



Meaning Representation of English Prepositional Phrase Roles: SNACS Supersenses vs. Tectogrammatical Functors

Wesley Scivetti and Nathan Schneider

Georgetown University

20 June 2023 ~ Nancy, France





Han Solo was washing the Millennium Falcon with Chewbacca.

Princess Leia says, ".... Can't you use a sponge?"

credit: https://twitter.com/kelly_knox/





Han Solo was washing the Millennium Falcon with Chewbacca.

Princess Leia says, ".... Can't you use a sponge?"

credit: https://twitter.com/kelly_knox/





Han Solo was washing the Millennium Falcon with Chewbacca.

- Many meaning representation frameworks (word senses, semantic roles) have ways to disambiguate the two readings.
- This work: in-depth comparison of two of them—SNACS and Prague tectogrammatical functors.

Semantic Network of Adposition and Case Supersenses (SNACS)

- SNACS (Schneider et al. 2018, *inter alia*): a set of lexical semantic classes ("supersenses") designed for disambiguating adpositions in English and other languages
- 52 total supersenses, organized into a hierarchy with 3 branches
 - influenced by VerbNet,
 FrameNet, AMR/UMR
 - \circ comprehensive annotation
 - semantic criteria (rather than alternations or associations with a predicate lexicon)



Image from <u>SNACS guidelines for English</u>, v2.6 (2022)

SNACS disambiguation

Han Solo was washing the Millennium Falcon with Chewbacca.



Princess Leia says, ".... Can't you use a sponge?"

credit: https://twitter.com/kelly_knox/



SNACS: 2 levels available

English: Thanks **for** (noun or verb) **Explanation**

French: Merci pour (thing)

French: Merci de (action)

Explanation

Explanation~>Source?



Prague Tectogrammatical Functors

- In Prague Czech-English Dependency Treebank, a parallel corpus of Wall Street Journal text
 - We use PCEDT v2.0 (Hajič et al., 2012)
 - We focus on the English section (PEDT)
- Multiple Layers of Description
 - Analytical Layer (a-layer)
 - Surface Syntax
 - Tectogrammatical Layer (t-layer)
 - "Deep syntax" / Semantics
 - Argument structure relations
 - Formemes keep track of surface syntactic realization (e.g. with a preposition)
 - 69 functors mark the relationship between parent / daughter nodes



Image Source: https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/pcedt2.0/

 Compare definitions of PEDT functors and SNACS supersenses

 Quantitatively and qualitatively evaluate the overlap between similar tags in the two tagsets

Example Overlap: SNACS Locus vs PEDT LOC

SNACS Locus Supersense

"Location, condition, or value. May be abstract." (Schneider et al., 2022)

- "I like to sing <u>at</u>.Locus the gym."
- "I read it in.Locus a book."

PEDT LOC Functor

"A functor for a free modification that specifies the location answering the question "where?", i.e. it indicates the place at which the event or state is situated." (Mikulová et al., 2005)

• "He works in Prague.LOC"

Example Overlap 2: SNACS Duration vs PEDT TFHL

SNACS Duration Supersense

"Indication of how long an event or state lasts (with reference to an amount of time or time period/larger event that it spans)." (Schneider et al., 2022)

- "I walked for Duration 20 minutes."
- "I mowed the lawn <u>for</u>.Duration an hour."

PEDT TFHL Functor

"A functor for a free modification that expresses a temporal meaning related to the question "for how long?"; it gives the length of duration of a state which is a result of the event expressed by the governing word." (Mikulová et al., 2005)

 "He came to stay <u>for a</u> <u>month</u>.**TFHL**"

Example Overlap 3: SNACS Explanation vs PEDT CAUS

SNACS Explanation Supersense

"Assertion of why something happens or is the case." (Schneider et al., 2022)

 "I went outside <u>because</u> of.Explanation the smell."

PEDT CAUS Functor

"The CAUS functor (cause) is assigned to modifications with the meaning of cause of an event or state..." (Mikulová et al., 2005)

 "The losses occurred <u>due to</u>.CAUS poor management."

Example Overlap 4: SNACS Gestalt vs PEDT APP

SNACS Gestalt Supersense

"Generalized notion of "whole" understood with reference to a component part, possession, set member, or characteristic." (Schneider et al., 2022)

- "The blueness of. Gestalt the sky."
- The president's.Gestalt power".

PEDT APP Functor

"a functor for a free adnominal modification denoting a person or an object, to which the person or object referred to by the governing noun is in the relation of appurtenance." (Mikulová et al., 2005)

- "<u>My</u>.**APP** castle"
- "The quality <u>of</u>.APP the service"

Methodology

 Use annotation guidelines / descriptions to create heuristic mapping to most likely SNACS Supersenses from PEDT functors

2. Run an automatic SNACS **Supersense** tagger on a small subset of PEDT (838 sentences, 1837 preposition tokens)

3. Evaluate overlap of predicted SNACS **Supersenses** with the expected corresponding PEDT **functors**

4. Compare results of automatic classifier and heuristic mapping

Heuristic Mapping: Descriptive Overlap

Functor	Supersense	Functor	Supersense	Functor	Supersense	Functor	Supersense	Functor	Supersense
TSIN	StartTime	LOC	Locus	MEANS	Instrument, Means	ACT	Agent,Force	EXT	Cost
TTILL	EndTime	DIR1	Source	MANN	Manner	PAT	Theme, Topic	APP	Gestalt
TFHL	Duration	DIR2	Direction, Path	CAUS	Explanation	ORIG	Originator	COMPL	Identity
THL	Duration	DIR3	Goal	AIM	Purpose	ADDR	Recipient	MAT	QuantityItem
THO	Frequency	EXT	Extent			BEN	Beneficiary	RSTR	Characteristic
TPAR	Time					ACMP	Ancillary	CPR	ComparisonRef
TWHEN	Time						HICOLUS		

- 32 of 52 Supersenses have a descriptively similar PEDT functor
- Many PEDT functors are probably not relevant to SNACS hierarchy (e.g. CONJ, VOCAT)
- Mapping from PEDT to remaining 20 supersenses (many of which are in the Configuration branch) remains unclear

Empirical Comparison - Heuristic vs Classifier Overlap

- How do our expected Supersenses (from our heuristic mapping) compare to automatically predicted SNACS Supersenses?
- Well, they don't align as well as we would hope
- Heuristic for functors aligning with Circumstances are more accurate than functors aligning with Configurations

# of Tokens	Percent Overlap		
818	50.3		
446	52.7		
212	66.5		
160	21.9		
500	47.0		
113	55.8		
238	58.0		
149	22.8		
386	36.0		
	# of Tokens 818 446 212 160 500 113 238 149 386		

Empirical Comparison - SNACS Spatiotemporals



Empirical Comparison - SNACS Configuration Branch

- Large "other" percentage
- Significant portion of predicted supersenses are aligning with unexpected functors
- Best matches: APP with Whole / Gestalt, MAT with QuantityItem



- We see for most spatiotemporal categories there is an alignment between PEDT and predicted supersenses
 - Most reliable correspondences are between TWHEN and Time, LOC and Locus, and TSIN and StartTime, TTILL and EndTime
 - DIR1 and Source, DIR3 and Goal do align, but LOC seems to overlap with Source and Goal
- Configuration: less clear patterns, supersenses don't seem to line up with any one functor
 - APP has representation across multiple Supersenses

Qualitative Error Analysis

Why do the overlaps diverge from expectations?

- 1. Errors by the automatic SNACS tagger
 - WSJ is out-of-domain for SNACS classifier (which achieves ~80% F1 in-domain)

- 2. Errors relating to SNACS scene/function distinction
 - LOC vs Locus ~> Goal, ACMP vs Agent ~> Ancillary

- 3. Errors due to unexpected systematic divergent usages of categories in the two sets
 - CPR vs ComparisonRef, DIR3 vs Goal, DIR2 vs Direction

 The new plant, located in Chinchon about 60 miles from.DIR1.Locus~>Source Seoul, will help meet increasing and diversifying demand for control products in South Korea, the company said.

 Moscow has settled pre-1917 debts with.ACMP.Agent~>Ancillary other countries in recent years at less than face value.

- A seat on the Chicago Board of Trade was sold for \$350,000, down \$16,000 from.CPR.Locus~>Source the previous sale last Friday.
 - **CPR** and **ComparisonRef** used differently

- 2. A disaffected, hard-drinking, nearly-30 hero sets off **for.DIR3.Direction** snow country in search of an elusive sheep...
 - **DIR3** ("where to") is closer to **Direction** than **DIR2** ("which way")
 - SNACS groups **Direction** as subtype of **Path**



- Similar descriptions for some functors and supersenses lead to broad overlap
 - Predominantly for temporal / spatial relationships

• However, descriptively similar categories do not always demonstrate good alignment in practice

 In particular, more work is needed to investigate more complex mappings from PEDT functors onto Configuration supersenses

References

Hajič, J., Hajičová, E., Panevová, J., Sgall, P., Bojar, O., Cinková, S., Fučíková, E., Mikulová, M., Pajas, P., Popelka, J., Semecký, J., Šindlerová, J., Štěpánek, J., Toman, J., Urešová, Z., & Zabokrtský, Z. (2012). Announcing Prague Czech-English Dependency Treebank 2.0. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)* (pp. 3153-3160). Istanbul, Turkey: European Language Resources Association (ELRA). Retrieved from http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2012/pdf/510_Paper.pdf

Mikulová, M., Bémová, A., Hajič, J., Hajičová, E., Havelka, J., Kolářová, V., Kučová, L., Lopatková, M., Pajas, P., Panevová, J., Razímová, M., Sgall, P., Štěpánek, J., Urešová, Z., Veselá, K., & Žabokrtský, Z. (2005). Annotation on the tectogrammatical layer in the Prague Dependency Treebank. *Language*, Advance online publication. Retrieved from <u>https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/pcedt2.0/publications/t-man-en.pdf</u>

Schneider, N., Hwang, J. D., Bhatia, A., Srikumar, V., Han, N. R., O'Gorman, T., Moeller, S. R., Abend, O., Shalev, A., Blodgett, A., & Prange, J. (2022). Adposition and Case Supersenses v2.6: Guidelines for English. *arXiv:1704.02134v4 [cs]*. Retrieved from <u>https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.02134v4</u>

Schneider, N., Hwang, J. D., Srikumar, V., Green, M., Suresh, A., Conger, K., O'Gorman, T., & Palmer, M. (2016). A Corpus of Preposition Supersenses. In *Proceedings of the 10th Linguistic Annotation Workshop held in conjunction with ACL 2016 (LAW-X 2016)* (pp. 99-109). Berlin, Germany: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <u>https://aclanthology.org/W16-1712</u>

Schneider, N., Hwang, J. D., Srikumar, V., Prange, J., Blodgett, A., Moeller, S. R., Stern, A., Bitan, A., & Abend, O. (2018). Comprehensive supersense disambiguation of English prepositions and possessives. In *Proc. of ACL* (pp. 185-196). Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <u>http://aclweb.org/anthology/P18-1018</u>

Schneider, N., Srikumar, V., Hwang, J. D., & Palmer, M. (2015). A hierarchy with, of, and for preposition supersenses. In Proc. of The 9th Linguistic Annotation Workshop (pp. 112-123). Denver, Colorado, USA. Retrieved from <u>http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W15-1612</u>

Circumstance

Temporal - Time - StartTime - EndTime - Frequency - Duration - Interval Locus - Source - Goal Path - Extent Means

- Manner Explanation
- Direction
- Purpose
- Participant Causer - Agent Theme - Topic - Content Ancillary Stimulus Experiencer Originator Recipient Beneficiary Instrument

Force

Cost

Configuration Identity Species Gestalt Possessor Whole - Org QuantityItem Characteristic Possession PartPortion - Stuff OrgMember - Quantity Value - Approximator Ensemble ComparisonRef SetIteration SocialRel



