Natural language processing: state of the art, prospects for the next few years

Alistair Knott

- Speech / orthography
- Lexical semantics
- Syntax
- Compositional semantics
- Dialogue

- Speech / orthography (physical symbols \leftrightarrow words)
- Lexical semantics
- Syntax
- Compositional semantics
- Dialogue

- Speech / orthography (physical symbols \leftrightarrow words)
- Lexical semantics (words \leftrightarrow word meanings)
- Syntax
- Compositional semantics
- Dialogue

- Speech / orthography (physical symbols \leftrightarrow words)
- Lexical semantics (words \leftrightarrow word meanings)
- Syntax (word sequence ↔ syntactic structure)
- Compositional semantics
- Dialogue

- Speech / orthography (physical symbols ↔ words)
- Lexical semantics (words ↔ word meanings)
- Syntax (word sequence ↔ syntactic structure)
- Compositional semantics (syn. structure ↔ utterance meaning)
- Dialogue

- Speech / orthography (physical symbols ↔ words)
- Lexical semantics (words ↔ word meanings)
- Syntax (word sequence ↔ syntactic structure)
- Compositional semantics (syn. structure ↔ utterance meaning)
- Dialogue (utterance \rightarrow next utterance)

Speech / orthography

Speech / orthography

Almost a solved problem.

Lexical semantics

Logic: \lambda x[crinkly'(x)]

- Logic: λx[crinkly'(x)]
- Stat. language modelling: the contexts in which crinkly is used

Ilustrating the statistical modelling approach



- Logic: $\lambda x[crinkly'(x)]$
- Stat. language modelling: the contexts in which crinkly is used

- Logic: λx[crinkly'(x)]
- Stat. language modelling: the contexts in which *crinkly* is used
- Embodied semantics: a tactile/auditory/sensory sensation

- Logic: λx[crinkly'(x)]
- Stat. language modelling: the contexts in which *crinkly* is used
- Embodied semantics: a tactile/auditory/sensory sensation

How well can we map words to word meanings?

- Logic: λx[crinkly'(x)]
- Stat. language modelling: the contexts in which *crinkly* is used
- Embodied semantics: a tactile/auditory/sensory sensation

How well can we map words to word meanings?

• The best methods use probabilities conditioned on nearby words.

- Logic: λx[crinkly'(x)]
- Stat. language modelling: the contexts in which *crinkly* is used
- Embodied semantics: a tactile/auditory/sensory sensation

How well can we map words to word meanings?

 The best methods use probabilities conditioned on nearby words. SEMEVAL/SENSEVAL compentitions: Coarse-grained word-sense disambiguation: over 90%.



People used to build grammars by hand.

Now, grammars are *learned*, from corpora of hand-parsed sentences.

People used to build grammars by hand.

Now, grammars are *learned*, from corpora of hand-parsed sentences.

• To represent a realistic fragment of a natural language, a grammar must be *huge*.

People used to build grammars by hand.

Now, grammars are *learned*, from corpora of hand-parsed sentences.

- To represent a realistic fragment of a natural language, a grammar must be *huge*.
- A large grammar finds that most sentences are massively ambiguous.
- To address this, grammars are probabilistic.
 The probability of each piece of structure is conditional on other structures nearby, and the words they contain.

People used to build grammars by hand.

Now, grammars are *learned*, from corpora of hand-parsed sentences.

- To represent a realistic fragment of a natural language, a grammar must be *huge*.
- A large grammar finds that most sentences are massively ambiguous.
- To address this, grammars are probabilistic.
 The probability of each piece of structure is conditional on other structures nearby, and the words they contain.

PARSEVAL competition

Over 90% (metric involves precision, recall, tree-similarity)

What are syntactic structures?

What are syntactic structures?

Many of the structures in any given language are simply learned conventions.

Many of the structures in any given language are simply learned conventions.

• Some linguists think that syntactic structures are *nothing but* learned conventions.

Many of the structures in any given language are simply learned conventions.

- Some linguists think that syntactic structures are *nothing but* learned conventions.
- Others think that syntactic structures also reflect an *innate* capacity for language.

Compositional semantics

• We have quite good models of compositional semantics...

- We have quite good models of compositional semantics...
- Caveat 1: we don't know what syntax is.

- We have quite good models of compositional semantics...
- Caveat 1: we don't know what syntax is.
- Caveat 2: we don't know what word meanings are.

Aside: Sentence translation

Now, translation systems just use statistics computed over surface words.

Now, translation systems just use statistics computed over surface words.

• They are trained on corpora of hand-translated sentences.

Now, translation systems just use statistics computed over surface words.

- They are trained on corpora of hand-translated sentences.
- They compute conditional probabilities of words/phrases in L2 given words/phrases in L1.

Now, translation systems just use statistics computed over surface words.

- They are trained on corpora of hand-translated sentences.
- They compute conditional probabilities of words/phrases in L2 given words/phrases in L1.
- Performance: see Google translate.

1. Question-answering systems. (A special case of dialogue systems)

1. Question-answering systems. (A special case of dialogue systems)

There are two basic methods:

- Text-based methods: rearrange the query sentence to create templates for answer sentences, then search the web for such sentences.
- Knowledge based methods: build a semantic representation of the query, then query a knowledge base.

1. Question-answering systems. (A special case of dialogue systems)

There are two basic methods:

- Text-based methods: rearrange the query sentence to create templates for answer sentences, then search the web for such sentences.
- Knowledge based methods: build a semantic representation of the query, then query a knowledge base.
- IBM's Watson uses a mixture of these methods.

1. Question-answering systems. (A special case of dialogue systems)

There are two basic methods:

- Text-based methods: rearrange the query sentence to create templates for answer sentences, then search the web for such sentences.
- Knowledge based methods: build a semantic representation of the query, then query a knowledge base.
- IBM's Watson uses a mixture of these methods.

QA systems are evaluated in the TREC competition.

- Circa 2013: The best systems can successfully answer 70% of 'factoid' questions.
- '90% of nurses follow Watson's guidance' in a specialised healthcare application.

Two basic methods:

Two basic methods:

 Surface-based methods (e.g. Microsoft's Tay): basically like text-based machine translation.

Two basic methods:

- Surface-based methods (e.g. Microsoft's Tay): basically like text-based machine translation.
- Knowledge-based methods: the best ones use dialogue managers, and often planning systems. These systems are clever, but fragile.

The future of NLP

Some parts of the pipeline already work very well.

- Speech, writing
- Word-sense disambiguation
- Those aspects of syntax that reflect conventions
- Compositional semantics

Some parts of the pipeline already work very well.

- Speech, writing
- Word-sense disambiguation
- Those aspects of syntax that reflect conventions
- Compositional semantics

Other parts still need big theoretical advances.

- Grounding lexical semantics in the world
- Answering foundational questions about 'what syntax is'
- Building dialogue systems that are robust *and* deep.

