the arguments of an instruction are listed succeeding its mnemonic. We use ‘<STR, t>’ to denote an STR cell of type t , and ‘<REF, a>’ to denote a REF cell pointing to the address a . Figure 3.6 lists the result of compiling the term $b(b(\boxed{1}d,\boxed{1}),d)$. When this code is executed (first the `put_node` instructions, then the `put_arc` ones), the resulting representation of the TFS in memory is the one shown above in figure 3.3.

```

put_node t/n, Xi ≡
  HEAP[H] ← <STR, t>;
  Xi ← H;
  H ← H + n + 1;

put_arc Xi, offset, Xj ≡
  HEAP[Xi+offset] ← <REF, Xj>;

```

Figure 3.5: The effect of the put instructions – put

```

put_node b/2,X1      % X1 = b(
  put_arc X1,1,X2    %      X2,
  put_arc X1,2,X3    %      X3)
put_node b/2,X2      % X2 = b(
  put_arc X2,1,X4    %      X4,
  put_arc X2,2,X4    %      X4)
put_node d/0,X4      % X4 = d
put_node d/0,X3      % X3 = d

```

Figure 3.6: Compiled code for the query $b(b(\perp d, \perp), d)$

3.2.6 Compilation of the Type Hierarchy

One of the reasons for the efficiency of our implementation is that it performs a major part of the unification during compile-time: the type unification. The WAM's equivalent of this operation is a simple functor and arity comparison. It is due to the nature of a typed system that this check has to be replaced by a more complex computation. Efficient methods were suggested for performing LUB computation at run time, relying on efficient encoding of types (see (Ait-Kaci et al., 1989)). We compute LUBs only once, at compile time, using a simple transitive closure computation. Since type unification adds information by returning the features of the unified type, this operation builds new structures, in our design, that reflect this addition. Moreover, the WAM's special register S is here replaced by a stack. S is used by the WAM to point to the next sub-term to be matched against, but in our design, as the arity of the two terms can differ, there might be a need to hold the addresses of more than one such sub-term. These addresses are stored in the stack (more details and an example are given below).

When the type hierarchy is processed, the (full) subsumption relation is computed and checked for bounded-completeness (using a straight-forward implementation of Warshall algorithm (Warshall, 1962)). Then, a table is generated which stores, for every two types t_1, t_2 , the least upper bound $t = t_1 \sqcup t_2$. In addition, this table lists also the arity of t , its features and their "origin": whether they are inherited from t_1, t_2 , both or none of them. Figure 3.7 graphically depicts the LUB and appropriateness tables generated for the running example type hierarchy.

t	least upper bound									Ar	$Approp$
\perp	\perp	g	d	a	b	c	e	d1	d2		
\perp	\perp	g	d	a	b	c	e	d1	d2	0	
g	g	g		a	b	c	e			1	f3:d
d	d		d					d1	d2	0	
a	a	a		a	c	c				2	f3:d,f1: \perp
b	b	b		c	b	c	e			2	f3:d,f2: \perp
c	c	c		c	c	c				4	f3:d,f1: \perp ,f4: \perp ,f2: \perp
e	e	e			e		e			2	f3:d,f2: \perp
d1	d1		d1					d1		0	
d2	d2		d2						d2	0	

Figure 3.7: Type unification tables

Out of this table a series of abstract machine language functions are generated. The functions are arranged as a two-dimensional array called `unify_type`, indexed by two types t_1, t_2 . Each such function receives one parameter, the address of a TFS on the heap. Recall that the machine is designed to unify two feature structures, one of which is part of a *program*, represented as code, and the other, which is part of the *query*, already resides on the heap. Each `unify_type` function receives the address of this second unificand as a parameter. When executed, it builds on the heap a skeleton for the unification result: an STR cell of the type $t_1 \sqcup t_2$, and a REF cell for each appropriate feature of it.

Consider `unify_type[t1,t2](addr)` where `addr` is the address of some TFS, A (of type t_2), in memory. Let $t = t_1 \sqcup t_2$, and let f be some feature appropriate for t . If f is inherited from t_2 only, the value of the REF cell in the skeleton result is simply set to point to the f -arc in A . In this case, a `build_ref i` instruction is generated, where i is the position of the feature f in t_2 . If f is inherited from t_1 only, a self-referential REF cell is created in the result. But an indication that the actual value for this cell is yet to be determined must be recorded. This is done by means of the global stack S , every element of which is a pair `<action,addr>`, where `action` is either ‘copy’ or ‘unify’. In the case we describe, the action is ‘copy’ and the address is that of the REF cell. Thus, the instruction that is generated is `build_self_ref`.

If f is appropriate for both t_1 and t_2 , a REF cell with the address of the f -arc in A is created, and a ‘unify’ cell is pushed onto the stack. The generated instruction is `build_ref_and_unify i`, where i is the position of f in t . Finally, if f is introduced by t , a VAR cell is created, with $t' = \text{Approp}(t, f)$ as its value, by the instruction `build_var t'` (VAR cells are explained in section 3.4.1).

As an example, we list in figure 3.8 the resulting code for the unification the two types a and b of the running example. Since $a \sqcup b = c$, the first instruction of the function is `build_str c`. For every feature that is appropriate for c an instruction is generated according to the rules described above. Finally, a `return` instruction completes the function.

```

unify_type[a,b] (b_addr)
  build_str(c);           % since a  $\sqcup$  b = c
  build_self_ref;        % the value of f1 is yet unknown.
  build_ref(1);          % f2 is the first feature of b,
  build_ref_and_unify(2); % f3 is the second, and it still
                        % has to be unified with a.
  build_var(bot);        % f4 is a new structure.
  return;

```

Figure 3.8: `unify_type[a,b]`

This example code is rather complex; often the code is much simpler: for example, when t_2 is subsumed by t_1 , nothing has to be done. As another example, if t_1 is subsumed by t_2 , then only additional features of the program term have to be added to A . For each such feature, a `unify_feat i` instruction is generated, where i is the position of the feature. Another case is when t_1 and t_2 are not compatible: `unify_type[t1,t2]` returns ‘fail’. This leads to a call to the function `fail`, which aborts the unification.² The effect of the type unification instructions is given in figure 3.9.

²The notion of failure is elaborated in section 3.3.4; rather than aborting all operations, failure will indicate the

The special purpose register ADDR is used for passing the parameter; the exact details of control transfer mechanisms, including the effect of `return`, are straight-forward and won't be specified here.

<pre> build_str t ≡ HEAP[H] ← <STR,t>; H ← H + 1; build_ref_and_unify i ≡ HEAP[H] ← <REF,ADDR+i+1>; push(unify,H); H ← H + 1; build_ref i ≡ HEAP[H] ← <REF,ADDR+i+1>; H ← H + 1; </pre>	<pre> build_self_ref i ≡ HEAP[H] ← <REF,H>; push(copy,H); H ← H + 1; build_var t ≡ HEAP[H] ← <VAR,t>; H ← H + 1; unify_feat i ≡ push(unify,ADDR+i+1); </pre>
---	--

Figure 3.9: The effect of the type unification instructions

3.2.7 Processing of a Program

The program is stored in a special memory area, the CODE area. Unlike the WAM, in our framework registers that are set by the execution of a query are not helpful when processing a program. The reason is that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the sub-terms of the query and the program, as the arities of the TFSs can differ. The registers are used, but (with the exception of X_1) their old values are not retained during execution of the program.

Three kinds of machine instructions are generated when processing a program equation of the form $X_{i_0} = t(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_n})$. The first one is `get_structure t/n, Xi0`, where $n = Ar(t)$. For each argument X_{i_j} of t an instruction of the form `unify_variable Xij` is generated if X_{i_j} is first encountered; if it was already encountered, `unify_value Xij` is generated. For example, the machine code that results from compiling the program $a(\boxed{3}d1, \boxed{3})$ is depicted in figure 3.10. The implementation of these three instructions is given in figure 3.11.

```

get_structure a/2,X1    % X1 = a(
unify_variable X2      %          X2,
unify_value X2         %          X2)
get_structure d1/0,X2  % X2 = d1

```

Figure 3.10: Compiled code for the program $a(\boxed{3}d1, \boxed{3})$

The `get_structure` instruction is generated for a TFS A_p (of type t) which is associated with a register X_i . Execution of this instruction matches A_p against a TFS A_q that resides in memory, using X_i as a pointer to A_q . Since A_q might have undergone some type inference (for example, due to previous unifications caused by other instructions), the value of X_i must first be dereferenced.

need in backtracking to an alternative solution.

```

get_structure t/n, Xi ≡
  addr ← deref(Xi); Xi ← addr;
  case HEAP[addr] of
    <REF, addr>:                               % uninstantiated cell
      HEAP[H] ← <STR, t>;
      bind(addr, H);                           % HEAP[addr] ← <REF, H>
      for j ← 1 to n do HEAP[H+j] ← <REF, H+j>
      for j ← n downto 1 do push(<copy, H+j>);
      H ← H + n + 1;
    <STR, t'>:                                 % a node
      if (unify_type[t, t'](addr) = fail) then fail;

unify_variable Xi ≡
  <action, addr> ← pop();
  Xi ← addr;

unify_value Xi ≡
  <action, addr> ← pop();
  case action of
    copy:  HEAP[addr] ← HEAP[Xi];
    unify: if (unify(addr, Xi) = fail) then fail;

```

Figure 3.11: Implementation of the get/unify instructions

This is done by the function `deref` which follows a chain of REF cells until one that does not point to another, different REF-cell, is reached. The address of this cell is the value it returns.

The dereferenced value of X_i , `addr`, can either be a self-referential REF cell or an STR cell. In the first case, the TFS has to be built by executing the program. A new TFS is being built on top of the heap (using code similar to that of `put_structure`) with `addr` set to point to it. For every feature of this structure, a ‘copy’ item is pushed onto the stack. The second case, in which X_i points to an existing TFS of type t' , is the more interesting one. An existing TFS has to be unified with a new one whose type is t . Here the pre-compiled `unify_type[t, t']` is invoked.

To readers familiar with the WAM, the `unify_variable` instruction resembles very much its WAM analog, in the *read mode* of the latter. There is no equivalent of the WAM’s *write mode* as there are no real variables in our system. However, in `unify_value` there is some similarity to the WAM’s modes, where the ‘copy’ action corresponds to write mode and the ‘unify’ action to read mode. In this latter case the function `unify` is called, just like in the WAM. This function (figure 3.12) is based upon `unify_type`. In contrast to `unify_type`, the two TFS arguments of `unify` reside in memory, and full unification is performed. The first difference is the reason for removing an item from the stack S and using it as a part of the unification process; the second is realized by recursive calls to `unify` for subgraphs of the unified graphs. Notice that the function returns immediately if its arguments point to the same address, and binds its arguments otherwise. This guarantees correctness even in the face of cyclic structures.

When a sequence of instructions that were generated for some TFS is successfully executed on

```

function unify(addr1,addr2:address): boolean;
begin
  addr1 ← deref(addr1); addr2 ← deref(addr2);
  if (addr1 = addr2) then return(true);
  if (HEAP[addr1] = <REF,addr1>) then
    bind(addr1,addr2); return(true);
  if (HEAP[addr2] = <REF,addr2>) then
    bind(addr2,addr1); return(true);
  t1 ← HEAP[addr1].type; t2 ← HEAP[addr2].type;
  if (unify_type[t1,t2](addr2) = fail) then return (false);
  for i ← 1 to Ar(t1) do
    <action,addr> ← pop();
    case action of
      copy:  HEAP[addr] ← <REF,addr1+i>;
      unify: if (not (unify (addr,addr1+i)))
              then return(false);
    bind(addr1,addr2);
  return(true);
end;

```

Figure 3.12: The code of the `unify` function

some query, the result of the unification of both structures is built on the heap and every register X_i stores the value of its corresponding node in this graph. The stack S is empty.

3.3 Parsing

The previous section delineated the core engine of *AMACLA*; this section shows how it is extended with control instructions to accommodate for *parsing*. This constitutes the major difference between *AMACLA* and abstract machines that were devised for variants of Prolog: computations performed on *AMACLA* amount to parsing with respect to the input grammar, as opposed to SLD resolution.

The parsing process described in section 2.9 above is a generic, abstract one: there is no specification of the order in which new items are computed during each application of $T_{G,w}$. When designing the control mechanisms of the machine, several parameters have to be explicated and their values determined. In what follows we describe how the machine (and a compiler for it) are designed to allow for efficient implementation of parsing, that is, computation of the least fix-point of $T_{G,w}$ for a given grammar G and an input string of lexical elements w of length n . The control modules of *AMACLA* are motivated by the abstract process of chart parsing and are not, in general, inspired by the specific TFS-based formalism that we deal with. For example, the machine can also be used for parsing with respect to “plain” context-free grammars.

Notice that cases 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 of $T_{G,w}$ are independent of the argument I and add the same items in every application of the operator. Therefore, when computing the least fix-point of the operator, they are computed only *once*, when the process is initiated. Cases 2.1 and 2.2 are more

interesting. We treat completion as a special case of dot movement where the dot is moved from the penultimate position to the final one, so that completion can take place immediately after the final application of dot movement. Dot movement creates an item on the basis of two items in I , an active one $[l, A, m, \text{ACT}]$ and a complete one $[m, B, r, \text{COMP}]$, where $l \leq m \leq r$.³ Since for every off-line parsable grammar the number of items that span a particular substring of the input is finite, it is possible first to generate the items spanning (m, r) , for all $m > l$, and all the items spanning (l, m) , where $m < r$, and only then the items spanning (l, r) . This is the invariant underlying our design. When generating items that span (l, r) , the active items that span (l, m) are combined with complete items that span (m, r) , where m decreases from $r - 1$ to l . We use a *chart* to store generated items, since they may be used more than once.

3.3.1 A Parsing Algorithm

A chart of size n is a data structure that can be accessed by a key that is a triple (l, m, r) , where $1 \leq r \leq n$, $0 \leq l \leq r - 1$ and $l \leq m \leq r - 1$. Given these restrictions, a chart of size n can be accessed by $\sum_{r=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{r-1} \sum_{m=l}^{r-1} 1 = \sum_{r=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{r-1} (r - l) = \sum_{r=1}^n r(r - 1)/2 = (n^3 - n)/6$ different keys. Keys are linearly ordered as follows: $(l, m, r) \prec (l', m', r')$ iff $r < r'$ or $((r = r')$ and $(l > l')$) or $((r = r')$ and $(l = l')$ and $(m < m'))$. Each element of the chart is a pair of *chart entries*. Such pairs are accessed by the coordinates of the key: the element indexed by (l, m, r) is a pair indexed by $\langle (l, m), (m, r) \rangle$. Additionally, if two elements have matching sub-keys then it is required that the corresponding elements of the pairs be identical: the element indexed by (l, m) in (l, m, r) must be identical to the element indexed by (l, m) in (l, m, r') . Therefore, even though there exist $(n^3 - n)/6$ different keys by which $2 \times (n^3 - n)/6$ chart entries can be accessed, there are only $n(n + 1)/2$ different chart entries.

Each chart entry contains two *lists of edges*: active and complete. Each list, both active and complete ones, is a sequence of *edges* along with a specified *current* edge, on which the following operations are defined:

new(list): return an empty list;

add_edge(list, edge): add edge to the end of list;

init(list): set the *current* edge of list to be the first edge, if there is one;

advance(list): set the *current* edge in list to be the next edge, if there is one.

current(list): return the *current* edge of list;

exhausted(list): return true iff the *current* element in list is undefined;

An *edge* can be either *active* or *complete*. An active edge stems from some grammar rule; it contains a part that was already scanned, and a part that is left to be seen. The position between the two parts is indicated by the location of the *dot*. A complete edge is a result of scanning an entire body of some rule, and constructing the rule's head.

The parsing process is outlined informally in figure 3.13: (a) shows the order in which chart entries are constructed; (b) shows the order in which chart entries are scanned to construct the `[left, right]` entry; combination of chart entries is performed as described in (c). The heart of the process is *dot movement*, which creates a new edge e by unifying the TFS that immediately succeeds the dot in an active edge $e1$ with some complete edge $e2$.


³We use l, m, r for left, mid and right, respectively.

a. Building chart entries

```

Procedure main
for right ← 0 to n do
  for left-1 ← right downto 0 do
    build_chart_entry (left,right)

```




b. Constructing one chart entry

```

Procedure build_chart_entry (left,right)
for mid ← right-1 downto left do
  combine(left,mid,right)

```



c. Combining two entries

```

Procedure combine(left,mid,right)
for every active edge e1 in chart[left,mid]
  for every complete edge e2 in chart[mid,right]
    e ← dot_movement(e1,e2)
    chart[left,right] ← chart[left,right] ∪ {e}

```

Figure 3.13: Parsing – informal description

The last part of the process requires some precaution: application of dot movement to an active edge in (l, m) and a complete one in (m, r) results in a new edge in (l, r) . This edge might be complete; in the special case where $l = m$, the complete edge that is thus created is added to $(l, r) = (m, r)$. Such edges can now be combined with active edges in (l, m) again. Notice that the situation occurs only when $l = m$. The only way an active edge in the (l, l) entry of the chart (that is, an edge with the dot in the initial position) can become complete is if the rule on which the edge is based is of length 2 (a unit rule). Therefore, for unit rules a special treatment is required: first, active edges that originate from unit rules are placed *before* edges that stem from other rules within the same chart entry. This guarantees that complete edges that result from application of dot movement on (an active edge that stems from) a unit rule are constructed *before* they are needed. The only problem left is the possibility of more than one unit edge in the same chart entry. Such rules are required to be ordered by the grammar writer, such that if ρ_1 can “feed” ρ_2 , ρ_1 precedes ρ_2 in the grammar.⁴

The advantage of this parsing algorithm is that it is simple; in particular, it does not require an *agenda*. In the above description we assumed that the chart is initialized with complete edges for the lexical entries of the input words, and with active edges – with the dot in the initial position

⁴Such an ordering must always exist for off-line parsable grammars.

– for the rules.

Following this informal description, several observations about the parsing process can be made:

- After the edges in the $[l, r]$ chart entry are constructed, no more edges will be added to entries that were constructed earlier;
- When complete edges of column c are used, no complete edges of columns $1, \dots, c - 1$ will be used any more. Consequently, at every point during the process, the complete edges in chart entries whose second index is less than r will not be used any more;
- active edges may be used over and over again.

These observations guide the specification of the machine architecture, which is divided into data structures and machine instructions.

3.3.2 Data Structures

The *chart* is represented as a two-dimensional array, indexed by two integers, where `chart[l,r]` refers to a *chart entry*. Each chart entry contains two *lists of edges*, which are referred to as `chart[l,r].active` and `chart[l,r].complete`.

A *complete edge* is represented in memory as a structure `e` containing an address, `e.addr`, of some **HEAP** cell that is the root of a feature structure. An *active edge* is represented as a structure containing a pointer, `e.label`, and a set of *register values*, `e.regs`. An active edge always stems from some grammar rule; it records a major part of the state of the machine at some given time. `e.label` is the address (in **CODE**) of the first instruction in the code that is generated for the TFS immediately following the *dot* of the edge; `e.regs` records the values of the machine registers. The registers represent the part of the edge prior to the dot, whereas the pointer represents the part following it.⁵ During a computation of *AMALIA*, edges are repeatedly stored in the chart and loaded from it. When an edge `e` is loaded, `e.label` is used to determine the next instruction that is to be executed; this implies an implicit branch whenever an active edge is loaded (see the effect of the `call` instruction below). The auxiliary function `make_edge` creates an edge from its components (an address and a set of values for the registers).

Special purpose registers record the current values of the chart indices `LEFT`, `RIGHT` and `MID` and the input length `LEN`. Like all the machine's data structures, the control structures are initialized before every execution of a program: the registers `LEFT`, `MID`, `RIGHT` and `LEN` are set to 0 and `new` is applied to every chart entry. The control structures are affected by the execution of machine instructions that are generated for both the program and the query, as explained below.

3.3.3 Compilation

Compilation of a grammar produces code that, when executed, realizes the parsing process with respect to the grammar and an input query (that is a sequence of TFSs) representing the Natural Language input. In this section we describe the compilation scheme in terms of the resulting code.

First, the chart is initialized. Three sets of edges have to be inserted to the chart, in correspondence to the three cases of $T_{G,w}$ (definition 2.9.2) that are independent of the input: complete edges for lexical items, active edges (with the dot in the initial position) for rules and complete edges for ϵ -rules.

⁵The machine's *stack* is always empty after the execution of a code that was generated for a feature structure. Therefore, the stack does not have to be included in the state.

The first set, corresponding to case 2.5 of $T_{G,w}$, is inserted to the chart by processing the query. Recall that processing a query results in the generation of machine code that is executed prior to the execution of the program code. When the query is composed of more than one feature structure, the generated code contains `proceed` instructions that are inserted after every feature structure in the query. The effect of `proceed` is given in figure 3.14; the parameter X_i is the register that points to the root of the feature structure that was just created (that is, the first register mentioned in the code that immediately precedes the `proceed` instruction). Processing

```

proceed  $X_i$   $\equiv$ 
    LEN  $\leftarrow$  LEN + 1;
    add_edge(make_edge( $X_i$ ,null), chart[LEN-1,LEN].complete);

```

Figure 3.14: The effect of the `proceed` instruction

of the query results in edges that are added to the $[i - 1, i]$ diagonal of the chart; in addition, the value of `LEN` is set to the length of the input.

The second set, corresponding to case 2.3, is added by means of specific machine instructions, `put_rule` l , that are generated for each of the rules in the input grammar, where l is the label of the first instruction of the compiled rule. `put_rule` adds an active edge for the rule starting at address L , with no registers bindings, to the $[i, i]$ entries of the chart (figure 3.15). Those instructions are placed by the compiler *prior* to any other instruction of the program.

```

put_rule  $L$   $\equiv$ 
    for  $i \leftarrow 0$  to LEN do
        add_edge(make_edge( $L$ ,null), chart[ $i$ , $i$ ].active);

```

Figure 3.15: The effect of `put_rule`

Rules of length one (ϵ -rules, or *empty categories*), corresponding to case 2.4, are processed by the compiler in a special way, that is described in section 3.4.3.

The main product of the compiler is the code that corresponds to dot movement and completion (cases 2.1 and 2.2). For a rule of the form: $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \Rightarrow A_0$ the compiler generates the code given in figure 3.16, where r_i is the index of the first register that is mentioned in the code for A_i , and where X is the first register mentioned in the code for A_0 . The effect of this code is discussed in section 3.3.4.

Controlling the order in which chart entries are constructed is independent of the grammar. Consequently, the compiler generates a few pieces of identical code for *every* grammar. On the basis of the generated code for one rule, the code for a grammar consisting of k rules is given in figure 3.17.

An important observation regarding the control flow of a compiled program has to be made here. In general it is impossible to determine, during compile time, the order in which machine instructions will be executed. Indeed, some control instructions (in particular, the key manipulation instructions) resemble ordinary conditional branches. However, other instructions (`call`, `copy_active_edge` and `copy_complete_edge`) ‘hide’ implicit branches to addresses that are only known at run time. Further details are given below.

```

put_rule L1          ; add active edges to the main diagonal
L1: load_fs r1
      [ (program) code for A1 ]
      copy_active_edge L2
      ⋮
Li: load_fs ri          ; Xri ← ADDR
      [ (program) code for Ai ]
      copy_active_edge Li+1 ; add edge to chart and return
      ⋮
Ln: load_fs rn
      [ (program) code for An ]
      [ (query) code for A0 ]
      copy_complete_edge X

```

Figure 3.16: Compiled rule

To conclude this section, figure 3.18 depicts (part of) the code that was generated by the compiler for the example grammar of figure 3.2. Lines 2-11 contain the constant, grammar independent code; lines 12-49 list the code that was generated for the first rule; and the code on the right side was generated for the lexical entries of the words “john” and “love”.

3.3.4 Effect of the Machine Instructions

This section details the effect of the control module machine instructions. While the effect of each instruction is given independently of its context, we assume throughout the description that a sequence of instructions is present that were generated by the compiler for some grammar.

The instructions `first_key`, `next_key` and `check_key`, constantly generated for every grammar, are aimed at implementing the outermost control flow during parsing. Motivated by the invariant stated in section 3.3.1 above, these instructions form a loop that causes *AMACLA* to build all the necessary chart entries in the order specified there. The body of the loop contains code whose effect corresponds to the procedure `Combine` of figure 3.13. The effect of the key-manipulation instructions is depicted in figure 3.19.

Every iteration of the main loop corresponds to the combination of two chart entries, taking the active edges from the entry indexed by the values of `LEFT` and `MID` and the complete edges from the entry indexed by the values of `MID` and `RIGHT`. To loop over all the active edges (in the designated chart entry), two instructions are used: `tst_active_edges` and `next_active_edge`. The instructions `tst_complete_edges` and `next_complete_edge` scan the complete edges in the chart entry that is indexed by the values of `MID` and `RIGHT`.

The effect of these four instructions is given in figure 3.20. The two instructions that loop over the active edges are straight-forward; the other two are quite similar, with a few differences. First, `tst_complete_edges` initializes the list of complete edges in the `[MID,RIGHT]` chart entry. Second, `next_complete_edge` calls the auxiliary function `reset_trail`, whose purpose will be discussed presently.

```

        put_rule L1
        :
        put_rule Lk
    first_key
Lstart: next_key
Lact:  tst_active_edges Lend
Lcomp: tst_complete_edges L'comp
        load_machine_state
        call
        next_complete_edge Lcomp
L'comp: next_active_edges Lact
Lend:  check_key Lstart
        end_program
L1:      code for 1st rule
        :
Lk:      code for k-th rule

```

Figure 3.17: Compiled code for a grammar with k rules

`call` (figure 3.21) sets the stage for the operation of dot movement. Let e_1 be the current active edge in the [LEFT,MID] entry of the chart, end e_2 – the current complete edge in the [MID,RIGHT] entry. The address in the code area of the next instruction to be executed is stored in $e_1.label$; this code is to be executed on the feature structure pointed to by $e_2.addr$. In other words, the code that was generated for the next element of e_1 , viewed as a procedure call, is to be executed on the complete edge e_2 , whose address is viewed as a parameter. `call` loads the registers' values from e_1 , and saves $e_2.label$ in the special purpose register ADDR, which is used for passing parameters. Then, it saves the address to return to (that is, the address of the instruction following the `call`) in a special purpose stack of return addresses and branches to $e_1.label$.

The first instruction that is executed in a 'procedure' is `load_fs X`, which loads the value stored in ADDR onto the register X . Then, the instructions that were generated for this part of the rule are executed in order, thus unifying the TFS immediately after the dot (in the active edge) with the TFS that X_r points to. If the unification succeeds, control flows to the `copy_active_edge` instruction that adds the newly created MRS to the chart, and returns the control to the address stored in the stack of return addresses. If the entire body of the rule was consumed, the last instruction is `copy_complete_edge` (see figure 3.16), which adds the newly created *complete* edge to the chart and returns. The auxiliary function `copy_mrs` copies the MRS accessible from the current registers on top of the heap. `copy_fs X` copies the feature structure rooted in X on top of the heap. The effect of these three instructions is depicted in figure 3.22.

When the code that is associated with some program feature structure is executed, the heap is modified. Sometimes the same code has to be executed on several TFSs (since one active edge might be combined with several complete ones). If the unification fails, that is, `fail` is called, the heap must be restored to its original form. To this end a new data structure is introduced: the *trail*. It is an array whose contents are pairs of the form $\langle address, value \rangle$, which record modifications

```

0      put_rule L6 (1)
1      put_rule L8 (2)
2      first_key
3 L1   : next_key
4 L2   : tst_active_edges L5
5 L3   : tst_complete_edges L4
6      call
7      next_complete_edge L3
8 L4   : next_active_edge L2
9 L5   : check_key L1
10     end_of_program
11 L6   : load_fs X1
12         get_structure sign, X1
13         unify_variable X2
14         unify_variable X3
15         unify_variable X4
16         get_structure n, X2
17         unify_variable X5
18         get_structure nom, X5
19         get_structure agr, X3
20         unify_variable X6
21         unify_variable X7
22         get_structure per, X6
23         get_structure num, X7
24         get_structure sem, X4
25         unify_variable X8
26         unify_variable X9
27         unify_variable X10
28         get_structure atom, X8
29         get_structure atom, X9
30         get_structure atom, X10
31     copy_active_edge L7
32 L7   : load_fs X11
33         get_structure sign, X11
34         unify_variable X12
35         unify_value X3
36         unify_variable X13
37         get_structure v, X12
38         get_structure sem, X13
39         unify_variable X14
40         unify_value X8
41         unify_variable X15
42         get_structure atom, X14
43         get_structure atom, X15
44         put_node phrase, X16
45         put_node s, X17
46         put_arc X16,1,X17
47         put_arc X16,2,X3
48         put_arc X16,3,X13
49     copy_complete_edge 16

0 L91  : put_node word, X1
1      put_node n, X2
2      put_node case, X5
3      put_node agr, X3
4      put_node third, X6
5      put_node sg, X7
6      put_node sem, X4
7      put_node john, X8
8      put_node atom, X9
9      put_node atom, X10
10     put_arc X1,1,X2
11     put_arc X1,2,X3
12     put_arc X1,3,X4
13     put_arc X2,1,X5
14     put_arc X3,1,X6
15     put_arc X3,2,X7
16     put_arc X4,1,X8
17     put_arc X4,2,X9
18     put_arc X4,3,X10
19     proceed X1

40 L93 : put_node word, X1
41     put_node v, X2
42     put_node agr, X3
43     put_node third, X5
44     put_node sg, X6
45     put_node sem, X4
46     put_node love, X7
47     put_node atom, X8
48     put_node atom, X9
49     put_arc X1,1,X2
50     put_arc X1,2,X3
51     put_arc X1,3,X4
52     put_arc X3,1,X5
53     put_arc X3,2,X6
54     put_arc X4,1,X7
55     put_arc X4,2,X8
56     put_arc X4,3,X9
57     proceed X1

```

Figure 3.18: Compiled code obtained for the example grammar

to `HEAP` cells. Pairs are being added to the trail by means of the `bind` function, whenever the value of a heap cell is modified. If all the unifications are successful, and control flows naturally to `next_complete_edge`, the trail is reset using the auxiliary function `reset.trail`.

Consider now the case where some unification fails. The effect of the `fail` function has to be modified: failure of a “local” unification no longer means termination of the program; rather, it indicates the need to try different edges to combine. Failure can be detected during the execution of any of the instructions in the `program` code. In this case, the previous bindings are undone, using a call to `unwind.trail`, and the stack is initialized using `reset.stack`. Then, a branch is made to the last `tst_complete_edges` instruction executed. This instruction’s address is stored in the special purpose register `RETURN_ADDR`. The definition of `fail` is given in figure 3.23.

```

first_key ≡
    RIGHT ← 0;
    LEFT ← -1;
    MID ← -1;

next_key ≡
    MID ← MID-1;
    if (MID < LEFT) then
        LEFT ← LEFT - 1;
        if (LEFT < 0) then
            RIGHT ← RIGHT + 1;
            LEFT ← RIGHT - 1;
        MID ← RIGHT - 1;
    init(chart[LEFT,MID].active);
    init(chart[MID,RIGHT].complete);

check_key l ≡
    if (RIGHT ≠ LEN or LEFT ≠ 0 or MID ≠ LEFT) then
        branch l;

```

Figure 3.19: The effect of the key-manipulation instructions

```

tst_active_edges l ≡
    if exhausted(chart[LEFT,MID].active) then
        branch l;

next_active_edge l ≡
    advance(chart[LEFT,MID].active)
    branch l

l: tst_complete_edges l' ≡
    if exhausted(chart[MID,RIGHT].complete) then
        init(chart[MID,RIGHT].complete);
        branch l';

next_complete_edge l ≡
    reset_trail;
    advance(chart[MID,RIGHT].complete);
    branch l;

```

Figure 3.20: The effect of the edge traversal instructions

```

l: call ≡
  registers ← current(chart[LEFT,MID].active).regs;
  ADDR ← current(chart[MID,RIGHT].complete).addr;
  push_return_addr(l + 1);
  branch current(chart[LEFT,MID].active).label;

```

Figure 3.21: The effect of the call instruction

```

load_fs r ≡
  Xr ← ADDR;

copy_active_edge l ≡
  copy_mrs;
  add_edge(make_edge(l, registers), chart[LEFT,RIGHT].active);
  branch pop_return_address();

copy_complete_edge X ≡
  copy_fs(X);
  add_edge(make_edge(X, null), chart[LEFT,RIGHT].complete);
  branch pop_return_address();

```

Figure 3.22: The effect of the copy instructions

The WAM uses a trail to undo ‘side effects’ on the stack and the heap upon backtracking to a choice point (see (Aït-Kaci, 1991, chapter 4.2)). In *AMALTA* no backtracking is performed and so the trail could have been eliminated. Notice that after execution of program code, the newly created edge (whether active or complete) is copied onto the heap. A different strategy could have been chosen, in which the active edge is copied *prior* to the execution of the program code. In this case, all that has to be done upon failure is restoring the value of the heap pointer *H*, so that the cells that were used by (ineffective) instructions can be re-used. While the gain in this strategy is that no trail is needed, it doesn’t seem to be too effective: active edges would have to be copied before they are used, which means that many MRSs will be copied in vain. Since copying is one of the most time-consuming operations, we opt for the method described above.

3.4 Optimizations and Extensions

3.4.1 Lazy Evaluation of Feature Structures

One of the drawbacks of maintaining total structures is that when two TFSs are unified, the values of features that are introduced by the unified type have to be built. For example, `unify_type[a,b]` (figure 3.8) has to build a TFS of type *bot*, which is the value of the *f4* feature of type *c*. This


```

procedure fail;
  unwind_trail;
  reset_stack;
  branch pop_return_address();

```

Figure 3.23: The fail function

is expensive in terms of both space and time; the newly built structure might not be used at all. Therefore, it makes sense to defer it.

To optimize the design in this aspect, a new kind of heap cells, VAR-cells, is introduced. A VAR cell whose contents is a type t stands for the most general TFS of type t . VAR cells are generated by the various `unify_type` functions for introduced features; they are expanded only when the explicit values of such features are needed: either during the execution of `get_structure`, where the dereferenced value is a VAR cell, or during `unify`.⁶ In both cases the TFS has to be built, by means of executing the pre-compiled function `build_most_general_fs` with the contents of the VAR cell as an argument. This function (which is automatically generated by the type hierarchy compiler) builds a TFS of the designated type on the heap, with VAR cells instead of REF cells for the features. These cells will, again, only be expanded when needed. We thus obtain a lazy evaluation of TFSs that weakly resembles Götz's notion of *unfilled feature structures* ((Götz, 1994)). Moreover, we gain another important property, namely that our type hierarchies can now contain loops, since appropriateness loops can only cause non termination when introduced features are fully constructed. This approach might not be applicable in the presence of type constraints, which are currently not supported by *AMACIA*.

3.4.2 Partial Descriptions

AMACIA requires that its input be total: both grammar rules and lexical entries are required to consist of totally well-typed feature structures. This requirement might be problematic for the grammar writer, who might prefer to specify only partial information. To this end, the compiler employs a pre-processor that performs type inference on the partial input; the result of this processing is almost total, but partiality is maintained in certain cases.

Recall that a normal term consists of a tag, a type and a sequence of arguments, each of which is a normal term. Whenever some sub-term is the most general term of its type, it is substituted by the type name only. Using the running example of figure 3.1, the term $a(bot, d())$ can be replaced by the term a .

When the compiler encounters such a partial description, it creates one of the following two instructions: `put_var t/n, Xi`, if the type t is part of a query code, or `get_var t/n, Xi`, if it is part of a program code. `put_var` is very similar to `put_node`, with two differences: it creates a VAR-cell, rather than an STR-cell, on the heap; and it does not leave space for REF-cells, as there won't be any. `get_var` is the analog of `get_structure`, but is much simpler: it uses `build_most_general_fs` to create the most general feature structure of type t on top of the heap, and then calls `unify` to unify this newly created TFS with the one that is pointed to by X_i . Thus,

⁶The effect of `get_structure` and the definition of `unify` are modified in a straight-forward way to accommodate VAR cells.

partial descriptions in the input result in a more efficient code, and consequently in a faster, more space-economic processing.

3.4.3 Empty Categories

The presence of empty categories (ϵ -rules) in a grammar causes both theoretical and practical problems. There is a current trend in HPSG of avoiding empty categories altogether, due to theoretical linguistic and cognitive reasons (see, e.g., (Sag and Fodor, 1994)). From a computational point of view, such categories always cause considerable efficiency degradation.

AMAZIA is designed to support empty categories as an inherent part of the input grammars. Empty categories are processed by the compiler at compile time. Each category is matched against every element i in the body of every rule r , and if the unification succeeds, a new rule is created: this rule consists of r , modified by the effects of the unification, in which the i -th element is removed. This process can be shown to yield an equivalent grammar, if it terminates.

However, for certain grammars, the process will never terminate, since it can lead to the creation of new empty categories (when it is applied to rules with just one element in their bodies). A typical example would be the rule

$$\boxed{2}[\mathbf{list}] \implies \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{list} \\ hd : [\mathbf{a}] \\ tl : \boxed{2} \end{array} \right]$$

When it is applied to the empty category $[\mathbf{elist}]$, a new empty category is created:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{list} \\ hd : [\mathbf{a}] \\ tl : [\mathbf{elist}] \end{array} \right]$$

This new empty category can, in turn, be unified with the head of the rule, etc. To eliminate such infinite loops and to maintain efficiency even in face of empty categories, the compiler limits their application: new rules, that were obtained by applying some empty category to an original grammar rule, can not be applied to other empty categories. This implies that a single grammar rule cannot derive two empty categories. Since usually empty categories are designed to operate in a very limited context, this seems to be a reasonable compromise.

3.4.4 Lexical Ambiguity

The lexicon associates every word w with a set of feature structures $Cat(w)$. If this set contains more than one element, w is said to be *ambiguous*. *AMAZIA* processes the lexicon at compile time: to every input word w_i the lexicon assigns a normal term, which is transformed to machine instructions. If w_i is ambiguous the lexicon assigns it several normal terms. The code that is generated for these terms is regular query code; however, the instruction that separates the code of one term from the code of another, if both are associated with the same word, is `same_word` instead of `proceed`. The only difference between the two instructions is that the former does not increment the value of the special purpose register `LEN`. At run time, `proceed` causes the machine to search for the next lexical entry, whereas `same_word` does not. Thus, the execution of the code that was generated for an ambiguous lexical entry w causes several complete edges to be inserted into the chart, one for each element of $Cat(w)$.

3.4.5 Functional Attachments

While the phrase structure grammar organization underlying our design is usually appropriate for constructing grammars for natural languages, there is sometimes need in computations that are not easily expressed using the formalism. Although contemporary grammatical formalisms tend to be highly declarative in nature, grammar writers might find it useful to resort to some mechanism that enables simple computations to be executed without the full power of the grammatical formalism. ALE supports this need to the fullest, by incorporating a complete system of definite clause attachments to grammar rules. Basically, this is a version of a Prolog-like programming language, where the basic units are TFSs rather than FOTs.

AMACIA does not include such a module. As a limited solution, we implemented a small set of functions that can be used by the grammar writer; these functions are executed during the parsing process and their results might be integrated with the parsing.

As an example, consider the pre-defined function `append`. It receives two parameters, which must be lists of TFSs, and returns a list consisting of their concatenation. The grammar writer can use `append` by integrating it in the grammar: following the body of any rule a goal of the form `'goal> append(L1,L2,L3)'` can be placed. The variables L1 and L2 must be associated with lists, and after the goal is executed, the variable L3 will be bound to the concatenation of the input lists. Now, L3 can be used in the head of the rule.

Since parsing is performed bottom-up, goals can only be placed *after* all the elements of the body of a rule; their input parameters must be instantiated, and the output parameter can only be used in the head of the rule. Currently, only a small number of functions (mainly for handling lists and sets) are integrated into *AMACIA*, but more can be easily added. It must be noted, though, that this situation is very different from ALE, in which the user can define just *any* definite clause relation.

3.5 Implementation

AMACIA is implemented as a complete grammar development system, containing a compiler from the ALE input language to the abstract machine language, an interpreter for the machine instructions, a simple debugger for the machine language and a graphical user interface (GUI) that eases the process of grammar design and debugging. The major part of the software is written in C; the compiler is written using *yacc* and *lex*, and the graphical user interface is implemented using *Tcl/Tk* (Ousterhout, 1994). The system is implemented on a Sun Sparc station under the Solaris operating system.

The system was tested with a wide variety of grammars, mostly adaptations of existing ALE grammars. It is important to note that *AMACIA* does not provide the wealth of input specifications ALE does. Some of ALE's features that are not included in *AMACIA* include lexical rules, free use of definite clause attachments and disjunctive descriptions. On the other hand, development of grammars in *AMACIA* is made easier due to the GUI and its improved performance over ALE. A complete description of *AMACIA*'s implementation, its deviations from ALE's input language and a complete users' guide, is given in Wintner, Gabrilovich, and Francez (1997).

To compare *AMACIA* with ALE we have used a few benchmark grammars. Both systems were used to compile the same grammar and to parse the same strings. We shortly describe below each of the grammars, and summarize the results of a performance comparison of *AMACIA* and ALE in figure 3.24. All times are in seconds; in ALE we measured the time for the first result to be displayed, and in *AMACIA* – the time for all the results.

The first grammar is an early version of the HPSG-based Hebrew grammar described in the next chapter. It consists of 4 rules and one empty category; the type hierarchy contains 84 types and 32 features, and the lexicon contains 13 words. The second grammar is an HPSG-based grammar for a subset (emphasizing relative clauses) of the Russian language, developed by Evgeniy Gabrilovich and Arkady Estrin. It consists of 8 rules and 76 lexical entries; the type hierarchy contains 151 types and 31 features. The third example is a simple grammar generating the language $\{a^n b^n \mid n > 0\}$. While the execution times for this simple grammar are less important, the differences in compilation time indicate a major advantage in using *AMACTA* for instructional purposes; in such cases grammars are compiled over and over again, while they are usually executed only a few times.

task	ALE	<i>AMACTA</i>
Grammar 1		
Compilation	35.0	1.4
Parsing, 6 words, 2 results	0.5	0.5
Parsing, 10 words, 8 results	3.2	0.8
Parsing, 14 words, 125 results	140.0	9.0
Grammar 2		
Compilation	68.0	2.3
Parsing, 2 words, 2 results	0.5	0.8
Parsing, 4 words, 2 results	2.4	0.9
Parsing, 7 words, 2 results	5.1	1.1
Parsing, 8 words, 2 results	7.8	1.2
Parsing, 12 words, 2 results	17.0	1.5
Grammar 3		
Compilation	6.5	0.2
Parsing, n=4	0.1	0.2
Parsing, n=8	0.8	0.3
Parsing, n=16	2.8	1.1
Parsing, n=32	26.0	16.0

Figure 3.24: Performance comparison of *AMACTA* and ALE

Chapter 4

An HPSG-based Grammar for Hebrew

In order to test the validity of the abstract machine and its appropriateness for designing HPSG-based grammars, we have devised a small-scale grammar for a fragment of the Hebrew language, based upon the principles of HPSG as stipulated in Pollard and Sag (1994). It must be emphasized that the main objective of the grammar design was to verify the machine, and therefore its linguistic contributions are minor. Still, it might serve as the starting point for the construction of a larger scale, broad coverage grammar for the language.

The Hebrew script uses a character set that differs from the one that appears on an ordinary keyboard. The script is highly ambiguous, as most of the vowels are not written; furthermore, many particles (prepositions, articles and conjunctions) are attached (in the script) to the words succeeding them. Since the problem of morphological analysis of Hebrew, even when represented in the Hebrew script, is practically solved, we have decided in this work to use a transcription of Hebrew, known as *Phonemic Script*¹ (Ornan, 1986; Ornan, 1994; Ornan and Katz, 1995). First, it uses only symbols that appear on any computer keyboard; second, it is unambiguous, similarly to average European languages.

We first list (section 4.1) some of the major HPSG schemata that serve to combine different kinds of phrases, along with their adaptation to our needs. Section 4.2 describes the structure of noun phrases, and we concentrate in section 4.3 on the status of the definite article in Hebrew. Section 4.4 briefly discusses noun-noun constructs. The complete grammar is listed in appendix B.

4.1 Phrase Structure Schemata

HPSG “rules” are organized as a set of *principles* that set constraints on the properties of well-formed phrases, along with a set of *ID schemata* that license certain phrase structures. The schemata are independent of the categories of the involved phrases; they state general conditions for the construction of larger phrases out of smaller ones, according to the function of the sub-phrases. In (Pollard and Sag, 1994) six schemata are listed; we have adopted four of them in our grammar.

¹This script was accepted as a standard number ISO-DIS 259-3.

ID schemata only *license* certain phrase combinations. They do not specify *all* the constraints imposed on the involved sub-phrases, as these are articulated by the principles. However, in a system that is based on phrase-structure rules (e.g., ALE) the principles and the schemata must be interleaved: each rule encodes not only the phrase structure, but also constraints imposed by the grammar principles.

Consider, for example, the *head-subject* schema of HPSG, which states that a phrase with an empty *subj* list can be constructed by combining a (head) phrase, whose *subj* list is of length 1, with a (subject) phrase. Nothing in the schema relates the subject to the head; it is the *subcategorization principle* that requires that the subject be unifiable with the single element in the head's *subj* list. Furthermore, the *head feature principle* requires that the values of the *head* features in both the phrase itself and its head sub-phrase be identical. The first rule listed below (figure 4.1) combines these constraints: it states that a phrase can be constructed out of two sub-phrases, the subject and the head, where the first element (the value of the *hd* feature) in the *subj* list of the head is token-identical to the subject (through the use of the *Subj* variable), and the *head* features of the phrase and its head are token-identical (through the use of the *Head* variable).

Subject-Head schema Most importantly, this schema licenses the combination of a subject with a predicate to form a sentence. The properties of the subject are taken from the *subj* feature of the head daughter. The schema is listed in figure 4.1.

Head-Complement schema The rest of the complements, other than the subject, are combined with the head by the head-complement schema. Once again, the appropriate complements are determined by the head and are specified as the elements in the list *comps*, as shown in figure 4.2.

Head-Marker Schema Markers are used to guarantee that a certain modifier combines only once with a certain head. A typical example is quantifiers (such as ‘every’) modifying nouns. This schema is listed in figure 4.3.

Head-Adjunct schema Adjuncts can be combined with the heads they modify over and over again. In HPSG adjuncts select their heads – it is the adjunct that determines the features of the head it might be attached too, through the value of the feature *mod*, as depicted in figure 4.4.

4.2 The Structure of Noun Phrases in Hebrew

A noun phrase (NP) is a phrase that is headed by a noun² (N), optionally modified or complemented by various adjuncts. In this section we list the possible adjuncts and briefly discuss their character. A more thorough discussion of selected phenomena is provided in the next sections. More Hebrew data as well as further references can be found in (Ornan, 1964; Ornan, 1979; Glinert, 1989; Wintner, 1991; Yizhar, 1993).

A *noun* is a word whose *head* feature has the type *noun* and whose *cont* feature is of type *nom_obj*. The *head* feature of nouns carries an additional (boolean) feature, *def*, which is explained in section 4.3.3 below. Hebrew nouns are specified for *gender*, *number* and *person*³, and these three features are listed as part of the *index* feature of nouns. Figure 4.5 depicts the lexical entry of the common noun *sepr* (book), where ‘ $\langle \rangle$ ’ represents an empty list and ‘ $\{ \}$ ’ denote a set.

²Elliptic NPs might not contain a noun, but we don't discuss ellipsis here.

³Only pronouns are specified for person, other nouns are inherently third person.

```

% Schema 1 (ch. 9, p. 347)
% Subject - Head
subject_head rule
(phrase, cat: (cat, head: Head, subj: e_list, comps: Comps, spr: Spr, marking: Marking),
  cont: Cont, conx: backgr: BM, qstore: QM)
==>
cat> % subject
(Subj, sign, cat: cat, cont: sem_obj, conx: backgr: BS, qstore: QS),
cat> % head
(sign, cat: (cat, head: Head, subj: (hd: Subj, tl: e_list),
  comps: (Comps, e_list), spr: Spr, marking: Marking),
  cont: (Cont, sem_obj), conx: backgr: BH, qstore: QH),
goal> union(QS, QH, QM),
goal> union(BS, BH, BM).

```

Figure 4.1: Subject-Head schema

```

% Schema 2 (ch. 9, p. 348)
% Head - Complement
head_complement rule
(phrase, cat: (cat, head: Head, subj: Subj, comps: Comps, spr: Spr, marking: Marking),
  cont: Cont, conx: backgr: BM, qstore: QM)
==>
cat> % head
(sign, cat: (cat, head: Head, subj: Subj,
  comps: (hd: Comp, tl: Comps),
  spr: Spr, marking: Marking),
  cont: Cont, conx: backgr: BH, qstore: QH),
cat> % complement
(Comp, sign, cat: cat, cont: sem_obj, conx: backgr: BC, qstore: QC),
goal> union(BH, BC, BM),
goal> union(QH, QC, QM).

```

Figure 4.2: Head-Complement schema

Hebrew is a relatively free constituent order language. Still, the order of the NP elements is sometimes fixed. In particular, the adjuncts can be strictly classified as either pre-head or post-head. Within each category a default ordering exists, from which some deviations are allowed. In the discussion below the adjuncts are listed by this default ordering.

Pre-head adjuncts

Determiners This is a closed class of words such as *koll* (all/every), *robb* (most-of), *kamma* (some) etc.

Cardinal numbers Such as *šloša* (three). Cardinals appear in two forms: the regular one and

```

% Schema 4 (ch. 1, p. 51)
% Marker - Head
marker_head rule
(phrase, cat: (cat, head: Head, subj: Subj, comps: Comps, spr: Spr, marking: Marking),
  cont: Cont, conx: backgr: BM, qstore: (elt: Elt, elts: Elts))
==>
cat> % marker
(word, cat: (cat, head: (mark, spec: HeadDtr),
  subj: list, comps: list, spr: list, marking: (Marking, marked)),
  cont: (Elt, quant, det: sem_det, restind: sem_obj),
  conx: backgr: BD, qstore: e_set),
cat> % head
(HeadDtr, sign, cat: (cat, head: Head, subj: Subj, comps: Comps,
  spr: Spr, marking: unmarked),
  cont: Cont, conx: backgr: BH, qstore: Elts),
goal> union(BD, BH, BM).

```

Figure 4.3: Head-Marker schema

```

% Schema 5 (ch. 9, p. 403)
% Head - Adjunct
head_adjunct rule
(phrase, cat: Cat, cont: Cont, conx: backgr: BM, qstore: QM)
==>
cat> % head
(HeadDtr, sign, cat: Cat, cont: sem_obj, conx: backgr: BH, qstore: QH),
cat> % adjunct
(sign, cat: head: (adj, defness: defness, mod: HeadDtr),
  cont: Cont, conx: backgr: BA, qstore: QA),
goal> union(BH, BA, BM),
goal> union(QH, QA, QM).

```

Figure 4.4: Head-Adjunct schema

the ‘nismak’ form, discussed in section 4.3.3.

Definite article The definite article *ha-* is separated from the other determiners for reasons that are explicated in section 4.3.

Post-head adjuncts

Nominal complement Hebrew allows a very elaborate system of nominal-nominal compounds. The first nominal might be a noun or, rarely, an adjective; it is the syntactic head of the compound, and it is morphologically marked. The second nominal can be any NP. Compounds are discussed in section 4.4.




Figure 4.5: The lexical entry of the noun *sepr*

Adjectives Hebrew adjectives are marked for number, gender and definiteness, on which they must agree with the head noun.

Ordinal numbers Such as \$eni (second).

Possessives These include possessive pronouns such as \$elli (mine) as well as phrases (\$ell dan – Dan’s).

Prepositional phrases The rules that govern the combination of prepositional phrases to head nouns in Hebrew are very similar to those in English.

Subcategorized complements Certain nouns subcategorize for particular complements. For example, verbal nouns such as racon (wish) permit an infinitival verb phrase as a complement. This is encoded in the list of complements (the value of *comp*) in the lexical entries of the nouns.

Relative clauses Are not covered in our grammar.

As mentioned above, a thorough and complete description of the linguistic data is outside the scope of this work. The reader is referred to, e.g., (Ornan, 1964; Ornan, 1979; Glinert, 1989; Yizhar, 1993) for more details.

4.3 The Status of the Definite Article in Hebrew

4.3.1 The Data

Hebrew marks *definiteness* in a way that differs a lot from English (but resembles other Semitic language, notably Arabic, and also modern Greek, as will be shown below). The definite article *ha-* in Hebrew attaches to *words*, not to phrases. It combines with various kinds of nominals: common nouns, a few proper nouns, adjectives, ordinal numbers, cardinal numbers and demonstratives. Moreover, definite noun phrases in Hebrew are *polydefinite*: most of the elements of the phrase are required to be explicitly definite, and there is a strict requirement that these elements *agree* on definiteness for the phrase to be grammatical. Hebrew does have *indefinite* articles ('*exxad*, '*axxat*, '*xadim*), but their use is optional and not common. It is therefore useful to view bare nominals (with no attached definite article) by default as indefinite. See examples (1) – (6) for some data.

(1)	<i>ha-</i> <i>sepr</i> the book “the book”	(4)	<i>sepr</i> (' <i>exxad</i>) book (one) “a book”
(2)	<i>ha-</i> <i>sepr</i> <i>ha-</i> <i>gadol</i> the book the big “the big book”	(5)	<i>sepr</i> <i>gadol</i> (' <i>exxad</i>) book big (one) “a big book”
(3)	<i>ha-</i> <i>sepr</i> <i>ha-</i> \$eni the book the second “the second book”	(6)	<i>sepr</i> \$eni book second “a second book”

4.3.2 HPSG Approach

HPSG (as formulated in (Pollard and Sag, 1994)) uses two schemata to form simple noun phrases (NPs): the head-marker schema combines a determiner (DET) with a noun (N), and the head-adjunct schema combines any number of adjectives (ADJs) with an NP. Nouns subcategorize for DET in English: the lexical entry of a singular noun explicitly states an anticipation for a determiner. The combination of DET-N results in a full NP; the effect of the determiner is recorded in the semantics of the phrase as the value of the QSTORE feature propagates from the determiner to the mother. Adjectives ‘select’ the NP they modify in the sense that the NP is the contents of the MOD feature in the adjunct’s lexical entry. The head-adjunct schema treats the NP as the head and the ADJ as the semantic head, so that the semantics of the phrase is inherited from the adjunct.

The HPSG account of Pollard and Sag (1994) would not be appropriate for Hebrew due to the differences in the structure of NPs in the two languages. Most notably, Hebrew nouns do not subcategorize for determiners, for bare nouns qualify perfectly as complete NPs, as shown in examples (1) - (6) above.

An alternative construction is the HPSG analysis of modern Greek NPs presented in (Kolliakou, 1996). It appears that in Greek, too, the definite article can attach to various kinds of nominals, and the language exhibits both *monadic* definites and *polydefinites*. Thus, all three phrases in (7) – (9) are grammatical:⁴

(7)	to kokino podilato the red bike “the red bike”
-----	--

⁴ The Greek examples are taken from Kolliakou (1996).

- (8) to kenurio to kokino podilato
the new the red bike
“the new red bike”
- (9) ta dio ta podilata ta kokina
the two the bikes the red
“the two red bikes”

Kolliakou (1996) concludes that the Greek definite article is not a regular determiner, but constitutes a category of its own. It does not head the phrase it occurs in (as was suggested by (Netter, 1994) for Germanic languages); rather, it functions as an adjunct: it is optional, and it selects the head it modifies by specifying this head as the value of the MOD feature. Furthermore, the definite article marks the phrase it occurs in as definite. This is achieved by introducing a new feature of nominals, UNIQUE,⁵ whose (boolean) value is ‘+’ iff the nominal is definite. Naturally, the value of this feature in the lexical entries of nominals is ‘-’ (since they are indefinite by default).

4.3.3 An Analysis of Hebrew Definites

The analysis of Kolliakou (1996) employs a non-quantificational approach to the semantics of definites. The UNIQUE feature is a semantic one (it is part of the CONTENTs of a phrase), and is the only indication of the definiteness of the phrase. This is in contrast to the approach of (Pollard and Sag, 1994) that is based on Cooper Storage of quantifiers. Whatever approach to semantics is taken, it is clear from examples (1) - (6) that agreement in definiteness among elements of the NP in Hebrew is a morpho-syntactic process, and we account here for this component of the grammar only.

In contrast to Greek, Hebrew exhibits no cases of monadic definites, so all we have to account for is the case of polydefinites. A major observation here is that the definite article attaches only to *words*. Therefore, it seems reasonable to account for definite article combination by means of a *lexical rule* that creates a definite nominal out of an indefinite one. For a detailed discussion of the definite article in Modern Hebrew, see (Ornan, 1964).

The *Definite Lexical Rule* (DLR) operates on various kinds of nominals: nouns (e.g., *sepr*), adjectives (e.g., *gadol*), ordinals (e.g., *\$eni*), demonstratives (e.g., *ze*) and cardinals (e.g., *\$lo\$a*). In all categories its effect on the phonology is that of prefixing it with *ha-*. To emphasize the fact that definiteness agreement in Hebrew is not a semantic process, we add a boolean feature DEF to the CATegory of nominals (rather than to their CONTENT). The DLR changes the value of the path SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|DEF from ‘-’ to ‘+’. When the DLR operates on *adjuncts*, it additionally changes the value of the path MOD|LOC|CAT|DEF in the same manner. Thus it is guaranteed that definite adjectives, for example, are not only specified as definite but also select definite heads. The effect of the DLR when applied to a few nominals is exemplified in figure 4.6.

Once the process of adding the definite article is taking place in the lexicon, the head-adjunct schema can remain intact. Moreover, the agreement in definiteness between a nominal and its adjuncts is stated in the lexical entry of the adjuncts, just like agreement on number and gender is.

Cardinals introduce an irregularity to the analysis of definites. As mentioned above, cardinals can combine with the definite article in Hebrew. However, such constructs are used only in elliptical phrases. In full noun phrases, when the head noun is present, the definiteness agreement between

⁵The specification of uniqueness has a semantic contribution in addition to its syntactic marking, but we suppress a complete discussion of semantics here.




Figure 4.6: The effect of the Definite Lexical Rule

the head noun and the cardinal number is realized in a unique way: a definite noun does not combine with a definite cardinal, but rather with *construct* form of the cardinal, ‘nismak’. The absolute form of many other nominals have ‘nismak’ forms that are used in noun-noun constructs (see section 4.4). However, cardinals in this form are implicitly definite, as they combine only with definite NPs.⁶ The data are summarized in examples (10) to (14) below.

- (10) \$lo\$a sparim
 three books
 “three books”
- (11) ?\$lo\$a ha- sparim
 three the books
 “?the three books”
- (12) \$lo\$t ha- sparim
 three-‘nismak’ the books
 “the three books”

⁶This rule has a few exceptions: the cardinal \$nei (two-‘nismak’) is combined with both definite and indefinite nouns; and there are few indefinite nouns (such as me’ot (hundreds) or ‘lapim (thousands)) that require ‘nismak’ cardinals. The phrases preceded by ‘?’ are marked, archaic forms.

(13) ?šlošt sparim
 three-‘nismak’ books
 “?three books”

(14) *ha- šloša ha- sparim
 the three the books
 “?the three books”

Notice that (14) is ungrammatical because the correct way of marking definiteness of cardinal in Hebrew is by using the ‘nismak’ form, and not because the phrase **ha-šloša** is ungrammatical. Indeed, this last phrase can be used in elliptical structures such as (15):

(15) qaniti šloša sparim. koll ha- šloša b-’anglit
 I-bought three books. All the three in-English
 “I bought three books. All three *of them are* in English”

The ‘nismak’ form of nominals is an inflection of their regular form, and therefore is obtained as the outcome of a lexical rule. As far as definiteness is concerned, when the DLR operates on an indefinite cardinal, its output is the ‘nismak’ form rather than the regular combination of **ha-** and the cardinal. All other details remain the same. The definite **ha-** is combined with cardinals by a different mechanism that is not discussed here.

4.4 Noun-Noun Constructs

Noun-noun compounds are constructed in a special way in Hebrew: the head noun, which appears first in the compound, has a marked morphological form⁷ – ‘nismak’. Most NPs can serve as the adjunct of a compound. Syntactically, the compound inherits all the features of the ‘nismak’, with the exception of *definiteness*, which is inherited from the NP complement. Consider the following examples:

(16) pirxei gann yapim
 flowers-pl-‘nismak’ garden-sg beautiful-pl
 “beautiful garden flowers”

(17) pirxei ha- gann ha- yapim
 flowers-pl-‘nismak’ the garden-sg the beautiful-pl
 “the beautiful garden flowers”

In both examples the entire phrase is in plural, as can be seen from the adjective, because the head noun *pirxei* is in plural. However, (17) is definite while (16) isn’t, due to the definite article modifying the complement *gann*.

The process of compounding is recursive, as the resulting compound is a legitimate NP for combining with some other ‘nismak’ form. When more than two nouns are combined, the resulting phrase might be (if the nouns have the same gender and number) syntactically ambiguous: example (18) can be translated as “my fat aunt’s cow” or as “my aunt’s fat cow”.

⁷For many nouns in Hebrew, especially among singular masculine and plural feminine, this form is identical to the regular form.

- (18) parat dodati ha- \$mena
 cow-‘nismak’ my-aunt the fat-f
 “my fat aunt’s cow / my aunt’s fat cow”

The ‘nismak’ form is generated from the regular noun form by means of the ‘nismak’ *lexical rule* (NLR). Apart from modifying the phonology of the noun, this rule has a double effect. First, it adds a subcategorized NP complement to the COMP list of the noun, to express the expectation for an NP complement; second, it unifies the values of the DEF feature of the noun and its newly added complement. When the noun is complemented, the resulting phrase inherits the definiteness from the adjunct. Figure 4.7 depicts the effect of applying the NLR to the noun *praxim* (flowers).




Figure 4.7: The effect of the ‘nismak’ lexical rule

Notice that the lexical entry of the ‘nismak’ noun *pirxei*, listed in figure 4.7, does not specify any value for the DEF feature. Hence, the DLR cannot be applied to *pirxei*, as it only applies for nominals that are specified as DEF –. This corresponds to the observation that ‘nismak’ nouns cannot be modified by the definite article in Hebrew. Once the ‘nismak’ lexical rule is applied to

‘nismak’-form nouns, their lexical entry specifies that they subcategorize for a nominal complement. Noun-noun compounds can thus be constructed by the head-complement schema (figure 4.2).

Chapter 5

Conclusion

As linguistic formalisms become more rigorous, the necessity of well defined semantics for grammars increases. We presented an operational semantics for TFS-based formalisms, making use of an abstract machine specifically tailored for this kind of applications. In addition, we described a compiler for a general TFS-based language. The compiled code, in terms of abstract machine instructions, can be interpreted and executed on ordinary hardware.

We have formalized in this thesis the concepts of *grammars* and *languages* for linguistic formalisms that are based on typed feature structures, using the notion of *multi-rooted structures* that generalize feature structures. We use multi-rooted structures for representing grammar *rules* as well as (the equivalent of) sentential forms that are generated during parsing. We described a computational process that corresponds to parsing with respect to such formalisms. We thus achieved two different specifications, namely a declarative (derivation-based) one and an algebraic (computation-based) one, for the semantics of those formalisms. Next, we have proved that the two specifications coincide, namely that the computational process induced by the algebraic specification is correct with respect to the declarative specification. Finally, we formally characterized a subset of the grammars, *off-line parsable* ones, for which termination of parsing can be guaranteed. Making use of the well-foundedness of the subsumption relation, we proved that for every grammar in this class, parsing is finitely terminating.

This view of parsing with typed feature structures is the basis for the design of *AMACTA*, an abstract machine specifically tailored for executing code that is compiled from grammars. We detailed the architecture of the machine, its data structures and instruction set, along with the process of compilation of ALE grammars. The use of abstract machine techniques results in highly efficient processing. The system was implemented and a comparison to ALE shows a great improvement in both compilation and execution times.

The current implementation of *AMACTA* is not fully compatible with ALE. Several features of ALE are missing in our implementation, and therefore a natural extension of this project would be to add them. Most notably, *AMACTA* doesn't support the use of lexical rules, which are considered important for any reasonable grammar of natural languages. ALE also includes a component of definite clauses over TFSs which is missing in *AMACTA* – an interesting extension would be to link the abstract machine with a WAM-like machine that can handle definite clauses.

AMACTA's current compiler is relatively basic, and several optimizations might be introduced to it in the future. A major optimization might be achieved by incorporating static (compile-time) analysis of grammars. Several interesting questions, relating grammars to computer programs,

arise: for example, what is the equivalent of *dead-code elimination*? How can concepts of *structured programming* be transferred to grammars? Can *modules* be defined for grammars, too?

A different line of improvements concerns the parsing algorithm incorporated by *AMALIA*. Currently only one, relatively simple, algorithm is inherent to the machine. An interesting extension would be to implement various algorithms, probably with user control over them, and to experiment their time and space efficiency.

AMALIA is currently being used as a platform for developing an HPSG grammar for the Hebrew language. While this endeavor is still underway, it serves as a realistic use of the system. The development of the grammar already resulted in many improvements and extensions to *AMALIA*, and the system proved stable and reliable enough to support it. We presented a partial HPSG-based grammar for a fragment of Hebrew, concentrating on noun phrases. We hope that this endeavor will serve as the basis for a more comprehensive, broad-coverage grammar of Hebrew.

Appendix A

List of Machine Instructions

The following table lists, for quick reference, the machine instructions and functions, accompanied by a reference to the page in the text in which they are described.

Query processing		Control	
put_node $t/n, X_i$	44	first_key	57
put_arc X_i, offset, X_j	44	next_key	57
proceed X_i	53	check_key	57
Type unification		tst_active_edges l	57
build_str t	47	next_active_edge l	57
build_ref_and_unify i	47	tst_complete_edges l'	57
build_ref i	47	next_complete_edge l	57
build_self_ref i	47	call	58
build_var t	47	load_fs r	58
unify_feat i	47	copy_active_edge l	58
Program processing		copy_complete_edge X	58
get_structure $t/n, X_i$	48	Auxiliary functions	
unify_variable X_i	48	bind(addr1, addr2)	56
unify_value X_i	48	deref(a):address	47
put_rule L	53	unify(addr1, addr2):boolean	49
		fail()	59

Appendix B

The Hebrew Grammar

```
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%  
%  
% File: Hebrew grammar  
%  
% Includes: 1. Schema 1  
%           2. Schema 2  
%           3. Schema 4  
%           4. Schema 5  
%           5.  
%           6. Head feature principle  
%           7. Valence principle (subj, comps, spr)  
%           8. Semantics principle (cont) - partial  
%           9. Contextual Consistency (conx) - approximate  
%           10. Quantifier storage - preliminary  
%  
%  
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
```

```
%%***** Type Hierarchy  
%th
```

```
bot sub [sign,list,  
        set,cat,sem_obj,sem_det,conx,qfsoa,index,per,num,gend,  
        head,vform,pform,defness,marking,boolean].  
  
sign sub [word,phrase] intro [cat:cat,cont:sem_obj,conx:conx,qstore:set_quant].  
  word sub [].  
  phrase sub [].  
  
cat sub [] intro [head:head,subj:list,comps:list,spr:list,marking:marking].  
  
sem_obj sub [psoa,nom_obj,quant].
```

```

nom_obj sub [pron,npro] intro [index:index,restr:set_psoa].
  pron sub [].
  npro sub [].
psoa sub [] intro [nucleus:qfpsoa].
quant sub [] intro [det:sem_det, restind:npro].

  sem_det sub [forall,exists,the].
    forall sub [].
    exists sub [].
    the sub [].

conx sub [] intro [backgr:set_psoa].

qfpsoa sub [un_relation,cn,naming].
  un_relation sub [walk,sing,red,big, bin_relation] intro [agent:index].
    walk sub [].
    sing sub [].
    red sub [].
    big sub [].
  bin_relation sub [see,eat, tri_relation] intro [theme:index].
    see sub [].
    eat sub [].
  tri_relation sub [sell,give] intro [patient:index].
    sell sub [].
    give sub [].
  cn sub [book,apple] intro [instance:index].
    book sub [].
    apple sub [].
  naming sub [dan,dana] intro [bearer:index].
    dan sub [].
    dana sub [].

index sub [] intro [per:per,num:num,gend:gend].
  per sub [first,second,third].
    first sub [].
    second sub [].
    third sub [].
  num sub [sg,pl].
    sg sub [].
    pl sub [].
  gend sub [masc,fem].
    masc sub [].
    fem sub [].

head sub [subst,func].
  func sub [mark] intro [spec:sign].
    mark sub [det].

```

```

    det sub [].
    subst sub [nominal,verb,prep].
    nominal sub [noun,adj,numeral] intro [defness:defness].
        noun sub [].
        adj sub [] intro [mod:sign].
        numeral sub [].
    prep sub [] intro [pform:pform].
    verb sub [] intro [vform:vform].
% I decided not to add a 'mod' feature to all substantials, since in
% most of the cases (excluding adjectives) its value is 'none'.

defness sub [indef,def].
    indef sub [].
    def sub [].

vform sub [fin,bse].
    fin sub [].
    bse sub [].

pform sub [to,in].
    to sub [].
    in sub [].

marking sub [marked,unmarked].
    marked sub [comp,determiner,quantifier].
        comp sub [].
        determiner sub [].
        quantifier sub [].
    unmarked sub [].

boolean sub [yes,no].
    yes sub [].
    no sub [].

list sub [e_list,ne_list].
    ne_list sub [] intro [hd:bot,tl:list].
    e_list sub [].

set sub [e_set,ne_set,set_psoa,set_quant].
    e_set sub [].
    ne_set sub [ne_set_psoa,ne_set_quant] intro [elt:bot,elts:set].
    set_psoa sub [e_set, ne_set_psoa].
        ne_set_psoa sub []. % intro [elt:psoa, elts:set_psoa].
    set_quant sub [e_set, ne_set_quant].
        ne_set_quant sub []. % intro [elt:quant, elts:set_quant].

%%%***** Macros

```

```

%macros

propn(Num,Gen,Name) macro
(word,cat:(cat,head:noun,subj:e_list,comps:e_list,spr:e_list),
  cont:(npro,index:(Ind,per:third,num:Num,gend:Gen),restr:elt:Sem),
  conx:backgr:(ne_set_psoa,elt:(Sem,psoa,nucleus:(Name,bearer:Ind)),
    elts:e_set)).

np(Per,Num,Gen,Index) macro
(sign, cat:head:noun,
  cont:(nom_obj,index:(Index,per:Per,num:Num,gend:Gen))).

noun(Num,Gen,Sem,Def) macro
(word,cat:(head:(noun,defness:Def),subj:e_list,comps:e_list,spr:e_list),
  cont:(nom_obj,index:(Ind,per:third,num:Num,gend:Gen),
    restr:(elt:(psoa,nucleus:(Sem,instance:Ind)),elts:e_set)),
  qstore:e_set).

intrans macro (cat:comps:e_list).

trans macro
(cat:comps:(hd:(@ np(Per,Num,Gen,Theme)),tl:e_list),
  cont:nucleus:theme:Theme).

ditrans macro
(cat:comps:(hd:(@ np(Per,Num,Gen,Theme)),
  tl:hd:(@ np(Per1,Num1,Gen1,Patient)),
  tl:tl:e_list),
  cont:nucleus:patient:Patient).

verb(Per,Num,Gen,Sem) macro
(word,cat:(cat,head:(verb,vform:fin),
  subj:hd:(@ np(Per,Num,Gen,SubjInd)),
  marking:unmarked),
  cont:nucleus:(Sem,agent:SubjInd),
  conx:backgr:e_set,
  qstore:e_set).

nominal(Def,Ind) macro
(sign,cat:(head:(nominal,defness:Def),
  subj:e_list,comps:e_list,spr:e_list,marking:unmarked),
  cont:(nom_obj,index:Ind)).

adj(Num,Gen,Sem,Def) macro
(word,cat:(head:(adj,defness:Def,
  mod:(@ nominal(Def,Ind))),
  subj:e_list,comps:e_list,spr:e_list),

```

```

        cont:(nom_obj,index:(Ind,num:Num,gend:Gen),
              restr:(elt:(psoa,nucleus:Sem,nucleus:agent:ModInd))),
        qstore:e_set).

***** Empty Categories

%%***** Grammar Rules
%grammar

% Schema 1 (ch. 9, p. 347)
% Subject - Head
subject_head rule

(phrase,cat:(cat,head:Head,
              subj:e_list,
              comps:Comps,
              spr:Spr,marking:Marking),
  cont:Cont,
  conx:backgr:BM,
  qstore:QM)
==>
cat> % subject
(Subj,sign,cat:cat,
  cont:sem_obj,
  conx:backgr:BS,
  qstore:QS),
cat> % head
(sign,cat:(cat,head:Head,
           subj:(hd:Subj,tl:e_list),
           comps:(Comps,e_list), % comps is required to be empty so that
% subject is added after all the complements.
           spr:Spr,marking:Marking),
  cont:(Cont,sem_obj),
  conx:backgr:BH,
  qstore:QH),
goal> union(QS,QH,QM),
goal> union(BS,BH,BM).

% Schema 2 (ch. 9, p. 348)
% Head - Complement
head_complement rule

(phrase,cat:(cat,head:Head,
              subj:Subj,
              comps:Comps,
              spr:Spr,marking:Marking),
  cont:Cont,

```

```

        conx:backgr:BM,
        qstore:QM)
===>
cat>
(sign,cat:(cat,head:Head, % head
        subj:Subj,
        comps:(hd:(Comp,sign,cat:cat,
                    cont:sem_obj,
                    conx:backgr:BC,
                    qstore:QC),
                tl:Comps),
        spr:Spr,marking:Marking),
cont:Cont,
conx:backgr:BH,
qstore:QH),
cat>
Comp, % complement
goal> union(BH,BC,BM),
goal> union(QH,QC,QM).

% Schema 4 (ch. 1, p. 51)
% Marker - Head
marker_head rule

(phrase,cat:(cat,head:Head,
        subj:Subj,
        comps:Comps,
        spr:Spr,marking:Marking),
cont:Cont,
conx:backgr:BM,
qstore:(elt:Elt,elts:Elts))
===>
cat> % marker
(word,cat:(cat,head:(mark,spec:HeadDtr),
        subj:list,comps:list,spr:list,marking:(Marking,marked)),
cont:(Elt,quant,det:sem_det,restind:sem_obj),
conx:backgr:BD,
qstore:e_set),
cat> % head
(HeadDtr,sign,cat:(cat,
        head:Head,
        subj:Subj,
        comps:Comps,
        spr:Spr, marking:unmarked),
cont:Cont,
conx:backgr:BH,

```



```
qstore:Elts),
goal> union(BD,BH,BM).
```

```
empty
(sign,cat:(head:(det,spec:(sign,cat:(head:noun,subj:e_list,comps:e_list,
                                spr:e_list),
                                cont:(Npro,index:(per:third,num:sg)),
                                qstore:e_set)),
      subj:e_list,comps:e_list,spr:e_list,marking:quantifier),
cont:(quant,det:exists,restind:Npro),
conx:backgr:e_set,
qstore:e_set).
```

```
% Schema 5 (ch. 9, p. 403)
```

```
% Head - Adjunct
```

```
%
```

```
% modification: the marking feature is shared by the adjunct and the
% head (to require definiteness agreement)
```

```
head_adjunct rule
```

```
(phrase,cat:Cat,
  cont:Cont,
  conx:backgr:BM,
  qstore:QM)
```

```
====>
```

```
cat> % head
```

```
(HeadDtr,sign,cat:Cat,
  cont:sem_obj,
  conx:backgr:BH,
  qstore:QH),
```

```
cat> % adjunct
```

```
(sign,cat:head:(adj,defness:defness,mod:HeadDtr),
  cont:Cont,
  conx:backgr:BA,
  qstore:QA),
```

```
goal> union(BH,BA,BM),
```

```
goal> union(QH,QA,QM).
```

```
%%%***** Lexical Entries
```

```
%lexicon
```

```
dan --->
```

```
(@ propn(sg,masc,dan)).
```

```
dana --->
```

```
(@ propn(sg,fem,dana)).
```

sepr --->
(@ noun(sg,masc,book,undef)).

ha-sepr --->
(@ noun(sg,masc,book,def)).

sparim --->
(@ noun(pl,masc,book,undef)).

\$ar --->
(@ verb(third,sg,masc,sing),(@ intrans)).

\$ara --->
(@ verb(third,sg,fem,sing),(@ intrans)).

^akal --->
(@ verb(third,sg,masc,eat),(@ trans)).

natan --->
(@ verb(third,sg,masc,give),(@ ditrans)).

^adomm --->
(@ adj(sg,masc,red,undef)).

gadol --->
(@ adj(sg,masc,big,undef)).

ha-gadol --->
(@ adj(sg,masc,big,def)).

gdolim --->
(@ adj(pl,masc,big,undef)).

Bibliography

- [Aho and Ullman1972] Aho, Alfred V. and Jeffrey D. Ullman. 1972. *The Theory of Parsing, Translation and Compiling*, volume 1: Parsing. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- [Ait-Kaci1991] Ait-Kaci, Hassan. 1991. *Warren's Abstract Machine: A Tutorial Reconstruction*. Logic Programming. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- [Ait-Kaci et al.1989] Ait-Kaci, Hassan, Robert Boyer, Patrick Lincoln, and Roger Nasr. 1989. Efficient implementation of lattice operations. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 11(1):115–146, January.
- [Ait-Kaci and Di Cosmo1993] Ait-Kaci, Hassan and Roberto Di Cosmo. 1993. Compiling order-sorted feature term unification. PRL Technical Note 7, Digital Paris Research Laboratory, December.
- [Ait-Kaci and Podelski1993] Ait-Kaci, Hassan and Andreas Podelski. 1993. Towards a meaning of LIFE. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 16(3-4):195–234, July-August.
- [Barton, Berwick, and Ristad1987] Barton, G. Edward, Robert C. Berwick, and Eric Sven Ristad. 1987. *Computational Complexity and Natural Language*. Computational Models of Cognition and Perception. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- [Beierle and Meyer1994] Beierle, Christoph and Gregor Meyer. 1994. Run-time type computations in the Warren abstract machine. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 18:123–148.
- [Bentur, Angel, and Segev1992] Bentur, Esther, Aviella Angel, and Danit Segev. 1992. Computerized analysis of Hebrew words. *Hebrew Linguistics*, 36:33–38, December. (in Hebrew).
- [Bird1990] Bird, Steven. 1990. *Constraint-Based Phonology*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- [Bird1992] Bird, Steven. 1992. Finite state phonology in HPSG. In *Proceedings of COLING-92*, pages 74–80.
- [Calcagno, Kathol, and Pollard1993] Calcagno, Mike, Andreas Kathol, and Carl Pollard. 1993. A bibliography of books, theses and articles in or on HPSG. Unpublished manuscript, August.
- [Carpenter1991] Carpenter, Bob. 1991. Typed feature structures: A generalization of first-order terms. In Vijai Saraswat and Ueda Kazunori, editors, *Logic Programming – Proceedings of the 1991 International Symposium*, pages 187–201, Cambridge, MA. MIT Press.

- [Carpenter1992a] Carpenter, Bob. 1992a. ALE – the attribute logic engine: User’s guide. Technical report, Laboratory for Computational Linguistics, Philosophy Department, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, December.
- [Carpenter1992b] Carpenter, Bob. 1992b. *The Logic of Typed Feature Structures*. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge University Press.
- [Chayen and Dror1976] Chayen, M. J. and Z. Dror. 1976. *Introduction to Hebrew Transformational Grammar*. University Publishing Projects Ltd., Jerusalem. (in Hebrew).
- [Choueka and Ne’eman1995] Choueka, Yaacov and Yoni Ne’eman. 1995. ”Nakdan-T”, a text vocalizer for modern Hebrew. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Bar-Ilan Symposium on Foundations of Artificial Intelligence*, June.
- [Cohen1984] Cohen, Daniel. 1984. *Mechanical Syntactic Analysis of a Hebrew Sentence*. Ph.D. thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (In Hebrew).
- [Dörre and Dorna1993] Dörre, Jochen and Michael Dorna. 1993. CUF – a formalism for linguistic knowledge representation. In Jochen Dörre, editor, *Computational Aspects of Constrained-Based Linguistic Description I, DYANA-2 deliverable R1.2.A*, ILLC/Department of Philosophy, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Doelenstraat 15, NL-1012 CP Amsterdam, August.
- [Emerson1983] Emerson, E. Allen. 1983. Alternative semantics for temporal logics. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 26:121–130.
- [Erbach1994] Erbach, Gregor. 1994. ProFIT: Prolog with features, inheritance and templates. CLAUS Report 42, Computerlinguistik, Universität des Saarlandes, D-66041, Saarbrücken, Germany, July.
- [Franz1990] Franz, Alex. 1990. A parser for HPSG. Report CMU-LCL-90-3, Laboratory for Computational Linguistics, Department of Philosophy, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, July.
- [GabrilovichIn preparation] Gabrilovich, Evgeniy. In preparation. Natural language generation by abstract machine. Master’s thesis, Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel.
- [Gazdar et al.1985] Gazdar, G. E., E. Klein, K. Pullum, and Ivan A. Sag. 1985. *Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- [Gazdar and Mellish1989] Gazdar, Gerald and Chris Mellish. 1989. *Natural Language Processing in PROLOG*. Addison-Wesley.
- [Gerdemann1993] Gerdemann, Dale. 1993. Troll: Type resolution system – fundamental principles and user’s guide. Unpublished manuscript, September.
- [Gerdemann and Hinrichs1988] Gerdemann, Dale and Erhard W. Hinrichs. 1988. Unicorn: A unification parser for attribute-value grammars. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 18(2):41–86.
- [Glinert1989] Glinert, Lewis. 1989. *The Grammar of Modern Hebrew*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- [Götz1994] Götz, Thilo W. 1994. A normal form for types feature structures. Master's thesis, Eberhard-Karls Universität, Tübingen, March.
- [Haas1989] Haas, Andrew. 1989. A parsing algorithm for unification grammar. *Computational Linguistics*, 15(4):219–232, December.
- [Hermenegildo1986] Hermenegildo, Manuel V. 1986. *An Abstract Machine Based Execution Model for Computer Architecture Design and Efficient Implementation of Logic Programs in Parallel*. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Computer Science, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712-1188, August.
- [Johnson1988] Johnson, Mark. 1988. *Attribute-Value Logic and the Theory of Grammar*, volume 16 of *CSLI Lecture Notes*. CSLI, Stanford, California.
- [JPSG Working GroupIn Preparation] JPSG Working Group. In Preparation. JPSG: A constraint based approach to japanese grammar. Technical memo, Institute for New Generation Computer Technology.
- [Kaplan and Bresnan1982] Kaplan, R. and J. Bresnan. 1982. Lexical functional grammar: A formal system for grammatical representation. In J. Bresnan, editor, *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., pages 173–281.
- [Kaplan1973] Kaplan, Ronald M. 1973. A general syntactic processor. In Randall Rustin, editor, *Natural Language Processing*, number 8 in Courant Computer Science Symposium. Algorithmics Press, P.O. Box 97, New York, N.Y. 10012, pages 194–241.
- [Kasper and Rounds1986] Kasper, Robert T. and William B. Rounds. 1986. A logical semantics for feature structures. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 257–265.
- [Kay1973] Kay, Martin. 1973. The MIND system. In Randall Rustin, editor, *Natural Language Processing*, number 8 in Courant Computer Science Symposium. Algorithmics Press, P.O. Box 97, New York, N.Y. 10012, pages 155–188.
- [Kay1983] Kay, Martin. 1983. Unification grammar. Technical report, Xerox Palo Alto Research Center, Palo Alto, CA.
- [King1989] King, Paul. 1989. *A Logical Formalism for HPSG*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.
- [King1992] King, Paul. 1992. Unification grammars and descriptive formalisms: Lecture notes for a graduate level course. Unpublished manuscript.
- [Kodrič, Popowich, and Vogel1992] Kodrič, Sandi, Fred Popowich, and Carl Vogel. 1992. The HPSG-PL system. CSS-IS TR 92-05, School of Computing Science, Centre for Systems Science, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B. C. Canada V5A 1S6, Jun.
- [Kolliakou1996] Kolliakou, Dimitra. 1996. Definiteness and the make-up of nominal categories. In Claire Grover and Enric Vallduví, editors, *Studies in HPSG*, volume 12 of *Edinburgh Working Papers in Cognitive Science*. Centre for Cognitive Science, The University of Edinburgh, chapter 4, pages 121–164.

- [Kursawe1987] Kursawe, Peter. 1987. How to invent a Prolog machine. *New Generation Computing*, 5:97–114.
- [Landin1964] Landin, P. J. 1964. The mechanical evaluation of expressions. *The Computer Journal*, 6(4):308–320.
- [Lloyd1987] Lloyd, John Wylie. 1987. *Foundations of Logic Programming*. Springer series in Symbolic Computation – Artificial Intelligence. Springer, Berlin, second edition.
- [Manaster-Ramer1987] Manaster-Ramer, Alexis. 1987. *Mathematics of Language*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- [Moshier1988] Moshier, Drew. 1988. *Extensions to Unification Grammars for the Description of Programming Languages*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- [Moshier and Rounds1987] Moshier, Drew M. and William C. Rounds. 1987. A logic for partially specified data structures. In *14th Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 156–167, January.
- [Müller1996] Müller, Stefan. 1996. HPSG literature. Available as an electronic document at <http://cl-www.dfki.uni-sb.de/HPSG/>.
- [Nerbonne1992] Nerbonne, John. 1992. Feature-based lexicons: An example and a comparison to DATR. Research Report RR-92-04, Deutsches Forschungszentrum für Künstliche Intelligenz GmbH, February.
- [Nerbonne, Netter, and Pollard1994] Nerbonne, John, Klaus Netter, and Carl Pollard, editors. 1994. *German in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Number 46 in CSLI lecture notes. CSLI, Stanford, Ca.
- [Netter1994] Netter, Klaus. 1994. Towards a theory of functional heads. In John Nerbonne, Klaus Netter, and Carl Pollard, editors, *German in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, volume 46 of *CSLI Lecture Notes*. CSLI, Stanford, CA, chapter 9, pages 297–340.
- [Nilsson1993] Nilsson, Ulf. 1993. Towards a methodology for the design of abstract machines for logic programming languages. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 16:163–189.
- [Nirenburg and Ben-Asher1984] Nirenburg, Sergei and Yosef Ben-Asher. 1984. HUH – the Hebrew University Hebrew understander. *Computer Languages*, 9(3/4).
- [Ornan1964] Ornan, Uzzi. 1964. *Noun Phrases in Modern Hebrew Literature*. Ph.D. thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem. (in Hebrew).
- [Ornan1979] Ornan, Uzzi. 1979. *The Simple Sentence*. Academon, Jerusalem, Israel. (in Hebrew).
- [Ornan1986] Ornan, Uzzi. 1986. Phonemic script: A central vehicle for processing natural language – the case of Hebrew. Technical Report 88.181, IBM Research Center, Haifa, Israel.
- [Ornan1994] Ornan, Uzzi. 1994. Basic concepts in "romanization" of scripts. Technical Report LCL 94-5, Laboratory for Computational Linguistics, Technion, Haifa, Israel, March.
- [Ornan and Katz1995] Ornan, Uzzi and Michael Katz. 1995. A new program for Hebrew index based on the Phonemic Script. Technical Report LCL 94-7, Laboratory for Computational Linguistics, Technion, Haifa, Israel, July.

- [Ousterhout1994] Ousterhout, John K. 1994. *Tcl and the Tk Toolkit*. Addison-Wesley Professional Computing Series. Addison-Wesley.
- [Penn1993] Penn, Gerald. 1993. A comprehensive HPSG grammar in ALE. Technical report, Laboratory for Computational Linguistics, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA.
- [Pereira and Warren1983] Pereira, Fernando C. N. and David H. D. Warren. 1983. Parsing as deduction. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 137–144, June.
- [Pollard and Sag1987] Pollard, Carl and Ivan A. Sag. 1987. *Information Based Syntax and Semantics*. Number 13 in CSLI Lecture Notes. CSLI.
- [Pollard and Sag1994] Pollard, Carl and Ivan A. Sag. 1994. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. University of Chicago Press and CSLI Publications.
- [Pollard and Moshier1990] Pollard, Carl J. and M. Drew Moshier. 1990. Unifying partial descriptions of sets. In Philip P. Hanson, editor, *Information, Language and Cognition*, volume 1 of *Vancouver Studies in Cognitive Science*. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver 1990, chapter 10, pages 285–322.
- [Popowich and Vogel1991] Popowich, Fred and Carl Vogel. 1991. A logic-based implementation of head-driven phrase structure grammar. In Charles Grant Brown and Gregers Koch, editors, *Natural Language Understanding and Logic Programming, III*, pages 227–245. Elsevier Science Publishers (North-Holland).
- [Prudian and Pollard1985] Prudian, Derek and Carl Pollard. 1985. Parsing head-driven phrase structure grammar. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Chicago, IL. University of Chicago.
- [Russell1993] Russell, Dale W. 1993. *Language Acquisition in a Unification-Based Grammar Processing System Using a Real-World Knowledge Base*. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois, July.
- [Russinoff1992] Russinoff, David M. 1992. A verified Prolog compiler for the Warren Abstract Machine. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 13:367–412.
- [Sag and Fodor1994] Sag, Ivan A. and Janet Dean Fodor. 1994. Extraction without traces. In Raul Aranovich, William Byrne, Susanne Preuss, and Martha Senturia, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Stanford. CSLI Publications/SLA.
- [Samuelsson1995] Samuelsson, Christer. 1995. An efficient algorithm for surface generation. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [Schumann1991] Schumann, Johann M. Ph. 1991. *Efficient Theorem Provers based on an Abstract Machine*. Ph.D. thesis, Technische Universität München, Institut Für Informatik.
- [Shieber1985] Shieber, Stuart M. 1985. Using restriction to extend parsing algorithms for complex-feature-based formalisms. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the ACL*, pages 145–152, July.
- [Shieber1986] Shieber, Stuart M. 1986. *An Introduction to Unification Based Approaches to Grammar*. CSLI Lecture Notes. CSLI.

- [Shieber1992] Shieber, Stuart M. 1992. *Constraint-Based Grammar Formalisms*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- [Shieber, Schabes, and Pereira1994] Shieber, Stuart M., Yves Schabes, and Fernando C. N. Pereira. 1994. Principles and implementation of deductive parsing. Technical Report TR-11-94, Center for Research in Computing Technology, Division of Applied Sciences, Harvard University, April.
- [Sikkel1993] Sikkel, Klaas. 1993. *Parsing Schemata*. Klaas Sikkel, Enschede.
- [Smolka1988] Smolka, Gert. 1988. A feature logic with subsorts. LILOG Report 33, IBM Deutschland, May.
- [Smolka and Treinen1994] Smolka, Gert and Ralf Treinen. 1994. Records for logic programming. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 18:229–258.
- [Swift and Warren1993] Swift, Terrance and David Warren. 1993. Compiling OLDT evaluation: Background and overview. Technical Report 92/04, SUNY Stony Brook, March.
- [Warren1983] Warren, David H. D. 1983. An abstract Prolog instruction set. Technical Note 309, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA., August.
- [Warshall1962] Warshall, Stephen. 1962. A theorem on boolean matrices. *Journal of the ACM*, 9(1):11–12, January.
- [Wintner1991] Wintner, Shuly. 1991. Syntactic analysis of Hebrew sentences. Master’s thesis, Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel, July. (In Hebrew, abstract in English).
- [Wintner1992] Wintner, Shuly. 1992. Syntactic analysis of Hebrew sentences using PATR. In Uzzi Ornan, Gideon Ariely, and Edit Doron, editors, *Hebrew Computational Linguistics*. Ministry of Science and Technology, chapter 4, pages 105–115. (In Hebrew).
- [Wintner and Francez1995a] Wintner, Shuly and Nissim Francez. 1995a. An abstract machine for typed feature structures. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Natural Language Understanding and Logic Programming*, pages 205–220, Lisbon, May.
- [Wintner and Francez1995b] Wintner, Shuly and Nissim Francez. 1995b. Parsing with typed feature structures. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on Parsing Technologies*, pages 273–287, Prague, September.
- [Wintner and Francez to appear] Wintner, Shuly and Nissim Francez. to appear. Off-line parsability and the well-foundedness of subsumption. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*.
- [Wintner, Gabrilovich, and Francez1997] Wintner, Shuly, Evgeniy Gabrilovich, and Nissim Francez, 1997. *AMALIA – Abstract MAchine for LInguistic Applications – User’s Guide*. Laboratory for Computational Linguistics, Computer Science Department, Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, 32000 Haifa, Israel, January.
- [Wintner and Ornan1991] Wintner, Shuly and Uzzi Ornan. 1991. Syntactic analysis of Hebrew sentences. In *Proceedings of the 8th Israeli Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Computer Vision*, pages 201–230. Information Processing Association of Israel, December.
- [Wintner and Ornan1996] Wintner, Shuly and Uzzi Ornan. 1996. Syntactic analysis of hebrew sentences. *Natural Language Engineering*, 1(3):261–288.

- [Yizhar1993] Yizhar, Dana. 1993. Computational grammar for Hebrew noun phrases. Master's thesis, Computer Science Department, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel, June. (In Hebrew).
- [Zajac1992] Zajac, Rémi. 1992. Inheritance and constraint-based grammar formalisms. *Computational Linguistics*, 18(2):159–182.