
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Today 2/21
"
$\qquad$

- Review HMMs
- EM Example
- Syntax
- Context-Free Grammars

| Review |
| :--- |
| - Parts of Speech |
| - Basic syntactic/morphological categories that |
| words belong to |
| - Part of Speech tagging |
| - Assigning parts of speech to all the words in a |
| sentence |
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## Urns and Balls

- Let's assume the input (observables) is Blue Blue Red (BBR)
- Since both urns contain red and blue balls any path through this machine could produce this output
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## Urns and Balls

| Viterbi: Says 111 is the most likely state sequence |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 111 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}(0.6 * 0.3) *(0.6 * 0.7)=0.0204$ |
| 112 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}(0.6 * 0.3)^{*}(0.4 * 0.4)=0.0077$ |
| 121 | $\left(0.9^{*} 0.3\right)^{*}\left(0.4^{*} 0.6\right) *\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)=0.0136$ |
| 122 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}(0.4 * 0.6) *(0.7 * 0.4)=0.0181$ |
| 211 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)^{*}(0.6 * 0.7)=0.0052$ |
| 212 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)^{*}(0.4 * 0.4)=0.0020$ |
| 221 | $(0.1 * 0.6) *(0.7 * 0.6) *(0.3 * 0.7)=0.0052$ |
| 222 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}(0.7 * 0.6)^{*}(0.7 * 0.4)=0.0070$ |


| Urns and Balls |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Forward: $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{BBR} \mid$ model $)=.0792 \quad \sum$ |  |
| 111 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}(0.6 * 0.3) *(0.6 * 0.7)=0.0204$ |
| 112 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}(0.6 * 0.3)^{*}(0.4 * 0.4)=0.0077$ |
| 121 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}(0.4 * 0.6)^{*}(0.3 * 0.7)=0.0136$ |
| 122 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}(0.4 * 0.6)^{*}(0.7 * 0.4)=0.0181$ |
| 211 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}(0.3 * 0.7)^{*}(0.6 * 0.7)=0.0052$ |
| 212 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}(0.3 * 0.7)^{*}(0.4 * 0.4)=0.0020$ |
| 221 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}(0.7 * 0.6)^{*}(0.3 * 0.7)=0.0052$ |
| 222 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}(0.7 * 0.6)^{*}(0.7 * 0.4)=0.0070$ |
| 2/28/08 |  |


| UrnS and Balls |
| :--- |
| • EM |
| • What if I told you I lied about the numbers in |
| the model (Priors,A,B). I just made them up. |
| - Can I get better numbers just from the input |
| sequence? |
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| Urns and Balls |
| :--- |
| - Yup |
| - Just count up and prorate the number of times |
| a given transition is traversed while |
| processing the observations inputs. |
| -Then use that count to re-estimate the |
| transition probability for that transition |
|  |
| 2 22008 |

## Urns and Balls

- But... we just saw that don't know the actual path the input took, its hidden!
- So prorate the counts from all the possible paths based on the path probabilities the model gives you
- But you said the numbers were wrong
- Doesn't matter; use the original numbers then replace the old ones with the new ones.
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| Urns and Balls |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Blue Blue Red |  |
| 111 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}(0.6 * 0.3)^{*}\left(0.6^{*} 0.7\right)=0.0204$ |
| 112 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}\left(0.6^{*} 0.3\right)^{*}\left(0.4^{*} 0.4\right)=0.0077$ |
| 121 | $\left(0.9^{*} 0.3\right)^{*}\left(0.4^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)=0.0136$ |
| 122 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}\left(0.4^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.7^{*} 0.4\right)=0.0181$ |
| 211 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)^{*}\left(0.6^{*} 0.7\right)=0.0052$ |
| 212 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)^{*}\left(0.4^{*} 0.4\right)=0.0020$ |
| 221 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}\left(0.7^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)=0.0052$ |
| 222 | $\left(0.1^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.7^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.7^{*} 0.4\right)=0.0070$ |
| 228808 |  |

## Urns and Balls

- That's
- (.0077*1)+(.0136*1)+(.0181*1)+(.0020*1) $\qquad$
$=.0414$
- Of course, that's not a probability, it needs to be divided by the probability of leaving Urn 1 total.
- There's only one other way out of Urn 1 (going back to urn1)
- So let's reestimate Urn1-> Urn1
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Let's re-estimate the Urn1->Urn1 transition
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| Urns and Balls |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Blue Blue Red |  |
| 111 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}\left(0.6^{*} 0.3\right)^{*}\left(0.6^{*} 0.7\right)=0.0204$ |
| 112 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}(0.6 * 0.3)^{*}\left(0.4^{*} 0.4\right)=0.0077$ |
| 121 | $(0.9 * 0.3)^{*}\left(0.4^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)=0.0136$ |
| 122 | $\left(0.9^{*} 0.3\right)^{*}\left(0.4^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.7^{*} 0.4\right)=0.0181$ |
| 211 | $\left(0.1^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)^{*}\left(0.6^{*} 0.7\right)=0.0052$ |
| 212 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)^{*}\left(0.4^{*} 0.4\right)=0.0020$ |
| 221 | $(0.1 * 0.6)^{*}\left(0.7^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.3^{*} 0.7\right)=0.0052$ |
| 222 | $\left(0.1^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.7^{*} 0.6\right)^{*}\left(0.7^{*} 0.4\right)=0.0070$ |
|  |  |
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| Urns and Balls |
| :--- |
| - That's just |
| • (2*.0204)+(1*.0077)+(1*.0052) $=.0537$ |
| - Again not what we need but we're closer... |
| we just need to normalize using those two |
| numbers. |
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| Urns and Balls |
| :--- |
| - The $1->2$ transition probability is |
| $.0414 /(.0414+.0537)=0.435$ |
| - The $1->1$ transition probability is |
| $.0537 /(.0414+.0537)=0.565$ |
| - So in re-estimation the $1->2$ transition |
| went from .4 to .435 and the $1->1$ |
| transition went from .6 to .565 |
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## EM Re-estimation

- As with Problems 1 and 2, you wouldn't actually compute it this way. The ForwardBackward algorithm re-estimates these numbers in the same dynamic programming way that Viterbi and Forward do.


## EM Re-estimation

- With a long enough training string, completely random initial model parameters will converge to the right parameters
- In real systems, you try to get the initial model parameters as close to correct as possible
- Then you use a small amount of training material to home in on the right parameters
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## Syntax

$\square$
$\qquad$

- By syntax (or grammar) I mean the kind of implicit knowledge of your native language
$\qquad$ that you had mastered by the time you were 2 or 3 years old without explicit instruction
- Not the kind of stuff you were later taught in school.

| Syntax |
| :--- |
|  |
| • Why should you care? |
| • Grammar checkers |
| • Question answering |
| - Information extraction |
| • Machine translation |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| 22808 |
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|  |
| :--- |

$\qquad$

For a lot of things, keyword search works well, said Barney Pell, chief executive of Powerset. But I think we are going to look back in 10 years and say, remember when we used to search using keywords. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
228/08

| Search |
| :--- |
|  |
| In a November interview, Marissa <br> Mayer, Google's vice president for <br> search and user experience, said: <br> "Natural language is really hard. I <br> don't think it will happen in the next <br> five years." <br>  <br> 22908 |

## Context-Free Grammars

$\qquad$
$\square$

- Capture constituency and ordering
- Ordering is easy

What are the rules that govern the ordering of words and bigger units in the language
$\qquad$
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-What's constituency?
How words group into units and how the various kinds of units behave wrt one another
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## CFG Examples

```
M,
```

- S -> NP VP
- NP -> Det NOMINAL
- NOMINAL -> Noun
- VP -> Verb
- Det -> a
- Noun -> flight
- Verb -> left


| Generativity |
| :--- |
| - As with FSAs and FSTs you can view |
| these rules as either analysis or synthesis |
| machines |
| - Generate strings in the language |
| - Reject strings not in the language |
| langose structures (trees) on strings in the |
| language |
|  |
| 22808 |

## Derivations

- A derivation is a sequence of rules applied to a string that accounts for that string
- Covers all the elements in the string
- Covers only the elements in the string


## Derivations as Trees
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| Other Options |
| :--- |
| • Regular languages (expressions) |
| - Too weak |
| • Context-sensitive or Turing equiv |
| • Too powerful (maybe) |
|  |


| COntext? |
| :--- | :--- |
| - The notion of context in CFGs has nothing to do with the |
| ordinary meaning of the word context in language. |
| - All it really means is that the non-terminal on the left- |
| hand side of a rule is out there all by itself (free of |
| context) |
| A -> B C |
| Means that |
| - I can rewrite an A as a B followed by a C regardless of the |
| - context in which A is found |
| Or when I see a B followed by a C I can infer an A regardless of |
| the surrounding context |

## Key Constituents (English)

- Sentences
- Noun phrases
- Verb phrases
- Prepositional phrases


## Sentence-Types

$\square$

- Declaratives: A plane left S -> NP VP
- Imperatives: Leave! $S$-> VP
- Yes-No Questions: Did the plane leave? $S$-> Aux NP VP
- WH Questions: When did the plane leave? S -> WH Aux NP VP


## Recursion

- We'll have to deal with rules such as the following where the non-terminal on the left also appears somewhere on the right (directly).
Nominal -> Nominal PP [[flight] [to Boston]] VP -> VP PP [[departed Miami] [at noon]]

| Recursion |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Of course, this is what makes syntax interesting |
| flights from Denver |
| Flights from Denver to Miami |
| Flights from Denver to Miami in February |
| Flights from Denver to Miami in February on a Friday |
| Flights from Denver to Miami in February on a Friday |
| under $\$ 300$ |
| Flights from Denver to Miami in February on a Friday |
| under $\$ 300$ with lunch |
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## Recursion

$\qquad$
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- Of course, this is what makes syntax $\qquad$ interesting
[[flights] [from Denver]]
[[[Flights] [from Denver]] [to Miami]]
[[[[Flights] [from Denver]] [to Miami]] [in February]] [[[[[[Flights] [from Denver]] [to Miami]] [in February]] [on a Friday]]
$\qquad$
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Etc.
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## Conjunctive Constructions

- $S$-> $S$ and $S$
- John went to NY and Mary followed him
- NP -> NP and NP
- VP -> VP and VP
- ...
- In fact the right rule for English is $X$-> $X$ and $X$

| Problems |
| :--- |
| - Agreement |
| - Subcategorization |
| - Movement (for want of a better term) |
|  |
|  |
| 228108 |



## Subcategorization

- Sneeze: John sneezed
- Find: Please find [a flight to NY] $]_{N P}$
- Give: Give [me] $]_{N P}[\text { a cheaper fare }]_{N P}$
- Help: Can you help $[m e]_{N P}[\text { with a flight }]_{P P}$
- Prefer: I prefer [to leave earlier] To-vp
- Told: I was told [United has a flight] $]_{S}$
- ..

28/0

## Subcategorization

- *John sneezed the book
- *I prefer United has a flight
- *Give with a flight
- Subcat expresses the constraints that a predicate (verb for now) places on the number and syntactic types of arguments it wants to take (occur with).

2218108

| So? |
| :--- |
|  |
| - So the various rules for VPs overgenerate. |
| - They permit the presence of strings containing |
| verbs and arguments that don't go together |
| - For example |
| - VP -> V NP therefore |
| Sneezed the book is a VP since "sneeze" is a |
| verb and "the book" is a valid NP |
| 22808 |
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| Next Time |
| :--- |
| - We're now into Chapters 12 and 13. |
| - Finish reading all of 12. |
| - Get through the CKY discussion in 13 |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| 228808 |

