CLAMR: Cross-Lingual Abstract Meaning Representations for Machine Translation

Ondřej Bojar, Wei-Te Chen, Silvie Cinkova, David Chiang, Frank Drewes, Ondřej Dušek, Jeff Flanigan, Dan Gildea, Jan Hajič, Alexander Koller, Adam Lopez, Tim O'Gorman, Martha Palmer, Xiaochang Peng, Martin Popel, Adithya Renduchintala, Naomi Saphra, Giorgio Satta, Roman Sudarikov, Zdeňka Urešová, Chuan Wang, Nianwen Xue, Yuchen Zhang

# Warren Weaver's letter (1949)

Think, by analogy, of individuals living in a series of tall closed towers, all erected over a common foundation. When they try to communicate with one another they shout back and forth, each from his own closed tower. It is difficult to make the sound penetrate even the nearest tower, and communication proceeds very poorly indeed. But when an individual goes down his tower, he finds himself in a great open basement, common to all the towers. Here he establishes easy and useful communication with the persons who have also descended from their towers.

# Warren Weaver's letter (1949)

Thus may it be true that the way to translate from Chinese to Arabic, or from Russian to Portuguese, is not to attempt the direct route, shouting from tower to tower. Perhaps the way is to descend, from each language, down to the common base of human communication - the real but as yet undiscovered universal language - and then re-emerge by whatever particular route is convenient.

# The Vauquois triangle



# Warren Weaver's letter (1949)

One naturally wonders if the problem of translation could conceivably be treated as a problem in cryptography. When I look at an article in Russian, I say This is really written in English, but it has been coded in some strange symbols. I will now proceed to decode.

# The IBM approach



#### The last decade



#### Last Month: Cross-Lingual AMR data



# Today: Cross-Lingual AMR systems



# Warren Weaver's letter (1949)

It is one of the chief purposes of this memorandum to emphasize that statistical semantic studies should be undertaken, as a necessary preliminary step.

# Part I

# GLAMR: Graph Languages for AMR

David Chiang, Frank Drewes, Daniel Gildea, Alexander Koller, Adam Lopez, Naomi Saphra, Giorgio Satta

#### input gimme suttin 2 beleive innnn output give me something to believe in



#### input ostoskeskuksessa output ostos#keskus+N+Sg+Ine









## **Common Problems**

- 1. Inputs/outputs are strings, trees, and graphs
- 2. Must cope with ambiguity

# **Common Solutions**

#### 1. Automata and transducers

#### 2. Probability

# Starting Point

	Strings	Trees	Graphs
acceptors	yes	yes	
transducers	yes	yes	
probabilistic	yes	yes	
recognition	yes	yes	
intersection	yes	yes	
summation	yes	yes	
implementation	$yes^*$	yes†	

\*OpenFST (Google), used by Kaldi ASR, Cambridge MT <sup>†</sup>Tiburon (ISI)

#### Trees vs. Graphs: Reentrancies





# Starting Point: Graph Grammars

	RTGs	DAGAs*	HRGs
reentrancies			
local	no	no yes?	
nonlocal	no	yes	no
acceptors	yes	yes	yes
transducers	yes	$yes^\dagger$	yes
probabilistic	yes	no	yes
recognition $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$	$q^{d+1}n$	2 <sup>n</sup>	$(3^d n)^{k+1}$
intersection	yes	yes	yes‡
summation	yes	?	yes

\*Nonplanar variant of Quernheim and Knight (2012)

<sup>†</sup>To trees

 $^{\ddagger}$ Of derivations, not graphs

# Section 2 Regular graph grammars

Simplified version of nonplanar DAG acceptors (Quernheim and Knight, 2010)















#### Probabilities

*q q q* ○ ○ ○

#### 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 referents

### Probabilities



 $\begin{array}{cccc} q & q & q & q \\ \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc \end{array}$ 

#### 0 0 0 0 0 ...

tables





tables



tables



tables

### Probabilities

	referents	CRP
maximum nodes	N	$\infty$
hyperparameters	N	$\alpha$
equivalent mergings	distinct	summed
independent	yes	no
exchangeable	yes	yes





#### Max-weight derivation



Total weight



# Recognition: Algorithm



Value for subtree depends only on state at root

# Recognition: Algorithm



- Time complexity:  $\mathcal{O}(q^{treewidth+1}n)$
- Average treewidth: 1.55 but need to add edges between sisters but Kleene star will help
- Implemented in Julia (by Naomi Saphra)

### Recognition as intersection



#### Interpretation as composition



#### Generation as composition



#### Grammar for a single graph







 $\mathcal{L}(M^{\cap}) = \mathcal{L}(M) \cap \mathcal{L}(M')$ 

#### Intersection: Algorithm





#### Intersection: Algorithm

Unique $(q_2) \Rightarrow$  Unique $(q_2r_1, q_2r_2, q_2r_3)$ Only one node in *any* of the states can exist (other states cannot be used)

# Hypergraphs

Grammar for a finite language can be represented as a hypergraph (analogous to lattices, packed forests).



Note: not all edges are drawn

#### Summation



$$\begin{array}{c}
 q_2 r_1, q_3 r_1 \mapsto 0.2 \\
 q_2 r_2, q_3 r_1 \mapsto 0.3 \\
 q_3 r_1, q_3 r_2 \mapsto 0.5 \\
 q_2 r_2, q_3 r_2 \mapsto 0.4 \\
 \vdots \\
\end{array}$$

- Time complexity:  $\mathcal{O}(q^{treewidth+1}n)$
- Byproduct: hyperedge replacement grammar

# Summary

	RTGs	DAGAs	HRGs	RGGs
reentrancies				
local	no	yes?	yes	yes?
nonlocal	no	yes	no	yes
acceptors	yes	yes	yes	yes
transducers	yes	yes	yes	yes?
probabilistic	yes	no	yes	$yes^*$
recognition $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$	$q^{d+1}n$	2 <sup>n</sup>	$(3^d n)^{k+1}$	$q^{k+1}n$
intersection	yes	yes	yes	yes
summation	yes	?	yes	yes

\*But nicest model makes algorithms harder

Section 3 Follow-Up Projects

# Eliminate 3<sup>d</sup> for HRG

- General algorithm for parsing graphs with HRG is O((3<sup>d</sup> n)<sup>k+1</sup>)
  - ▶ *n*: size of graph
  - ► k: treewidth
  - ► *d*: degree of graph
- Known conditions for polynomial-time parsing:
  - separability: removing s nodes breaks graph into O(log n) components
  - componentwise derivation: remove node of high degree, derive components independently
- AMRs: nodes of high degree are often implicit arguments (first condition) or conjunctions (second condition)

# Bag of Node Parsing

- Words observed in sentence  $\Rightarrow$  nodes in graph
- Node parsing problem: find all graphs generated by grammar *G* having bag of nodes *V*

# Synchronous RGG

- Combining RGG derivation with CFG (or dependency) derivation
- Node merge operation: pronouns?
- Are derivation trees on RGG side projective on string side?
  - Mildly context sensitive on string side?

# HRGs with Node Merge

- Syntactic re-entrancies (control verbs) generated by HRG
- Non-local re-entrancies (pronouns) generated by RGG merge operation