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

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

| Sample Grammar |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & S \rightarrow N P V P \\ & S \rightarrow \text { Aux } N P V P \\ & S \rightarrow V P \\ & N P \rightarrow \text { Pronoun } \\ & N P \rightarrow \text { Proper-Noun } \\ & N P \rightarrow \text { Det Nominal } \\ & \text { Nominal } \rightarrow \text { Noun } \\ & \text { Nominal } \rightarrow \text { Nominal Noun } \\ & \text { Nominal } \rightarrow \text { Nominal } P P \\ & V P \rightarrow \text { Verb } \\ & V P \rightarrow \text { Verb NP } \\ & V P \rightarrow \text { Verb NP } P P \\ & V P \rightarrow \text { Verb PP } \\ & V P \rightarrow V P P P \\ & P P \rightarrow \text { Preposition } N P \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\\|$ Det $\rightarrow$ that $\mid$ this $\mid a$ <br> Noun $\rightarrow$ book $\mid$ flight $\mid$ meal $\mid$ money <br> Verb $\rightarrow$ book $\mid$ include $\mid$ prefer <br> Pronoun $\rightarrow I \mid$ she $\mid$ me <br> Proper-Noun $\rightarrow$ Houston $\mid$ TWA <br> Aux $\rightarrow$ does <br> Preposition $\rightarrow$ from $\mid$ to $\mid$ on $\mid$ near $\mid$ through |

## Dynamic Programming

- DP methods fill tables with partial results and
- Do not do too much avoidable repeated work
- Solve exponential problems in polynomial time (sort of)
- Efficiently store ambiguous structures with shared sub-parts.


## CKY Parsing

——

- First we'll limit our grammar to epsilonfree, binary rules (more later)
- Consider the rule A -> BC
- If there is an A in the input then there must be a $B$ followed by a $C$ in the input.
- If the A spans from i to $j$ in the input then there must be some kst. $i<k<j$
- le. The B splits from the C someplace.
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## CKY

- So let's build a table so that an A spanning from ito $j$ in the input is placed in cell $[i, j]$ in the table.
- So a non-terminal spanning an entire string will sit in cell [0, n]
- If we build the table bottom up we'll know that the parts of the A must go from $i$ to $k$ and from k to j


## CKY

- Meaning that for a rule like A -> B C we should look for a $B$ in $[i, k]$ and a $C$ in $[k, j]$. $\qquad$
- In other words, if we think there might be an A spanning $i, j$ in the input... AND $\qquad$
- A -> B C is a rule in the grammar THEN
- There must be a B in $[\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{k}]$ and a C in $[\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{j}]$ $\qquad$ for some $i<k<j$


## CKY

"
$\qquad$

- So to fill the table loop over the cell[i,j] values in some systematic way
-What constraint should we put on that?
- For each cell loop over the appropriate k values to search for things to add. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\square$
function CKY-PARSE(words, grammar) returns table
for $j \leftarrow$ from 1 to LENGTH(words) do table $[j-1, j] \leftarrow\{A \mid A \rightarrow$ words $[j] \in$ grammar $\}$ for $i \leftarrow$ from $j-2$ downto 0 do table $[i, v] \leftarrow$ table $[i, j] \cup$
$\{A \mid A \rightarrow B C \in$ grammar,
$B \in$ table $[i, k]$,
$C \in \operatorname{table}[k, j]\}$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| CKY Parsing |
| :--- |
| • Is that really a parser? |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| 11108 |

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

| Note |
| :--- |
| - We arranged the loops to fill the table a |
| column at a time, from left to right, bottom |
| to top. |
| - This assures us that whenever we're filling a |
| cell, the parts needed to fill it are already in |
| the table (to the left and below) |

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

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

| Other Ways to Do It? |
| :--- |
| - Are there any other sensible ways to fill |
| the table that still guarantee that the cells |
| we need are already filled? |

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

Other Ways to Do It? $\qquad$

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

| Sample Grammar |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mid$ Det $\rightarrow$ that $\mid$ this $\mid a$ <br> Noun $\rightarrow$ book $\mid$ flight $\mid$ meal $\mid$ money <br> Verb $\rightarrow$ book $\mid$ include $\mid$ prefer <br> Pronoun $\rightarrow I \mid$ she $\mid$ me <br> Proper-Noun $\rightarrow$ Houston $\mid$ TWA <br> Aux $\rightarrow$ does <br> Preposition $\rightarrow$ from $\mid$ to $\mid$ on $\mid$ near $\mid$ through |

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

| Problem |
| :--- |
| - What if your grammar isn't binary? |
| - As in the case of the TreeBank grammar? |
| - Convert it to binary... any arbitrary CFG can |
| be rewritten into Chomsky-Normal Form |
| automatically. |
| - What does this mean? |
| - The resulting grammar accepts (and rejects) the |
| same set of strings as the original grammar. |
| - But the resulting derivations (trees) are different. |
| 31100 |

## Problem

$\qquad$

- More specifically, rules have to be of the form $\qquad$
A -> B C
Or
$\qquad$
A -> w

That is, rules can expand to either 2 nonterminals or to a single terminal.
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\mathrm{NP} \rightarrow$ Det Nominal
Nominal $\rightarrow$ Noun
Nominal $\rightarrow$ Nominal Noun
$\xrightarrow{\text { Nominal }} \rightarrow$ Nominal PP
$V P \rightarrow V e r b$
$\underset{V P}{V P} \rightarrow$ Verb NP
$V P \rightarrow V$ Verb $N P$ PP
$V P \rightarrow V$ erb $P P$
$V P \rightarrow V P P P$
$P P \rightarrow P$ reposition $N P$
3/11/08
CNF Conversion

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

## CKY Algorithm

$\qquad$

| ```function CKY-PARSE(words, grammar) returns table for \(j \leftarrow\) from 1 to LENGTH(words) do table \([j-1, j] \leftarrow\{A \mid A \rightarrow\) words \([j] \in\) grammar \(\}\) for \(i \leftarrow\) from \(j-2\) downto 0 do for \(k \leftarrow i+1\) to \(j-1\) do table \([i, j] \leftarrow\) table \([i, j] \cup\) \(\{A \mid A \rightarrow B C \in\) grammar, \(B \in\) table \([i, k]\), \(C \in \operatorname{table}[k, j]\}\)``` |  |
| :---: | :---: |


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

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

| Example |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |

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

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

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

## CKY Notes

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

- Since it's bottom up, CKY populates the table with a lot of phantom constituents. $\qquad$
- Segments that by themselves are constituents but cannot really occur in the context in which they are being suggested
- To avoid this we can switch to a top-down control strategy or
- We can add some kind of filtering that blocks constituents where they can not happen in a final analysis.
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$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Earley Parsing

$\square$
$\qquad$

- Allows arbitrary CFGs
- Top-down control
- Fills a table in a single sweep over the input words
- Table is length $N+1 ; N$ is number of words
- Table entries represent
- Completed constituents and their locations
- In-progress constituents
- Predicted constituents


## States

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

- The table-entries are called states and are represented with dotted-rules.

| S -> $\cdot$ VP | A VP is predicted |
| :--- | :--- |
| NP $->$ Det $\cdot$ Nominal | An NP is in progress |
| VP $->$ V NP . | A VP has been found |
|  |  |
|  |  |

$\square$

- S -> • VP $[0,0]$
- $\mathrm{A} V P$ is predicted at the start of the sentence
- NP -> Det • Nominal [1,2]
- VP -> V NP • [0,3] 3/11/08 $\qquad$ 31 goes from 1 to 2

A VP has been found starting at 0 and ending at 3
$\qquad$


## Earley

- As with most dynamic programming approaches, the answer is found by looking in the table in the right place.
- In this case, there should be an S state in the final column that spans from 0 to n and is complete.
- If that's the case you're done.
- $S \rightarrow \alpha \bullet[0, n]$
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$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

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


## Earley Code

function EARLEY-PARSE(words, grammar) returns chart
$\operatorname{AdDToChart}((\gamma \rightarrow \bullet S,[0,0])$, chart[0] $)$ $\qquad$
for $i \leftarrow$ from 0 to LENGTH(words) do
for each state in chart $[i]$ do if Incomplete?(state) and

NEXT-CAT(state) is not a part of speech then PREDICTOR(state)
elseif InCOMPLETE?(state) and
Next-CAT(state) is a part of speech then SCANNER(state)

## else

Completer(state)
end
end
3/11/08
eturn(chart)

| Earley Code |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ```procedure Predictor((A->\alpha\bulletB \beta,[i,j])) for each (B->\gamma) in GRAMMAR-RULES-FOR(B, grammar) do AddToChart ((B-> \bullet \gamma, [j,j]),chart[j]) end procedure SCANNER((A->\alpha\bulletB \beta,[i,j])) if }B\in\mathrm{ PARTS-OF-SPEECH(word[j]) then AdDToChart((B }->\mathrm{ word[j] •, [j,j+1]), chart[j+l]) procedure COMPLETER((B -> \gamma \bullet, [j,k])) for each (A->\alpha\bulletB \beta,[i,j]) in chart[j] do AddToChart((A->\alphaB\bullet\beta,[i,k]), chart[k]) end``` |  |
| 3/11/08 |  | 37 |

## Example

- Book that flight
- We should find... an S from 0 to 3 that is a completed state...


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

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ S13 VP $\rightarrow$ Verb
[0,1] Comer
S14 VP $\rightarrow$ Verb $\bullet N P$
[0,1]
Completer
Completer
Completer
Completer
S17 $S \rightarrow V P$
Predictor
Predictor
Predictor
S21 NP $\rightarrow$ - Det Nominal

3/11/08

## Example

$\qquad$

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


- For such a simple example, there seems to be a lot of useless stuff in there.
-Why?
- It's predicting things that aren't consistent with the input
-That's the flipside to the CKY problem.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$



## Back to Ambiguity

- Did we solve it?
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

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


## Ambiguity

- No...
- Both CKY and Earley will result in multiple S structures for the [0,n] table entry.
- They both efficiently store the sub-parts that are shared between multiple parses.
- And they obviously avoid re-deriving those sub-parts.
- But neither can tell us which one is right.


## Ambiguity

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

- In most cases, humans don't notice incidental ambiguity (lexical or syntactic). It is resolved on the fly and never noticed.
$\qquad$
- We'll try to model that with probabilities.
- But note something odd and important
$\qquad$ about the Groucho Marx example...
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| Next Time |
| :--- |
| - Partial Parsing and chunking |
| - After that we'll move on to probabilistic parsing |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| $1 / 1108$ |

