

EDAN20

Language Technology

<http://cs.lth.se/edan20/>
Chapter 12: Constituent Parsing

Pierre Nugues

Lund University
Pierre.Nugues@cs.lth.se
http://cs.lth.se/pierre_nugues/

September 18, 2017



Parsing

Possible parsing strategies are top-down or bottom-up


Prolog uses a top-down exploration and backtracks in case of error

Ambiguity can produce two or more possible parse trees

It is necessary to use probabilistic or symbolic techniques to rank parse trees



Bottom-up Parsing



Shift and Reduce

The shift and reduce algorithm implements bottom-up parsing.

Two input arguments: the list of words to parse and the parsing goal.

The algorithm gradually reduces words, parts of speech, and phrases until it reaches the parsing goal.

The algorithm consists of a loop of two steps:

- **Shift** a word from the phrase or sentence to parse onto a stack;
- Apply a sequence of grammar rules to **reduce** elements of the stack

until there is no more word in the list and the stack is reduced to the parsing goal.



DCG Rules

Nonterminal symbols

```
s --> np, vp.  
np --> det, noun.  
np --> np, pp.  
vp --> verb, np.  
vp --> verb, np, pp.  
pp --> prep, np.
```

Terminal symbols

```
det --> [the].  
det --> [a].  
noun --> [waiter].  
noun --> [meal].  
noun --> [table].  
noun --> [day].  
verb --> [brought].  
prep --> [to].  
prep --> [of].
```



Shift and Reduce in Action

| It. | Stack | S/R | Word list |
|-----|--------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|
| 0 | | | [the, waiter, brought, the, meal] |
| 1 | [the] | Shift | [waiter, brought, the, meal] |
| 2 | [det] | Reduce | [waiter, brought, the, meal] |
| 3 | [det, waiter] | Shift | [brought, the, meal] |
| 4 | [det, noun] | Reduce | [brought, the, meal] |
| 5 | [np] | Reduce | [brought, the, meal] |
| 6 | [np, brought] | Shift | [the, meal] |
| 7 | [np, v] | Reduce | [the, meal] |
| 8 | [np, v, the] | Shift | [meal] |
| 9 | [np, v, det] | Reduce | [meal] |
| 10 | [np, v, det, meal] | Shift | [] |
| 11 | [np, v, det, n] | Reduce | [] |
| 12 | [np, v, np] | Reduce | [] |
| 13 | [np, vp] | Reduce | [] |
| 14 | [s] | Reduce | [] |



Backtracking May be Inefficient

Example:

The meal of the day

np --> npx. npx --> det, noun.

np --> npx, pp.

pp --> prep, np.



The Structure of a Chart

A chart is a data structure that avoids backtracking

It uses classical grammar rules


It is a graph (DAG) where nodes are intervals between words

0 *Bring* 1 *the* 2 *meal* 3

0 *The* 1 *meal* 2 *of* 3 *the* 4 *day* 5




Parsing with a Chart



Charts Contain Alternative Parses

We can view rules $vp \rightarrow v, np$ and $vp \rightarrow v, np, pp$ in the chart



The Active Chart

The active chart stores constituents being parsed and marks the rules accordingly.

The rule:

`np --> det noun •`

is a completely parsed noun phrase: a determiner and a noun.

The arc is said to be inactive

The rules below are said to be active:

`np --> det • noun` A determiner has been found

`np --> • det noun` We are seeking a noun phrase



The Earley Algorithm

Complexity of $O(N^3)$

Three modules: the predictor, the scanner, and the completer.

They use phrase-structure rules as:

start $\rightarrow \bullet$ np

np \rightarrow det, noun.


np \rightarrow det, adj, noun.

np \rightarrow np, pp.


pp \rightarrow prep, np.



The Predictor




The Scanner




The Completer



The Next Steps (I)



The Next Steps (II)



The Prolog Database

| Module | New chart entries |
|--|--|
| | Position 0 |
| start predictor | arc(start, ['.', np], 0, 0) arc(np, [., d, n], 0, 0), arc(np, [., d, a, n], 0, 0), arc(np, [., np, pp], 0, 0) |
| | Position 1 |
| scanner completer predictor | arc(d, [the, .], 0, 1) arc(np, [d, ., a, n], 0, 1), arc(np, [d, ., n], 0, 1) [] |
| | Position 2 |
| scanner completer completer predictor | arc(n, [meal, .], 1, 2) arc(np, [d, n, .], 0, 2) arc(np, [np, ., pp], 0, 2), arc(start, [np, .], 0, 2) arc(pp, [., prep, np], 2, 2) |



The Prolog Database

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | Position 3 |
| scanner | arc(preposition, [of, .], 2, 3) |
| completer | arc(pp, [preposition, ., np], 2, 3) |
| predictor | arc(np, [., d, n], 3, 3), arc(np, [., d, a, n], 3, 3), arc(np, [., np, pp], 3, 3) |
| | Position 4 |
| scanner | arc(d, [the, .], 3, 4) |
| completer | arc(np, [d, ., a, n], 3, 4), arc(np, [d, ., n], 3, 4) |
| predictor | [] |
| | Position 5 |
| scanner | arc(n, [day, .], 4, 5) |
| completer | arc(np, [d, n, .], 3, 5) |
| completer | arc(np, [np, ., pp], 3, 5), arc(pp, [preposition, np, .], 2, 5) |
| completer | arc(np, [np, pp, .], 0, 5) |
| completer | arc(np, [np, ., pp], 0, 5), arc(start, [np, ., 0, 5]) |



Probabilistic Context-Free Grammars

$$P(T, S) = \prod_{rule(i) \text{ producing } T} P(rule(i)).$$

where

$$P(lhs \rightarrow rhs_i | lhs) = \frac{Count(lhs \rightarrow rhs_i)}{\sum_j Count(lhs \rightarrow rhs_j)}.$$



An Example of PCFG

| Rules | P | Rules | P |
|---------------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| s --> np vp | 0.8 | det --> the | 1.0 |
| s --> vp | 0.2 | noun --> waiter | 0.4 |
| np --> det noun | 0.3 | noun --> meal | 0.3 |
| np --> det adj noun | 0.2 | noun --> day | 0.3 |
| np --> pronoun | 0.3 | verb --> bring | 0.4 |
| np --> np pp | 0.2 | verb --> slept | 0.2 |
| vp --> v np | 0.6 | verb --> brought | 0.4 |
| vp --> v np pp | 0.1 | pronoun --> he | 1.0 |
| vp --> v pp | 0.2 | prep --> of | 0.6 |
| vp --> v | 0.1 | prep --> to | 0.4 |
| pp --> prep np | 1.0 | adj --> big | 1.0 |



Parse Trees of *Bring the meal of the day*

Parse trees

T1: `vp(verb(bring),
 np(np(det(the), noun(meal)),
 pp(prepare(of), np(det(the), noun(day))))))`

T2: `vp(verb(bring),
 np(np(det(the), noun(meal))),
 pp(prepare(of), np(det(the), noun(day))))`





Computing the Probabilities

$$\begin{aligned}
 &P(T_1, \text{Bring the meal of the day}) = \\
 &P(vp \rightarrow v, np) \times P(v \rightarrow \text{Bring}) \times P(np \rightarrow np, pp) \times \\
 &P(np \rightarrow det, noun) \times P(det \rightarrow the) \times P(noun \rightarrow meal) \times \\
 &P(pp \rightarrow prep, np) \times P(pre \rightarrow of) \times P(np \rightarrow det, noun) \times \\
 &P(det \rightarrow the) \times P(noun \rightarrow day) = \\
 &0.6 \times 0.4 \times 0.2 \times 0.3 \times 1.0 \times 0.3 \times 1.0 \times 0.6 \times 0.3 \times 1.0 \times 0.3 = 0.00023328,
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &P(T_2, \text{Bring the meal of the day}) = \\
 &P(vp \rightarrow v, np, pp) \times P(v \rightarrow \text{Bring}) \times P(np \rightarrow det, noun) \times \\
 &P(det \rightarrow the) \times P(noun \rightarrow meal) \times P(pp \rightarrow prep, np) \times P(pre \rightarrow of) \times \\
 &P(np \rightarrow det, noun) \times P(det \rightarrow the) \times P(noun \rightarrow day) = \\
 &0.1 \times 0.4 \times 0.3 \times 1.0 \times 0.3 \times 1.0 \times 0.6 \times 0.3 \times 1.0 \times 0.3 = 0.0001944,
 \end{aligned}$$



Computing the Probabilities



PCF Grammars Ignore Lexical Preferences

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{P(T1|\text{Bring the meal of the day})}{P(T2|\text{Bring the meal of the day})} &= \frac{P(T1|\text{Bring the meal to the table})}{P(T2|\text{Bring the meal to the table})}, \\ &= \frac{P(vp \rightarrow v, np) \times P(np \rightarrow np, pp)}{P(vp \rightarrow v, np, pp)}\end{aligned}$$

PCF grammars do not take into account the lexicon and the attachment preferences of *of* and *to*.



Parser Evaluation

Constituent parsing

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\text{Number of correct constituents generated by the parser}}{\text{Number of constituents in the manually bracketed corpus}}$$

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{Number of correct constituents generated by the parser}}{\text{Total number of constituents generated by the parser}}$$

| Bracketing | Crossing brackets |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| (((bring) (the meal)) (of the day)) | () () |
| ((bring) ((the meal) (of the day))) | () () |

