A Comparison of HPSG and LFG

Frank Richter and Valia Kordoni
Universität Tübingen

Frank Richter and Valia Kordoni
Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft
Kleine Wilhelmstraße 113
D-72074 Tübingen
Email: {fr,korder}@sfs.nphil.uni-tuebingen.de
WWW: http://www.sfs.nphil.uni-tuebingen.de/~{fr,korder}/

HPSG/LFG

- HPSG and LFG are widely perceived as closely related paradigms

BUT

- both have changed much since their inception

AND

- there is significant evidence that they may now differ more than they agree

Aim

- we will discuss both paradigms from ontological presuppositions through formal mechanisms to linguistic analyses;
- we will not concentrate on comparisons of specific grammars;
- rather, we will focus on:
  - which structures of grammar the two paradigms permit or impose, and
  - which assumptions about language are inherent in each of the paradigms

HPSG (First Week)

Trends in HPSG:

1. Formalization of HPSG'94 (Pollard and Sag 1994):
   (a) RSRL (Relational Speciate Re-entrant Language; Richter 2000):
   - we will first look at:
     i. Pollard and Sag 1994;
     ii. King 1999;
     iii. Pollard 1999;

   (b) Examples of Grammars in RSRL:
   - Case Theory of Przepiórkowski 1999;
   - Representation languages for modeling the semantics of natural languages: Ty2
2. Unification Tradition Closely Related to Processing:
   - we will focus on defaults (cf., Lascarides and Copestake 1999) as representational issues of processing (for a linguistic analysis using defaults, see Ginzburg and Sag 1999)
3. Featureless HPSG:
   - Moshier 1997b, Moshier 1997a

LFG (Second Week)

- overview of the development of LFG from 1982 onwards

Trends in LFG:

1. Classical LFG:
   - Kaplan and Bresnan 1982, Kaplan and Bresnan 1995, Kaplan 1995;
   - among the advances in the theory of functional structure since the publication of the 1982 volume is the ability to characterize nonlocal relations between f-structures, allowing for a formally well-defined treatment of long-distance dependencies and constraints on anaphoric binding; cf., among others, Dalrymple 1993, Dalrymple, Maxwell, and Zaenen 1995
2. "Glue" LFG:
   - Dalrymple, Lamping, and Saraswat 1993 propose a deductive approach to assembly of meanings that relies on the projection architecture to specify the correspondence between an f-structure and its meaning;
   - the use of linear logic as a "glue" for assembling meanings gives a clean treatment of a range of phenomena including modification, complex predicate formation (Dalrymple, Lamping, and Saraswat 1993), and quantifier scoping, bound anaphora and their interactions with intensionality (Dalrymple, Lamping, Pereira, and Saraswat 1994)

References

Dalrymple, M. (1993). *The Syntax of Anaphoric Binding*. CSLI Publications.

Dalrymple, M., J. Lamping, F. C. N. Pereira, and V. Saraswat (1994). Quantifiers, Anaphora, and Intensionality. Ms. Xerox PARC and AT&T Bell Laboratories.

Dalrymple, M., J. Lamping, and V. Saraswat (1993). LFG Semantics via Constraints. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference of the European ACL*. European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics.

Dalrymple, M., J. T. Maxwell, and A. Zaenen (1995). Modeling Syntactic Constraints on Anaphoric Binding. In M. Dalrymple, R. M. Kaplan, J. T. Maxwell, and A. Zaenen (Eds.), *Formal Issues in Lexical-Functional Grammar*, pp. 167–175. CSLI Publications.

Ginzburg, J. and I. A. Sag (1999). Constructional Ambiguity in Conversation. Amsterdam Colloquium, 1999.

Kaplan, R. M. (1995). The Formal Architecture of Lexical-Functional Grammar. In M. Dalrymple, R. M. Kaplan, J. T. Maxwell, and A. Zaenen (Eds.), *Formal Issues in Lexical-Functional Grammar*, pp. 7–27. CSLI Publications.

Kaplan, R. M. and J. Bresnan (1982). Lexical Functional Grammar: a Formal System for Grammmatical Representation. In J. Bresnan (Ed.), *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, pp. 173–281. MIT Press:Cambridge, MA.

Kaplan, R. M. and J. Bresnan (1995). Lexical Functional Grammar: a Formal System for Grammmatical Representation. In M. Dalrymple, R. M. Kaplan, J. T. Maxwell, and A. Zaenen (Eds.), *Formal Issues in Lexical-Functional Grammar*, pp. 29–130. CSLI Publications.

King, P. J. (1999). Towards Truth in Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar. In V. Kordoni (Ed.), *Tübingen Studies in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340, Nr. 132, Volume 2, pp. 301–352. Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.

Lascarides, A. and A. Copestake (1999). Default Representation in Constraint-based Frameworks. *Computational Linguistics 25*(1), 55–105.

Moshier, M. A. (1997a). Featureless HPSG. In P. Blackburn and M. de Rijke (Eds.), *Specifying Syntactic Structures*, pp. 115–155. CSLI Publications.

Moshier, M. A. (1997b). Is HPSG Featureless or Unprincipled? *Linguistics and Philosophy 20*, 669–695.

Pollard, C. and I. A. Sag (1994). *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. University of Chicago Press.

Pollard, C. J. (1999). Strong Generative Capacity in HPSG. In G. Webelhuth, J.-P. Koenig, and A. Kathol (Eds.), *Lexical and Constructional Aspects of Linguistic Explanation*, pp. 281–297. CSLI Publications.

Przepiórkowski, A. (1999). *Case Assignment and the Complement-Adjunct Dichotomy: A Non-Configurational Constraint-Based Approach*. Ph. D. thesis, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.

Richter, F. (2000). A Mathematical Formalism for Linguistic Theories with an Application in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. Dissertation, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen, Version of April 28th, 2000.