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Combinatory Categorial Grammar
Combinatory Categorial Grammar (CCG)

• Categorial grammar (CG) is one of the oldest grammar formalisms

• \textit{Combinatory} Categorial Grammar now well established and computationally well founded (Steedman, 1996, 2000)

• Account of syntax; semantics; prosody and information structure; automatic parsers; generation
Combinatory Categorial Grammar (CCG)

- CCG is a lexicalized grammar
- An elementary syntactic structure – for CCG a lexical category – is assigned to each word in a sentence
  \[ \text{walked: } S\backslash NP \text{ “give me an NP to my left and I return a sentence”} \]
- A small number of rules define how categories can combine
  - Rules based on the combinators from Combinatory Logic
CCG Lexical Categories

- Atomic categories: S, N, NP, PP, … (not many more)
- Complex categories are built recursively from atomic categories and slashes, which indicate the directions of arguments
- Complex categories encode subcategorisation information
  - intransitive verb: S \NP *walked*
  - transitive verb: (S \NP )/NP *respected*
  - ditransitive verb: ((S \NP )/NP )/NP *gave*
- Complex categories can encode modification
  - PP nominal: (NP \NP )/NP
  - PP verbal: ((S \NP ))(S \NP )/NP
Simple CCG Derivation

```
interleukin - 10 inhibits production

NP  (S\NP)/NP  NP

S\NP

S
```

> forward application

< backward application
Function Application Schemata

- Forward (>) and backward (<) application:

\[ X / Y \quad Y \quad \Rightarrow \quad X \quad (>) \]
\[ Y \quad X \backslash Y \quad \Rightarrow \quad X \quad (<) \]
Classical Categorial Grammar

- ‘Classical’ Categorial Grammar only has application rules
- Classical Categorial Grammar is context free

```
S
  \--------\      \--------/    \--------
|        |      |        |      |        |
NP      (S\NP)\NP NP
  |                  |                  |
interleukin-10 inhibits production
```
Classical Categorial Grammar

- ‘Classical’ Categorial Grammar only has application rules
- Classical Categorial Grammar is context free
Extraction out of a Relative Clause

The company which Microsoft bought

NP/N N (NP\NP)/(S/NP) NP (S\NP)/NP
Extraction out of a Relative Clause

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{The } \quad \text{company} \quad \text{which} \quad \text{Microsoft} \quad \text{bought} \\
&\text{NP/N} \quad \text{N} \quad (\text{NP/\ NP})/(\text{S/NP}) \quad \text{NP} \quad (\text{S/\ NP})/\text{NP} \\
&S/(\text{S/\ NP}) \quad >^T \quad \text{type-raising}
\end{align*}
\]
Extraction out of a Relative Clause

The company which Microsoft bought

NP/N N (NP\NP)/(S/\NP) NP (S/\NP)/NP

S/(S/\NP)\rightarrow{T}

S/\NP\rightarrow{B}

> T type-raising

> B forward composition
Extraction out of a Relative Clause

The company which Microsoft bought

NP/N  N  (NP/NP)/(S/NP)  NP  (S/NP)/NP

S/(S/NP)  S/NP  NP/NP
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Extraction out of a Relative Clause

The company which Microsoft bought

\[ \frac{NP/N}{NP} \quad N \quad (NP\backslash NP)/(S/\text{NP}) \quad \frac{NP}{NP} \quad (S\backslash \text{NP})/NP \]

\[ \frac{S/(S\backslash \text{NP})}{\text{NP}\backslash \text{NP}} \quad < \]
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Forward Composition and Type-Raising

- **Forward composition ($\triangleright_B$):**

  \[
  X / Y \ Y / Z \Rightarrow X / Z \quad (\triangleright_B)
  \]

- **Type-raising ($T$):**

  \[
  X \Rightarrow T/(T\backslash X) \quad (\triangleright_T)
  \]

  \[
  X \Rightarrow T\backslash(T/X) \quad (<_T)
  \]

- **Extra combinatory rules increase the weak generative power to mild context-sensitivity**
"Non-constituents" in CCG – Right Node Raising

Google sells but Microsoft buys shares

> T type-raising
“Non-constituents” in CCG – Right Node Raising

Google sells but Microsoft buys shares

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NP} & \quad (S\backslash NP)/\text{NP} \\
\text{NP} & \quad (S\backslash NP)/\text{NP} \\
S/\text{NP} & \quad \triangleright^T \\
S/\text{NP} & \quad \triangleright^T \\
S/\text{NP} & \quad \triangleright^B \\
S/\text{NP} & \quad \triangleright^B
\end{align*}
\]

> T type-raising
> B forward composition
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"Non-constituents" in CCG – Right Node Raising

Google \(\overline{NP} (S\backslash NP)/NP\) sells \(\overline{NP} \text{ conj} S/(S\backslash NP)\) but Microsoft \(\overline{NP} (S\backslash NP)/NP\) buys \(\overline{NP} \text{ conj} S/(S\backslash NP)\) shares

\[\frac{S/(S\backslash NP)}{S/\overline{NP}} \text{ } \frac{S/(S\backslash NP)}{S/\overline{NP}} \text{ } \frac{S/(S\backslash NP)}{S/\overline{NP}} \text{ } \frac{S/(S\backslash NP)}{S/\overline{NP}} \text{ } \frac{S/(S\backslash NP)}{S/\overline{NP}} \]
“Non-constituents” in CCG – Right Node Raising

Google sells but Microsoft buys shares

NP \( (S \setminus NP) / NP \)

conj NP \( (S \setminus NP) / NP \)

NP

\[ S \rightarrow T \]

\[ S \rightarrow B \]

\[ S \rightarrow \Phi \]

\[ S \rightarrow S \]
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Combinatory Categorial Grammar

- $\text{CCG}$ is *mildly* context sensitive
- Natural language is provably non-context free
- Constructions in Dutch and Swiss German (Shieber, 1985) require more than context free power for their analysis
  - these have *crossing* dependencies (which $\text{CCG}$ can handle)

Type 0 languages

Context sensitive languages

Context free languages

Regular languages

Mildly context sensitive languages = natural languages (?)
CCG Semantics

• Categories encode argument sequences
• Parallel syntactic combinator operations and lambda calculus semantic operations

\[ John \vdash \text{NP} : \text{john}' \]
\[ \text{shares} \vdash \text{NP} : \text{shares}' \]
\[ \text{buys} \vdash (S\backslash\text{NP})/\text{NP} : \lambda x.\lambda y.\text{buys}'xy \]
\[ \text{sleeps} \vdash S\backslash\text{NP} : \lambda x.\text{sleeps}'x \]
\[ \text{well} \vdash (S\backslash\text{NP}) \backslash (S\backslash\text{NP}) : \lambda f.\lambda x.\text{well}'(fx) \]
## CCG Semantics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left arg.</th>
<th>Right arg.</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(X/Y : f)</td>
<td>(Y : a)</td>
<td>Forward application</td>
<td>(X : f(a))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y : a)</td>
<td>(X\backslash Y : f)</td>
<td>Backward application</td>
<td>(X : f(a))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X/Y : f)</td>
<td>(Y/Z : g)</td>
<td>Forward composition</td>
<td>(X/Z : \lambda x. f(g(x)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X : a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Type raising</td>
<td>(T/(T\backslash X) : \lambda f. f(a))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

etc.
Tree Adjoining Grammar
TAG Building Blocks

- Elementary trees (of many depths)
- Substitution at $\downarrow$
- Tree *Substitution* Grammar equivalent to CFG
TAG Building Blocks

- Auxiliary trees for *adjunction*
- Adds extra power beyond CFG

\[ \alpha_1 \quad NP \quad \alpha_2 \quad S \quad \alpha_3 \quad NP \quad \beta \quad VP \]

\[ \alpha_1 \quad NP \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Harry} \]

\[ \alpha_2 \quad S \quad \downarrow \quad NP \quad VP \]

\[ \alpha_3 \quad NP \quad \downarrow \quad \text{peanuts} \]

\[ \beta \quad VP \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Adv} \quad \text{passionately} \]
Semantics

\[ Harry(x) \land \text{likes}(e, x, y) \land \text{peanuts}(y) \land \text{passionately}(e) \]