

# Discourse Representation Structures for ACE 6.7

Technical Report

2013

Norbert E. Fuchs, Kaarel Kaljurand, Tobias Kuhn

Department of Informatics & Institute of Computational Linguistics  
University of Zurich

fuchs@ifi.uzh.ch, kaljurand@gmail.com, kuhntobias@gmail.com

## Abstract

This technical report describes the discourse representation structures (DRS) derived from texts written in version 6.7 of Attempto Controlled English (ACE 6.7). The description is done by a set of examples.

Among other things, ACE 6.7 supports modal statements, negation as failure, and sentence subordination. These features require an extended form of discourse representation structures.

The discourse representation structure itself uses a reified, or 'flat' notation, meaning that its atomic conditions are built from a small number of predefined predicates that take constants standing for words of the ACE text as their arguments.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introductory Notes</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Notation</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Basics . . . . .	6
2.2	Flat Notation . . . . .	6
2.3	Predicate Declarations . . . . .	7
2.3.1	object . . . . .	7
2.3.2	property . . . . .	7
2.3.3	relation . . . . .	8
2.3.4	predicate . . . . .	8
2.3.5	modifier_adv . . . . .	9
2.3.6	modifier_pp . . . . .	9
2.3.7	has_part . . . . .	9
2.3.8	query . . . . .	9
2.4	Complex Structures . . . . .	10
2.4.1	Classical Negation . . . . .	10
2.4.2	Negation As Failure . . . . .	10
2.4.3	Implication and Disjunction . . . . .	10
2.4.4	Possibility and Necessity . . . . .	11
2.4.5	Recommendation and Admissibility . . . . .	11
2.4.6	Sentence Subordination . . . . .	12
2.4.7	Questions and Commands . . . . .	12
2.4.8	Nesting . . . . .	13
2.5	Sentence and Token Numbers . . . . .	13
<b>3</b>	<b>Noun Phrases</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1	Singular Countable Noun Phrases . . . . .	14

3.2	Mass Nouns . . . . .	15
3.3	Proper Names . . . . .	16
3.4	Plural Noun Phrases . . . . .	16
3.5	Indefinite Pronouns . . . . .	17
3.6	Expressions . . . . .	19
3.6.1	Atomic Expressions . . . . .	19
3.6.2	Compound Expressions . . . . .	19
3.6.3	Lists and Sets . . . . .	20
3.7	Generalised Quantors . . . . .	20
3.8	Noun Phrase Conjunction . . . . .	21
3.9	Measurement Noun Phrases . . . . .	22
3.10	Nothing But . . . . .	22
<b>4</b>	<b>Verb Phrases</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1	Intransitive Verbs . . . . .	23
4.2	Transitive Verbs . . . . .	23
4.3	Ditransitive Verbs . . . . .	23
4.4	Copula . . . . .	24
4.4.1	Copula and Intransitive Adjectives . . . . .	24
4.4.2	Copula and Transitive Adjectives . . . . .	25
4.4.3	Copula and Noun Phrase . . . . .	26
4.4.4	Copula and Prepositional Phrase . . . . .	27
4.5	Coordinated Verb Phrases . . . . .	27
4.5.1	Verb Phrase Conjunction . . . . .	27
4.5.2	Verb Phrase Disjunction . . . . .	27
<b>5</b>	<b>Modifying Nouns and Noun Phrases</b>	<b>28</b>
5.1	Adjectives . . . . .	28

5.2	Variables . . . . .	29
5.3	Relative Sentences . . . . .	29
5.3.1	Simple Relative Sentences . . . . .	29
5.3.2	Relative Sentence Conjunction and Disjunction . . . . .	30
5.4	<i>of</i> -Prepositional Phrases . . . . .	31
5.5	Possessive Nouns . . . . .	31
<b>6</b>	<b>Modifying Verb Phrases</b>	<b>32</b>
6.1	Adverbs . . . . .	32
6.2	Prepositional Phrases . . . . .	33
<b>7</b>	<b>Composite Sentences</b>	<b>34</b>
7.1	Conditional Sentences . . . . .	34
7.2	Coordinated Sentences . . . . .	35
7.2.1	Sentence Conjunction . . . . .	35
7.2.2	Sentence Disjunction . . . . .	35
7.3	Sentence Subordination . . . . .	35
7.4	Positive Sentence Marker . . . . .	36
7.5	Formulas . . . . .	37
<b>8</b>	<b>Quantified Sentences</b>	<b>37</b>
8.1	Existential Quantification . . . . .	37
8.2	Universal Quantification . . . . .	38
8.3	Global Universal Quantification . . . . .	38
<b>9</b>	<b>Negation</b>	<b>38</b>
9.1	Quantor Negation . . . . .	38
9.1.1	Negated Existential Quantor . . . . .	38
9.1.2	Negated Universal Quantor . . . . .	39

9.2	Verb Phrase Negation . . . . .	40
9.3	Sentence Negation . . . . .	41
9.4	Negation as Failure . . . . .	42
9.4.1	Verb Phrase Negation for NAF . . . . .	42
9.4.2	Sentence Negation for NAF . . . . .	43
<b>10</b>	<b>Modality</b>	<b>44</b>
10.1	Possibility . . . . .	44
10.2	Necessity . . . . .	45
10.3	Recommendation . . . . .	47
10.4	Admissibility . . . . .	48
<b>11</b>	<b>Plural Interpretations</b>	<b>49</b>
11.1	Reading 1 . . . . .	49
11.2	Reading 2 . . . . .	50
11.3	Reading 3 . . . . .	50
11.4	Reading 4a . . . . .	51
11.5	Reading 4b . . . . .	52
11.6	Reading 5 . . . . .	52
11.7	Reading 6 . . . . .	53
11.8	Reading 7 . . . . .	53
11.9	Reading 8 . . . . .	54
<b>12</b>	<b>Questions and Commands</b>	<b>54</b>
12.1	Yes/No-Questions . . . . .	54
12.2	Who/What/Which-Questions . . . . .	55
12.3	How/Where/When-Questions . . . . .	56
12.4	How many/much Questions . . . . .	56
12.5	Commands . . . . .	57

# 1 Introductory Notes

This technical report describes the representation of discourse representation structures (DRS) derived from version 6.7 of Attempto Controlled English (ACE 6.7). It uses illustrative ACE examples, but does not describe ACE itself. For a complete description of the ACE language please refer to the Attempto web site<sup>1</sup>.

We expect the reader to be familiar with the basic notions of Discourse Representation Theory (DRT) [3] as, for instance, introduced in [1]. Consult [2] for the DRS representation of modality and sentence subordination.

## 2 Notation

### 2.1 Basics

The ACE parser translates an ACE text unambiguously into a DRS representation. The discourse representation structure derived from the ACE text is returned as

```
drs(Domain,Conditions)
```

The first argument of `drs/2` is a list of discourse referents, i.e. quantified variables naming objects of the domain of discourse. The second argument of `drs/2` is a list of simple and complex conditions for the discourse referents. The list separator ‘;’ stands for logical conjunction. Simple conditions are logical atoms, while complex conditions are built from other discourse representation structures with the help of the logical connectors negation ‘-’, disjunction ‘v’, and implication ‘=>’. Furthermore, we use non-standard logical connectors for possibility ‘can’, necessity ‘must’, recommendation ‘should’, admissibility ‘may’, negation as failure ‘~’, and a connector for the assignment of variables to sub-DRSs ‘:’.

A DRS like

```
drs([A,B],[condition(A),condition(B)])
```

is usually pretty-printed as

<i>A B</i>
<i>condition(A)</i>
<i>condition(B)</i>

### 2.2 Flat Notation

The discourse representation structure uses a reified, or ‘flat’ notation for logical atoms. For example, the noun *a card* that customarily would be represented as

---

<sup>1</sup><http://attempto.ifi.uzh.ch/site>

`card(A)`

is represented here as

`object(A, card, countable, na, eq, 1)`

relegating the predicate 'card' to the constant 'card' used as an argument in the predefined predicate 'object'.

As a consequence, the large number of predicates in the customary representation is replaced by a small number of predefined predicates. This allows us to conveniently formulate axioms for the predefined predicates.

## 2.3 Predicate Declarations

### 2.3.1 object


The `object`-predicates stand for objects that are introduced by the different forms of nouns.

`object(Ref, Noun, Class, Unit, Op, Count)`

**Ref** The variable that stands for this object and that is used for references.

**Noun** The noun (mass or countable) that was used to introduce the object.

**Class** This is one of `{dom, mass, countable}` and defines the classification of the object. The tree structure below shows the hierarchy of these values.



**Unit** If the object was introduced together with a measurement noun (e.g. "2 kg of apples") then this entry contains the value of the measurement noun (e.g. kg). Otherwise, this entry is na.

**Op** One of `{eq, geq, greater, leq, less, exactly, na}`. `eq` stands for "equal", `geq` for "greater or equal", and `leq` for "less or equal".

**Count** A positive number or na. Together with `Unit` and `Op`, this defines the cardinality or extent of the object.

### 2.3.2 property

The `property`-predicates stand for properties that are introduced by adjectives. The references can either be variables or expressions. See section 3.6 for the representation of expressions.

<i>1-ary</i>	property(Ref1, Adjective, Degree)
<i>2-ary</i>	property(Ref1, Adjective, Degree, Ref2)
<i>3-ary</i>	property(Ref1, Adjective, Ref2, Degree, CompTarget, Ref3)

Ref1 The variable or expression that stands for the primary object of the property (i.e. the subject).

Ref2 The variable or expression that stands for the secondary object of the property.

Ref3 The variable or expression that stands for the tertiary object of the property.

Adjective The intransitive or transitive adjective.

Degree This is one of {pos, pos\_as, comp, comp\_than, sup} and it defines the degree of the adjective. Positive and comparative forms can have an additional comparison target (“as rich as ...”, “richer than ...”), and for those cases pos\_as and comp\_than are used.

CompTarget This is one of {subj, obj} and it defines for transitive adjectives whether the comparison targets the subject (“John is more fond-of Mary than Bill”) or the object (“John is more fond-of Mary than of Sue”).

### 2.3.3 relation

The relation-predicates stand for relations that are introduced by *of*-constructs.

relation(Ref1, of, Ref2)
--------------------------

Ref1 A variable that refers to the left hand side object. This variable is always associated with an object-predicate.

Ref2 A variable or expression that stands for the right hand side object.

Note that the second argument is always *of* since no other prepositions can attach to nouns.

### 2.3.4 predicate

The predicate-predicates stand for relations that are introduced by intransitive, transitive, and ditransitive verbs.

<i>intransitive</i>	predicate(Ref, Verb, SubjRef)
<i>transitive</i>	predicate(Ref, Verb, SubjRef, ObjRef)
<i>ditransitive</i>	predicate(Ref, Verb, SubjRef, ObjRef, IndObjRef)

Ref A variable that stands for this relation and that is used to attach modifiers (i.e. adverbs and prepositional phrases).

Verb The intransitive, transitive, or ditransitive verb.

SubjRef A variable or expression that stands for the subject.

ObjRef A variable or expression that stands for the direct object.

IndObjRef A variable or expression that stands for the indirect object.



### 2.3.5 modifier\_adv

The `modifier_adv`-predicates stand for verb phrase modifiers that are introduced by adverbs.

`modifier_adv(Ref, Adverb, Degree)`

`Ref` A variable that refers to the modified verb.

`Adverb` The adverb.

`Degree` This is one of {`pos`, `comp`, `sup`} and defines the degree of the adverb.

### 2.3.6 modifier\_pp

The `modifier_pp`-predicates stand for verb phrase modifiers that are introduced by prepositional phrases.

`modifier_pp(Ref1, Preposition, Ref2)`

`Ref1` A variable that refers to the modified verb.

`Preposition`. The preposition of the prepositional phrase.

`Ref2` A variable or expression that stands for the object of the prepositional phrase.

### 2.3.7 has\_part

The `has_part`-predicates define the memberships of objects in groups of objects.

`has_part(GroupRef, MemberRef)`

`GroupRef` A variable that refers to a group of objects.

`MemberRef` A variable or expression that stands for the object that is a member of the group.

### 2.3.8 query

A `query`-predicate points to the object or relation a query was put on.

`query(Ref, QuestionWord)`

`Ref` A variable that refers to the object or relation of the query.

`QuestionWord` One of {`who`, `what`, `which`, `how`, `howm`, `where`, `when`}.

## 2.4 Complex Structures

### 2.4.1 Classical Negation

A negated DRS like

$$\neg \frac{A \ B}{\begin{array}{l} \text{condition}(A) \\ \text{condition}(B) \end{array}}$$

is internally represented as

`-drs([A,B],[condition(A),condition(B)])`

The prefix operator `-/1` stands for the logical negation '¬'.

### 2.4.2 Negation As Failure

A DRS that is negated using negation as failure (NAF) is marked with a tilde sign:

$$\sim \frac{A \ B}{\begin{array}{l} \text{condition}(A) \\ \text{condition}(B) \end{array}}$$

It is represented as

`~drs([A,B],[condition(A),condition(B)])`

The prefix operator `~/1` stands for negation as failure.

### 2.4.3 Implication and Disjunction

In a DRS, all variables are existentially quantified unless they occur in the precondition of an implication. The implication

$$\frac{A}{\text{condition}(A)} \Rightarrow \frac{B}{\text{condition}(B)}$$

is internally represented as

`drs([A],[condition(A)]) => drs([B],[condition(B)])`

The disjunction

A	∨	B
condition(A)		condition(B)

is likewise internally represented as

`drs([A],[condition(A)]) ∨ drs([B],[condition(B)])`

The predicates `=>/2` and `∨/2` are defined as infix operators.

#### 2.4.4 Possibility and Necessity

Possibility and necessity are modal extensions for DRSs. Consult [2] for details about such modal constructs and their representations in first-order logic. Possibility is represented with the word 'can'

CAN	<table style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 5px;">A B</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 5px;">condition(A)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 5px;">condition(B)</td> </tr> </table>	A B	condition(A)	condition(B)
A B				
condition(A)				
condition(B)				

and is internally represented as

`can(drs([A,B],[condition(A),condition(B)]))`

Necessity is represented with the word 'must'

MUST	<table style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 5px;">A B</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 5px;">condition(A)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 5px;">condition(B)</td> </tr> </table>	A B	condition(A)	condition(B)
A B				
condition(A)				
condition(B)				

and is internally represented as

`must(drs([A,B],[condition(A),condition(B)]))`

The predicates `can/1` and `must/1` are used to represent possibility and necessity, respectively.

#### 2.4.5 Recommendation and Admissibility

Recommendation and admissibility are structures for which no general semantics are defined. Depending on the domain, they can be interpreted in different way. Recommendation is marked by the word 'should'

SHOULD	<i>A B</i>
	<i>condition(A)</i>
	<i>condition(B)</i>

and is internally represented as

```
should(drs([A,B],[condition(A),condition(B)]))
```

In the same way, admissibility is marked by the word 'may'

MAY	<i>A B</i>
	<i>condition(A)</i>
	<i>condition(B)</i>

and is internally represented as

```
may(drs([A,B],[condition(A),condition(B)]))
```

The predicates `should/1` and `may/1` are used to represent recommendation and admissibility.

#### 2.4.6 Sentence Subordination

For sentences like 'John believes that Mary sleeps' we need an extended DRS syntax. For that reason we introduce a new notation that allows us to attach labels to sub-DRSs. Consult [2] for details.

X :	<i>A B</i>
	<i>condition(A)</i>
	<i>condition(B)</i>

This is internally represented as

```
X:drs([A,B],[condition(A),condition(B)])
```

The infix operator `:/2` is used to attach labels to sub-DRSs.

#### 2.4.7 Questions and Commands


Questions are marked in the DRS by the word 'question'

QUESTION	<i>A B</i>
	<i>condition(A)</i>
	<i>condition(B)</i>

and is internally represented as

```
question(drs([A,B],[condition(A),condition(B)]))
```

In the same way, commands are marked by the word 'command'




and is internally represented as

```
command(drs([A,B],[condition(A),condition(B)]))
```

The predicates `question/1` and `command/1` are used to represent questions and commands.

### 2.4.8 Nesting

In nested discourse representation structures, a DRS can occur as an element of the conditions list of another DRS. Therefore



is represented as

```
drs([A,B],[condition(A),-drs([],[condition(B)])])
```


## 2.5 Sentence and Token Numbers

Logical atoms occurring in `drs/2` are actually written as `Atom-SID/TID` (using `-` and `/` as infix operators) where the number `SID` refers to the sentence from which `Atom` was derived and `TID` to the token within that sentence.

The example text

```
John enters a card. Every card is green.
```

the DRS of which is



will thus internally be represented as

```


drs([A, B], [
  object(A, card, countable, na, eq, 1)-1/4,
  predicate(B, enter, named('John'), A)-1/2,
  drs([C], [
    object(C, card, countable, na, eq, 1)-2/2
  ])
])
=>
drs([D, E], [
  property(D, green, pos)-2/4,
  predicate(E, be, C, D)-2/3
])
])

```


### 3 Noun Phrases

#### 3.1 Singular Countable Noun Phrases

*a card*




*no card*




Note that the representation of “no card” depends on the context (see section 9.1.1).

*every card*




*not every card*




### 3.2 Mass Nouns

*some rice*




*no rice*




Note that the representation of “no rice” depends on the context (see section 9.1.1). Furthermore, the determiner *no* is ambiguous between countable and mass. For nouns that can be countable or mass, e.g. *money*, preference to countable is given. Mass reading can be forced by using sentential negation, e.g. *It is false that some money is omnipotent*.

*all rice*




*not all rice*




### 3.3 Proper Names

*John waits.*




### 3.4 Plural Noun Phrases

*some cards*



*2 cards*





*five cards*

A
$object(A, card, countable, na, eq, 5)$

### 3.5 Indefinite Pronouns

*someone / somebody*

A
$object(A, somebody, countable, na, eq, 1)$

*something*

A
$object(A, something, dom, na, na, na)$

*no one / nobody*


$\neg$		
<table border="1"><tr><td>A</td></tr><tr><td><math>object(A, somebody, countable, na, eq, 1)</math></td></tr></table>	A	$object(A, somebody, countable, na, eq, 1)$
A		
$object(A, somebody, countable, na, eq, 1)$		

*nothing*


$\neg$		
<table border="1"><tr><td>A</td></tr><tr><td><math>object(A, something, dom, na, na, na)</math></td></tr></table>	A	$object(A, something, dom, na, na, na)$
A		
$object(A, something, dom, na, na, na)$		

Note that the representations of “no one”, “nobody”, and “nothing” depend on the context (see section 9.1.1).


*everyone / everybody*




*everything*



*not everyone / not everybody*



*not everything*



## 3.6 Expressions

### 3.6.1 Atomic Expressions

*A number is 14.*

A B
<i>object(A,number,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(B,be,A,int(14))</i>

*3.5 is greater than 2.3.*

A B
<i>property(A,great,comp_than,real(2.3))</i> <i>predicate(B,be,real(3.5),A)</i>

*"abcd" is entered by John.*

A
<i>predicate(A,enter,named('John'),string(abcd))</i>

### 3.6.2 Compound Expressions

*A value is (1 + 2) / X \* 4.*

A B C
<i>object(A,value,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>object(B,something,dom,na,na,na)</i> <i>predicate(C,be,A,expr(*,expr(/,expr(+,int(1),int(2)),B),int(4)))</i>

*"abc" & "123" is a valid password.*

A B
<i>object(A,password,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>property(A,valid,pos)</i> <i>predicate(B,be,expr(&amp;,string(abc),string('123')),A)</i>

### 3.6.3 Lists and Sets

3 is the first element of [3,4.5,"ab",John,1+2].

A B
<pre>predicate(A,be,int(3),B) relation(B,of,list([int(3),real(4.5),string(ab),named('John'),expr(+,int(1),int(2))])) property(B,first,pos) object(B,element,countable,na,eq,1)</pre>

{3,6,[1,2]} contains 6.

A
<pre>predicate(A,contain,set([int(3),int(6),list([int(1),int(2)])]),int(6))</pre>

### 3.7 Generalised Quantors

If the generalised quantor implies only a minimality condition then the DRS representation is flat.

A customer has **at least 2** cards that are valid.

A B C D E
<pre>object(A,customer,countable,na,eq,1) object(B,card,countable,na,geq,2) property(C,valid,pos) predicate(D,be,B,C) predicate(E,have,A,B)</pre>

A customer has **more than 2** cards that are valid.

A B C D E
<pre>object(A,customer,countable,na,eq,1) object(B,card,countable,na,greater,2) property(C,valid,pos) predicate(D,be,B,C) predicate(E,have,A,B)</pre>

If the generalised quantor implies a maximality condition then the conditions inside of the scope of the maximality are bracketed. This is necessary because we need to capture the scope of the maximality restriction.

A customer has **exactly 2** cards that are valid.

A	B	C	D	E
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i>				
<i>object(B, card, countable, na, <b>exactly, 2</b>)</i>				
<i>property(C, valid, pos)</i>				
<i>predicate(D, be, B, C)</i>				
<i>predicate(E, have, A, B)</i>				

A customer has **at most 2** cards that are valid.

A	B	C	D	E
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i>				
<i>object(B, card, countable, na, <b>leq, 2</b>)</i>				
<i>property(C, valid, pos)</i>				
<i>predicate(D, be, B, C)</i>				
<i>predicate(E, have, A, B)</i>				

A customer has **less than 2** cards that are valid.

A	B	C	D	E
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i>				
<i>object(B, card, countable, na, <b>less, 2</b>)</i>				
<i>property(C, valid, pos)</i>				
<i>predicate(D, be, B, C)</i>				
<i>predicate(E, have, A, B)</i>				

### 3.8 Noun Phrase Conjunction

*a customer and a clerk*

A	B	C
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i>		
<i>object(B, clerk, countable, na, eq, 1)</i>		
<i>has_part(C, A)</i>		
<i>has_part(C, B)</i>		
<i>object(C, na, countable, na, eq, 2)</i>		

### 3.9 Measurement Noun Phrases

*2 kg of apples*

<i>A</i>
<i>object(A,apple,countable,kg,eq,2)</i>

*2 kg of rice*

<i>A B</i>
<i>object(A,rice,mass,kg,eq,2)</i>

*John's weight is 80 kg.*

<i>A B</i>
<i>relation(A,of,named('John'))</i> <i>object(A,weight,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(B,be,A,int(80,kg))</i>

### 3.10 Nothing But

*John eats nothing but apples.*

<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>A B</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>predicate(A,eat,named('John'),B)</i> <i>object(B,something,dom,na,na,na)</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>A B</i>	<i>predicate(A,eat,named('John'),B)</i> <i>object(B,something,dom,na,na,na)</i>	$\Rightarrow$	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>C D</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>object(C,apple,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(D,be,B,C)</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>C D</i>	<i>object(C,apple,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(D,be,B,C)</i>
<i>A B</i>						
<i>predicate(A,eat,named('John'),B)</i> <i>object(B,something,dom,na,na,na)</i>						
<i>C D</i>						
<i>object(C,apple,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(D,be,B,C)</i>						

*No man but John waits.*

<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>A B</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>predicate(A,wait,B)</i> <i>object(B,man,countable,na,eq,1)</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>A B</i>	<i>predicate(A,wait,B)</i> <i>object(B,man,countable,na,eq,1)</i>	$\Rightarrow$	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>C</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>predicate(C,be,B,named('John'))</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>C</i>	<i>predicate(C,be,B,named('John'))</i>
<i>A B</i>						
<i>predicate(A,wait,B)</i> <i>object(B,man,countable,na,eq,1)</i>						
<i>C</i>						
<i>predicate(C,be,B,named('John'))</i>						

## 4 Verb Phrases

### 4.1 Intransitive Verbs

A customer **waits**.

<b>A B</b>
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b>predicate(B, wait, A)</b>

### 4.2 Transitive Verbs

The following two sentences are parsed identically.

John **enters** a card.  
A card **is entered by** John.

<b>A B</b>
<i>object(A, card, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b>predicate(B, enter, named('John'), A)</b>

### 4.3 Ditransitive Verbs

The following four sentences are parsed identically.

A clerk **gives** a password **to** a customer.  
A clerk **gives** a customer a password.  
A password **is given to** a customer **by** a clerk.  
A customer **is given** a password **by** a clerk.

<b>A B C D</b>
<i>object(A, clerk, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>object(B, password, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>object(C, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b>predicate(D, give, A, B, C)</b>

## 4.4 Copula

### 4.4.1 Copula and Intransitive Adjectives

*A customer is important.*

<b>A B C</b>
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b>property(B, important, pos)</b> <b>predicate(C, be, A, B)</b>

*A customer is as important as John.*

<b>A B C</b>
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b>property(B, important, pos, as, named('John'))</b> <b>predicate(C, be, A, B)</b>

*A customer is more important.*

<b>A B C</b>
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b>property(B, important, comp)</b> <b>predicate(C, be, A, B)</b>

*A customer is more important than John.*

<b>A B C</b>
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b>property(B, important, comp, than, named('John'))</b> <b>predicate(C, be, A, B)</b>

*A customer is most important.*

<b>A B C</b>
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b>property(B, important, sup)</b> <b>predicate(C, be, A, B)</b>



*A card is valid and correct.*

<b>A B C</b>
<i>object(A,card,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <b><i>property(B,valid,pos)</i></b> <b><i>property(B,correct,pos)</i></b> <b><i>predicate(C,be,A,B)</i></b>

*2 codes are valid.*

<b>A B C</b>
<i>object(A,code,countable,na,eq,2)</i> <b><i>property(B,valid,pos)</i></b> <b><i>predicate(C,be,A,B)</i></b>

*Each of 2 codes is valid.*

<b>A</b>				
<i>object(A,code,countable,na,eq,2)</i>				
<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td><b>B</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>has_part(A,B)</i></td> </tr> </table> <span style="font-size: 2em; vertical-align: middle;">⇒</span> <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td><b>C D</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td> <b><i>property(C,valid,pos)</i></b>  <b><i>predicate(D,be,B,C)</i></b> </td> </tr> </table>	<b>B</b>	<i>has_part(A,B)</i>	<b>C D</b>	<b><i>property(C,valid,pos)</i></b> <b><i>predicate(D,be,B,C)</i></b>
<b>B</b>				
<i>has_part(A,B)</i>				
<b>C D</b>				
<b><i>property(C,valid,pos)</i></b> <b><i>predicate(D,be,B,C)</i></b>				

#### 4.4.2 Copula and Transitive Adjectives

*John is fond-of Mary.*

<b>A B</b>
<b><i>property(A,'fond-of',pos,named('Mary'))</i></b> <b><i>predicate(B,be,named('John'),A)</i></b>

*John is as fond-of Mary as Bill.*

<b>A B</b>
<b><i>property(A,'fond-of',named('Mary'),pos_as,subj,named('Bill'))</i></b> <b><i>predicate(B,be,named('John'),A)</i></b>

*John is as fond-of Mary as of Sue.*

<b>A B</b>
<i>property(A, 'fond-of', named('Mary'), pos_as, obj, named('Sue'))</i> <i>predicate(B, be, named('John'), A)</i>

*John is more fond-of Mary.*

<b>A B</b>
<i>property(A, 'fond-of', comp, named('Mary'))</i> <i>predicate(B, be, named('John'), A)</i>

*John is more fond-of Mary than Bill.*

<b>A B</b>
<i>property(A, 'fond-of', named('Mary'), comp_than, subj, named('Bill'))</i> <i>predicate(B, be, named('John'), A)</i>

*John is more fond-of Mary than of Sue.*

<b>A B</b>
<i>property(A, 'fond-of', named('Mary'), comp_than, obj, named('Sue'))</i> <i>predicate(B, be, named('John'), A)</i>

*John is most fond-of Mary.*

<b>A B</b>
<i>property(A, 'fond-of', sup, named('Mary'))</i> <i>predicate(B, be, named('John'), A)</i>

#### 4.4.3 Copula and Noun Phrase

*John is a rich customer.*

<b>A B</b>
<i>property(A, rich, pos)</i> <i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>predicate(B, be, named('John'), A)</i>

#### 4.4.4 Copula and Prepositional Phrase

*John is in the bank.*

<b>A B</b>
<i>predicate(A,be,named('John'))</i> <i>modifier_pp(A,in,B)</i> <i>object(B,bank,countable,na,eq,1)</i>

#### 4.5 Coordinated Verb Phrases

##### 4.5.1 Verb Phrase Conjunction

*A screen flashes and blinks.*

<b>A B C</b>
<i>object(A,screen,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(B,flash,A)</i> <i>predicate(C,blink,A)</i>

##### 4.5.2 Verb Phrase Disjunction

*A screen flashes or blinks.*

<b>A</b>				
<i>object(A,screen,countable,na,eq,1)</i>				
<table border="1"><tr><td><b>B</b></td></tr><tr><td><i>predicate(B,flash,A)</i></td></tr></table> $\vee$ <table border="1"><tr><td><b>C</b></td></tr><tr><td><i>predicate(C,blink,A)</i></td></tr></table>	<b>B</b>	<i>predicate(B,flash,A)</i>	<b>C</b>	<i>predicate(C,blink,A)</i>
<b>B</b>				
<i>predicate(B,flash,A)</i>				
<b>C</b>				
<i>predicate(C,blink,A)</i>				

## 5 Modifying Nouns and Noun Phrases

### 5.1 Adjectives

An **important** customer waits.

A B
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b><i>property(A, important, pos)</i></b> <i>predicate(B, wait, A)</i>

A **more important** customer waits.

A B
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b><i>property(A, important, comp)</i></b> <i>predicate(B, wait, A)</i>

The **most important** customer waits.

A B
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b><i>property(A, important, sup)</i></b> <i>predicate(B, wait, A)</i>

A **rich and old** customer waits.

A B
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b><i>property(A, rich, pos)</i></b> <b><i>property(A, old, pos)</i></b> <i>predicate(B, wait, A)</i>

## 5.2 Variables

A *customer X* greets a clerk. The clerk is happy. *X* is glad.

A B C D E F G
<b>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</b>
object(B, clerk, countable, na, eq, 1)
predicate(C, greet, A, B)
property(D, happy, pos)
predicate(E, be, B, D)
property(F, glad, pos)
predicate(G, be, A, F)

Note: Variables do not appear in the DRS. They only establish anaphoric references.

## 5.3 Relative Sentences

### 5.3.1 Simple Relative Sentences


A customer enters a card **which is valid**.

A B C D E
object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)
object(B, card, countable, na, eq, 1)
<b>property(C, valid, pos)</b>
<b>predicate(D, be, B, C)</b>
predicate(E, enter, A, B)


Every card **a code of which is correct** is valid.

<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>A B C D</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>object(A, card, countable, na, eq, 1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>property(B, correct, pos)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>predicate(C, be, D, B)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>relation(D, of, A)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>object(D, code, countable, na, eq, 1)</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	A B C D	object(A, card, countable, na, eq, 1)	<b>property(B, correct, pos)</b>	<b>predicate(C, be, D, B)</b>	<b>relation(D, of, A)</b>	<b>object(D, code, countable, na, eq, 1)</b>	⇒	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>E F</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>property(E, valid, pos)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>predicate(F, be, A, E)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	E F	property(E, valid, pos)	predicate(F, be, A, E)
A B C D											
object(A, card, countable, na, eq, 1)											
<b>property(B, correct, pos)</b>											
<b>predicate(C, be, D, B)</b>											
<b>relation(D, of, A)</b>											
<b>object(D, code, countable, na, eq, 1)</b>											
E F											
property(E, valid, pos)											
predicate(F, be, A, E)											


Everything **which eats** is animate.



John **who is a clerk** waits.




A card **which a customer possesses** is valid.



### 5.3.2 Relative Sentence Conjunction and Disjunction

A customer enters a card **which is green and which is valid**.



A customer enters a card **which is green or which is red**.

<b>A B C</b>					
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>object(B, card, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>predicate(C, enter, A, B)</i>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>D E</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td> <i>property(D, green, pos)</i>  <i>predicate(E, be, B, D)</i> </td> </tr> </table>	<b>D E</b>	<i>property(D, green, pos)</i> <i>predicate(E, be, B, D)</i>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>F G</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td> <i>property(F, red, pos)</i>  <i>predicate(G, be, B, F)</i> </td> </tr> </table>	<b>F G</b>	<i>property(F, red, pos)</i> <i>predicate(G, be, B, F)</i>
<b>D E</b>					
<i>property(D, green, pos)</i> <i>predicate(E, be, B, D)</i>					
<b>F G</b>					
<i>property(F, red, pos)</i> <i>predicate(G, be, B, F)</i>					

## 5.4 of-Prepositional Phrases

The surface **of** the card has a green color.

<b>A B C D</b>
<i>object(A, surface, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>object(B, card, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b>relation(A, of, B)</b> <i>object(C, color, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>property(C, green, pos)</i> <i>predicate(B, have, A, C)</i>

## 5.5 Possessive Nouns

Possessive nouns are introduced by a possessive pronoun or a Saxon genitive. While possessive nouns are equivalent to *of* PPs, Saxon genitives in general are not because of the scoping rules of quantifiers:

- a man's dog (1 man with 1 dog) = a dog of a man (1 man with 1 dog)
- every man's dog (several men each with 1 dog)  $\neq$  a dog of every man (1 dog of several men)

The customer's card is valid.

<b>A B C D</b>
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>object(B, card, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <b>relation(B, of, A)</b> <i>property(C, valid, pos)</i> <i>predicate(D, be, B, C)</i>

Note: There are no recursive Saxon genitives. “A customer’s card” is in ACE, but “A customer’s card’s code” is not.

There is a customer. **His** code is correct.

A B C D
<i>object(A,customer,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>object(B,code,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <b>relation(B,of,A)</b> <i>property(C,correct,pos)</i> <i>predicate(D,be,B,C)</i>

## 6 Modifying Verb Phrases

### 6.1 Adverbs

The following two sentences are parsed identically.

*A customer **quickly** enters a card.*  
*A customer enters a card **quickly**.*

A B C
<i>object(A,customer,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>object(B,card,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(C,enter,A,B)</i> <b>modifier_adv(C,quickly,pos)</b>

The following two sentences are parsed identically.

*A customer **more quickly** enters a card.*  
*A customer enters a card **more quickly**.*

A B C
<i>object(A,customer,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>object(B,card,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(C,enter,A,B)</i> <b>modifier_adv(C,quickly,comp)</b>

The following two sentences are parsed identically.



A customer **most quickly** enters a card.  
A customer enters a card **most quickly**.

A B C
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>object(B, card, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>predicate(C, enter, A, B)</i> <b><i>modifier_adv(C, quickly, sup)</i></b>

## 6.2 Prepositional Phrases

John enters a card **in a bank**.

A B C
<i>object(A, card, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>predicate(B, enter, named('John'), A)</i> <b><i>object(C, bank, countable, na, eq, 1)</i></b> <b><i>modifier_pp(B, in, C)</i></b>


A customer enters a card **quickly and manually in a bank in the morning**.

A B C D E
<i>object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>object(B, card, countable, na, eq, 1)</i> <i>predicate(C, enter, A, B)</i> <b><i>modifier_adv(C, quickly, pos)</i></b> <b><i>modifier_adv(C, manually, pos)</i></b> <b><i>object(D, bank, countable, na, eq, 1)</i></b> <b><i>modifier_pp(C, in, DD)</i></b> <b><i>object(E, morning, countable, na, eq, 1)</i></b> <b><i>modifier_pp(C, in, E)</i></b>

## 7 Composite Sentences


### 7.1 Conditional Sentences

*If the code is valid then the machine accepts the request.*




Conditional sentences always take wide scope. Narrow scope requires starting a new sentence.

*If the code is valid then the machine accepts the request and the transaction succeeds.*



*If the code is valid then the machine accepts the request. The transaction succeeds.*



## 7.2 Coordinated Sentences

### 7.2.1 Sentence Conjunction

*The screen blinks and John waits.*

<i>A B C</i>
<i>predicate(A,blink,B)</i> <i>object(B,screen,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(C,wait,named('John'))</i>

### 7.2.2 Sentence Disjunction

*A screen blinks or John waits.*

<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>A B</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td> <i>object(A,screen,countable,na,eq,1)</i>  <i>predicate(B,blink,A)</i> </td> </tr> </table>	<i>A B</i>	<i>object(A,screen,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(B,blink,A)</i>	∨	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>C</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td> <i>predicate(C,wait,named('John'))</i> </td> </tr> </table>	<i>C</i>	<i>predicate(C,wait,named('John'))</i>
<i>A B</i>						
<i>object(A,screen,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(B,blink,A)</i>						
<i>C</i>						
<i>predicate(C,wait,named('John'))</i>						

## 7.3 Sentence Subordination

*A customer believes **that** his own card is correct.*

<i>A B C</i>		
<i>object(A,customer,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>predicate(B,believe,A,C)</i>		
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>D E F</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td> <i>relation(D,of,A)</i>  <i>object(D,card,countable,na,eq,1)</i>  <i>property(E,correct,pos)</i>  <i>predicate(F,be,D,E)</i> </td> </tr> </table>	<i>D E F</i>	<i>relation(D,of,A)</i> <i>object(D,card,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>property(E,correct,pos)</i> <i>predicate(F,be,D,E)</i>
<i>D E F</i>		
<i>relation(D,of,A)</i> <i>object(D,card,countable,na,eq,1)</i> <i>property(E,correct,pos)</i> <i>predicate(F,be,D,E)</i>		
<i>C :</i>		

Sentence subordination takes narrow scope unless the word “*that*” is repeated.

A customer believes **that** his own card is correct and the machine is broken.

A B C D E F																				
object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)																				
predicate(B, believe, A, C)																				
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3">G H I</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">relation(G, of, A)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C :</td> <td colspan="2">object(G, card, countable, na, eq, 1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">property(H, correct, pos)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">predicate(I, be, G, H)</td> </tr> </table>						G H I			relation(G, of, A)			C :	object(G, card, countable, na, eq, 1)			property(H, correct, pos)			predicate(I, be, G, H)	
G H I																				
relation(G, of, A)																				
C :	object(G, card, countable, na, eq, 1)																			
	property(H, correct, pos)																			
	predicate(I, be, G, H)																			
object(D, machine, countable, na, eq, 1)																				
property(E, broken, pos)																				
predicate(F, be, D, E)																				

A customer believes **that** his own card is correct and **that** the machine is broken.

A B C																										
object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)																										
predicate(B, believe, A, C)																										
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3">D E F G H I</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">relation(D, of, A)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">object(D, card, countable, na, eq, 1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">property(E, correct, pos)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C :</td> <td colspan="2">predicate(F, be, D, E)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">object(G, machine, countable, na, eq, 1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">property(H, broken, pos)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">predicate(I, be, G, H)</td> </tr> </table>			D E F G H I			relation(D, of, A)			object(D, card, countable, na, eq, 1)			property(E, correct, pos)			C :	predicate(F, be, D, E)			object(G, machine, countable, na, eq, 1)			property(H, broken, pos)			predicate(I, be, G, H)	
D E F G H I																										
relation(D, of, A)																										
object(D, card, countable, na, eq, 1)																										
property(E, correct, pos)																										
C :	predicate(F, be, D, E)																									
	object(G, machine, countable, na, eq, 1)																									
	property(H, broken, pos)																									
	predicate(I, be, G, H)																									

## 7.4 Positive Sentence Marker

For consistency reasons, we support the sentence-initial phrase “*It is true that ...*”.

**It is true that** a customer waits.

A B	
object(A, customer, countable, na, eq, 1)	
predicate(B, wait, A)	

## 7.5 Formulas

$10 = 4 + 6.$

$formula(int(5),=,int(3))$

$5 > 3.$

$formula(int(5),>,int(3))$

$X \geq 13.4.$

$A$
$object(A,something,dom,na,na,na)$ $formula(A,\geq,real(13.4))$

$3 < 4$  and  $3 = < 5.$

$formula(int(3),<,int(4))$ $formula(int(3),=<,int(5))$

## 8 Quantified Sentences

### 8.1 Existential Quantification

*A card ... / There is a card.*


$A$
$object(A,card,countable,na,eq,1)$

*John enters a card.*

$A B$
$object(A,card,countable,na,eq,1)$ $predicate(B,enter,named('John'),A)$

## 8.2 Universal Quantification

John enters **every** code.




## 8.3 Global Universal Quantification

The following two sentences are parsed identically.

**For every** code a clerk enters it.

**For every** code there is a clerk who enters it.



# 9 Negation


Unless stated otherwise, we talk about classical negation. For negation as failure see subsection 9.4.

## 9.1 Quantor Negation


### 9.1.1 Negated Existential Quantor

Note that negated existential quantors can produce different DRS representations, depending on the context. Within “*there is ...*”, a negated sub-DRS is created. Otherwise, we get an implication with a negated sub-DRS on the right hand side.

There is **no** code.




Sue enters **no** code.




### 9.1.2 Negated Universal Quantor

Sue enters **not every** code.




## 9.2 Verb Phrase Negation


A man **does not** enter a code.



Every man **does not** enter a code.




A man **does not** enter every code.






A card is **not** valid.




### 9.3 Sentence Negation

*It is false that* a screen blinks.




*It is false that* every screen blinks.




Sentence negation takes narrow scope, but wide scope can be triggered by repeating the *that* complementizer. Compare the following two examples.

**It is false that** a man waits and a woman sings.



**It is false that** a man waits and **that** a woman sings.




## 9.4 Negation as Failure

There are two ways to express negation as failure (NAF). First, one can use the construct "... *not provably* ..." for verb phrase negation. Second, the predefined phrase "*It is not provable that* ..." can be used for sentence negation.


### 9.4.1 Verb Phrase Negation for NAF

The construct "... *not provably* ..." can be used for all the cases of verb phrase negation as explained in section 9.2.

A customer does **not provably** enter a code.




A card is **not provably** valid.




Furthermore, classical negation can be directly nested inside of negation as failure.

A card is **not provably** not valid.



#### 9.4.2 Sentence Negation for NAF

*It is not provable that* a screen blinks.



Concerning scoping, it behaves like the classical sentence negation (“*It is false that ...*”) explained in section 9.3.


## 10 Modality

Each of the four forms of modality (possibility, necessity, recommendation, and admissibility) can be represented in two different ways. First, we can use the modal auxiliary “*can*”, “*must*”, “*should*”, or “*may*”, respectively. Second, we can use the sentence-initial phrase “*It is possible that...*”, “*It is necessary that ...*”, “*It is recommended that...*”, or “*It is admissible that...*”, respectively. Negation of these constructs is also allowed (see below for details).

Note that “*a customer can enter a card*” is not equivalent to “*it is possible that a customer enters a card*” (see below).

### 10.1 Possibility

*A customer **can** enter a card.*




The following three sentences are equivalent.


*A customer **can't** enter a card.*

*A customer **cannot** enter a card.*


*A customer **can not** enter a card.*



**It is possible that** a customer enters a card.




**It is not possible that** a customer enters a card.



## 10.2 Necessity


The two synonyms “*must*” and “*has to*” can be used.

A customer **must** enter a card.  
A customer **has to** enter a card.




For the negation, only “*does not have to*” is allowed.


A customer **does not have to** enter a card.



**It is necessary that** a customer enters a card.




**It is not necessary that** a customer enters a card.



### 10.3 Recommendation


A customer **should** enter a card.




The following two sentences are equivalent.

A customer **shouldn't** enter a card.


A customer **should not** enter a card.



**It is recommended that** a customer enters a card.




**It is not recommended that** a customer enters a card.




## 10.4 Admissibility

A customer **may** enter a card.




A customer **may not** enter a card.






**It is admissible that** a customer enters a card.



**It is not admissible that** a customer enters a card.



## 11 Plural Interpretations

In this section, we present the eight readings of the natural English sentence


*2 girls lift 2 tables.*

which can be expressed in ACE. For background information on the disambiguation of plurals consult [4] and [5]. The numbers refer to [4]. Note that reading 4 has two interpretations 4a and 4b and that reading 5 is identical to reading 1.

In ACE, a plural noun phrase has a default collective reading. To express a distributive reading, a noun phrase has to be preceded by the marker *each of*. The relative scope of a quantifier corresponds to its surface position. We use *there is/are* and *for each of* to move a quantifier to the front of a sentence and thus widen its scope.

### 11.1 Reading 1

*girls tables*




2 girls lift 2 tables.

A	B	C
object(A,girl,countable,na,eq,2)		
object(B,table,countable,na,eq,2)		
<b>predicate(C,lift,A,B)</b>		

## 11.2 Reading 2

girls tables




2 girls lift each of 2 tables.


A	B				
object(A,girl,countable,na,eq,2)					
object(B,table,countable,na,eq,2)					
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>C</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>has_part(B,C)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	C	has_part(B,C)	$\Rightarrow$ <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>D</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>predicate(D,lift,A,C)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	D	predicate(D,lift,A,C)
C					
has_part(B,C)					
D					
predicate(D,lift,A,C)					

## 11.3 Reading 3

girls tables




Each of 2 girls lifts 2 tables.




### 11.4 Reading 4a

*girls*      *tables*




Each of 2 girls lifts each of 2 tables.




## 11.5 Reading 4b

*girls*      *tables*




There are 2 girls and there are 2 tables and each of the girls lifts each of the tables.




## 11.6 Reading 5

Reading 5 is identical to reading 1.

*girls*      *tables*




There are 2 tables and 2 girls lift the tables.




## 11.7 Reading 6

*girls*      *tables*





There are 2 tables and each of 2 girls lifts the tables.




## 11.8 Reading 7

*girls*      *tables*




For each of 2 tables 2 girls lift it.




## 11.9 Reading 8

*girls*      *tables*



For each of 2 tables each of 2 girls lifts it.




## 12 Questions and Commands


Questions introduce nested DRSs using the operator QUESTION.

### 12.1 Yes/No-Questions

*Does John enter a card?*




Is the card valid?




## 12.2 Who/What/Which-Questions

**Who** enters **what**?



**Which** customer enters a card?



## 12.3 How/Where/When-Questions

*How* does John enter a card?

QUESTION	<table border="1"><tr><td>A B</td></tr><tr><td><i>object(A,card,countable,na,eq,1)</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>predicate(B,enter,named('John'),A)</i></td></tr><tr><td><b><i>query(B,how)</i></b></td></tr></table>	A B	<i>object(A,card,countable,na,eq,1)</i>	<i>predicate(B,enter,named('John'),A)</i>	<b><i>query(B,how)</i></b>
A B					
<i>object(A,card,countable,na,eq,1)</i>					
<i>predicate(B,enter,named('John'),A)</i>					
<b><i>query(B,how)</i></b>					

*Where* does John wait?

QUESTION	<table border="1"><tr><td>A</td></tr><tr><td><i>predicate(A,wait,named('John'))</i></td></tr><tr><td><b><i>query(A,where)</i></b></td></tr></table>	A	<i>predicate(A,wait,named('John'))</i>	<b><i>query(A,where)</i></b>
A				
<i>predicate(A,wait,named('John'))</i>				
<b><i>query(A,where)</i></b>				

*When* does John wait?

QUESTION	<table border="1"><tr><td>A</td></tr><tr><td><i>predicate(A,wait,named('John'))</i></td></tr><tr><td><b><i>query(A,when)</i></b></td></tr></table>	A	<i>predicate(A,wait,named('John'))</i>	<b><i>query(A,when)</i></b>
A				
<i>predicate(A,wait,named('John'))</i>				
<b><i>query(A,when)</i></b>				

## 12.4 How many/much Questions

*How many* beaches have *how much* sand?


QUESTION	<table border="1"><tr><td>A B C</td></tr><tr><td><b><i>query(A,howm)</i></b></td></tr><tr><td><i>object(A,beach,countable,na,geq,2)</i></td></tr><tr><td><b><i>query(B,howm)</i></b></td></tr><tr><td><i>object(B,sand,mass,na,na,na)</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>predicate(C,have,A,B)</i></td></tr></table>	A B C	<b><i>query(A,howm)</i></b>	<i>object(A,beach,countable,na,geq,2)</i>	<b><i>query(B,howm)</i></b>	<i>object(B,sand,mass,na,na,na)</i>	<i>predicate(C,have,A,B)</i>
A B C							
<b><i>query(A,howm)</i></b>							
<i>object(A,beach,countable,na,geq,2)</i>							
<b><i>query(B,howm)</i></b>							
<i>object(B,sand,mass,na,na,na)</i>							
<i>predicate(C,have,A,B)</i>							



## 12.5 Commands

Commands introduce nested DRSs using the operator `COMMAND`.

*John, get a beer!*



## References

- [1] Patrick Blackburn and Johan Bos. *Working with Discourse Representation Structures*, volume 2nd of *Representation and Inference for Natural Language: A First Course in Computational Linguistics*. September 1999.
- [2] Johan Bos. Computational Semantics in Discourse: Underspecification, Resolution, and Inference. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 13(2):139–157, 2004
- [3] Hans Kamp and Uwe Reyle. *From Discourse to Logic. Introduction to Modeltheoretic Semantics of Natural Language, Formal Logic and Discourse Representation Theory*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht/Boston/London, 1993
- [4] Uta Schwertel. Controlling Plural Ambiguities in Attempto Controlled English. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Controlled Language Applications*, Seattle, Washington, 2000
- [5] Uta Schwertel. *Plural Semantics for Natural Language Understanding — A Computational Proof-Theoretic Approach*. PhD thesis, University of Zurich, 2004