#### The XDG Grammar Development Kit

Ralph Debusmann<sup>1</sup>

Denys Duchier<sup>2</sup> Joachim Niehren<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Programming Systems Lab, Saarbrücken, Germany
<sup>2</sup> LORIA, Nancy, France
<sup>3</sup> INRIA Futurs, Lille, France

#### 1. Introduction

- 2. Extensible Dependency Grammar (XDG)
- 3. Lexicon specification language
- 4. XDG Development Kit (XDK)
- 5. Mozart implementation
- 6. Conclusions

### Declarative grammar formalisms

- long tradition for modeling natural language (Kay 1979), (Bresnan/Kaplan 1982)
- idea: specify linguistic knowledge in grammars independent from processing
- parsers/generators: can be generically created for all grammars in the formalism
- examples:
  - Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) (Bresnan/Kaplan 1982)
  - Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) (Pollard/Sag 1994)
  - Tree Adjoining Grammar (TAG) (Joshi et al. 1975), (Joshi 1985)

#### Grammar development systems

- tools for grammar creation
- concrete syntax for grammar specification
- parsers
- generators
- debugging facilities
- examples:
  - Grammar Writer's Workbench (Kaplan/Maxwell 1996) for LFG
  - LKB (Copestake 2002) for HSPG
  - XTAG (XTAG Group 2001) for TAG

### Constraint programming

- existing grammar formalisms rely on first-order unification of feature structures
- Smolka (Smolka/Uszkoreit 1996): Could more advanced constraint programming techniques improve linguistic processing?
- motivation: languages with freer word order than English (e.g. German, Czech, Hindi etc.) pose problems for existing formalisms

## Axiomatization of dependency trees

- (Duchier 1999): axiomatization of valid dependency trees using finite set constraints
- parsing: reduced to finite set constraint programming
- (Duchier/Debusmann 2001): Topological Dependency Grammar (TDG)
- elegant treatment of German word order

### Extensible Dependency Grammar (XDG)

- (Debusmann et al. 2004): generalization of TDG
- graph description language flexible for modeling multiple levels of linguistic structure
- same parsing methods by constraint programming (Duchier 2003)
- allows to extend TDG with a concurrent syntax-semantics interface

# XDG Grammar Development Kit (XDK)

- first grammar development system for XDG
- new lexicon specification language
- implemented in Mozart/Oz, published in MOGUL (Duchier 2004)
- comprehensive suite of facilities:
  - concrete syntaxes (XML, UL, IL)
  - solver for parsing and generation
  - GUI
  - graphical output tools
  - debugging facilities

## Overview

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Extensible Dependency Grammar (XDG)
- 3. Lexicon specification language
- 4. XDG Development Kit (XDK)
- 5. Mozart implementation
- 6. Conclusions

# Graphs

- XDG describes labeled graphs
- uses the linguistic notion of dependency grammar
- example dependency graph:



## Multiple graphs

- XDG typically describes an arbitrary number of graphs called dimensions
- same set of nodes, different edges
- elegant treatment of word order (Duchier/Debusmann 2001)
- concurrent syntax-semantics interface (Debusmann et al. 2004)

#### Example

• Syntax tree:



• Semantic dag:



## Graph description language

- well-formedness conditions: interaction of principles and the lexicon
- principles: restrictions on one or more dimensions
- controlled by feature structures, assigned to the nodes by the lexicon
- principles: subset of an extensible principle library
- library covers large fragments of German and English, smaller fragments of Arabic, Czech and Dutch

### Example principles

- tree: Dimension i must be a tree
- dag: Dimension *i* must be a dag
- valency: For each node on dimension *i*, the incoming edges must be licensed by the in specification, and the outgoing edges by the out specification
- order: Constrains the order of words on dimension *i*, e.g. subjects precede objects
- linking: Constrains how arguments on dimension i (semantics) must be realized on dimension j (syntax)

### Lexical entry

• lexical entry for *like*:

$$Like = \begin{bmatrix} syn : & in : \{vcomp?\} \\ out : \{obj!\} \end{bmatrix} \\ in : \{prop?\} \\ out : \{ag!, pat!\} \\ link : \{ag \mapsto \{subj\} \\ & pat \mapsto \{obj\} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Extensible Dependency Grammar (XDG)
- 3. Lexicon specification language
- 4. XDG Development Kit (XDK)
- 5. Mozart implementation
- 6. Conclusions

### Lexicalization

- XDG: linguistic information mostly specified in the lexicon
- widely accepted in computational linguistics
- lexicon grows huge even for medium-sized grammars
- need facilities for adequate modularization and factorization

# Lexical types

- flexible system to define various types of lexical information
- each type: set L and partial function  $\Box : L \times L \rightarrow L$ (combination function of L)
- □: typically greatest lower bound
- domains, records, valencies, sets, tuples, strings

#### **Domain types**

• e.g. set of edge labels:

*syn.label* = {det, subj, obj, vcomp}

• combination function:  $a \sqcap a = a$ ,  $a \sqcap b$  undefined for  $a \neq b$ 

#### **Record types**

• given set of features  $(f_i)_{i=1...n}$  and types  $T_i = (L_i, \Box_i)$ :

$$[f_1:v_1,\ldots,f_n:v_n]$$

where  $v_i \in L_i$ .

combination operation defined feature-wise:

$$[f_1:v_1,\ldots,f_n:v_n] \sqcap [f_1:v'_1,\ldots,f_n:v'_n] = [f_1:v_1\sqcap_1 v'_1,\ldots,f_n:v_n\sqcap_n v'_n]$$

when  $v_i \sqcap_i v'_i$  defined, undefined otherwise.

#### Valency types

• e.g. in and out specifications:

*syn.valency* = valency(*syn.label*)

• defines *syn.valency* to be the record type:

[det : mode, subj : mode, obj : mode, vcomp : mode]

- $mode = \{0, ?, !, *\}$
- notation:

[det: 0, subj:!, obj:?, vcomp: 0] = [subj!, obj?]

commutative combination operation:

 $0 \sqcap x = x \quad * \sqcap! = ! \quad * \sqcap? = ? \quad ? \sqcap! = !$ 

### Meta Grammars

- used for lexicon specification
- CFG-like descriptive device:

Clause ::= Name  $\rightarrow$  Goal Goal ::= Goal  $\land$  Goal  $\mid$  Goal  $\lor$  Goal  $\mid$  Name  $\mid c$ 

- *Clause* defines a non-terminal *Name*
- *Goal*: non-terminal (lexical class)
- $c \in L$ : terminal (feature structure)

# Example (1)

• finite verbs can be roots or the root of a relative clause:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \text{finite} & \to & \text{root} \lor \text{rel} \\ \text{root} & \to & \left[ \begin{array}{c} syn & : & \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{in} & : & \left\{ \right\} \end{array} \right] \right] \\ \text{rel} & \to & \left[ \begin{array}{c} syn & : & \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{in} & : & \left\{ \right\} \end{array} \right] \right] \end{array} \end{array}$$

# Example (2)

finite verbs may be either intransitive, transitive or ditransitive:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \operatorname{verb} & \to & \operatorname{intr} \lor \operatorname{tr} \lor \operatorname{ditr} \\ \operatorname{intr} & \to & \left[ \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{syn} & : & \left[ \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{out} & : & \left\{ \operatorname{subj!} \right\} \end{array} \right] \\ \operatorname{tr} & \to & \operatorname{intr} \land \left[ \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{syn} & : & \left[ \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{out} & : & \left\{ \operatorname{obj!} \right\} \end{array} \right] \\ \operatorname{ditr} & \to & \operatorname{tr} \land \left[ \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{syn} & : & \left[ \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{out} & : & \left\{ \operatorname{obj!} \right\} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array}$$

### Example (3)

• finite verb:

```
\textit{finite.verb} \quad \rightarrow \quad \textit{finite} \land \textit{verb}
```

• generative process with start symbol finite.verb:

 $\begin{array}{ll} (\mathsf{root}\wedge\mathsf{intr}) & (\mathsf{root}\wedge\mathsf{tr}) & (\mathsf{root}\wedge\mathsf{ditr}) \\ (\mathsf{rel}\wedge\mathsf{intr}) & (\mathsf{rel}\wedge\mathsf{tr}) & (\mathsf{rel}\wedge\mathsf{ditr}) \end{array}$ 

• e.g.:

$$\mathsf{rel} \land \mathsf{ditr} \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{syn} & : & \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{in} & : & \{\mathsf{relcl?}\} \\ \mathsf{out} & : & \{\mathsf{subj!}, \mathsf{obj!}, \mathsf{iobj!}\} \end{array} \right] \right]$$

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Extensible Dependency Grammar (XDG)
- 3. Lexicon specification language
- 4. XDG Development Kit (XDK)
- 5. Mozart implementation
- 6. Conclusions

#### Concrete syntax

- three concrete syntaxes for different purposes:
  - XML language: automated grammar development
  - User Language (UL): handcrafted grammars
  - Intermediate Language (IL): record-based language, tailored for Mozart/Oz and further processing within the XDK
- UL, XML, IL: conversion into each other

### Grammar file compiler

- fast static grammar checker
- fast grammar file compilation
- implemented for IL: i.e. also used for XML language, UL
- compiled grammars stored as pickles (portable) or using Denys Duchier's GNU GDBM interface (faster)

### **Graphical interfaces**

- comprehensive GUI
- solver search tree visualization: Oz Explorer (Schulte 1997), IOzSeF (Tack 2003)
- visualization of partial/full analyses: output library:
  - Tcl/Tk dag display
  - LaTeX dag output (using Denys Duchier's dtree.sty)
  - internal solver language output using the Oz Inspector (Brunklaus 2000)
- XML output for evaluation, further processing

	XDG: Main window	×
<u>P</u> roject Grammar Examples	<u>Search Dimensions Principles Outputs Extras</u> r: MOZ04.ul s: MOZ04.txt	
Inspect	t lexical entries	
every pro	ogrammer should like Mozart	
Parse	every programmer should like Mozar	

# Oz Explorer







#### Solver

- based on axiomatization of dependency parsing in (Duchier 99), (Duchier 2003)
- factorized into modular, extensible principle library
- principles: sets of constraint functors
- e.g. valency principle: in constraint and out constraint
- starting sequence regulated by global constraint priorities to increase efficiency

- idea: guide the search for solutions by external knowledge sources: oracles
- idea by Thorsten Brants and Denys Duchier, extended in (Dienes et al. 2003)
- oracles interact with solver using sockets
- XDK: supports new standard oracle architecture created by Marco Kuhlmann

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Extensible Dependency Grammar (XDG)
- 3. Lexicon specification language
- 4. XDG Development Kit (XDK)
- 5. Mozart implementation
- 6. Conclusions

### Finite set constraints

- model the graph configuration problem
- e.g. daughters of node w reached by traversing an edge labeled obj represented by set variable obj(w)
- valency specification obj? corresponds to cardinality constraint  $|obj(w)| \in \{0,1\}$

### Selection constraints

- efficient handling of ambiguity
- typically: word w has multiple lexical entries  $L_1, \ldots, L_n$
- variable  $E_w$ : ultimately selected entry
- integer variable  $I_w$ : index of  $E_w$  in the sequence
- selection constraint:

$$E_w = \langle L_1, \ldots, L_n \rangle [I_w]$$

- declarative semantics:  $E_w = L_{I_w}$
- can be trivially lifted to record types

### Deep guards in disjunctive propagators

- *G*<sub>1</sub>[]*G*<sub>2</sub> enforces complex mutually exclusive well-formedness conditions
- e.g. either a certain edge exists and satisfies additional conditions (G<sub>1</sub>) or not (G<sub>2</sub>)
- disjunctive propagator for each possible edge

### Miscellaneous specialities

- ozmake for convenient compilation and deployment into MOGUL
- principle and output libraries: dynamically linked functors
- two parsers for grammar compilation:
  - flexible LR/LALR parser by Denys Duchier (Gump replacement, fully written in Mozart/Oz)
  - XML parser by Denys Duchier (Mozart Standard Library)
- GUI: Mozart Tcl/Tk interface
- Oz Explorer, IOzSeF, Oz Inspector

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Extensible Dependency Grammar (XDG)
- 3. Lexicon specification language
- 4. XDG Development Kit (XDK)
- 5. Mozart implementation
- 6. Conclusions

### Conclusions

- introduced XDG Development Kit (XDK)
- new lexicon specification language
- large number of development tools implemented in Mozart/Oz
- extensive texinfo documentation (180+ pages)
- no other programming language provides the required expressiveness to combine:
  - set constraints
  - selection constraints
  - deep guards

#### Future work

- solver: fairly efficient for handcrafted grammars, but not for automatically generated ones
- why? grammar encoding or solver or both?
- theoretical investigation of fragments of XDG
- integration of the new faster GECODE constraint library (Christian Schulte, Gabor Szokoli, Guido Tack)
- super-tagging (lexicon disambiguation before parsing/generation)