

Chart parsing with non-atomic categories

Three options for chart parsing with grammars employing non-atomic categories:

1. Expand the grammar into a CFG with atomic categories
2. Parse using an atomic CFG backbone with reduced information
3. Incorporate special mechanisms into the parser

1

Idea 2: Parse using an atomic CFG backbone with reduced information

- idea:
 - parse using a property defined for all categories
 - use other properties to filter solutions from set of parses
- downside:
 - parsing with partial information can significantly enlarge the search space

3

Idea 1: Expand the grammar into a CFG with atomic categories

- number of categories grows exponentially, e.g., 3^n is size of category set with n binary features (plus, minus, unspecified)
- leads to a potentially huge set of rules
- grammar size relevant for time and space efficiency of parsing

2

Idea 3: Incorporate special mechanism into parser

- The equality check used for atomic categories has to be replaced by **unification**.
- Every active and inactive edge in a chart may be used for different uses. So for each time an edge is used, a new **copy** needs to be made.
- Revise the duplication check: only add an edge if it is not **subsumed** by an edge already in the chart.

4

- Two efficiency issues:
 - intelligent **indexing** of edges in chart
 - **packing** of similar edges in chart (cf. Tomita parser)

5

Earley parser with unification

Prediction:

for each $_i[A \rightarrow \alpha \bullet_j B \beta]$ in chart
 for each $B' \rightarrow \gamma$ in rules
 add $_j[\sigma(B \rightarrow \bullet_j \gamma)]$ with $\sigma = \text{mgu}(B, B')$ to chart

Completion (fundamental rule of chart parsing):

for each $_i[A \rightarrow \alpha \bullet_k B \beta]$ and $_k[B' \rightarrow \gamma \bullet_j]$ in chart
 add $_i[\sigma(A \rightarrow \alpha B \bullet_j \beta)]$ with $\sigma = \text{mgu}(B, B')$ to chart

7

Earley parser with atomic categories

Prediction: for each $_i[A \rightarrow \alpha \bullet_j B \beta]$ in chart
 for each $B \rightarrow \gamma$ in rules
 add $_j[B \rightarrow \bullet_j \gamma]$ to chart

Scanning: let $w_1 \dots w_j \dots w_n$ be the input string
 for each $_i[A \rightarrow \alpha \bullet_{j-1} w_j \beta]$ in chart
 add $_i[A \rightarrow \alpha w_j \bullet_j \beta]$ to chart

Completion (fundamental rule of chart parsing):

for each $_i[A \rightarrow \alpha \bullet_k B \beta]$ and $_k[B \rightarrow \gamma \bullet_j]$ in chart
 add $_i[A \rightarrow \alpha B \bullet_j \beta]$ to chart

6

Using restriction to prevent prediction loops

- Prediction terminates for grammars with atomic categories, since a new item is only added to the chart if not already there and there is a finite number of atomic categories.
- Moving beyond atomic categories, there can be an infinite number of non-atomic categories.
- Prediction loop on left-recursive rules can be problem again.
- Solution: use **restriction** on prediction substitution to limit to finite number of cases

8

An example for a problematic grammar

Shieber/Shabes/Pereira (1994, p. 13): Grammar accepting ab^n with N being instantiated to the successor representation of n .

$$\begin{aligned}\text{start} &\rightarrow \mathbf{r}(0, N) \\ \mathbf{r}(X, N) &\rightarrow \mathbf{r}(s(X), N) \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{r}(N, N) &\rightarrow \mathbf{a}\end{aligned}$$

Prediction step with unification will loop:

$$\begin{aligned}{}_0[\text{start} &\rightarrow \bullet_0 \mathbf{r}(0, N)] \\ {}_0[\mathbf{r}(0, N) &\rightarrow \bullet_0 \mathbf{r}(s(0), N) \mathbf{b}] \\ {}_0[\mathbf{r}(s(0), N) &\rightarrow \bullet_0 \mathbf{r}(s(s(0)), N) \mathbf{b}] \\ {}_0[\mathbf{r}(s(s(0)), N) &\rightarrow \bullet_0 \mathbf{r}(s(s(s(0))), N) \mathbf{b}] \\ \dots &\end{aligned}$$

9

Prediction with restriction

for each ${}_i[A \rightarrow \alpha \bullet_j B \beta]$ in chart

for each $B' \rightarrow \gamma$ in rules

add ${}_j[\sigma(B \rightarrow \bullet_j \gamma)]$ with $\sigma = \text{restriction}(\text{mgu}(B, B'))$ to chart

– $\text{restriction}(\text{mgu}(B, B'))$ can be any operation reducing the number of possible substitutions to finite classes:

- (a) depth bound on term complexity
- (b) elimination of terms that are known to grow indefinitely
- (c) use only of selected terms known not to grow indefinitely

– sound since predicted edge only step towards completion!

10