# Natural Language Processing

George Konidaris gdk@cs.brown.edu

Fall 2021















# Natural Language Processing

Understanding spoken/written sentences in a natural language.

#### Major area of research in Al.

Why?

- Humans use language to communicate.
- Most natural interface.
- Huge amounts of NLP "knowledge" around.
  - E.g., books, the entire internet.
- Generative power
- Key to intelligence?
  - Hints as to underlying mechanism
  - Key indicator of intelligence

# Natural Language Processing

- It is also incredibly hard. Why?
- I saw a bat.
- Lucy owns a parrot that is larger than a cat.
- John kissed his wife, and so did Sam.
- Mary invited Sue for a visit, but she told her she had to go to work.
- I went to the hospital, and they told me to go home and rest.
- The price of tomatoes in Des Moines has gone through the roof.
- Mozart was born in Salzburg and Beethoven, in Bonn.

(examples via Ernest Davis, NYU)



# Natural Language Processing



"If you are a fan of the justices who fought throughout the Rehnquist years to pull the Supreme Court to the right, Alito is a home run - a strong and consistent conservative with the skill to craft opinions that make radical results appear inevitable and the ability to build trusting professional relationships across ideological lines." (TNR, Nov. 2005)

(examples via Ernest Davis, NYU)



# Perception





# Major Challenges

Speaker accent, volume, tone.





No pauses - word boundaries? Noise. Variation.



## Speech Recognition







#### Issues

Phoneme sequence not Markov

- Must introduce memory for context
- k-Markov Models

People speak faster or slower

- "Window" does not have fixed length
- Dynamic Time Warping

Quite a simplistic model for a complex phenomenon.

#### Nevertheless, speech recognition tech based on HMMs commercially-viable mid-1990s.





# Speech Recognition with Deep Nets

How to deal with dependency on prior states and observations?



Recurrent nets: form of memory.



Syntactic Analysis

**Syntax**: characteristic of language.

- Structure.
- Composition.

But observed in linear sequence.





# Syntactic Analysis

How to describe this structure?

Formal grammar.

- Set of rules for generating sentences.
- Varying power:
  - Recursively enumerable (equiv. Turing Machines)
  - Context-Sensitive
  - Context-Free
  - Regular

Each uses a set of rewrite rules to generate syntactically correct sentences.

Colorless green ideas sleep furiously.



# Syntax

 $\mathcal{E}_0$  :

S	$\rightarrow$	NP VP	[0.90]	I + feel a breeze	
		S Conj $S$	[0.10]	I feel a breeze + and + It stinks	
NP	$\rightarrow$	Pronoun	[0.30]	Ι	SPERAM
		Name	[0.10]	John	
		Noun	[0.10]	pits	
		Article Noun	[0.25]	the + wumpus	
		Article Adjs Noun	[0.05]	the + smelly dead + wumpus	
		Digit Digit	[0.05]	3 4	
		NP PP	[0.10]	the wumpus + in 1 3	
		NP RelClause	[0.05]	the wumpus + that is smelly	
			_		
VP	$\rightarrow$	Verb	[0.40]	stinks	
		VP NP	[0.35]	feel + a breeze	
		VP Adjective	[0.05]	smells + dead	
		VP PP	[0.10]	is + in 1 3	
		VP Adverb	[0.10]	go + ahead	
		4.1.	[0.00]		
Adjs	$\rightarrow$	Adjective	[0.80]	smelly	
		Adjective Adjs	[0.20]	smelly + dead	

Adjs	$\rightarrow$	Adjective	[0.80]	smelly
		Adjective Adjs	[0.20]	smelly + dead
PP	$\rightarrow$	Prep NP	[1.00]	to + the east
RelClause	$\rightarrow$	RelPro VP	[1.00]	that + is smelly

### Formal Grammars

Two types of symbols:

- Terminals (stop and output this)
- Non-terminals (one is a start symbol)



Production (*rewrite*) rules that modify a string of symbols by matching expression on left, and replacing it with one on right.

 $S \rightarrow AB \qquad ab$   $A \rightarrow AA \qquad aaaaaab$   $A \rightarrow a \qquad abbb$   $B \rightarrow BBB \qquad aabbbbb$ 

#### Context-Free Grammars

Rules must be of the form:



 $A \to B$ 

where A is a **single** non-terminal and B is any sequence of terminals and non-terminal.

Why is this called context-free?

### Probabilistic CFGs

Attach a probability to each rewrite rule:





Probabilities for the same left symbol sum to 1.

Why do this?

More vs. less likely sentences.

**Probability distribution over valid sentences.** 

I	
I	$\mathbf{\cap}$
	U



Noun	$\rightarrow$	stench [0.05]   breeze [0.10]   wumpus [0.15]   pits [0.05]
Verb	$\rightarrow$	is [0.10]   feel [0.10]   smells [0.10]   stinks [0.05]
Adjective	$\rightarrow$	right [0.10]   dead [0.05]   smelly [0.02]   breezy [0.02]
Adverb	$\rightarrow$	here [0.05]   ahead [0.05]   nearby [0.02]
Pronoun	$\rightarrow$	me [0.10]   you [0.03]   I [0.10]   it [0.10]
RelPro	$\rightarrow$	that [0.40]   which [0.15]   who [0.20]   whom [0.02] ∨
Name	$\rightarrow$	John [0.01]   Mary [0.01]   Boston [0.01]
Article	$\rightarrow$	the [0.40]   a [0.30]   an [0.10]   every [0.05]
Prep	$\rightarrow$	to [0.20]   in [0.10]   on [0.05]   near [0.10]
Conj	$\rightarrow$	and [0.50]   or [0.10]   but [0.20]   yet [0.02] ∨
Digit	$\rightarrow$	<b>0</b> [0.20]   <b>1</b> [0.20]   <b>2</b> [0.20]   <b>3</b> [0.20]   <b>4</b> [0.20]

Lexicon



 $E_0$ 



(R&N)

$\mathcal{E}_0$ : S	$\rightarrow$	NP VP	[0.90]	I + feel a breeze
		S Conj $S$	[0.10]	I feel a breeze + and + It stinks
		-		
NP	$\rightarrow$	Pronoun	[0.30]	Ι
		Name	[0.10]	John
	i	Noun	[0.10]	pits
	Í	Article Noun	[0.25]	the + wumpus
		Article Adjs Noun	[0.05]	the + smelly dead + wumpus
	ĺ	Digit Digit	[0.05]	34
		NP PP	[0.10]	the wumpus + in 13
		NP RelClause	[0.05]	the wumpus + that is smelly
VP	$\rightarrow$	Verb	[0.40]	stinks
		VP NP	[0.35]	feel + a breeze
		VP Adjective	[0.05]	smells + dead
		VP PP	[0.10]	is + in 1 3
		VP Adverb	[0.10]	go + ahead
Adjs	$\rightarrow$	Adjective	[0.80]	smelly
		Adjective Adjs	[0.20]	smelly + dead
PP	$\rightarrow$	Prep NP	[1.00]	to + the east
RelClause	$\rightarrow$	RelPro VP	[1.00]	that + is smelly

Grammar





**Semantics**: what the sentence actually means, eventually in terms of symbols available to the agent (e.g., a KB).

"the cat sat on the mat"



SatOn(x = Cat, y = Mat)SatOn(cat3, mat16)





Key idea: compositional semantics.

# The semantics of sentences are built out of the semantics of their constituent parts.

"The cat sat on the mat."

Therefore there is a clear relationship between syntactic analysis and semantic analysis.

Useful step:

- Probability of parse depends on words
- Lexicalized PCFGs



 $VP(v) \rightarrow Verb(v)NP(n)[P_1(v,n)]$ variables

ate bandanna

probability depends on variable bindings

vs. ate banana

"John loves Mary" Desired output: Loves(John, Mary)



Semantic parsing:

• Exploit compositionality of parsing to build semantics.

```
S(pred(obj)) \rightarrow NP(obj) VP(pred)

VP(pred(obj)) \rightarrow Verb(pred) NP(obj)

NP(obj) \rightarrow Name(obj)

Name(John) \rightarrow John

Name(Mary) \rightarrow Mary

Verb(\lambda y \ \lambda x \ Loves(x, y)) \rightarrow loves
```





#### Machine Translation

Major goal of NLP research for decades.









# Google Translate





100 languages, 200 million people, 100 billion words daily