

Computational Linguistics II: Parsing

Unger's Parsing Method

Frank Richter & Jan-Philipp Söhn

fr@sfs.uni-tuebingen.de, jp.soehn@uni-tuebingen.de

November 29th, 2006

Unger's Parser

- top-down processing
- guesses how to split the input string into partitions that can be derived from a particular daughter
- all possible splits are tried
- assume: ϵ -free grammar
- example: rule: $S \rightarrow PP\ NP\ VP \mid NP\ VP \mid VP$
sentence: In the Olympic Games, Greeks ran races, jumped, hurled the biscuits, and threw the java.

Unger's Parser – Example

- $S \rightarrow VP$: easy
 $\Rightarrow VP \rightarrow$ In the Olympic Games, Greeks ran races, jumped, hurled the biscuits, and threw the java.
- $S \rightarrow NP VP$:

NP	VP
In	the Olympic Games, Greeks...
In the	Olympic Games, Greeks ran...
In the Olympic	Games, Greeks ran races...
In the Olympic Games,	Greeks ran races, jumped...
	...
In the Olympic...	java.

Unger's Parser – Example II

- $S \rightarrow PP\ NP\ VP$:

PP	NP	VP
In	the	Olympic Games,...
In	the Olympic	Games, Greeks...
	...	
In the	Olympic	Games, Greeks ran...
In the	Olympic Games,	Greeks ran...
	...	
In the Olympic...	the	java.

- then try all rules and all partitions for *PP*, *NP*, *VP*
- each symbol needs to cover at least one word \Rightarrow the strings will always become shorter

Unger's Parser – Details

- can be executed depth-first or breadth-first
- immense number of comparisons: exponential time complexity
- possible optimization: discard splits for which terminals do not match:
rule: $NPK \rightarrow NP \text{ and } NP$
impossible split:
{NP many poems and}{and verse}{NP and also literature}
- more optimizations: e.g. compute minimum number of terminals that derive from a non-terminal
i.e. non-terminal: VP , minimal length for $VP = 3$, then discard all partitions of less than 3 words

Unger Algorithm – parallel

- 1 if $Z \in T$ and $Z = w_k$, finish
- 2 select rule $Z \rightarrow X_1 \dots X_n$
- 3 split up sentence in n parts $w_1 \dots w_n$ in all different ways
- 4 for all $k = 1$ to n : if $X_k \in T$ and $X_k \neq w_k$, discard split otherwise store split
- 5 select one split, for all parts Z repeat steps 1 – 4

Towards a Real Algorithm

- What knowledge needs to be preserved during the parse?
- What data structures do we need?
- What happens if a possibility turns out to be wrong?

Unger's Parser with ϵ Rules

- allow empty string as partition:
rule: $S \rightarrow NP VP$:

NP	VP
In	In the Olympic Games,...
In the	the Olympic Games, Greeks...
In the Olympic	Olympic Games, Greeks ran...
In the Olympic Games,	Games, Greeks ran races...
	Greeks ran races, jumped...
...	...
In the Olympic...	java.
In the Olympic...	

Unger's Parser with ϵ Rules II

- problem: loops
rules: $S \rightarrow NP VP$, and $VP \rightarrow V S$
sentence: The Magna Carta provided that no free man should be hanged twice for the same offense.
- problematic partition:

NP	VP
	The Magna Carta provided that...

V	S
	The Magna Carta provided...

Unger's Parser with ϵ Rules III

Solution: check in decision history whether the same situation has occurred before

S \Rightarrow The Magna ... same offense.

NP $\Rightarrow \epsilon$; VP \Rightarrow The Magna ... same offense.

V $\Rightarrow \epsilon$; S \Rightarrow The Magna ... same offense.

cut off!

...

NP \Rightarrow The; VP \Rightarrow Magna ... same offense

Example

Sentence:

shit happens on the other side of the wormhole (Trekism, DS9)

Grammar:

S → NP VP
NP → N | DET N | DET ADJ N | NP PP
VP → V PP
PP → P NP
ADJ → other
DET → the
N → shit | side | wormhole
P → on | of
V → happens