

Superframes v0 Manual

Kilian Evang

Last updated: March 11, 2024

Contents

Contents	1
1 Introduction	3
1.1 Role Type I: Modifier Roles	5
1.2 Role Type II: Core Argument Roles	5
1.3 Role Type IIa: Initial and Intermediate Range Roles	5
1.4 Role Type III: Non-core Argument Roles	6
1.5 General Guidelines for Framing	6
1.6 Handling Control Constructions	8
1.7 Dual Framing	9
2 Superframe Relations	10
2.1 Accompaniment (acc)	10
2.2 Asset (ast)	11
2.3 Causer (cau)	12
2.4 Comparison (cmp)	13
2.5 Location (loc)	15
2.5.1 Wrapping and Wearing	15
2.5.2 Ingestion and Excretion	15
2.5.3 Embellishment and Tarnishment	16
2.5.4 Hitting	16
2.6 Manner (mnr)	17
2.7 Means (mns)	18
2.8 Message (msg)	19
2.8.1 Expression	19
2.8.2 Gesture	19
2.8.3 Performance	19
2.8.4 Depiction	20
2.8.5 Recording	20
2.8.6 Perception	20
2.9 Participation (pcp)	22
2.9.1 States and Properties	22
2.9.2 Kinds	22
2.9.3 Activities	22
2.9.4 Experiences	22

2.9.5	Transformation and Creation	23
2.9.6	Reproduction	23
2.9.7	Destruction	23
2.9.8	Phase	24
2.9.9	Causation	24
2.9.10	Prevention	24
2.9.11	Predicate Modifiers	25
2.9.12	Assignment	25
2.10	Precedence (prc)	26
2.11	Possession (pss)	27
2.12	Part-whole (pwh)	28
2.13	Quantity (qnt)	29
2.14	Recipient (rcp)	30
2.14.1	Beneficiaries and Maleficiaries	31
2.14.2	Mental State	31
2.15	Sender (snd)	32
2.16	Social (soc)	33
2.17	Temporal (tmp)	35
2.18	Explanation (xpl)	36
3	Constructional Relations	37
3.1	Attribute (att)	37
3.2	Complex Predicate (cpd)	38
3.2.1	Light Verbs	38
3.2.2	Verbal Idioms	38
3.2.3	Weather pronouns	38
3.2.4	Expletive <i>there</i>	38
3.2.5	Inherently Reflexive Verbs	38
3.3	Discourse Marker (dim)	39
3.4	Depictive (dpc)	40
3.5	Expletive (exp)	41
3.6	Resultative (rsd, rsr)	42
	Bibliography	43

1 Introduction

Superframes is an annotation scheme for semantic roles. It has the following goals:

1. **Lexicon-free annotation:** With fine-grained schemes like FrameNet (Baker et al., 1998) or PropBank (Palmer et al., 2005), annotators have to constantly look up which frames exist and which roles are defined for them. Lexicons are also perennially incomplete, and the process of extending them is complicated. Superframes defines only a small number of coarse-grained frames with the aim of making annotation quick and easy across all languages and domains, and to minimize role divergence even in the absence of a lexicon.
2. **Obvious role choices through framing:** In semantic role inventories in the VerbNet tradition (Kipper Schuler, 2005), roles are semantically defined only vaguely and ambiguously. For example, the subject of the English verb *watch* can be described as an Agent as well as an Experiencer. Prior approaches to resolving this ambiguity involve the creation of a lexicon (see above) or giving up on the idea of categorial role labels altogether (White et al., 2016). The Superframes approach is to proceed in two steps: first pick the most fitting superframe for each predicate, then the core roles are clearly defined. Additional argument roles are handled via mixin roles (see below).
3. **Comprehensive annotation with a unified vocabulary:** Superframes is a comprehensive and unified inventory of coarse semantic roles applicable to all types of morphosyntactic dependencies between content words, including modifier relations, compound relations, state argument relations, process argument relations, event argument relations, discourse relations, etc. It is designed to be annotated on top of existing morphosyntactic dependency graphs (e.g., Universal Dependencies; de Marneffe et al., 2021). This has the advantage that the markables are pre-identified and that an explicit annotation of the morphosyntax-semantics interface results.
4. **Ambiguity tolerance:** not all ambiguities in choosing a superframe can be resolved. Superframes embraces data perspectivism (Basile, 2020) and encourages annotators to annotate multiple possibilities, in particular in the case of metaphorical language.
5. **Fine-grained comparisons:** By virtue of being annotated atop syntactic dependencies, Superframes target the syntax-semantics interface and enable cross-linguistic studies that go beyond comparisons of meaning representations like AMR (Banarescu et al., 2013).


The Superframes annotation scheme is based on the binary relations shown in Table 1. Borrowing terminology from AMR, we call the first relate the “domain” and the second relate the “range”. This inventory is then used to annotate bilexical dependencies with roles. We distinguish a number of types of roles, as explained in the following.

relation	description	domain	range	sec.
<i>superframe relations</i>				
acc	accompaniment	accompanied	accompanier	2.1
ast	asset	scene	asset	2.2
cau	causer	scene	cause(r)	2.3
cmp	comparison	compared	reference	2.4
loc	location	located	location	2.5
mnr	manner	scene	manner	2.6
mns	means	scene	means	2.7
msg	message	topic	comment	2.8
pcp	participation	participant	scene	2.9
prc	precedence	successor	predecessor	2.10
pss	possession/control	possessee	possessor	2.11
pwh	part-whole	part	whole	2.12
qnt	quantity	of what	how much	2.13
rcp	recipient	scene	recipient	2.14
snd	sender	scene	sender	2.15
soc	social	somebody	relative/org/task...	2.16
tmp	temporal	scene	time/frequency/...	2.17
xpl	explanation	scene	explanation	2.18
<i>constructional relations</i>				
att	attribute	predicate	attribute	3.1
cpd	complex predicate	predicate	same predicate	3.2
dim	discourse marker	token	discourse marker	3.3
dpc	depictive	predicate	secondary predicate	3.4
exp	expletive	predicate	expletive	3.5
rsd	resultative	predicate	affected entity	3.6
rsr	resultative	predicate	result	3.6

Table 1: The inventory of superframes, with links to the manual sections in which they are described.


1.1 Role Type I: Modifier Roles

Modifier dependencies are annotated with a plain binary relation or its inverse (denoted by -of, as in AMR). This applies equally to verb, noun, and other modifiers.



1.2 Role Type II: Core Argument Roles


Predicates such as verbs (but also adjectives, state/process/event nouns, relational nouns, etc.) evoke their own superframe. The core arguments are those that correspond to the domain and the range, respectively. We denote them by the suffixes d and r, respectively.



The first example illustrates that Superframes abstract away from aktionsart: it does not matter for the choice of superframe or roles whether a state (Kim is in Boston), an event bringing that state about (Kim went to Boston), or a process (Kim is walking) is described. Borrowing terminology from UCCA (Abend and Rappoport, 2013), we collectively call states, processes, and events “scenes”.


1.3 Role Type IIa: Initial and Intermediate Range Roles

However, some predicates denote the dissolution of a relation between a domain and an initial range, and the establishment of the domain and a new range. To distinguish the initial from the final range, we use the prefix ir instead of r for it. Likewise, we use mr for intermediate ranges.




1.4 Role Type III: Non-core Argument Roles


Some predicates have more than just the domain and range arguments. For such arguments, annotators should choose the binary relation that describes the relation between the scene and the argument best, and prefix it with *x* to distinguish it from a modifier. Particularly frequent non-core roles are *xcau*, *xsnd*, and *xrcp*.




1.5 General Guidelines for Framing

Part of the annotation task is to choose a superframe for each instance of a predicate. In choosing a superframe, keep in mind *implicit arguments*, i.e., arguments that are part of the syntactic frame of the predicate but not realized in the present instance. For example, the superframe chosen in (5-a), (6-a), and (7-a) may not be obvious unless you consider the implicit arguments, which are explicit in (5-b), (6-b), and (7-b).







Likewise, *shadow* and *default* arguments should be considered when choosing a superframe.




A participant whose syntactic argument position is occupied should not be treated like an implicit argument. For example, consider (9-a). Here, *The knife* occupies the subject position and should be treated as the causer of the cutting. We could add the person handling the knife as the causer, and treat the knife as an instrument. However, for this we would not merely have to realize another argument, but change the syntactic argument structure so that the subject position goes to that causer, as in (9-b). Thus, we treat this as a different framing with a different causer, rather than a more explicit version of the same framing. Likewise, (10-a) and (10-b) are two different framings, one with *price* as the pcpr, and one with *butter*.




When in doubt, try to treat different syntactic frames of the same predicate consistently. For example, in (11-a) *chase* could be framed as caused motion (with Kim as an xcau) or as accompanied motion (with Kim as an xacc). Because the latter works for other syntactic frames of *chase* as well, as in (11-b), prefer it.







Prefer core roles over non-core roles. For example, if the subject is both the causer and the final possessor in a scene, choose pssr over xcau.



1.6 Handling Control Constructions

In control construction, a predicate has an argument or modifier that is not its child (but rather a sibling or something else) in the syntactic dependency tree. This necessitates an additional arc on which to do the role labeling.







TODO: additional relations for acc, att?

1.7 Dual Framing

If you are not sure which framing fits better, annotate both.




Likewise, if both a literal and a metaphorical meaning are accessible to you, annotate both.




2 Superframe Relations

2.1 Accompaniment (acc)


The accd and the accr appear together, more or less symmetrically.



Can also be used for scenes unfolding in close connection.



Often, the accompanier denotes not a scene but an entity participating in it, and must be metonymically understood as the scene.











2.2 Asset (ast)

Entity given or offered in an exchange or wager.


- (19) a. Kim bought the house for a million dollars
-
- b. Kim offered Sandy a million dollars for the house
-
- c. I bet you 30 bucks to an apple he will win
-

2.3 Causer (cau)

Entity causing a scene.


- (20)
- a. Kim broke the glass

 - b. The knife cut the bread

 - c. Kim cut the bread with a knife

 - d. The war caused a famine

 - e. There was a famine because of the war

 - f. Der Wasserdruck stieg , wodurch der Brunnen überfloss

 - g. Die Qualität ist der Motivation geschuldet

 - h. Kim went to town because they wanted to buy food


Note how the last example expresses a purpose, but construes it as a cause, so cau is the right relation to use. Compare this to construal as a purpose:


- (21)
- a. Kim went to town to buy food


2.4 Comparison (cmp)


cmpd is compared with or in some other way described in reference to cmpr.
Used to contrast scenes:




In concessive contexts, the range is what happens admittedly, and the domain is what happens nevertheless:




cmp is also used to compare non-scene entities:











The comparative of adjectives is treated as a valency-changing operation that gives the adjective an additional **xcmp** argument:








2.5 Location (loc)

Describes the location (or change of location, i.e., motion) of the locd.


- (26)
- a. The hat in the box

 - b. Kim lives in Boston

 - c. Kim went from the living room through the door into the kitchen

 - d. Kim placed the hat on the table

 - e. Kim is running

 - f. Kim is dancing around the room with Sandy


2.5.1 Wrapping and Wearing

The item wrapping or being worn by something is construed as the locd.

- (27)
- a. Kim is wearing a shirt

 - b. Kim is wearing glasses

 - c. The shroud wraps the scepter

 - d. Kim put on a sweater

 - e. Kim took off their glasses


2.5.2 Ingestion and Excretion

- (28)
- a. Kim ate an apple


- b. Kim nibbled on the pretzel
- c. Kim threw up the apple
- d. Kim sneezed

2.5.3 Embellishment and Tarnishment


- (29) a. Kim decorated the balcony with fairy lights
- b. Kim splashed Sandy with water
- c. Kim washed the dirt off Sandy
- d. Kim washed Sandy

2.5.4 Hitting

- (30) a. Kim hit Sandy
- b. Kim hit Sandy with a stick
- c. The stick hit Sandy
- d. Kim hit Sandy on the head with a pool noodle
- e. Kim kicked Sandy





2.6 Manner (mnr)

Manner in which a scene unfolds.



2.7 Means (mns)










Intermediary between the causer and a scene; instrument or second scene through which the causer causes the first scene.

- (32)
- a. Kim cut the cake with a knife

 - b. Kim painted the room by exploding a paint bomb

 - c. Kim used a pen to get the lid off

 - d. You used me !




2.8 Message (msg)

A message is expressed or received, where msgd is what the message is about, and msgr is the message itself, or its contents. Often used together with xsnd (sender) and xrcp (recipient).

2.8.1 Expression


- (33)
- a. Kim yelled

 - b. Kim said : it 's fine

 - c. Kim said it was fine

 - d. Kim called Sandy a liar

 - e. Kim told Sandy a secret

 - f. Kim talked about Sandy

 - g. Kim talked shit about Sandy

 - h. Kim and Sandy conversed

 - i. Kim conversed with Sandy


2.8.2 Gesture


- (34)
- a. Kim curtsayed to the Queen

 - b. Kim shook their head no


2.8.3 Performance


Performing a work of art is framed as expression where the work of art is the msgd.




2.8.4 Depiction



When the object is the resulting work of art, frame it as creation (pcp) instead:

















2.8.5 Recording



2.8.6 Perception

Perception, including mental and volitional perception.



- c. 
- d. 
- e. 
- f. 
- g. 
- h. 
- i. 
- j. 
- k. 
- l. 
- m. 
- n. 
- o. 

2.9 Participation (pcp)

pcpd is the single core participant of a scene specified by the predicate, or a participant in a scene specified by the pcpr.

2.9.1 States and Properties

- (40) a. Kim is tall
 b. The painting improved
 c. Kim improved the painting
-

2.9.2 Kinds

- (41) a. Kim is a painter
 b. Thag dog is a labrador
-

2.9.3 Activities


“Activities” are events with a single core participant that can be characterized as actively participating in the event.

- (42) a. Kim partied
 b. Kim partied with Sandy
 c. Kim had sex with Sandy
-

2.9.4 Experiences

“Experiences” are events with a single core participant that can be characterized as undergoing the event.


- (43) a. Kim attacked Sandy
 b. They played you like a fool
-




In the last example, understand *Sandy* to metonymically stand for a scene, e.g. one of Sandy helping Kim.

2.9.5 Transformation and Creation


pcpd denotes the entity undergoing the transformation, and pcpr denotes its new state. Creation is framed as transformation of some material (pcpd, often unrealized) into the newly created entity (pcpr).



2.9.6 Reproduction











2.9.7 Destruction






2.9.8 Phase

The scene starting, continuing, ending, etc., is always the range. Only use pcpd if the predicate has a separate argument for a participant in the scene.




- (47)
- a. The wound began to heal

 - b. A commotion started

 - c. Kim started a commotion

 - d. The concert ended

 - e. The concert continued

 - f. Kim interrupted the session

 - g. The storm ebbed

 - h. Kim calmed the commotion


2.9.9 Causation

- (48)
- a. Kim let Sandy join

 - b. Kim made Sandy join

 - c. Kim allowed Sandy to join


2.9.10 Prevention



- (49)
- a. Kim kept Sandy from joining


- b. 
- c. 
- d. 

In the last example, understand *dragon* metonymically as a scene in which the dragon causes harm to Sandy.





2.9.11 Predicate Modifiers

Modifiers that are themselves predicates which assign the modified entity a role, such as adjectives or relative clauses, use the *pcp* relation.

- (50) a. 
- b. 









2.9.12 Assignment

The participation relation is also used for the assignment of names, identifiers, tasks, or abstract assignment of other entities to entities.

- (51) a. 
- b. 
- c. 
- d. 












2.10 Precedence (prc)

The prcd follows the prcr, e.g., temporally, logically, by rank, as a heir, etc. Also used for ordinal numbers.

- (52)
- a. 
 - b. 
 - c. 
 - d. 
 - e. 
 - f. 
 - g. 
 - h. 






2.11 Possession (pss)

The pssr possesses or controls the pssd.

- (53)
- a. Kim 's house
 
 - b. Kim owns a house
 
 - c. The house belongs to Kim
 
 - d. the owner of the house
 
 - e. Kim has Sandy 's phone
 
 - f. Kim bought a house from Sandy
 
 - g. Sandy sold Kim the house
 
 - h. Kim kept the house
 
 - i. Kim lost the house
 
 - j. Caesar conquered Gaul
 
 - k. Caesar 's conquest of Gaul
 






2.12 Part-whole (pwh)

The pwhd is part of the pwhr.

- (54)
- a. Kim 's leg

 - b. a man with a mustache

 - c. the beginning of the party

 - d. Wheat contains gluten

 - e. Kim began the party with a speech














2.13 Quantity (qnt)

qntr is the quantity, degree, or extent of qntd.

- (55)
- a. 
 - b. 
 - c. 
 - d. 
 - e. 

2.14 Recipient (rcp)

Entity that perceives or experiences a scene, or that a message is addressed to.

- (56)
- a. Sandy heard about the virus

 - b. Kim deduced the truth from the clues

 - c. Kim told Sandy about the virus

 - d. Kim saw a flower

 - e. Kim saw Sandy swim

 - f. Kim found the flower beautiful

 - g. The virus seems dangerous to Kim

 - h. Kim sent Sandy a letter , but it never arrived

 - i. Kim managed with dealing the cards

 - j. Die Piroggen waren Maria zu dunkel geraten

 - k. Emily delivered Carlos 's message to Nianwen to Kilian

 - l. Carlos 's message to Nianwen


2.14.1 Beneficiaries and Maleficiaries






- (57) a. Kim danced for Sandy
- b. Kim did it for Sandy
-
- ```
graph TD
 subgraph (57a)
 locd[locd] --> Sandy_a[Sandy]
 rcp_a[rcp] --> Kim_a[Kim]
 end
 subgraph (57b)
 pcpd[pcpd] --> Sandy_b[Sandy]
 pcpr[pcpr] --> Kim_b[Kim]
 rcp_b[rcp] --> Sandy_b
 end
```

### 2.14.2 Mental State

- (58) a. Kim is tired
- b. Kim is crazy
- 
- ```
graph TD
    subgraph (58a)
        rcpr_a[rcpr] --> Kim_a[Kim]
    end
    subgraph (58b)
        rcpr_b[rcpr] --> Kim_b[Kim]
    end
```
















2.15 Sender (snd)

Entity that sends a signal that can be perceived by a recipient.

- (59)
- a. Kim told Sandy about the virus
 
 - b. Kim called Sandy a liar
 
 - c. Kim hummed a little melody , but nobody heard it
 
 - d. Kim exploded at Sandy
 
 - e. Kim bowed to Sandy
 

2.16 Social (soc)





The socd is an individual that is in some socially constructed relationship with the socr. The socr might e.g. be a relative, a friend, an organization, a responsibility, or a judicial sentence.

- (60)
- a. Kim 's friend
 
 - b. Kim is my cousin
 
 - c. Kim and Sandy are friends
 
 - d. Kim is friends with Sandy
 
 - e. Kim works at Google
 
 - f. Kim works for Sandy
 
 - g. Kim emcees
 
 - h. Kim is hosting the party
 
 - i. Kim is under house arrest
 
 - j. Kim 's sentence was suspended
 
 - k. Kim married Sandy
 
 - l. The official married Kim to Sandy
 
 - m. The official married Kim and Sandy
 
 - n. Kim divorced Sandy
 
 - o. Kim befriended Sandy
 

- p. Kim took the job
- q. Kim joined Google
- r. Kim joined a union
- s. Sandy fired Kim from their job
- t. Kim left Google
- u. Kim assumed office
- v. The judge sentenced Kim to three days in prison
- w. Kim was pardoned


2.17 Temporal (tmp)

When, how often, or for how long an event takes place.

- (61)
- a. Kim swims on Monday

 - b. Kim sneezed twice

 - c. Kim swam for an hour

 - d. Kim says hello whenever I meet them


2.18 Explanation (xpl)

Explanation that is not a cause, such as a purpose.




3 Constructional Relations

Constructional relations do not correspond to superframes, but mark various types of mismatches between syntactic and semantic predicate-argument structure.

3.1 Attribute (att)



Used for arguments and adjuncts that denote that part or attribute of another participant which is most directly involved in the scene.




3.2 Complex Predicate (cpd)

If a predicate together with one or more of its syntactic arguments forms a complex predicate, those syntactic dependencies are labeled *cpd*.


3.2.1 Light Verbs

- (64) a. Kim gave a lecture
- 
- b. Kim had sex with Sandy
- 


Causative light verbs, on the other hand, are handled with the *pcp* relation:

- (65) a. Kim gave Sandy a headache
- 

3.2.2 Verbal Idioms

- (66) a. Kim went bananas
- 


3.2.3 Weather pronouns

- (67) a. It is raining
- 

3.2.4 Expletive *there*


- (68) a. There was a famine
- 

3.2.5 Inherently Reflexive Verbs

- (69) a. I address myself to you
- 


3.3 Discourse Marker (**dim**)

Used for adverbials etc. that mark a clause for its relation to preceding/following discourse, speaker attitude, etc.




3.4 Depictive (dpc)

Used for secondary predicates that describe the state of one of the participants during the scene.




3.5 Expletive (exp)

Used for expletive pronouns and pronominal adverbs that fill in for a dislocated clause. Not used for weather pronouns and expletive *there*, which are instead treated as parts of complex predicates (Section 3.2).



3.6 Resultative (rsd, rsr)

Secondary predicates that denote the end state of a participant are marked rsr. If that participant is not assigned a role by the primary predicate, use rsd instead.



Bibliography

- Abend, O. and Rappoport, A. (2013). Universal Conceptual Cognitive Annotation (UCCA). In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 228–238, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Baker, C. F., Fillmore, C. J., and Lowe, J. B. (1998). The Berkeley FrameNet project. In *36th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and 17th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Volume 1*, pages 86–90, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Banarescu, L., Bonial, C., Cai, S., Georgescu, M., Griffitt, K., Hermjakob, U., Knight, K., Koehn, P., Palmer, M., and Schneider, N. (2013). Abstract Meaning Representation for sembanking. In *Proceedings of the 7th Linguistic Annotation Workshop and Interoperability with Discourse*, pages 178–186, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Basile, V. (2020). It’s the end of the gold standard as we know it. In *International Conference of the Italian Association for Artificial Intelligence*. Springer.
- de Marneffe, M.-C., Manning, C. D., Nivre, J., and Zeman, D. (2021). Universal Dependencies. *Computational Linguistics*, 47(2):255–308.
- Kipper Schuler, K. (2005). *VerbNet: A broad-coverage, comprehensive verb lexicon*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- Palmer, M., Gildea, D., and Kingsbury, P. (2005). The Proposition Bank: An annotated corpus of semantic roles. *Computational Linguistics*, 31(1):71–106.
- White, A. S., Reisinger, D., Sakaguchi, K., Vieira, T., Zhang, S., Rudinger, R., Rawlins, K., and Van Durme, B. (2016). Universal compositional semantics on Universal Dependencies. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1713–1723, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.