# TuLiPA: Towards a Multi-Formalism Parsing Environment for Grammar Engineering

**Laura Kallmeyer**
SFB 441
Universität Tübingen
D-72074, Tübingen, Germany
lk@sfs.uni-tuebingen.de

**Timm Lichte**
SFB 441
Universität Tübingen
D-72074, Tübingen, Germany
timm.lichte@uni-tuebingen.de

**Wolfgang Maier**
SFB 441
Universität Tübingen
D-72074, Tübingen, Germany
wo.maier@uni-tuebingen.de

**Yannick Parmentier**
CNRS - LORIA
Nancy Université
F-54506, Vandœuvre, France
parmenti@loria.fr

**Johannes Dellert**
SFB 441 - SfS
Universität Tübingen
D-72074, Tübingen, Germany

**Kilian Evang**
SFB 441 - SfS
Universität Tübingen
D-72074, Tübingen, Germany
{jdellert,kevang}@sfs.uni-tuebingen.de

## Abstract

In this paper, we present an open-source parsing environment (Tübingen Linguistic Parsing Architecture, TuLiPA) which uses Range Concatenation Grammar (RCG) as a pivot formalism, thus opening the way to the parsing of several mildly context-sensitive formalisms. This environment currently supports tree-based grammars (namely Tree-Adjoining Grammars (TAG) and Multi-Component Tree-Adjoining Grammars with Tree Tuples (TT-MCTAG)) and allows computation not only of syntactic structures, but also of the corresponding semantic representations. It is used for the development of a tree-based grammar for German.

## 1 Introduction

Grammars and lexicons represent important linguistic resources for many NLP applications, among which one may cite dialog systems, automatic summarization or machine translation. Developing such resources is known to be a complex task that needs useful tools such as parsers and generators (Erbach, 1992).

Furthermore, there is a lack of a common framework allowing for multi-formalism grammar engineering. Thus, many formalisms have been proposed to model natural language, each coming with specific implementations. Having a common framework would facilitate the comparison between formalisms (e.g., in terms of parsing complexity in practice), and would allow for a better sharing of resources (e.g., having a common lexicon, from which different features would be extracted depending on the target formalism).

In this context, we present a parsing environment relying on a general architecture that can be used for parsing with mildly context-sensitive (MCS) formalisms[1] (Joshi, 1987). Its underlying idea is to use Range Concatenation Grammar (RCG) as a pivot formalism, for RCG has been shown to strictly include MCS languages while being parsable in polynomial time (Boullier, 2000).

Currently, this architecture supports tree-based grammars (Tree-Adjoining Grammars and Multi-Component Tree-Adjoining Grammars with Tree Tuples (Lichte, 2007)). More precisely, tree-based grammars are first converted into equivalent RCGs, which are then used for parsing. The result of RCG parsing is finally interpreted to extract a derivation structure for the input grammar, as well as to perform additional processings (e.g., semantic calculus, extraction of dependency views).

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, we present the architecture of the TuLiPA parsing environment and show how the use of RCG as a pivot formalism makes it easier to design a modular system that can be extended to support several dimensions (syntax, semantics) and/or formalisms. In section 3, we give some desiderata for grammar engineering and present TuLiPA's cur-

[1] A formalism is said to be mildly context sensitive (MCS) iff (i) it generates limited cross-serial dependencies, (ii) it is polynomially parsable, and (iii) the string languages generated by the formalism have the constant growth property (e.g., $\{a^{2^n} | n \geq 0\}$ does not have this property). Examples of MCS formalisms include Tree-Adjoining Grammars, Combinatory Categorial Grammars and Linear Indexed Grammars.

rent state with respect to these. In section 4, we compare this system with existing approaches for parsing and more generally for grammar engineering. Finally, in section 5, we conclude by presenting future work.

## 2 Range Concatenation Grammar as a pivot formalism

The main idea underlying TuLiPA is to use RCG as a pivot formalism for RCG has appealing formal properties (e.g., a generative capacity lying beyond Linear Context Free Rewriting Systems and a polynomial parsing complexity) and there exist efficient algorithms, for RCG parsing (Boullier, 2000) and for grammar transformation into RCG (Boullier, 1998; Boullier, 1999).

Parsing with TuLiPA is thus a 3-step process:

1. The input tree-based grammar is converted into an RCG (using the algorithm of Kallmeyer and Parmentier (2008) when dealing with TT-MCTAG).

2. The resulting RCG is used for parsing the input string using an extension of the parsing algorithm of Boullier (2000).

3. The RCG derivation structure is interpreted to extract the derivation and derived trees with respect to the input grammar.

The use of RCG as a pivot formalism, and thus of an RCG parser as a core component of the system, leads to a modular architecture. In turns, this makes TuLiPA more easily extensible, either in terms of functionalities, or in terms of formalisms.

### 2.1 Adding functionalities to the parsing environment

As an illustration of TuLiPA's extensibility, one may consider two extensions applied to the system recently.

First, a semantic calculus using the syntax/semantics interface for TAG proposed by Gardent and Kallmeyer (2003) has been added. This interface associates each tree with flat semantic formulas. The arguments of these formulas are unification variables, which are co-indexed with features labelling the nodes of the syntactic tree. During classical TAG derivation, trees are combined, triggering unifications of the feature structures labelling nodes. As a result of these unifications, the arguments of the semantic formulas are unified (see Fig. 1).




Figure 1: Semantic calculus in Feature-Based TAG.

In our system, the semantic support has been integrated by (i) extending the internal tree objects to include semantic formulas (the RCG-conversion is kept unchanged), and (ii) extending the construction of the derived tree (step 3) so that during the interpretation of the RCG derivation in terms of tree combinations, the semantic formulas are carried and updated with respect to the feature unifications performed.

Secondly, let us consider lexical disambiguation. Because of the high redundancy lying within lexicalized formalisms such as lexicalized TAG, it is common to consider tree schemata having a frontier node marked for *anchoring* (i.e., lexicalization). At parsing time, the tree schemata are anchored according to the input string. This anchoring selects a subgrammar supposed to cover the input string. Unfortunately, this subgrammar may contain many trees that either do not lead to a parse or for which we know *a priori* that they cannot be combined within the same derivation (so we should not predict a derivation from one of these trees to another during parsing). As a result, the parser could have poor performance because of the many derivation paths that have to be explored. Bonfante et al. (2004) proposed to polarize the structures of the grammar, and to apply an automaton-based filtering of the compatible structures. The idea is the following. One compute polarities representing the needs/resources brought by a given tree (or tree tuple for TT-MCTAG). A substitution or foot node with category NP reflects a need for an NP (written NP-). In the same way, an NP root node reflects a resource of type NP (written NP+). Then you build an automaton

whose edges correspond to trees, and states to polarities brought by trees along the path. The automaton is then traversed to extract all paths leading to a final state with a neutral polarity for each category and +1 for the axiom (see Fig. 2, the state 7 is the only valid state and {proper., trans., det., noun.} the only compatible set of trees).




Figure 2: Polarity-based lexical disambiguation.

In our context, this polarity filtering has been added before step 1, leaving untouched the core RCG conversion and parsing steps. The idea is to compute the sets of compatible trees (or tree tuples for TT-MCTAG) and to convert these sets separately. Indeed the RCG has to encode only valid adjunctions/substitutions. Thanks to this automaton-based "clustering" of the compatible tree (or tree tuples), we avoid predicting incompatible derivations. Note that the time saved by using a polarity-based filter is not negligible, especially when parsing long sentences.[2]

### 2.2 Adding formalisms to the parsing environment

Of course, the two extensions introduced in the previous section may have been added to other modular architectures as well. The main gain brought by RCG is the possibility to parse not only tree-based grammars, but other formalisms provided they can be encoded into RCG. In our system, only TAG and TT-MCTAG have been considered so far. Nonetheless, Boullier (1998) and Søgaard (2007) have defined transformations into RCG for other mildly context-sensitive formalisms.[3]

[2] An evaluation of the gain brought by this technique when using Interaction Grammar is given by Bonfante et al. (2004).

[3] These include Multi-Component Tree-Adjoining Grammar, Linear Indexed Grammar, Head Grammar, Coupled Context Free Grammar, Right Linear Unification Grammar and Synchronous Unification Grammar.

To sum up, the idea would be to keep the core RCG parser, and to extend TuLiPA with a specific conversion module for each targeted formalism. On top of these conversion modules, one should also provide interpretation modules allowing to decode the RCG derivation forest in terms of the input formalism (see Fig. 3).




Figure 3: Towards a multi-formalism parsing environment.

An important point remains to be discussed. It concerns the role of lexicalization with respect to the formalism used. Indeed, the tree-based grammar formalisms currently supported (TAG and TT-MCTAG) both share the same lexicalization process (i.e., tree *anchoring*). Thus the lexicon format is common to these formalisms. As we will see below, it corresponds to a 2-layer lexicon made of inflected forms and lemma respectively, the latter selecting specific grammatical structures. When parsing other formalisms, it is still unclear whether one can use the same lexicon format, and if not what kind of general lexicon management module should be added to the parser (in particular to deal with morphology).

## 3 Towards a complete grammar engineering environment

So far, we have seen how to use a generic parsing architecture relying on RCG to parse different formalisms. In this section, we adopt a broader view and enumerate some requirements for a linguistic resource development environment. We also see to what extent these requirements are fulfilled (or partially fulfilled) within the TuLiPA system.

### 3.1 Grammar engineering with TuLiPA

As advocated by Erbach (1992), grammar engineering needs *"tools for testing the grammar with respect to consistency, coverage, overgeneration and accuracy"*. These characteristics may

be taken into account by different interacting software. Thus, consistency can be checked by a semi-automatic grammar production device, such as the XMG system of Duchier et al. (2004). Overgeneration is mainly checked by a generator (or by a parser with adequate test suites), and coverage and accuracy by a parser. In our case, the TuLiPA system provides an entry point for using a grammar production system (and a lexicon conversion tool introduced below), while including a parser. Note that TuLiPA does not include any generator, nonetheless it uses the same lexicon format as the GenI surface realizer for TAG[4].

TuLiPA's input grammar is designed using XMG, which is a *metagrammar* compiler for tree-based formalisms. In other terms, the linguist defines a factorized description of the grammar (the so-called metagrammar) in the XMG language. Briefly, an XMG metagrammar consists of (i) elementary tree fragments represented as tree description logic formulas, and (ii) conjunctive and disjunctive combinations of these tree fragments to describe actual TAG tree schemata.[5] This metagrammar is then compiled by the XMG system to produce a tree grammar in an XML format. Note that the resulting grammar contains tree schemata (i.e., unlexicalized trees). To lexicalize these, the linguist defines a lexicon mapping words with corresponding sets of trees. Following XTAG (2001), this lexicon is a 2-layer lexicon made of morphological and lemma specifications. The motivation of this 2-layer format is (i) to express linguistic generalizations at the lexicon level, and (ii) to allow the parser to only select a subgrammar according to a given sentence, thus reducing parsing complexity. TuLiPA comes with a lexicon conversion tool (namely lexConverter) allowing to write a lexicon in a user-friendly text format and to convert it into XML. An example of an entry of such a lexicon is given in Fig. 4.

The morphological specification consists of a word, the corresponding lemma and morphological features. The main pieces of information contained in the lemma specification are the ∗ENTRY field, which refers to the lemma, the ∗CAT field referring to the syntactic category of the anchor node, the ∗SEM field containing some semantic

Morphological specification:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| vergisst | vergessen | [pos=v,num=sg,per=3] |

Lemma specification:

∗ENTRY: vergessen
∗CAT: v
∗SEM: BinaryRel[pred=vergessen]
∗ACC: 1
∗FAM: Vnp2
∗FILTERS: []
∗EX:
∗EQUATIONS:
NParg1 → cas = nom
NParg2 → cas = acc
∗COANCHORS:

Figure 4: Morphological and lemma specification of *vergisst*.

information allowing for semantic instantiation, the ∗FAM field, which contains the name of the tree family to be anchored, the ∗FILTERS field which consists of a feature structure constraining by unification the trees of a given family that can be anchored by the given lemma (used for instance for non-passivable verbs), the ∗EQUATIONS field allowing for the definition of equations targeting named nodes of the trees, and the ∗COANCHORS field, which allows for the specification of co-anchors (such as *by* in the verb *to come by*).

From these XML resources, TuLiPA parses a string, corresponding either to a sentence or a constituent (noun phrase, prepositional phrase, *etc.*), and computes several output pieces of information, namely (for TAG and TT-MCTAG): derivation/derived trees, semantic representations (computed from underspecified representations using the utool software[6], or dependency views of the derivation trees (using the DTool software[7]).

### 3.2 Grammar debugging

The engineering process introduced in the preceding section belongs to a development cycle, where one first designs a grammar and corresponding lexicons using XMG, then checks these with the parser, fixes them, parses again, and so on.

[4] `http://trac.loria.fr/~geni`

[5] See (Crabbé, 2005) for a presentation on how to use the XMG formalism for describing a core TAG for French.

[6] See `http://www.coli.uni-saarland.de/projects/chorus/utool/`, with courtesy of Alexander Koller.

[7] With courtesy of Marco Kuhlmann.

To facilitate grammar debugging, TuLiPA includes both a verbose and a robust mode allowing respectively to (i) produce a log of the RCG-conversion, RCG-parsing and RCG-derivation interpretation, and (ii) display mismatching features leading to incomplete derivations. More precisely, in robust mode, the parser displays derivations step by step, highlighting feature unification failures.

TuLiPA's options can be activated via an intuitive Graphical User Interface (see Fig. 5).




Figure 5: TuLiPA's Graphical User Interface.

### 3.3 Towards a functional common interface

Unfortunately, as mentioned above, the linguist has to move back-and-forth from the grammar/lexicon descriptions to the parser, i.e., each time the parser reports grammar errors, the linguist fixes these and then recomputes the XML files and then parses again. To avoid this tedious task of resources re-compilation, we started developing an Eclipse[8] plug-in for the TuLiPA system. Thus, the linguist will be able to manage all these resources, and to call the parser, the metagrammar compiler, and the lexConverter from a common interface (see Fig. 6).

The motivation for this plug-in comes from the observation that designing electronic grammars is a task comparable to designing source code. A powerful grammar engineering environment should thus come with development facilities such as precise debugging information, syntax highlighting, *etc*. Using the Eclipse open-source



Figure 6: TuLiPA's eclipse plug-in.

development platform allows for reusing several components inherited from the software development community, such as plug-ins for version control, editors coupled with explorers, *etc*.

Eventually, one point worth considering in the context of grammar development concerns data encoding. To our knowledge, only few environments provide support for UTF-8 encoding, thus guarantying the coverage of a wide set of charsets and languages. In TuLiPA, we added an UTF-8 support for linguistic resources (in the lexConverter), thus allowing to design a TAG for Korean (work in progress).

### 3.4 Usability of the TuLiPA system

As mentioned above, the TuLiPA system is made of several interacting components, that one currently has to install separately. Nonetheless, much attention has been paid to make this installation process as easy as possible and compatible with all major platforms.[9]

XMG and lexConverter can be installed by compiling their sources (using a *make* command). TuLiPA is developed in Java and released as an executable jar. No compilation is needed for it, the only requirement is the Gecode/GecodeJ library[10] (available as a binary package for many platforms). Finally, the TuLiPA eclipse plug-in can be installed easily from eclipse itself. All these tools are released under Free software licenses (either GNU GPL or Eclipse Public License).

[8] See `http://www.eclipse.org`

[9] See `http://sourcesup.cru.fr/tulipa`.

[10] See `http://www.gecode.org/gecodej`.

This environment is being used (i) at the University of Tübingen, in the context of the development of a TT-MCTAG for German describing both syntax and semantics, and (ii) at LORIA Nancy, in the development of an XTAG-based metagrammar for English. The German grammar, called GerTT (for German Tree Tuples), is released under a LGPL license for Linguistic Resources[11] and is presented in (Kallmeyer et al., 2008). The test-suite currently used to check the grammar is hand-crafted. A more systematic evaluation of the grammar is in preparation, using the Test Suite for Natural Language Processing (Lehmann et al., 1996).

## 4 Comparison with existing approaches

### 4.1 Engineering environments for tree-based grammar formalisms

To our knowledge, there is currently no available parsing environment for multi-component TAG.

Existing grammar engineering environments for TAG include the DyALog system[12] described in Villemonte de la Clergerie (2005). DyALog is a compiler for a logic programming language using tabulation and dynamic programming techniques. This compiler has been used to implement efficient parsing algorithms for several formalisms, including TAG and RCG. Unfortunately, it does not include any built-in GUI and requires a good knowledge of the GNU build tools to compile parsers. This makes it relatively difficult to use. DyALog's main quality lies in its efficiency in terms of parsing time and its capacity to handle very large resources. Unlike TuLiPA, it does not compute semantic representations.

The closest approach to TuLiPA corresponds to the SemTAG system[13], which extends TAG parsers compiled with DyALog with a semantic calculus module (Gardent and Parmentier, 2007). Unlike TuLiPA, this system only supports TAG, and does not provide any graphical output allowing to easily check the result of parsing.

Note that, for grammar designers mainly interested in TAG, SemTAG and TuLiPA can be seen as complementary tools. Indeed, one may use TuLiPA to develop the grammar and check specific syntactic structures thanks to its intuitive parsing environment. Once the grammar is stable, one may use SemTAG in batch processing to parse corpuses and build semantic representations using large grammars. This combination of these 2 systems is made easier by the fact that both use the same input formats (a metagrammar in the XMG language and a text-based lexicon). This approach is the one being adopted for the development of a French TAG equipped with semantics.

For Interaction Grammar (Perrier, 2000), there exists an engineering environment gathering the XMG metagrammar compiler and an eLEtrOstatic PARser (LEOPAR).[14] This environment is being used to develop an Interaction Grammar for French. TuLiPA's lexical disambiguation module reuses techniques introduced by LEOPAR. Unlike TuLiPA, LEOPAR does not currently support semantic information.

### 4.2 Engineering environments for other grammar formalisms

For other formalisms, there exist state-of-the-art grammar engineering environments that have been used for many years to design large deep grammars for several languages.

For Lexical Functional Grammar, one may cite the Xerox Linguistic Environment (XLE).[15] For Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar, the main available systems are the Linguistic Knowledge Base (LKB)[16] and the TRALE system.[17] For Combinatory Categorial Grammar, one may cite the OpenCCG library[18] and the C&C parser.[19]

These environments have been used to develop broad-coverage resources equipped with semantics and include both a generator and a parser. Unlike TuLiPA, they represent advanced projects, that have been used for dialog and machine translation applications. They are mainly tailored for a specific formalism.[20]

[11] See `http://infolingu.univ-mlv.fr/DonneesLinguistiques/Lexiques-Grammaires/lgpllr.html`

[12] See `http://dyalog.gforge.inria.fr`

[13] See `http://trac.loria.fr/~semconst`

[14] See `http://www.loria.fr/equipes/calligramme/leopar/`

[15] See `http://www2.parc.com/isl/groups/nltt/xle/`

[16] See `http://wiki.delph-in.net/moin`

[17] See `http://milca.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/A4/Course/trale/`

[18] See `http://openccg.sourceforge.net/`

[19] See `http://svn.ask.it.usyd.edu.au/trac/candc/wiki`

[20] Nonetheless, Beavers (2002) encoded a CCG in the LKB's Type Description Language.

## 5 Future work

In this section, we give some prospective views concerning engineering environments in general, and TuLiPA in particular. We first distinguish between 2 main usages of grammar engineering environments, namely a pedagogical usage and an application-oriented usage, and finally give some comments about multi-formalism.

**Pedagogical usage** Developing grammars in a pedagogical context needs facilities allowing for inspection of the structures of the grammar, step-by-step parsing (or generation), along with an intuitive interface. The idea is to abstract away from technical aspects related to implementation (intermediate data structures, optimizations, etc.).

The question whether to provide graphical or text-based editors can be discussed. As advocated by Baldridge et al. (2007), a low-level text-based specification can offer more flexibility and bring less frustration to the grammar designer, especially when such a specification can be graphically interpreted. This is the approach chosen by XMG, where the grammar is defined via an (advanced or not) editor such as gedit or emacs. Within TuLiPA, we chose to go further by using the Eclipse platform. Currently, it allows for displaying a summary of the content of a metagrammar or lexicon on a side panel, while editing these on a middle panel. These two panels are linked via a jump functionality. The next steps concern (i) the plugging of a graphical viewer to display the (meta)grammar structures independently from a given parse, and (ii) the extension of the eclipse plug-in so that one can easily consistently modify entries of the metagrammar or lexicon (especially when these are split over several files).

**Application-oriented usage** When dealing with applications, one may demand more from the grammar engineering environment, especially in terms of efficiency and robustness (support for larger resources, partial parsing, etc.).

Efficiency needs optimizations in the parsing engine making it possible to support grammars containing several thousands of structures. One interesting question concerns the compilation of a grammar either off-line or on-line. In DyALog's approach, the grammar is compiled off-line into a logical automaton encoding all possible derivations. This off-line compilation can take some minutes with a TAG having 6000 trees, but the resulting parser can parse sentences within a second.

In TuLiPA's approach, the grammar is compiled into an RCG on-line. While giving satisfactory results on reduced resources[21], it may lead to troubles when scaling up. This is especially true for TAG (the TT-MCTAG formalism is by definition a factorized formalism compared with TAG). In the future, it would be useful to look for a way to precompile a TAG into an RCG off-line, thus saving the conversion time.

Another important feature of grammar engineering environments consists of its debugging functionalities. Among these, one may cite unit and integration testing. It would be useful to extend the TuLiPA system to provide a module for generating test-suites for a given grammar. The idea would be to record the coverage and analyses of a grammar at a given time. Once the grammar is further developed, these snapshots would allow for regression testing.

**About multi-formalism** We already mentioned that TuLiPA was opening a way towards multi-formalism by relying on an RCG core. It is worth noticing that the XMG system was also designed to be further extensible. Indeed, a metagrammar in XMG corresponds to the combination of elementary structures. One may think of designing a library of such structures, these would be dependent on the target grammar formalism. The combinations may represent general linguistic concepts and would be shared by different grammar implementations, following ideas presented by Bender et al. (2005).

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a multi-formalism parsing architecture using RCG as a pivot formalism to parse mildly context-sensitive formalisms (currently TAG and TT-MCTAG). This system has been designed to facilitate grammar development by providing user-friendly interfaces, along with several functionalities (e.g., dependency extraction, derivation/derived tree display and semantic calculus). It is currently used for developing a core grammar for German.

[21] For a TT-MCTAG counting about 300 sets of trees and an and-crafted lexicon made of about 300 of words, a 10-word sentence is parsed (and a semantic representation computed) within seconds.

At the moment, we are working on the extension of this architecture to include a fully functional Eclipse plug-in. Other current tasks concern optimizations to support large scale parsing and the extension of the syntactic and semantic coverage of the German grammar under development.

## Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) and the Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst (DAAD, grant A/06/71039). We are grateful to three anonymous reviewers for valuable comments on this work.

## References

Baldridge, Jason, Sudipta Chatterjee, Alexis Palmer, and Ben Wing. 2007. DotCCG and VisCCG: Wiki and programming paradigms for improved grammar engineering with OpenCCG. In King, Tracy Holloway and Emily M. Bender, editors, *Proceedings of GEAF07*, pages 5–25, Stanford, CA. CSLI.

Beavers, John. 2002. Documentation: A CCG Implementation for the LKB. LinGO Working Paper No. 2002-08, CSLI, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Bender, Emily, Dan Flickinger, Frederik Fouvry, and Melanie Siegel. 2005. Shared representation in multilingual grammar engineering. *Research on Language & Computation*, 3(2):131–138.

Bonfante, Guillaume, Bruno Guillaume, and Guy Perrier. 2004. Polarization and abstraction of grammatical formalisms as methods for lexical disambiguation. In *Proceedings of CoLing 2004*, pages 303–309, Geneva, Switzerland.

Boullier, Pierre. 1998. Proposal for a natural language processing syntactic backbone. Rapport de Recherche 3342, INRIA.

Boullier, Pierre. 1999. On TAG and Multicomponent TAG Parsing. Rapport de Recherche 3668, INRIA.

Boullier, Pierre. 2000. Range concatenation grammars. In *Proceedings of IWPT 2000*, pages 53–64, Trento, Italy.

Crabbé, Benoit. 2005. Grammatical development with XMG. In *Proceedings of LACL 05*, pages 84–100, Bordeaux, France.

Duchier, Denys, Joseph Le Roux, and Yannick Parmentier. 2004. The Metagrammar Compiler: An NLP Application with a Multi-paradigm Architecture. In *Proceedings of MOZ'2004*, pages 175–187, Charleroi, Belgium.

Erbach, Gregor. 1992. Tools for grammar engineering. In *3rd Conference on Applied Natural Language Processing*, pages 243–244, Trento, Italy.

Gardent, Claire and Laura Kallmeyer. 2003. Semantic Construction in FTAG. In *Proceedings of EACL 2003*, pages 123–130, Budapest, Hungary.

Gardent, Claire and Yannick Parmentier. 2007. Semtag: a platform for specifying tree adjoining grammars and performing tag-based semantic construction. In *Proceedings of the ACL 2007, Companion Volume Proceedings of the Demo and Poster Sessions*, pages 13–16, Prague, Czech Republic.

Joshi, Aravind K. 1987. An introduction to Tree Adjoining Grammars. In Manaster-Ramer, A., editor, *Mathematics of Language*, pages 87–114. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Kallmeyer, Laura and Yannick Parmentier. 2008. On the relation between Multicomponent Tree Adjoining Grammars with Tree Tuples (TT-MCTAG) and Range Concatenation Grammars (RCG). In *Proceedings of LATA 2008*, pages 277–288, Tarragona, Spain.

Kallmeyer, Laura, Timm Lichte, Wolfgang Maier, Yannick Parmentier, and Johannes Dellert. 2008. Developping an MCTAG for German with an RCG-based Parser. In *Proceedings of LREC 2008*, Marrakech, Morocco.

Lehmann, Sabine, Stephan Oepen, Sylvie Regnier-Prost, Klaus Netter, Veronika Lux, Judith Klein, Kirsten Falkedal, Frederik Fouvry, Dominique Estival, Eva Dauphin, Hervé Compagnion, Judith Baur, Lorna Balkan, and Doug Arnold. 1996. TSNLP — Test Suites for Natural Language Processing. In *Proceedings of CoLing 1996*, volume 2, pages 711–716, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Lichte, Timm. 2007. An MCTAG with tuples for coherent constructions in German. In *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Formal Grammar*, Dublin, Ireland.

Perrier, Guy. 2000. Interaction grammars. In *Proceedings of CoLing 2000*, pages 600–606, Saarbruecken, Germany.

Søgaard, Anders. 2007. *Complexity, expressivity and logic of linguistic theories*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Villemonte de la Clergerie, Éric. 2005. DyALog: a tabular logic programming based environment for NLP. In *Proceedings of the workshop on Constraint Satisfaction for Language Processing (CSLP 2005)*, pages 18–33, Barcelona, Spain.

XTAG-Research-Group. 2001. A lexicalized tree adjoining grammar for english. Technical Report IRCS-01-03, IRCS, University of Pennsylvania. Available at `http://www.cis.upenn.edu/~xtag/gramrelease.html`.