### Parsing with Context-Free Grammars

#### CS 585, Fall 2017

Introduction to Natural Language Processing <a href="http://people.cs.umass.edu/~brenocon/inlp2017">http://people.cs.umass.edu/~brenocon/inlp2017</a>

#### Brendan O'Connor

College of Information and Computer Sciences University of Massachusetts Amherst

## Context-Free Grammar

- CFG describes a generative process for an (infinite) set of strings
  - I. Nonterminal symbols
    - "S": START symbol / "Sentence" symbol
  - 2. Terminal symbols: word vocabulary
  - 3. Rules (a.k.a. Productions). Practically, two types:

<u>"Grammar": one NT expands to >=1 NT</u> always one NT on left side of rulep

Lexicon: NT expands to a terminal

$S \rightarrow NP VP$ $NP \rightarrow Pronoun$   Proper-Noun   Det Nominal $Nominal \rightarrow Nominal Noun$   Noun	I + want a morning flight I Los Angeles a + flight morning + flight flights	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
$VP \rightarrow Verb$ $  Verb NP$ $  Verb NP PP$ $  Verb PP$ $PP \rightarrow Preposition NP$	do want + a flight leave + Boston + in the morning leaving + on Thursday from + Los Angeles	Chicago   United   American   Determiner $\rightarrow$ the   a   an   this   these   that   Preposition $\rightarrow$ from   to   on   near   Conjunction $\rightarrow$ and   or   but

### Constituent Parse Trees



#### Representations:

#### Bracket notation

(12.2)  $[_{S} [_{NP} [_{Pro} I]] [_{VP} [_{V} prefer] [_{NP} [_{Det} a] [_{Nom} [_{N} morning] [_{Nom} [_{N} flight]]]]]$ Non-terminal positional spans e.g. (NP, 0, I), (VP, I, 5), (NP, 2, 5), etc.

Syntactic ambiguity is endemic to natural language:<sup>1</sup>

Attachment ambiguity: we eat sushi with chopsticks,
 I shot an elephant in my pajamas.

<sup>1</sup>Examples borrowed from Dan Klein

Syntactic ambiguity is endemic to natural language:<sup>1</sup>

 Attachment ambiguity: we eat sushi with chopsticks, I shot an elephant in my pajamas.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

Modifier scope: southern food store

<sup>1</sup>Examples borrowed from Dan Klein

Syntactic ambiguity is endemic to natural language:<sup>1</sup>

- Attachment ambiguity: we eat sushi with chopsticks, I shot an elephant in my pajamas.
- Modifier scope: southern food store
- Particle versus preposition: The puppy tore up the staircase.

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▼ りへで

<sup>1</sup>Examples borrowed from Dan Klein

Syntactic ambiguity is endemic to natural language:<sup>1</sup>

- Attachment ambiguity: we eat sushi with chopsticks, I shot an elephant in my pajamas.
- Modifier scope: southern food store
- Particle versus preposition: The puppy tore up the staircase.

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆ 三 ▶ ◆ 三 ● ∽ へ ⊙

Complement structure: The tourists objected to the guide that they couldn't hear.

Syntactic ambiguity is endemic to natural language:<sup>1</sup>

- Attachment ambiguity: we eat sushi with chopsticks, I shot an elephant in my pajamas.
- Modifier scope: southern food store
- Particle versus preposition: The puppy tore up the staircase.
- Complement structure: The tourists objected to the guide that they couldn't hear.

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▼ りへで

Coordination scope: "I see," said the blind man, as he picked up the hammer and saw.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Examples borrowed from Dan Klein

Syntactic ambiguity is endemic to natural language:<sup>1</sup>

- Attachment ambiguity: we eat sushi with chopsticks, I shot an elephant in my pajamas.
- Modifier scope: southern food store
- Particle versus preposition: The puppy tore up the staircase.
- Complement structure: The tourists objected to the guide that they couldn't hear.
- Coordination scope: "I see," said the blind man, as he picked up the hammer and saw.
- Multiple gap constructions: The chicken is ready to eat

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Examples borrowed from Dan Klein

#### Attachment ambiguity

Probability of attachment sites

- [ imposed [ a ban [ on asbestos ]]]
- [ imposed [ a ban ][ on asbestos ]]

▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ♪ ▲□

#### Attachment ambiguity

Probability of attachment sites

- [ imposed [ a ban [ on asbestos ]]]
- [ imposed [ a ban ][ on asbestos ]]

Include head of embedded NP

- In the second of the second
- In the second second

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ ● ● ● ●

#### Attachment ambiguity

Probability of attachment sites

- [ imposed [ a ban [ on asbestos ]]]
- [ imposed [ a ban ][ on asbestos ]]

Include head of embedded NP

- In the second of the second
- Image: ...[it [would end [its venture ][with Maserati]]]
  Resolve multiple ambiguities simultaneously

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ ● ● ● ● ●

► Cats scratch people with claws with knives

## Ambiguities make parsing hard

- I. Computationally: how to reuse work across combinatorially many trees?
- 2. How to make good attachment decisions?

# Parsing with a CFG

- Task: given text and a CFG, answer:
  - Does there exist at least one parse?
  - Enumerate parses (backpointers)
- Approaches: top-down, left-to-right, bottom-up
- CKY (Cocke-Kasami-Younger) algorithm
  - Bottom-up dynamic programming: Find possible nonterminals for short spans of sentence, then possible combinations for higher spans
  - Requires converting CFG to Chomsky Normal Form a.k.a. binarization: <=2 nonterminals in expansion</li>
    - instead of NP -> NP CC NP, could do:
      - NP -> NP\_CC NP
      - NP\_CC -> NP CC



















































# Probabilistic CFGs



- Defines a probabilistic generative process for words in a sentence
- Extension of HMMs, strictly speaking
- Learning?
  - Fully supervised: need a treebank
  - Unsupervised: with EM 25

# (P)CFG model, (P)CKY algorithm

- CKY: given CFG and sentence w
  - Does there exist at least one parse?
  - Enumerate parses (backpointers)
- Weighted CKY: given PCFG and sentence w
  - => Viterbi parse argmax<sub>y</sub> P(y | w) = argmax<sub>y</sub> P(y, w)
- Inside-outside: Likelihood of sentence P(w)

- Parsers' computational efficiency
  - Grammar constant; pruning & heuristic search
  - O(N<sup>3</sup>) for CKY (ok? depends...)
  - O(N) [or so...]: left-to-right incremental algorithms
- Parsing model accuracy: still lots of ambiguity!!
  - PCFGs lack lexical information to resolve attachment decisions
  - Vanilla PCFG accuracy: 70-80%

#### **Rules vs. Annotations** ( (S

- In the old days: hand-built grammars. Difficult to scale.
- Annotation-driven sup. learning
  - ~1993: Penn Treebank
  - Construct PCFG (or whatever) with supervised learning
- (Cool open research: unsupervised learning?)

```
(NP-SBJ (NNP General) (NNP Electric) (NNP Co.) )
(VP (VBD said)
  (SBAR (-NONE- 0)
      (NP-SBJ (PRP it) )
      (VP (VBD signed)
        (NP
          (NP (DT a) (NN contract) )
          (PP (-NONE- *ICH*-3) ))
        (PP (IN with)
          (NP
            (NP (DT the) (NNS developers) )
            (PP (IN of)
              (NP (DT the) (NNP Ocean) (NNP State) (NNP Power)
                  (NN project) ))))
        (PP-3 (IN for)
          (NP
            (NP (DT the) (JJ second) (NN phase) )
            (PP (IN of)
              (NP
                (NP (DT an) (JJ independent)
                  (ADJP
                    (QP ($ $) (CD 400) (CD million) )
                    (-NONE- *U*))
                  (NN power) (NN plant) )
                (, ,)
                (SBAR
                  (WHNP-2 (WDT which) )
                  (S
                   (NP-SBJ-1 (-NONE- *T*-2) )
                    (VP (VBZ is)
                      (VP (VBG being)
                        (VP (VBN built)
                          (NP (-NONE- *-1) )
                          (PP-LOC (IN in)
                            (NP
                              (NP (NNP Burrillville) )
                              (, ,)
```

(S

### Treebanks

- Penn Treebank (constituents, English)
  - http://www.cis.upenn.edu/~treebank/home.html
  - Recent revisions in Ononotes
- Universal Dependencies
  - <u>http://universaldependencies.org/</u>
- Prague Treebank (syn+sem)
- many others...
- Know what you're getting!

# Ambiguities make parsing hard

I. Computationally: how to reuse work across combinatorially many trees?

# • 2. How to make good attachment decisions?

- Enrich PCFG with
  - parent information: what's above me?
  - lexical information via head rules
    - VP[fight]: a VP headed by "fight"
- (or better, word/phrase embedding-based generalizations: e.g. recurrent neural network grammars (RNNGs))





### Head rules

- Idea: Every phrase has a head word
- Head rules: for every nonterminal in tree, choose one of its children to be its "head". This will define head words.
- Every nonterminal type has a different head rule; e.g. from Collins (1997):

- If parent is NP,
  - Search from right-to-left for first child that's NN, NNP, NNPS, NNS, NX, JJR
  - Else: search left-to-right for first child which is NP