

Module 3

Semantics-Representing Meaning-canonical
forms-FOPC-ambiguity resolution-scoping phenomena

What is Semantics?

Semantics is the study of meaning. In computational linguistics, it's about how to represent and reason with the meaning of words, phrases, and sentences in a way a computer can process.

- **Syntax vs. Semantics**

- **Syntax:** The grammatical structure of a sentence. Is it well-formed?
 - **Colorless green ideas sleep furiously.** (Syntactically PERFECT, semantically NONSENSE).
- **Semantics:** The meaning of a sentence. Is it sensible? What does it entail?
 - **The car hit the tree.** (Semantically valid, describes an event).

The ultimate goal is to build a representation of meaning from the text.

The Need for a Meaning Representation

We can't just use the raw sentences. We need a formal, unambiguous structure.

Requirements for a Meaning Representation:

1. **Verifiability:** The ability to check if the representation is true or false given a Knowledge Base (KB).
2. **Unambiguous Representation:** A single, agreed-upon structure for a specific meaning.
3. **Canonical Form:** Different sentences with the same meaning should map to the same representation.
4. **Inference and Reasoning:** The ability to derive new knowledge from what's already known

Canonical Forms: One Meaning, One Form

Different sentences can have the same core meaning. A good representation captures this.

Canonical Form is the standardized representation of a specific meaning.

- **Example:**

1. "Maria serves pasta."
2. "Pasta is served by Maria."
3. "It is Maria who serves the pasta."

All three should map to the **same logical form** in our system. A plausible FOPC canonical form could be:

$\exists e, \text{Serving}(e) \wedge \text{Server}(e, \text{Maria}) \wedge \text{Served}(e, \text{Pasta})$

Representing Meaning: First-Order Predicate Calculus(FOPC)

First-Order Predicate Calculus (FOPC) is a powerful and expressive formal language for representing meaning. It gives us the tools to model objects, properties, and relations.

Key Idea: We can model the world as:

- **Objects:** Entities like people, places, things (e.g., *John*, *London*, *book*).
- **Properties:** Characteristics of objects (e.g., *red*, *tall*, *prime*).
- **Relations:** Connections between objects (e.g., *likes*, *located_in*, *older_than*).

FOPC: The Building Blocks

Constants: Specific objects in the world.

- John, Mary, Table1

Predicates: Properties of objects or relations between them.

- Tall(John) -> John has the property of being tall.
- Likes(John, Mary) -> There is a 'likes' relation between John and Mary.

Variables: Stand-ins for objects.

- x, y, z

Logical Connectives: \wedge (and), \vee (or), \neg (not), \Rightarrow (implies).

FOPC: The Building Blocks

Quantifiers:

- **\forall Universal Quantifier** ("for all"): $\forall x, \text{Human}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Mortal}(x)$
 - "All humans are mortal."
- **\exists Existential Quantifier** ("there exists"): $\exists y, \text{Cat}(y) \wedge \text{Black}(y)$
 - "There exists a cat that is black." or "Some cat is black."

Ambiguity: The Core Problem in NLP

A single surface form (sentence) can have multiple possible meanings. Resolving this is a primary goal of semantic analysis.

- **Lexical Ambiguity:** A single word has multiple meanings.
 - "The fishermen went to the **bank**." (River bank or financial institution?)
- **Syntactic (Structural) Ambiguity:** A sentence has multiple valid parse trees.
 - "I saw the man with the telescope." (Who has the telescope? Me or the man?)
- **Scope Ambiguity:** The scope of quantifiers like 'every', 'a', 'some' is unclear.

Scoping Phenomena

Quantifier Scope Ambiguity is one of the most famous and difficult semantic challenges.

- **Example Sentence:** "Every student took a test."

This sentence has two distinct logical interpretations (readings):

1. **Reading 1:** $\forall s (\text{Student}(s) \Rightarrow \exists t (\text{Test}(t) \wedge \text{Took}(s, t)))$
 - "For every student, there exists some test that they took."
 - This is the most common interpretation. Each student took a test, but they could all be *different* tests.
2. **Reading 2:** $\exists t (\text{Test}(t) \wedge \forall s (\text{Student}(s) \Rightarrow \text{Took}(s, t)))$
 - "There exists one specific test that every student took."
 - This implies all students took the *same* test.

