

# Meaning Representation and Inference

### Cleo Condoravdi, Dag Haug, and Stephan Oepen

Center for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters



# Meaning Representation and Inference 'Collective Brainstorming'

### Cleo Condoravdi, Dag Haug, and Stephan Oepen

Center for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters



# Meaning Representation and Inference 'Collective Brainstorming and Soul Searching'

### Cleo Condoravdi, Dag Haug, and Stephan Oepen

Center for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters

### (Part) of Our Motivation for Bringing Everyone Here

#### **Cross-Framework Assessment of Meaning Representations**

- From point of view of so-called *textual inference* ... but how to define that?
- sentence vs. speaker meaning; linguistic semantics vs. world knowledge?



MRI — 28-MAY-18 (oe@ifi.uio.no) ·

## (Part) of Our Motivation for Bringing Everyone Here

#### **Cross-Framework Assessment of Meaning Representations**

- From point of view of so-called *textual inference* ... but how to define that?
- sentence vs. speaker meaning; linguistic semantics vs. world knowledge?

### Questions to Answer before Lunch on Wednesday

- What properties should meaning representations have to support inference?
- What kinds of information should lexical resources make available?
- What kinds of inferential relations are essential for textual inference?
- How to factor in ambiguity and underspecification: scope, senses, anaphora?
- Can we have 'robust inference'? Does the notion even make sense?



### **Desirable Properties in Meaning Representations?**

#### November 2014: Contrastive Computational Semantics (CCS)

- In-depth, cross-framework comparison of individual semantic analyses;
- most broad-coverage schools represented: AKR, AMR, DRS, ERS, FGD.



MRI — 28-MAY-18 (oe@ifi.uio.no) -

### **Desirable Properties in Meaning Representations?**

### **November 2014: Contrastive Computational Semantics (CCS)**

- In-depth, cross-framework comparison of individual semantic analyses;
- most broad-coverage schools represented: AKR, AMR, DRS, ERS, FGD.

Type of Information	AKR	AMR	DRS	ERS	FGD
Predicate–Argument Structure	+	+	+	+	+
Quantification & Scope				$\pm$	
Sense Disambiguation				$\pm$	
<b>Presupposition Projection</b>				_	
Anaphoric Coreference				_	

### Form of Representation



MRI — 28-MAY-18 (oe@ifi.uio.no) -

MRS

## **Kinds of Inferential Relations at Play?**

Textual Inference Often Defined through Datasets, e.g. RTE, SICK, NLI



- MRI — 28-MAY-18 (oe@ifi.uio.no)

Meaning Representation and Inference (4)

## **Kinds of Inferential Relations at Play?**

Textual Inference Often Defined through Datasets, e.g. RTE, SICK, NLI

T Romano Prodi will meet the US President George Bush in his capacity as the president of the European Commission.

H George Bush is the president of the European Commission.

T A woman is slicing an onion.

H A vegetable is being sliced by a woman.

T A man, a woman and two girls are walking on the beach.

H Four people are walking on the beach.



MRI — 28-MAY-18 (oe@ifi.uio.no)

- Ambiguity vs. underspecification: all or nothing?
- Is the logic for meaning construction the same as the logic for meaning representation?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

(1) He went to the bank

$$\exists x.y.he(x) \land bank(y) \land go.to(x,y)$$

or



▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲臣▶ ▲臣▶ ―臣 … のへで

Which approach is right for what?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

- Uniformity across phenomena?
  - anaphora resolution
  - scope ambiguities
  - lexical ambiguities
- What kinds of arguments?
  - conceptual
  - computational
  - emprical

#### Lexical inferential potential

- Lexical implication signatures
- Implication propagation

#### Lexical inferential potential

- (1) The Chancellor regrets that the president did not forget to force the commissioner to leave Athens on May 1.
- (2) The Chancellor does not regret that the president did not forget to force the commissioner to leave Athens on May 1.
- (3) The commissioner was in Athens on May 2.