



Do Large Language Models Understand Anaphoric Accessibility?

Yale

Xiaomeng Zhu* Zhenghao Zhou* Simon Charlow Robert Frank
Department of Linguistics, Yale University

TL;DR

- We present a hierarchy of natural language understanding abilities and argue for the importance of the **discourse level**.
- We propose the task of **anaphora accessibility** and develop an evaluation dataset inspired by theoretical research in dynamic semantics.
- We find that LLMs and humans align on some tasks and diverge on others, and such divergence can be explained by LLMs' reliance on specific lexical items as opposed to abstract structure as indicators of discourse structure.

Existential vs. Universal

Explicit / Lexical $\forall$

A farmer worked in his field. He dreamed of the harvest.
Every farmer worked in his field. # He dreamed of the harvest.
Discourse entity Quantifier scope Anaphora
Infelicitous because outside of scope


$\exists x(\text{Farmer}(x) \wedge \text{WorkInField}(x)) \wedge \text{Dream}(x)$

Implicit / Embedded $\forall$

The farmer owns a donkey, and he beats it. It is a big one.
If the farmer owns a donkey, he beats it. # It is a big one.
Discourse entity Quantifier scope Anaphora
Infelicitous because outside of scope

$\forall x[\text{Farmer}(x) \rightarrow \text{WorkInField}(x)] \wedge \text{Dream}(x)$


Prediction: $P(\text{cont} | \exists) > P(\text{cont} | \forall)$




Conclusion: LLMs are sensitive to the difference in anaphora accessibility between universal and existential quantifiers.

Sentence boundaries:

$\forall, \exists, \neg, \vee, \wedge$



"It" ☒ anaphora accessible



"It" ☐ anaphora inaccessible


Disjunction vs. Conjunction

disjunction
There is no manuscript. [There is a manuscript and] It was hidden by the librarian.
Not possible for conjunction
Discourse entity Scope Anaphora

$[\neg \exists x(\text{Manuscript}(x))] \vee [\exists x(\text{Manuscript}(x) \wedge \text{Hidden}(x))]$

$\neg \exists x(\text{Manuscript}(x)) \wedge \text{Hidden}(x)$

Prediction: $SLOR(\text{disjunction}) > SLOR(\text{conjunction})$



Conclusion: LLMs are sensitive to the difference between disjunction and conjunction, but are also subject to lexical factors.


Negation

The farmer owned a cow. It was away on the meadow.
It was not the case that the farmer didn't own a cow.
The farmer didn't own a cow. # It was away on the meadow.
Discourse entity Scope Anaphora

$\exists x(\text{Cow}(x) \wedge \text{Own}(\text{farmer}, x)) \wedge \text{Away}(x)$

$\neg [\exists x(\text{Cow}(x) \wedge \text{Own}(\text{farmer}, x))] \wedge \text{Away}(x)$

Prediction: $P(\text{cont} | \exists, \neg \neg) > P(\text{cont} | \neg)$



Conclusion: LLMs recognize that both Exi and DN are better than Neg, but are influenced by lexical factors.

Anaphora Accessibility


Hierarchy of NLU

Level 3: Discourse Level Understanding:
Integration of sentence meaning to coherent discourse meaning

Level 2: Sentence Level Understanding:
Integration of lexical meaning to coherent sentential meaning

Level 1: Lexical Level Understanding:
a word's extension and intension

Natural Language Structure



Example Tasks

Long-Document Understanding;
Discourse Entity Recognition & Tracking; Discourse Parsing...

Natural Language Inference;
Pragmatic Inference; Scope Ambiguity...

Word Sense Disambiguation;
Taxonomy Construction; Lexical Entailment; Analogical Relation...