

language modeling: n-gram models

CS 585, Fall 2018

Introduction to Natural Language Processing
<http://people.cs.umass.edu/~miyyer/cs585/>

Mohit Iyyer

College of Information and Computer Sciences
University of Massachusetts Amherst

some slides from Dan Jurafsky and Richard Socher

questions from last time...

- why do we have to update word embeddings during backpropagation?


you don't *have* to, but it is common esp. if the domain you trained your embeddings on differs from the domain of your downstream task

- lots of us are missing class next week... can you record the lectures?

goal: assign probability to a piece of text


- why would we ever want to do this?
- translation:
 - $P(i \text{ flew to the movies}) \lllll P(i \text{ went to the movies})$
- speech recognition:
 - $P(i \text{ saw a van}) \ggggg P(\text{eyes awe of an})$

You use Language Models every day!



You use Language Models every day!



what is the | 

what is the **weather**
what is the **meaning of life**
what is the **dark web**
what is the **xfi**
what is the **doomsday clock**
what is the **weather today**
what is the **keto diet**
what is the **american dream**
what is the **speed of light**
what is the **bill of rights**

[Google Search](#) [I'm Feeling Lucky](#)

philosophical question!
should building the perfect
language model be the ultimate
goal of NLP?



Emily M. Bender

@emilymbender

Following



Replying to @emilymbender @tallinzen and 3 others

I tried to get this point across at my [#RELNLP](#) talk by having folks imagine they were given the sum total of all Thai literature in a huge library. (All in Thai, no translations.) Assuming you don't already know Thai, you won't learn it from that.

2:20 PM - 30 Jul 2018

1 Retweet 7 Likes





Emily M. Bender @emilymbender · Jul 30



Replying to @emilymbender @tallinzen and 3 others

Someone came up to me afterwards and asked: Really? If you put a kid in a room with just audiobooks, they won't learn the language. My answer: No, no they won't.



Emily M. Bender @emilymbender · Jul 30



They could learn the sound system, and prosody, and maybe do some word segmentation. But again, if the input is form only, then the only thing you can hope to learn is properties of the forms.



((((U)U) 'yoav))) @yoavgo · Jul 30



The kid might learn a language model though. That is, be able to produce sentences, even generalize to unseen ones. Maybe even reasonably complete sentences posed by others. (Need to be a really robotic kid though.)





Emily M. Bender

@emilymbender

Following



Replying to @gneubig @yoavgo and 5 others

Ok, how's this: Give your NN all well-formed java code that's ever been written but only the surface form of the code. Then ask it to evaluate (i.e. execute) part of it.

5:58 AM - 2 Aug 2018

32 Likes



Tweet your reply



Jacob Andreas @jacobandreas · Aug 2



Replying to @emilybender @gneubig and 5 others

Thanks, this is clarifying. I believe it's the case that: (1) You cannot possibly extract from the LM any bytecode written according to the Java standard; you certainly cannot execute anything extracted on the Java Virtual Machine without cheating.



1



4



Jacob Andreas @jacobandreas · Aug 2



But (2) at the same time, there must be an implementation of the JVM inside the weights of the LM: a model can't generate all code with well-formed tests unless it has the ability to execute representations of code.



1



1



3



Jacob Andreas @jacobandreas · Aug 2



In case (2) there will be an isomorphism between compiled Java and parts of the LM state, and an isomorphism between JVM state and different parts of the LM state. (I think this could be made precise---witnesses to non-isomorphism would produce bad Java when decoded.)



1



3





(((U)U) 'yoav)))

@yoavgo

Following



Replying to [@jacobandreas](#) [@emilymbender](#) and 6 others

Yeah it's just (one of the many) trivial examples where perfect LM entails solving not only all of language but also all of AI. Which I guess is why all the AGI crowd are so excited about it.

1:56 PM - 3 Aug 2018

4 Likes



4



back to reality...

Probabilistic Language Modeling

- Goal: compute the probability of a sentence or sequence of words:

$$P(W) = P(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5 \dots w_n)$$

- Related task: probability of an upcoming word:

$$P(w_5 | w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$$

- A model that computes either of these:

$P(W)$ or $P(w_n | w_1, w_2 \dots w_{n-1})$ is called a **language model** or **LM**

we have already seen one way to do this... where?

How to compute $P(W)$

- How to compute this joint probability:
 - $P(\text{its, water, is, so, transparent, that})$
- Intuition: let's rely on the Chain Rule of Probability

Reminder: The Chain Rule

- Recall the definition of conditional probabilities

$$P(B | A) = P(A, B) / P(A) \quad \text{Rewriting: } P(A, B) = P(A)P(B | A)$$

- More variables:

$$P(A, B, C, D) = P(A)P(B | A)P(C | A, B)P(D | A, B, C)$$

- The Chain Rule in General

$$P(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n) = P(x_1)P(x_2 | x_1)P(x_3 | x_1, x_2) \dots P(x_n | x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$$

The Chain Rule applied to compute joint probability of words in sentence

$$P(w_1 w_2 \dots w_n) = \prod_i P(w_i | w_1 w_2 \dots w_{i-1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} P(\text{“its water is so transparent”}) = & \\ & P(\text{its}) \times P(\text{water} | \text{its}) \times P(\text{is} | \text{its water}) \\ & \times P(\text{so} | \text{its water is}) \times P(\text{transparent} | \text{its water is so}) \end{aligned}$$

How to estimate these probabilities

- Could we just count and divide?

$$P(\text{the } | \text{ its water is so transparent that}) = \frac{\textit{Count}(\text{its water is so transparent that the})}{\textit{Count}(\text{its water is so transparent that})}$$

How to estimate these probabilities

- Could we just count and divide?

$$P(\text{the} \mid \text{its water is so transparent that}) = \frac{\textit{Count}(\text{its water is so transparent that the})}{\textit{Count}(\text{its water is so transparent that})}$$

- No! Too many possible sentences!
- We'll never see enough data for estimating these

Markov Assumption

- Simplifying assumption:



Andrei Markov (1856~1922)

$P(\text{the } | \text{ its water is so transparent that}) \approx P(\text{the } | \text{ that})$

- Or maybe

$P(\text{the } | \text{ its water is so transparent that}) \approx P(\text{the } | \text{ transparent that})$

Markov Assumption

$$P(w_1 w_2 \dots w_n) \approx \prod_i P(w_i | w_{i-k} \dots w_{i-1})$$

- In other words, we approximate each component in the product

$$P(w_i | w_1 w_2 \dots w_{i-1}) \approx P(w_i | w_{i-k} \dots w_{i-1})$$

Simplest case: Unigram model

$$P(w_1 w_2 \dots w_n) \approx \prod_i P(w_i)$$

Some automatically generated sentences from a unigram model:

fifth, an, of, futures, the, an, incorporated, a, a,
the, inflation, most, dollars, quarter, in, is, mass

thrift, did, eighty, said, hard, 'm, july, bullish

that, or, limited, the

less dumb demo:

<https://mesotron.shinyapps.io/languagemodel/>

Approximating Shakespeare

1
gram

–To him swallowed confess hear both. Which. Of save on trail for are ay device and rote life have

–Hill he late speaks; or! a more to leg less first you enter

2
gram

–Why dost stand forth thy canopy, forsooth; he is this palpable hit the King Henry. Live king. Follow.

–What means, sir. I confess she? then all sorts, he is trim, captain.

3
gram

–Fly, and will rid me these news of price. Therefore the sadness of parting, as they say, 'tis done.

–This shall forbid it should be branded, if renown made it empty.

4
gram

–King Henry. What! I will go seek the traitor Gloucester. Exeunt some of the watch. A great banquet serv'd in;

–It cannot be but so.

N-gram models

- We can extend to trigrams, 4-grams, 5-grams
- In general this is an insufficient model of language
 - because language has **long-distance dependencies**:
“The computer which I had just put into the machine room on the fifth floor crashed.”
- But we can often get away with N-gram models

next lecture, we will look at some models that can theoretically handle some of these longer-term dependencies

Estimating bigram probabilities

- The Maximum Likelihood Estimate (MLE)
 - relative frequency based on the empirical counts on a training set

$$P(w_i | w_{i-1}) = \frac{\mathit{count}(w_{i-1}, w_i)}{\mathit{count}(w_{i-1})}$$

$$P(w_i | w_{i-1}) = \frac{c(w_{i-1}, w_i)}{c(w_{i-1})}$$

c – count

An example

$$P(w_i | w_{i-1}) \stackrel{\text{MLE}}{=} \frac{c(w_{i-1}, w_i)}{c(w_{i-1})}$$

<s> I am Sam </s>
<s> Sam I am </s>
<s> I do not like green eggs and ham </s>

$$P(\text{I} | \text{<s>}) = \frac{2}{3} = .67$$

$$P(\text{Sam} | \text{<s>}) = ???$$

$$P(\text{</s>} | \text{Sam}) = \frac{1}{2} = 0.5$$

$$P(\text{Sam} | \text{am}) = ???$$

An example

$$P(w_i | w_{i-1}) \stackrel{\text{MLE}}{=} \frac{c(w_{i-1}, w_i)}{c(w_{i-1})}$$

<s> I am Sam </s>
<s> Sam I am </s>
<s> I do not like green eggs and ham </s>

$$P(\mathbf{I} | \langle \mathbf{s} \rangle) = \frac{2}{3} = .67$$

$$P(\mathbf{Sam} | \langle \mathbf{s} \rangle) = \frac{1}{3} = .33$$

$$P(\mathbf{am} | \mathbf{I}) = \frac{2}{3} = .67$$

$$P(\langle \mathbf{/s} \rangle | \mathbf{Sam}) = \frac{1}{2} = 0.5$$

$$P(\mathbf{Sam} | \mathbf{am}) = \frac{1}{2} = .5$$

$$P(\mathbf{do} | \mathbf{I}) = \frac{1}{3} = .33$$

A bigger example:

Berkeley Restaurant Project sentences

- can you tell me about any good cantonese restaurants close by
- mid priced thai food is what i'm looking for
- tell me about chez panisse
- can you give me a listing of the kinds of food that are available
- i'm looking for a good place to eat breakfast
- when is caffe venezia open during the day

Raw bigram counts

- Out of 9222 sentences

	i	want	to	eat	chinese	food	lunch	spend
i	5	827	0	9	0	0	0	2
want	2	0	608	1	6	6	5	1
to	2	0	4	686	2	0	6	211
eat	0	0	2	0	16	2	42	0
chinese	1	0	0	0	0	82	1	0
food	15	0	15	0	1	4	0	0
lunch	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
spend	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

Raw bigram probabilities

$$P(w_i | w_{i-1}) \stackrel{\text{MLE}}{=} \frac{c(w_{i-1}, w_i)}{c(w_{i-1})}$$

- Normalize by unigrams:

i	want	to	eat	chinese	food	lunch	spend
2533	927	2417	746	158	1093	341	278

- Result:

	i	want	to	eat	chinese	food	lunch	spend
i	0.002	0.33	0	0.0036	0	0	0	0.00079
want	0.0022	0	0.66	0.0011	0.0065	0.0065	0.0054	0.0011
to	0.00083	0	0.0017	0.28	0.00083	0	0.0025	0.087
eat	0	0	0.0027	0	0.021	0.0027	0.056	0
chinese	0.0063	0	0	0	0	0.52	0.0063	0
food	0.014	0	0.014	0	0.00092	0.0037	0	0
lunch	0.0059	0	0	0	0	0.0029	0	0
spend	0.0036	0	0.0036	0	0	0	0	0

Bigram estimates of sentence probabilities

$$P(\langle s \rangle \text{ I want english food } \langle /s \rangle) =$$

$$P(\text{I} | \langle s \rangle)$$

$$\times P(\text{want} | \text{I})$$

$$\times P(\text{english} | \text{want})$$





$$\times P(\text{food} | \text{english})$$

$$\times P(\langle /s \rangle | \text{food})$$

$$= .000031$$

these probabilities get super tiny when we have longer inputs w/ more infrequent words... how can we get around this?

What kinds of knowledge?

- $P(\text{english} | \text{want}) = .0011$ 
- $P(\text{chinese} | \text{want}) = .0065$
- $P(\text{to} | \text{want}) = .66$ 
- $P(\text{eat} | \text{to}) = .28$
- $P(\text{food} | \text{to}) = 0$ 
- $P(\text{want} | \text{spend}) = 0$ 
- $P(i | \langle s \rangle) = .25$

Language Modeling Toolkits

- SRILM

- <http://www.speech.sri.com/projects/srilm/>

- KenLM

- <https://kheafield.com/code/kenlm/>

Evaluation: How good is our model?

- Does our language model prefer good sentences to bad ones?
 - Assign higher probability to “real” or “frequently observed” sentences
 - Than “ungrammatical” or “rarely observed” sentences?
- We train parameters of our model on a **training set**.
- We test the model’s performance on data we haven’t seen.
 - A **test set** is an unseen dataset that is different from our training set, totally unused.
 - An **evaluation metric** tells us how well our model does on the test set.

Evaluation: How good is our model?

- The goal isn't to pound out fake sentences!
 - Obviously, generated sentences get “better” as we increase the model order
 - More precisely: using maximum likelihood estimators, higher order is always better likelihood on **training set**, but not **test set**

Training on the test set

- We can't allow test sentences into the training set
- We will assign it an artificially high probability when we set it in the test set
- “Training on the test set”
- Bad science!
- And violates the honor code

Intuition of Perplexity



Claude Shannon
(1916~2001)

- The Shannon Game:

- How well can we predict the next word?

I always order pizza with cheese and _____

The 33rd President of the US was _____

I saw a _____

- Unigrams are terrible at this game. (Why?)

- A better model of a text

- is one which assigns a higher probability to the word that actually occurs
- compute per word log likelihood
(M words, m test sentence s_i)

mushrooms 0.1
pepperoni 0.1
anchovies 0.01
.....
fried rice 0.0001
.....
and 1e-100

$$l = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^m \log p(s_i)$$

Perplexity

The best language model is one that best predicts an unseen test set

- Gives the highest $P(\text{sentence})$

Perplexity is the inverse probability of the test set, normalized by the number of words:

$$\begin{aligned} PP(W) &= P(w_1 w_2 \dots w_N)^{-\frac{1}{N}} \\ &= \sqrt[N]{\frac{1}{P(w_1 w_2 \dots w_N)}} \end{aligned}$$

Chain rule:

$$PP(W) = \sqrt[N]{\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{P(w_i | w_1 \dots w_{i-1})}}$$

For bigrams:

$$PP(W) = \sqrt[N]{\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{P(w_i | w_{i-1})}}$$

Minimizing perplexity is the same as maximizing probability

Perplexity as branching factor

Let's suppose a sentence consisting of random digits

What is the perplexity of this sentence according to a model that assign $P=1/10$ to each digit?

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PP}(W) &= P(w_1 w_2 \dots w_N)^{-\frac{1}{N}} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{10}\right)^{-\frac{1}{N}} \\ &= 10^{\frac{1}{N}} \\ &= 10 \end{aligned}$$

Lower perplexity = better model

- Training 38 million words, test 1.5 million words, Wall Street Journal

N-gram Order	Unigram	Bigram	Trigram
Perplexity	962	170	109

Zero probability bigrams

- Bigrams with zero probability
 - mean that we will assign 0 probability to the test set!
- And hence we cannot compute perplexity (can't divide by 0)!

$$PP(W) = P(w_1 w_2 \dots w_N)^{-\frac{1}{N}}$$
$$= \sqrt[N]{\frac{1}{P(w_1 w_2 \dots w_N)}}$$

for bigram

$$PP(W) = \sqrt[N]{\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{P(w_i | w_{i-1})}}$$

Q: How do we deal with ngrams of zero probabilities?

Shakespeare as corpus

- $N=884,647$ tokens, $V=29,066$
- Shakespeare produced 300,000 bigram types out of $V^2= 844$ million possible bigrams.
 - So 99.96% of the possible bigrams were never seen (have zero entries in the table)
- Quadrigrams worse: What's coming out looks like Shakespeare because it *is* Shakespeare

Zeros

Training set:

- ... denied the allegations
- ... denied the reports
- ... denied the claims
- ... denied the request

- Test set
 - ... denied the offer
 - ... denied the loan

$$P(\text{"offer"} \mid \text{denied the}) = 0$$

The intuition of smoothing (from Dan Klein)

- When we have sparse statistics:

$P(w \mid \text{denied the})$


3 allegations

2 reports

1 claims

1 request

7 total



- Steal probability mass to generalize better

$P(w \mid \text{denied the})$

2.5 allegations


1.5 reports

0.5 claims

0.5 request

2 other

7 total



Add-one estimation (again!)

- Also called Laplace smoothing
- Pretend we saw each word one more time than we did
- Just add one to all the counts!

- MLE estimate:

$$P_{MLE}(w_i | w_{i-1}) = \frac{c(w_{i-1}, w_i)}{c(w_{i-1})}$$

- Add-1 estimate:

$$P_{Add-1}(w_i | w_{i-1}) = \frac{c(w_{i-1}, w_i) + 1}{c(w_{i-1}) + V}$$

Berkeley Restaurant Corpus: Laplace smoothed bigram counts

	i	want	to	eat	chinese	food	lunch	spend
i	6	828	1	10	1	1	1	3
want	3	1	609	2	7	7	6	2
to	3	1	5	687	3	1	7	212
eat	1	1	3	1	17	3	43	1
chinese	2	1	1	1	1	83	2	1
food	16	1	16	1	2	5	1	1
lunch	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
spend	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1

Laplace-smoothed bigrams

$$P^*(w_n|w_{n-1}) = \frac{C(w_{n-1}w_n) + 1}{C(w_{n-1}) + V}$$

	i	want	to	eat	chinese	food	lunch	spend
i	0.0015	0.21	0.00025	0.0025	0.00025	0.00025	0.00025	0.00075
want	0.0013	0.00042	0.26	0.00084	0.0029	0.0029	0.0025	0.00084
to	0.00078	0.00026	0.0013	0.18	0.00078	0.00026	0.0018	0.055
eat	0.00046	0.00046	0.0014	0.00046	0.0078	0.0014	0.02	0.00046
chinese	0.0012	0.00062	0.00062	0.00062	0.00062	0.052	0.0012	0.00062
food	0.0063	0.00039	0.0063	0.00039	0.00079	0.002	0.00039	0.00039
lunch	0.0017	0.00056	0.00056	0.00056	0.00056	0.0011	0.00056	0.00056
spend	0.0012	0.00058	0.0012	0.00058	0.00058	0.00058	0.00058	0.00058

Reconstituted counts

$$c^*(w_{n-1}w_n) = \frac{[C(w_{n-1}w_n) + 1] \times C(w_{n-1})}{C(w_{n-1}) + V}$$

	i	want	to	eat	chinese	food	lunch	spend
i	3.8	527	0.64	6.4	0.64	0.64	0.64	1.9
want	1.2	0.39	238	0.78	2.7	2.7	2.3	0.78
to	1.9	0.63	3.1	430	1.9	0.63	4.4	133
eat	0.34	0.34	1	0.34	5.8	1	15	0.34
chinese	0.2	0.098	0.098	0.098	0.098	8.2	0.2	0.098
food	6.9	0.43	6.9	0.43	0.86	2.2	0.43	0.43
lunch	0.57	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.38	0.19	0.19
spend	0.32	0.16	0.32	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16

Compare with raw bigram counts

	i	want	to	eat	chinese	food	lunch	spend
i	5	827	0	9	0	0	0	2
want	2	0	608	1	6	6	5	1
to	2	0	4	686	2	0	6	211
eat	0	0	2	0	16	2	42	0
chinese	1	0	0	0	0	82	1	0
food	15	0	15	0	1	4	0	0
lunch	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
spend	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

	i	want	to	eat	chinese	food	lunch	spend
i	3.8	527	0.64	6.4	0.64	0.64	0.64	1.9
want	1.2	0.39	238	0.78	2.7	2.7	2.3	0.78
to	1.9	0.63	3.1	430	1.9	0.63	4.4	133
eat	0.34	0.34	1	0.34	5.8	1	15	0.34
chinese	0.2	0.098	0.098	0.098	0.098	8.2	0.2	0.098
food	6.9	0.43	6.9	0.43	0.86	2.2	0.43	0.43
lunch	0.57	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.38	0.19	0.19
spend	0.32	0.16	0.32	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16

Add-1 estimation is a blunt instrument

- So add-1 isn't used for N-grams:
 - We'll see better methods
- But add-1 is used to smooth other NLP models
 - For text classification
 - In domains where the number of zeros isn't so huge.

Backoff and Interpolation

- Sometimes it helps to use **less** context
 - Condition on less context for contexts you haven't learned much about
- **Backoff:**
 - use trigram if you have good evidence,
 - otherwise bigram, otherwise unigram
- **Interpolation:**
 - mix unigram, bigram, trigram
- Interpolation works better

Linear Interpolation

- Simple interpolation

$$\hat{P}(w_n|w_{n-2}w_{n-1}) = \lambda_1 P(w_n|w_{n-2}w_{n-1}) + \lambda_2 P(w_n|w_{n-1}) + \lambda_3 P(w_n) \quad \sum_i \lambda_i = 1$$

- Lambdas conditional on context:

$$\hat{P}(w_n|w_{n-2}w_{n-1}) = \lambda_1(w_{n-2}^{n-1})P(w_n|w_{n-2}w_{n-1}) + \lambda_2(w_{n-2}^{n-1})P(w_n|w_{n-1}) + \lambda_3(w_{n-2}^{n-1})P(w_n)$$

Absolute discounting: just subtract a little from each count

- Suppose we wanted to subtract a little from a count of 4 to save probability mass for the zeros
- How much to subtract ?
- Church and Gale (1991)'s clever idea
- Divide up 22 million words of AP Newswire
 - Training and held-out set
 - for each bigram in the training set
 - see the actual count in the held-out set!

Bigram count in training	Bigram count in heldout set
0	.0000270
1	0.448
2	1.25
3	2.24
4	3.23
5	4.21
6	5.23
7	6.21
8	7.21
9	8.26

Absolute Discounting Interpolation

- Save ourselves some time and just subtract 0.75 (or some d)!

$$P_{\text{AbsoluteDiscounting}}(w_i | w_{i-1}) = \frac{\overset{\text{discounted bigram}}{c(w_{i-1}, w_i)} - d}{c(w_{i-1})} + \overset{\text{Interpolation weight}}{\lambda(w_{i-1})} \overset{\text{unigram}}{P(w)}$$

- (Maybe keeping a couple extra values of d for counts 1 and 2)
- But should we really just use the regular unigram $P(w)$?

Kneser-Ney Smoothing Intuition

- Better estimate for probabilities of lower-order unigrams!
 - Shannon game: *I can't see without my reading* Francisso ?
 - “Francisco” is more common than “glasses”
 - ... but “Francisco” always follows “San”
- The unigram is useful exactly when we haven't seen this bigram!
- Instead of $P(w)$: “How likely is w ”
- $P_{\text{continuation}}(w)$: “How likely is w to appear as a novel continuation?”
 - For each word, count the number of bigram types it completes
 - Every bigram type was a novel continuation the first time it was seen

$$P_{\text{CONTINUATION}}(w) \propto |\{w_{i-1} : c(w_{i-1}, w) > 0\}|$$

exercise (from last time)!