

Displacement Logic for Grammar

Glyn Morrill & Oriol Valentín

Department of Computer Science
Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya
morrill@cs.upc.edu & oriol.valentin@gmail.com

ESLLI 2016, Bolzano – Bozen

Lecture 5

Comparisons

The Alternatives 1: Structural postulates

This is the methodology of MMTLG (Moortgat 1997[5]; Oehrle 2011[9]): multiple residuated base logics + structural postulates of inclusion between their modes. Instances are the underlyingly non-associative logics of scope $NL_{\lambda/CL}$ (Barker and Shan 2014[1]) and Lambek-Grishin calculus (Moortgat 2009[6]).

- ▶ This is as well for as far as it goes, for many years it has been mainstream, and **D** can, as we have seen, be considered a MMTLG, but the structural postulates increase derivation lengths and widen the proof/derivation search space. However as we have also seen, in **hD** the structural postulates are fully *absorbed* in the sequent syntax so that there are only logical rules, making derivations shorter and narrowing the proof/derivation search space.
- ▶ They deal with only scope whereas **D** addresses also e.g. discontinuous functors, parentheticals, cross-serial dependencies, comparative subdeletion, gapping, ...

- ▶ It could be argued that the structural postulates of $NL_{\lambda/CL}$ and Lambek-Grishin calculus might also be absorbed, but that would be for their proponents to show.
- ▶ The calculus of **D** is conceived from an algebraic semantics akin to language models whereas $NL_{\lambda/CL}$ and Lambek-Grishin calculus have only post-hoc frame semantics. It could be argued that the structural postulates of $NL_{\lambda/CL}$ and Lambek-Grishin calculus might also have algebraic semantics, but that would be for their proponents to show.

The Alternatives 2: Lambda syntax

This is the methodology of including linear lambda abstraction for word order (Oehrle 1994[10]; ACG: de Groot 2001[2]; λ -Grammar: Muskens 2001[8]; HTLG: Kubota and Levine 2012[4]).

- ▶ In ACG and λ -Grammar, there is the KLM (Kubota, Levine, Moot) problem with non-directional linear types $B \multimap A$ that as a higher-order argument, there is no discrimination between continuous and discontinuous dependents $\multimap A$; consequently there is overgeneration of readings of right-node raising, and even of transitive verb coordination.

HTLG *fibres* (Gabbay 1999[3]) non-directional linear implication over the Lambek connectives and largely circumvents the KLM problem. However there is a remnant problem that in a higher order argument $(C \multimap B) \multimap A$ the left-to-right orders of the two discontinuous dependents B and A are not distinguished; consequently there is overgeneration of e.g. determiner gapping (Y. Kubota, p.c.):

(1) *Most_i dogs like_j Whiskas and I e_j e_i cats.

D has no such problems (Morrill and Valentín to appear[7]).



C Barker and C Shan.

Continuations and Natural Language, volume 53 of *Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*.

Oxford University Press, 2014.



Philippe de Groote.

Towards Abstract Categorical Grammars.

In *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, Toulouse, 2001.



Dov M Gabbay.

Fibring Logics.

Number 38 in Oxford Logic Guides. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1999.



Yusuke Kubota and Robert Levine.

Gapping as like-category coordination.

In Denis Bechet and Alexander Dikovsky, editors, *Logical Aspects of Computational Linguistics*, volume 7351 of

Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 135–150.
Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.



Michael Moortgat.

Categorial Type Logics.

In Johan van Benthem and Alice ter Meulen, editors,
Handbook of Logic and Language, pages 93–177. Elsevier
Science B.V. and the MIT Press, Amsterdam and
Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1997.



Michael Moortgat.

Symmetric Categorial Grammar.

Journal of Philosophical Logic, 38(6), 2009.



Glyn Morrill and Oriol Valentín.

A reply to Kubota and Levine on gapping.

Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, to appear.



Reinhard Muskens.

Lambda Grammars and the Syntax-Semantics Interface.

In R. van Rooy and M. Stokhof, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Amsterdam Colloquium*, pages 150–155, Amsterdam, 2001.



R. T. Oehrle.

Multi-Modal Type-Logical Grammar.

In R. D. Borsley and K. Börjars, editors,
Non-transformational Syntax: Formal and Explicit Models of Grammar. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, UK, 2011.
doi 10.1002/9781444395037.ch6.



Richard T. Oehrle.

Term-labeled categorial type systems.

Linguistics and Philosophy, pages 633–678, 1994.

Thank you!