# A pretty simple English CFG This is (most of) the English grammar in Eisenstein, ch. 9.

#### Santancas

The most common production rule for sentences is,

$$S \rightarrow NP VP$$
 (8.27)

which accounts for simple sentences like *Abigail ate the kimchi* — as we will see, the direct object *the kimchi* is part of the verb phrase. But there are more complex forms of sentences as well:

$S \mathop{\rightarrow} ADVP \ NP \ VP$	Unfortunately Abigail ate the kimchi.	(8.28)
$S \rightarrow S Cc S$	Abigail ate the kimchi and Max had a burger.	(8.29)
$S \! \to \! VP$	Eat the kimchi.	(8.30)

where ADVP is an adverbial phrase (e.g., unfortunately, very unfortunately) and CC is a coordinating conjunction (e.g., and, but)?

## Noun phrases

Noun phrases refer to entities, real or imaginary, physical or abstract: Asha, the steamed dumpling, parts and labor, nobody, and the rise of revolutionary syndicalism in the early twentieth century. Noun phrase productions include "bare" nouns, which may optionally follow determiners, as well as pronouns:

$$NP \rightarrow NN \mid NNS \mid NNP \mid PRP$$
 (8.31)  
 $NP \rightarrow DET \ NN \mid DET \ NNS \mid DET \ NNP$  (8.32)

The part-of-speech tags NN, NNS, and NNP refer to singular, plural, and proper nouns; PRP refers to personal pronouns, and DET refers to determiners. The grammar also contains terminal productions from each of these tags, e.g., PRP  $\rightarrow I \mid you \mid we \mid \dots$ 

Noun phrases may be modified by adjectival phrases (ADJP; e.g., the small Russian dog) and numbers (CD; e.g., the five pastries), each of which may optionally follow a determiner:

$$NP \rightarrow ADJP \ NN \ | \ ADJP \ NNs \ | \ DET \ ADJP \ NN \ | \ DET \ ADJP \ NNs$$
 (8.33) 
$$NP \rightarrow CD \ NNs \ | \ DET \ CD \ NNs \ | \ \dots$$
 (8.34)

 $^7$ Notice that the grammar does not include the recursive production  $S \to ADVP~S$ . It may be helpful to think about why this production would cause the grammar to overgenerate.

Some noun phrases include multiple nouns, such as the liberation movement and an antelope horn, necessitating additional productions:

$$NP \rightarrow NN NN \mid NN NNS \mid DET NN NN \mid \dots$$
 (8.35)

These multiple noun constructions can be combined with adjectival phrases and cardinal numbers, leading to a large number of additional productions.

Recursive noun phrase productions include coordination, prepositional phrase attachment, subordinate clauses, and verb phrase adjuncts:

$NP \rightarrow NP CC NP$	e.g., the red and the black	(8.36)
$NP \to\! NP \; PP$	e.g., the President of the Georgia Institute of Technology	(8.37)
$NP \to \! NP \; SBAR$	e.g., the bicycle that I found outside	(8.38)
$NP \rightarrow NP VP$	e.v., a hicucle made of titanium	(8.39)

These recursive productions are a major source of ambiguity, because the VP and PP nonterminals can also generate NP children. Thus, the the President of the Georgia Institute of Technology can be derived in two ways, as can a bicycle made of titanium found outside.

### Other contituents

The remaining constituents require far fewer productions. **Prepositional phrases** almost always consist of a preposition and a noun phrase,

$PP \to IN \; NP$	United States of America	(8.59)
$PP \rightarrow TO NP$	He cane his kimchi to Ahicail	(8.60)

Similarly, complement clauses consist of a complementizer (usually a preposition, possibly null) and a sentence,

$SBAR \to IN \; S$	She said that it was spicy	(8.61)
$SBAR \to S$	She said it was spicy	(8.62)

Adverbial phrases are usually bare adverbs (ADVP  $\rightarrow$  RB), with a few exceptions:

$ADVP \to RB \; RBR$	They went considerably further	(8.63)
$ADVP \to ADVP \; PP$	They went considerably further than before	(8.64)

The tag RBR is a comparative adverb.

Adjectival phrases extend beyond bare adjectives (ADJP  $\rightarrow$  JJ) in a number of ways:

$ADJP \to RB\ JJ$	very hungry	(8.65)
$ADJP \to RBRJJ$	more hungry	(8.66)
$ADJP \to JJs\ JJ$	best possible	(8.67)
$ADJP \to RBJJR$	even bigger	(8.68)
$ADJP \to JJ\;CC\;JJ$	high and mighty	(8.69)
$ADJP \to JJ\;JJ$	West German	(8.70)
$ADJP \rightarrow RB VBN$	previously reported	(8.71)

The tags JJR and JJS refer to comparative and superlative adjectives respectively.

All of these phrase types can be coordinated:

(8.72)	on time and under budget	$PP \rightarrow PP \ CC \ PP$
(8.73)	now and two years ago	$ADVP \to \!\! ADVP \; Cc \; ADVP$
(8.74)	quaint and rather deceptive	$ADJP \rightarrow ADJP CC ADJP$
(8.75)	whether they want control	$SBAR \rightarrow SBAR CC SBAR$
	or whether they want exports	

#### Verb phrases

Verb phrases describe actions, events, and states of being. The PTB tagset distinguishes several classes of verb inflections: base form (VB; she likes to snack), present-tense third-person singular (VBZ; she snacks), present tense but not third-person singular (VBP; they

snack), past tense (VBD; they snacked), present participle (VBG; they are snacking), and past participle (VBN; they had snacked).<sup>8</sup> Each of these forms can constitute a verb phrase on its own:

$$VP \rightarrow VB \mid VBZ \mid VBD \mid VBN \mid VBG \mid VBP$$
 (8.40)

More complex verb phrases can be formed by a number of recursive productions, including the use of coordination, modal verbs (MD; she should snack), and the infitival to (TO):

$VP \to M \text{d } VP$	She will snack	(8.41)
$VP \to V \text{Bd } VP$	She had snacked	(8.42)
$VP \to V \text{Bz } VP$	She has been snacking	(8.43)
$VP \to V B N \ VP$	She has been snacking	(8.44)
$VP \to To \ VP$	She wants to snack	(8.45)
$VP \to VP \; VP$	She buys and eats many snacks	(8.46)

Each of these productions uses recursion, with VP appearing on the right-hand side. This enables the creation of very complex verb phrases, such as *She will have wanted to have been snacking*.

Transitive verbs take noun phrases as direct objects, and ditransitive verbs take two direct objects:

$VP \to V\text{BZ }NP$	She teaches algebra	(8.47)
$VP \to V \text{BG } NP$	She has been teaching algebra	(8.48)
$VP \to V \text{Bd NP NP}$	She taught her brother algebra	(8.49)

These productions are *not* recursive, so a unique production is required for each verb part-of-speech. They also do not distinguish transitive from intransitive verbs, so the resulting grammar overgenerates examples like \*She sleeps sushi and \*She learns Boyang algebra. Sentences can also be direct objects:

$VP \to V\text{BZ }S$	Asha wants to eat the kimchi	(8.50)
$VP \rightarrow VBZ SBAR$	Asha knows that Boyang eats the kimchi	(8.51)

The first production overgenerates, licensing sentences like \*Asha sees Boyang eats the kimchi. This problem could be addressed by designing a more specific set of sentence nonterminals, indicating whether the main verb can be conjugated.

Verbs can also be modified by prepositional phrases and adverbial phrases:

$VP \to V\text{BZ }PP$	She studies at night	(8.52)
$VP \to V\text{BZ ADVP}$	She studies intensively	(8.53)
$VP \rightarrow ADVP VBG$	She is not studying	(8.54)

Again, because these productions are not recursive, the grammar must include productions for every verb part-of-speech.

A special set of verbs, known as **copula**, can take **predicative adjectives** as direct objects:

(8.55)	She is hungry	$VP \to V\text{BZ ADJP}$
(8.56)	Success seems increasingly unlikely	$VP \rightarrow VBP ADIP$

The PTB does not have a special non-terminal for copular verbs, so this production generates non-grammatical examples such as \*She eats tall.

Particles (PRT as a phrase; RP as a part-of-speech) work to create phrasal verbs:

$VP \to VB\ PRT$	She told them to fuck off	(8.57)
$VP \rightarrow VBD PRT NP$	They gave up their ill-gotten gains	(8.58)

As the second production shows, particle productions are required for all configurations of verb parts-of-speech and direct objects.

# <u>Using this grammar</u>, and reasonable POS tags, please:

- 1. Draw parse trees for these phrases:
  - redeve flights [this is not an S]
  - I need to fly between Philadelphia and Atlanta.
- Invent a new sentence that has a syntactic ambiguity. Draw it and two legitimate parse trees for it.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>It bears emphasis the principles governing this tagset design are entirely English-specific: VBP is a meaningful category only because English morphology distinguishes third-person singular from all personnumber combinations.