

Links, Tails and Monotonicity

Stefan Bott

Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona

LoLa9, August 2006

What this talk is about

- The discourse functions of Links and Tails

What this talk is about

- The discourse functions of Links and Tails
- Do Links locate file-cards (Vallduí 1992)?
- Are Links non-monotone anaphora (Hendriks and Dekker 1996)?

What this talk is about

- The discourse functions of Links and Tails
- Do Links locate file-cards (Vallduí 1992)?
- Are Links non-monotone anaphora (Hendriks and Dekker 1996)?
- What function do Tails have?

The information partitioning of sentences

- Vallduví's sentence level partition:

Link	Tail	Focus
Background		Focus
Topic	Comment	

Vallduví's classification
Focus-Background
Topic-Comment

The sentence level

Both Catalan and English show clear differences in the realisation of Links, Tails and Foci.

The sentence level

CATALAN

- Links are realised as left dislocated constituents
- Tails are realised as right dislocated constituents
- The focus corresponds to the core clause

The sentence level

CATALAN

- Links are realised as left dislocated constituents
- Tails are realised as right dislocated constituents
- The focus corresponds to the core clause

(1) **A: What about the boss? Does he like broccoli?**

B: [L'amo]_{link} [L'ODIA]_{focus} [el bróquil]_{tail}
[The boss]_{link} [it-hates]_{focus} [the broccoli]_{tail}

The sentence level

ENGLISH

- Links receive a B-Accent (L+H*)
- Tails are unaccented
- Foci are A-accented (H*)

The sentence level

ENGLISH

- Links receive a B-Accent (L+H*)
- Tails are unaccented
- Foci are A-accented (H*)

(2) A: What about the boss? Does he like broccoli?

B: [The boss]_{link} [HATES]_{focus} [broccoli]_{tail}
L+H* H*

What's the function of Links and Tails in discourse?

The function of Links & co in discourse is much
harder to explain

What's the function of Links and Tails in discourse?

Vallduví:

Operations on file cards of file change semantics:

Links: GOTO a file card

Tails: REPLACE some of the content of a file card

Focus: ADD content to a located file card

What's the function of Links and Tails in discourse?

Vallduví:

Different constellations of Links, Tails and Foci trigger different actions on the file:

For example:

Link-Focus: GOTO(fc)(UPDATE-ADD(Is))

Focus-Tail: UPDATE-REPLACE(Is,
RECORD(fc))

The problem

- Vallduví's explanation of the discourse function of Links gives file cards a crucial status

The problem

- Vallduví's explanation of the discourse function of Links gives file cards a crucial status
- File cards are an artefact of file change semantics
- They have no equivalent in other frameworks of discourse representation
- Heim (1982) only gives them a metaphoric status

The problem

- Vallduví's account of the function of Links is highly “platform dependent”
- A transportation from File Change Semantics to some other theory of discourse (e.g. Discourse Representation Theory, DRT) is problematic

Hendriks and Dekker (1996): Arguments against a FCS-solution

- DRT implies less cognitive effort (because no file cards have to be re-ordered)
- Pronouns in weather sentences cannot be located:
The pronoun *it* does not correspond to a file card
- Negation, quantification and disjunction are problematic

Hendriks and Dekker (1996): Arguments against a FCS-solution

- DRT implies less cognitive effort (because no file cards have to be re-ordered)
- Pronouns in weather sentences cannot be located:
The pronoun *it* does not correspond to a file card

(3) It's raining
problematic

Hendriks and Dekker (1996): Arguments against a FCS-solution

- DRT implies less cognitive effort (because no file cards have to be re-ordered)
- Pronouns in weather sentences cannot be located:
The pronoun *it* does not correspond to a file card
- Negation, quantification and disjunction are problematic

(4) No/every man walks

Hendriks and Dekker (1996): The proposed alternative

Links are non-monotone anaphora:

“Linkhood (marked by L+H* accent in English) serves to signal non-monotone anaphora.”

Hendriks and Dekker (1996): The proposed alternative

Here “monotonic” means “upward monotonic”

L

(5) John took Mary to Acapulco. They had a lousy time.
(Kamp and Reyle, 1993)

“

monotonic anaphora:

- (6) a. Our neighbours are extremely nice people.
b. He is a teacher, she is a housewife.

(van Deemter 1992)

Hendriks and Dekker (1996): The proposed alternative

Here “monotonic” means “upward monotonic”

L

(5) John took Mary to Acapulco. They had a lousy time.

(Kamp and Reyle, 1993)

“

monotonic anaphora:

(6) a. Our neighbours are extremely nice people.

b. He is a teacher, she is a housewife.

(van Deemter 1992)

Hendriks and Dekker (1996): The proposed alternative

Here “monotonic” means “upward monotonic”

L (5) John took Mary to Acapulco. They had a lousy time.
“ (Kamp and Reyle, 1993)

“ monotonic anaphora:

(6) a. Our neighbours are extremely nice people.
b. He is a teacher, she is a housewife.

(van Deemter 1992)

Hendriks and Dekker (1996): The proposed alternative

NonMonotone Anaphora Hypothesis (NAH, Hendriks & Dekker 1996):

- Linkhood (marked by L+H* accent in English) serves to signal non-monotone anaphora.
- If an expression is a link, then its discourse referent Y is anaphoric to an antecedent discourse referent X such that $X \not\subseteq Y$.

Hendriks and Dekker (1996): The proposed alternative

- Hendriks and Dekker argue BOTH
 - 1) against the use of file cards as basic unit in the interpretation of information structureAND
 - 2) against a location function of Links

Questions which Hendriks and Dekker do not address

- 1) If Links are anaphora, how can their antecedents be resolved and which factors constrain the anaphoric relationship? How can the relation between a Link and its antecedent be modelled?
- 2) If Links are anaphora, what are Tails? Most probably they should be treated as anaphora as well. Are they then monotone anaphora?

A further question

3) Is non-monotonicity really a **necessary** condition for Links?

Cases in which Links are licensed

Cases in which Links are licensed

- The cases of Links discussed in the literature fall broadly into four categories:

Cases in which Links are licensed

- The cases of Links discussed in the literature fall broadly into four categories:
- Is non-monotonicity really a necessary condition for Links in all of them?

Cases in which Links are licensed

1: Links are part of a plural individual antecedent

(7) A: Què en saps, dels teus amics?

What do you know about your friends?

B: [La Maria]_{link}, la vaig veure fa poc.

[ART Maria]_{link}, her have-seen ago little.

Mary, I have seen recently.

Cases in which Links are licensed

1: Links are part of a plural individual antecedent

(7) A: Què en saps, dels teus amics?

What do you know about your friends?

B: [La Maria]_{link} la vaig veure fa poc.

[ART Mária]_{link} her have-seen ago little.

Mary, I have seen recently.

Cases in which Links are licensed

1: Links are part of a plural individual antecedent

- (7) A: Què en saps, dels teus amics?
What do you know about your friends?
B: [La Maria]_{link} la vaig veure fa poc.
[ART Mária]_{link} her have-seen ago little.

The NAH predicts this case, because Maria is part of your friends. Or:

$X \not\subseteq Y$

**(X is the referent of my friends,
Y is the referent of Maria)**

Cases in which Links are licensed

2: Links overspecify (are more specific than) their antecedent

(8) A: A Mozart, li agradaven els instruments de corda?
Did Mozart like string instruments?

B: [La viola]_{link} segur que li agradava.
[The viola]_{link} surely that DAT he-liked
The VIOLA, he surely liked.

(modelled on an example by van Deemter 1992)

(9) B: He surely LOVED **the viola**

H* L+H*

Cases in which Links are licensed

2: Links overspecify (are more specific than) their antecedent

(8) A: A Mozart, li agradaven els instruments de corda?
Did Mozart like string instruments?

B: [La viola]_{link} segur que li agradava.
[The viola]_{link} surely that DAT he-liked
The VIOLA, he surely liked.

(modelled on an example by van Deemter 1993)

(9) B: He surely LOVED **the viola**

H* L+H*

Cases in which Links are licensed

2: Links overspecify (are more specific than) their antecedent

(8) A: A Mozart, li agradaven els instruments de corda?
Did Mozart like string instruments?

B: [La viola]_{link} segur que li agradava.

The NAH predicts this case:

$X \not\subseteq Y$

where $X = \text{dr}(\text{instruments de corda})$ and $Y = \text{dr}(\text{viola})$

(9)

BUT: We have to stipulate that the kind-referring instruments de corda denotes a set

Cases in which Links are licensed

3: Non-identity anaphora

(10) a. Ten guys were playing basketball in the rain

b. [The fathers]_{link} were having FUN.
L+H* H*

b' [The fathers]_{tail} were having FUN.
H*

(example by Hendriks and Dekker)

Cases in which Links are licensed

3: Non-identity anaphora

- (10) a. Ten guys were playing basketball in the rain
 b. [The fathers]_{link} were having FUN.
 L+H* H*
 b' [The fathers]_{tail} were having FUN.
 H*

(example by Hendriks and Dekker)

The NAH predicts non-identity

Cases in which Links are licensed

4: Links pick up a discourse referent which is not as high in the accessibility ranking as a conflicting alternative antecedent

- (11) A: He vist que el president té una col·lecció de porcellana de Delft. He comprat una nova peça per a la col·lecció. Creus que ha estat bona idea?
I have seen that the president has a collection of Delft china. I bought a new piece for his collection. Do you think this was a good idea?
- B: No. [El president]_{link} l'odia, [la porcellana de Delft]_{tail}.
No. [The president]_{link} it-hates, [the china from Delft]_{tail}.
No. The president hates the Delft china set.

Cases in which Links are licensed

(11) A: He vist que el president té una col·lecció de porcellana de Delft. He comprat una nova peça per a la col·lecció. Creus que ha estat bona idea?

I have seen that the president has a collection of Delft china. I bought a new piece for his collection. Do you think this was a good idea?

B: No. [El president]_{link} l'odia, [la porcellana de Delft]_{tail}.

No. [The president]_{link} it-hates, [the china from Delft]_{tail}.

No. The president hates the Delft china set.

Cases in which Links are licensed

(11) A: He vist que el president té una col·lecció de porcellana de Delft. He comprat una nova peça per a la col·lecció. Creus que ha estat bona idea?

I have seen that the president has a collection of Delft china. I bought a new piece for his collection. Do you think this was a good idea?

B: No. [El president]_{link} l'odia, [la porcellana de Delft]_{tail}.

No. [The president]_{link} it-hates, [the china from Delft]_{tail}.

No. The president hates the Delft china set.

Cases in which Links are licensed

(11) A: He vist que el president té una col·lecció de porcellana de Delft. He comprat una nova peça per a la col·lecció. Creus que ha estat bona idea?

I have seen that the president has a collection of Delft china. I bought a new piece for his collection. Do you thing this was a good idea?

B: No. [El president]_{link} l'odia, [la porcellana de Delft]_{tail}.
No. [The president]_{link} it-hates, [the china from Delft]_{tail}.

No. The president hates the Delf china set.

The NAH does not predict this case:

X = Y

The NAH would predict that there are two presidents!

Cases in which Links are licensed

- (11) A: He vist que el president té una col·lecció de porcellana de Delft. He comprat una nova peça per a la col·lecció. Creus que ha estat bona idea?
I have seen that the president has a collection of Delft china. I bought a new piece for his collection. Do you thing this was a good idea?
- B: No. [El president]_{link} l'odia, [la porcellana de Delft]_{tail}.
No. [The president]_{link} it-hates, [the china from Delft]_{tail}.
No. The president hates the Delf china set.

We must conclude that non-monotonicity is not a necessary condition for Links

Links can not signal non-monotonicity (by themselves)!

Cases in which Links are licensed

(11) A: He vist que el president té una col·lecció de porcellana de Delft. He comprat una nova peça per a la col·lecció. Creus que ha estat bona idea?

I have seen that the president has a collection of Delft china. I bought a new piece for his collection. Do you thing this was a good idea?

B: No. [El president]_{link} l'odia, [la porcellana de Delft]_{tail}.
No. [The president]_{link} it-hates, [the china from Delft]_{tail}.

No. The president hates the Delf china set.

Non-identity must follow from some other property of Links

The revised anaphor hypothesis for Links (partial)

...

If an expression is a link, then its discourse referent
Y is anaphoric to an antecedent discourse referent
X such that $X \geq Y$.

...

Tails

- If Links stand in an upward part-of (\leq) relation to their antecedent, do Tails stand in a downward (\geq) relation to their antecedent?
- Are the previous examples reversible?

Tails

- (12) Mozart wrote many pieces for the viola. He must have LOVED [string instruments]_{tail}
(van Deemter, 1993)

Tails

- (12) Mozart wrote many pieces for the viola. He must have LOVED [string instruments]_{tail}
(van Deemter, 1992)

Tails

- (12) Mozart wrote many pieces for the viola. He must have LOVED [string instruments]_{tail}
- (13) A: What do you know about Mary?
B: I haven't MET [friends]_{tail} recently.
B': I haven't met ANY [friends]_{tail} recently.

Tails

- (12) Mozart wrote many pieces for the viola. He must have LOVED [string instruments]_{tail}
- (13) A: What do you know about Mary?
B: I haven't MET [friends]_{tail} recently.
B': I haven't met ANY [friends]_{tail} recently.

Tails

- (12) Mozart wrote many pieces for the viola. He must have LOVED [string instruments]_{tail}
- (13) A: What do you know about Mary?
B: I haven't MET [friends]_{tail} recently.
B': I haven't met ANY [friends]_{tail} recently.

Tails can stand at least in a > relation to their antecedent

The limiting case: identity

What about identity between a background constituent and its antecedent?

Identity is both covered by \leq and \geq
(the condition for Links and Tails, respectively)

The limiting case: identity

TAILS:

(14) A: Saps alguna cosa de l'Enric?

Do you have any news about Enric?

B: No en sé res , [de l'Enric]_{tail}.

Not cl I-know nothing , [about art-Enric]_{tail}.

No, I don't know ANYTHING about Enric.

The limiting case: identity

LINKS:

(15) A: Saps alguna cosa de l'Enric?

Do you have any news about Enric?

B': a. [De l'Enric]_{link} , no en sé res.
[About art-Enric]_{link} , not cl I-know nothing.
I don't know **ANYTHING about Enric.**

.

The limiting case: identity

LINKS:

(15) A: Saps alguna cosa de l'Enric?

Do you have any news about Enric?

B': a. [De l'Enric]_{link} , no en sé res.
[About art-Enric]_{link} , not cl I-know nothing.

I don't know **ANYTHING about Enric**.

b. Però la seva germana sí que l'he vist

But art his sister yes that her-I-have seen

But I have **SEEN his sister**.

The limiting case: identity

LINKS:

(15) A: Saps alguna cosa de l'Enric?

Do you have any news about Enric?

B': a. [De l'Enric]_{link} , no en sé res.
[About art-Enric]_{link} , not cl I-know nothing.

I don't know **ANYTHING about Enric**.

b. Però la seva germana sí que l'he vist

But art his sister yes that her-I-have seen

But I have **SEEN his sister**.

Contrastivity!

An Outlook

LINKS:

(15)

Both *Enric* and *his sister* have the same antecedent *x*.

- B': a. [De l'Enric]_{link} , no en sé res.
[About art-Enric]_{link} , not cl I-know nothing.
I don't know **ANYTHING about Enric.**
- b. Però la seva germana sí que l'he vist
But art his sister yes that her-I-have seen
But I have **SEEN his sister.**
-

An Outlook

LINKS:

(15)

Both *Enrik* and *his sister* have the same antecedent x .

x must be inferred:

$x \geq (\text{enric}' \ \& \ \text{his_sister}')$ ng.

B': a. [De l'Enric]_{lit}
[About art-Enric]_{lit}
I don't know **ANYTHING about Enric.**

b. Però la seva germana sí que l'he vist
But art his sister yes that her-I-have seen
But I have **SEEN his sister.**

x

An Outlook

- Are Links anaphoric to their contrastive set?
- Do contrastive sets project their own discourse segment?

An Outlook

- Are Links anaphoric to their contrastive set?
- Do contrastive sets project their own discourse segment?
- Unfortunately there are examples which are neither contrastive nor non-monotone:

(2) A: What about the boss? Does he like broccoli?

B: [The boss]_{link} [HATES]_{focus} [broccoli]_{tail}
L+H* H*

Conclusion

- Links DO NOT locate file cards (although they might locate something else)
- Links DO NOT signal non-monotone anaphora (although they might be non-monotone)
 - Links DO NOT signal necessarily non-identity anaphora

Conclusion

- Links must stand in a \leq relation to their antecedent
- Tails must stand in a \geq relation to their antecedent
- Accessibility ranking of antecedents plays a role
(where “play a role” does not mean to “cause” something)
- Contrastivity effects play a role

Outlook/further work

- How does information partitioning relate to discourse structure?
- Do Links locate the right discourse segment to which the information must be attached?
- Does contrastivity follow from discourse structure?

Outlook/further work

- To be continued

Merci