

this discretion to pursue political and economic ends. Most experiences, however, suggest the limited power of privatization in changing the modes of governance which are prevalent in each country's large private companies. Further, those countries which have chosen the mass (voucher) privatization route have done so largely out of necessity and face ongoing efficiency problems as a result. In the UK, a country whose privatization policies are often referred to as a benchmark, 'control [of privatized companies] is not exerted in the forms of threats of take-over or bankruptcy; nor has it for the most part come from direct investor intervention' (Bishop et al. 1994, p. 11). After the steep rise experienced in the immediate aftermath of privatizations, the slow but constant decline in the number of small shareholders highlights the difficulties in sustaining people's capitalism in the longer run. In Italy, for example, privatization was accompanied by a legislative effort aimed at providing noncontrolling shareholders (i.e. both individual and collective investors) with more adequate safeguards and at introducing the necessary conditions to allow them to monitor managers. But successive governments were unsuccessful in broadening the number of large private business groups, whereas enhancing the mobility of control to investors outside the traditional core of Italy's capitalism was explicitly included among the authorities' strategic goals. On the other hand, experiences such as those of the UK and Chile underscore that mass sell-offs require the development of new institutional investors such as pension funds that may later play an active role in corporate governance. (In Chile, for example, the takeover of the country's dominant electricity utility, Enersis, one of the largest in emerging markets, was stalled for some months in 1998 as pension funds' questioned lucrative additional terms that the management had negotiated for themselves based on important agreements concerning the future strategic direction of Enersis that they had never told other shareholders about.)

To conclude, although privatization's promise has been frequently oversold, not least by international organizations, its ills have also been greatly exaggerated. When ownership transfer has been accompanied by market liberalization and proper implementation, in OECD and non-OECD countries alike, consumers and end-users have benefited in terms of choice, quality, and prices. If public opinion and policy-makers wish so, much remains to be sold and the future challenges for the regulatory state remain substantial to ensure maximization of welfare benefits.

See also: Business Law; Capitalism: Global; Corporate Finance: Financial Control; Corporate Governance; Corporate Law; International Law and Treaties; International Trade: Commercial Policy and Trade Negotiations; Law and Economics; Law and Economics: Empirical Dimensions; Liberalism; Markets

and the Law; Monetary Policy; Multinational Corporations; Regulation, Economic Theory of; Regulation: Working Conditions; Smith, Adam (1723–90); Socialism; Venture Capital

Bibliography

- Armijo L 1998 Balance sheet or ballot box? Incentives to privatize in emerging democracies. In: Oxborn P, Starr P (eds.) *The Problematic Relationship between Economic and Political Liberalization*. Lynne Rienner, Boulder, CO
- Bishop M, Kay J, Mayer C 1994 Introduction: privatization in performance. In: Bishop M, Kay J, Mayer C (eds.) *Privatization and Economic Performance*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK
- Boubakri N, Cosset J-C 1998 The financial and operating performance of newly privatized firms: evidence from developing countries. *Journal of Finance* **53**: 1081–110
- Estrin S, Rosevear A 1999 Enterprise performance and ownership: The case of Ukraine. *European Economic Review* **43**: 1125–36
- Evans P 1978 *Dependent Development*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ
- Meggison W, Netter J 1999 From state to market: a survey of empirical studies on privatization. *Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper*, No. 01-99
- Nicoletti G 2000 The implementation and the effects of regulatory reform: past experience and current issues. *Mimeo*. OECD Economics Department, Paris
- Schamis H M 1998 Distributional coalitions and the politics of economic reform in Latin America. *World Politics* **51**: 236–68
- Shirley M M 1998 Bureaucrats in business: the roles of privatization versus corporatization in state-owned enterprise reform. *World Development* **27**: 115–36
- Spicer A, McDermott G, Kogut B 1999 Entrepreneurship and privatization in Central Europe: the tenuous balance between destruction and creation. The Wharton School. *Reginald H. Jones Center Working Paper*, No. 99-04

A. E. Goldstein

Probabilistic Grammars and their Applications

1. Introduction

Natural language processing is the use of computers for processing natural language text or speech. Machine translation (the automatic translation of text or speech from one language to another) began with the very earliest computers (Kay et al. 1994). Natural language interfaces permit computers to interact with humans using natural language, for example, to query databases. Coupled with speech recognition and speech synthesis, these capabilities will become more important with the growing popularity of portable computers that lack keyboards and large display

screens. Other applications include spell and grammar checking and document summarization. Applications outside of natural language include compilers, which translate source code into lower-level machine code, and computer vision (Fu 1974, 1982).

Most natural language processing systems are based on formal grammars. The development and study of formal grammars is known as computational linguistics. A *grammar* is a description of a language; usually it identifies the sentences of the language and provides descriptions of them, for example, by defining the phrases of a sentence, their interrelationships, and perhaps also aspects of their meanings. *Parsing* is the process of recovering a sentence's description from its words, while *generation* is the process of translating a meaning or some other part of a sentence's description into a grammatical or well-formed sentence. Parsing and generation are major research topics in their own right. Evidently, human use of language involves some kind of parsing and generation process, as do many natural language processing applications. For example, a machine translation program may parse an input language sentence into a (partial) representation of its meaning, and then generate an output language sentence from that representation.

Modern computational linguistics began with Chomsky (1957), and was initially dominated by the study of his 'transformational' grammars. These grammars involved two levels of analyses, a 'deep structure' meant to capture more-or-less simply the meaning of a sentence, and a 'surface structure' which reflects the actual way in which the sentence was constructed. The deep structure might be a clause in the active voice, 'Sandy saw Sam,' whereas the surface structure might involve the more complex passive voice, 'Sam was seen by Sandy.'

Transformational grammars are computationally complex, and in the 1980s several linguists came to the conclusion that much simpler kinds of grammars could describe most syntactic phenomena, developing Generalized Phrase-Structure Grammars (Gazdar et al. 1985) and Unification-based Grammars (Kaplan and Bresnan 1982, Pollard and Sag 1987, Shieber 1986). These grammars generate surface structures directly; there is no separate deep structure and therefore no transformations. These kinds of grammars can provide very detailed syntactic and semantic analyses of sentences, but even today there are no comprehensive grammars of this kind that fully accommodate English or any other natural language.

Natural language processing using handcrafted grammars suffers from two major drawbacks. First, the syntactic coverage offered by any available grammar is incomplete, reflecting both our lack of understanding of even relatively frequently occurring syntactic constructions and the organizational difficulty of manually constructing any artifact as complex as a grammar of a natural language. Second, such grammars almost always permit a large number of

spurious ambiguities, that is, parses which are permitted by the rules of syntax but have unusual or unlikely semantic interpretations. For example, in the sentence 'I saw the boat with the telescope,' the prepositional phrase 'with the telescope' is most easily interpreted as the instrument used in seeing, while in 'I saw the policeman with the rifle,' the prepositional phrase usually receives a different interpretation in which the policeman has the rifle. Note that the corresponding alternative interpretation is marginally accessible for each of these sentences: in the first sentence one can imagine that the telescope is on the boat, and in the second, that the rifle (say, with a viewing scope) was used to view the policeman.

In effect, there is a dilemma of coverage. A grammar rich enough to accommodate natural language, including rare and sometimes even 'ungrammatical' constructions, fails to distinguish natural from unnatural interpretations. But a grammar sufficiently restricted so as to exclude what is unnatural fails to accommodate the scope of real language. These observations led, in the 1980s, to a growing interest in stochastic approaches to natural language, particularly to speech. Stochastic grammars became the basis of speech recognition systems by outperforming the best of the systems based on deterministic handcrafted grammars. Largely inspired by these successes, computational linguists began applying stochastic approaches to other natural language processing applications. Usually, the architecture of such a stochastic model is specified manually, while the model's parameters are estimated from a *training corpus*, that is, a large representative sample of sentences.

As explained in the body of this article, stochastic approaches replace the binary distinctions (grammatical vs. ungrammatical) of nonstochastic approaches with probability distributions. This provides a way of dealing with the two drawbacks of nonstochastic approaches. Ill-formed alternatives can be characterized as extremely low probability rather than ruled out as impossible, so even ungrammatical strings can be provided with an interpretation. Similarly, a stochastic model of possible interpretations of a sentence provides a method for distinguishing more plausible interpretations from less plausible ones.

The introduction sets out formally various classes of grammars and languages. Probabilistic grammars are introduced in Sect. 2, along with the basic issues of parametric representation, inference, and computation.

2. Grammars and Languages

The formal framework, whether used in a transformational grammar, a generalized phrase-structure grammar, or a more traditionally styled context-free grammar, is due to Chomsky (1957) and his co-

workers. This section presents a brief introduction to this framework. But for a thorough (and very readable) presentation we highly recommend the book by Hopcroft and Ullman (1979).

The concept and notation of a formal grammar is perhaps best introduced by an example:

Example 1: Define a *grammar*, G_1 , by $G_1 = (T_1, N_1, S, R_1)$, where $T_1 = \{\text{grows, rice, wheat}\}$ is a set of words (a ‘lexicon’), $N_1 = \{S, NP, VP\}$ is a set of symbols representing grammatically meaningful strings of words, such as clauses or parts of speech (e.g., S for ‘Sentence,’ NP for ‘Noun Phrase,’ VP for ‘Verb Phrase’), and $R_1 = \{S \rightarrow NP VP, NP \rightarrow \text{rice, NP} \rightarrow \text{wheat, VP} \rightarrow \text{grows}\}$ is a collection of rules for rewriting, or instantiating, the symbols in N_1 . Informally, the nonterminal S rewrites to sentences or clauses, NP rewrites to noun phrases and VP rewrites to verb phrases. The *language*, L_{G_1} , generated by G_1 is the set of strings of words that are reachable from S through the rewrite rules in R_1 . In this example, $L_{G_1} = \{\text{rice grows, wheat grows}\}$, derived by $S \Rightarrow NP VP \Rightarrow \text{rice VP} \Rightarrow \text{rice grows}$, and $S \Rightarrow NP VP \Rightarrow \text{wheat VP} \Rightarrow \text{wheat grows}$.

More generally, if T is a finite set of symbols, let T^* be the set of all strings (i.e., finite sequences) of symbols of T , including the empty string, and let T^+ be the set of all nonempty strings of symbols of T . A language is a subset of T^* . A *rewrite grammar* G is a quadruple $G = (T, N, S, R)$, where T and N are disjoint finite sets of symbols (called the *terminal* and *nonterminal* symbols respectively), $S \in N$ is a distinguished nonterminal called the *start* or *sentence symbol*, and R is a finite set of productions. A *production* is a pair (α, β) where $\alpha \in N^+$ and $\beta \in (N \cup T)^*$; productions are usually written $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$. Productions of the form $\alpha \rightarrow \epsilon$, where ϵ is the empty string, are called *epsilon productions*. This entry restricts attention to grammars without epsilon productions, that is, $\beta \in (N \cup T)^+$, as this simplifies the mathematics considerably.

A rewrite grammar G defines a *rewriting relation* $\Rightarrow_G \subseteq (N \cup T)^* \times (N \cup T)^*$ over pairs of strings consisting of terminals and nonterminals as follows: $\beta A \gamma \Rightarrow \beta \alpha \gamma$ iff $A \rightarrow \alpha \in R$ and $\beta, \gamma \in (N \cup T)^*$ (the subscript G is dropped when clear from the context). The reflexive, transitive closure of \Rightarrow is denoted \Rightarrow^* . Thus \Rightarrow^* is the rewriting relation using arbitrary finite sequences of productions. (It is called ‘reflexive’ because the identity rewrite, $\alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$, is included.) The language generated by G , denoted L_G , is the set of all strings $w \in T^+$ such that $S \Rightarrow^* w$.

Rewrite grammars are traditionally classified by the shapes of their productions. $G = (T, N, S, R)$ is a *context-sensitive* grammar if for all productions $\alpha \rightarrow \beta \in R$, $|\alpha| \leq |\beta|$, that is, the right-hand side of each production is not shorter than its left-hand side. G is a *context-free* grammar if $|\alpha| = 1$, that is, the left-hand side of each production consists of a single non terminal. G is a *left-linear* grammar if G is context-free


and β (the right-hand side of the production) is either of the form Aw or of the form w where $A \in N$ and $w \in T^*$; in a *right-linear* grammar β always is of the form wA or w . A right or left-linear grammar is called a *regular* grammar. G_1 , in Example 1, is context sensitive and context free.

It is straightforward to show that the classes of languages generated by these classes of grammars stand in strict equality or subset relationships. Specifically, the class of languages generated by right-linear grammars is the same as the class generated by left-linear grammars; this class is called the *regular* languages, and is a strict subset of the class of languages generated by context-free grammars, which is a strict subset of the class of languages generated by context-sensitive grammars, which in turn is a strict subset of the class of languages generated by rewrite grammars.

It turns out that context-sensitive grammars (where a production rewrites more than one nonterminal) have not had many applications in natural language processing, so from here on we will concentrate on context-free grammars, where all productions take the form $A \rightarrow \beta$, where $A \in N$ and $\beta \in (N \cup T)^+$.

An appealing property of grammars with productions in this form is that they induce tree structures on the strings that they generate. And, as Sect. 3 shows, this is the basis for bringing in probability distributions and the theory of inference. We say that the context-free grammar $G = (T, N, S, R)$ generates the labeled, ordered tree ψ , iff the root node of ψ is labeled S , and for each node n in ψ , either n has no children and its label is a member of T (i.e., it is labelled with a terminal) or else there is a production $A \rightarrow \beta \in R$ where the label of n is A and the left-to-right sequence of labels of n ’s immediate children is β . It is straightforward to show that w is in L_G if G generates a tree ψ whose *yield* (i.e., the left-to-right sequence of terminal symbols labeling ψ ’s leaf nodes) is w ; ψ is called a *parse tree* of w (with respect to G). In what follows, we define Ψ_G to be the set of parse trees generated by G , and $\mathcal{Y}(\cdot)$ to be the function that maps trees to their yields.


Example 1 (continued): The grammar G_1 defined above generates the following two trees, ψ_1 and ψ_2 .



In this example, $\mathcal{Y}(\psi_1) = \text{‘rice grows’}$ and $\mathcal{Y}(\psi_2) = \text{‘wheat grows.’}$

A string of terminals w is called *ambiguous* if w has two or more parse trees. Linguistically, each parse tree of an ambiguous string usually corresponds to a distinct interpretation.

Example 2: Consider $G_2 = (T_2, N_2, S, R_2)$, where $T_2 = \{\text{I, saw, the, man, with, telescope}\}$, $N_2 = \{\text{S, NP, N, Det, VP, V, PP, P}\}$ and $R_2 = \{\text{S} \rightarrow \text{NP VP}, \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{I}, \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{Det N}, \text{Det} \rightarrow \text{the}, \text{N} \rightarrow \text{NP}, \text{PP}, \text{N} \rightarrow \text{man, N} \rightarrow \text{telescope}, \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{V NP}, \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{VP PP}, \text{PP} \rightarrow \text{P NP}, \text{V} \rightarrow \text{saw}, \text{P} \rightarrow \text{with}\}$. Informally, N rewrites to nouns, Det to determiners, V to verbs, P to prepositions and PP to prepositional phrases. It is easy to check that the two trees ψ_3 and ψ_4 with the yields $\mathcal{Y}(\psi_3) = \mathcal{Y}(\psi_4) = \text{'I saw the man with the telescope'}$ are both generated by G_2 . Linguistically, these two parse trees represent two different syntactic analyses of the sentence. The first analysis corresponds to the interpretation where the seeing is by means of a telescope, while the second corresponds to the interpretation where the man has a telescope.



3. Probability and Statistics

Obviously broad coverage is desirable—natural language is rich and diverse, and not easily held to a small set of rules. But it is hard to achieve broad coverage without massive ambiguity (a sentence may have tens of thousands of parses), and this of course complicates applications like language interpretation, language translation, and speech recognition. This is the dilemma of coverage that we referred to earlier, and it sets up a compelling role for probabilistic and statistical methods.

We briefly review the main probabilistic grammars and their associated theories of inference. We begin in Sect. 3.1 with probabilistic regular grammars, also known as hidden Markov models (HMM), which are the foundation of modern speech recognition systems—see Jelinek (1997) for a survey.

In Sect. 3.2 we discuss probabilistic context-free grammars, which turn out to be essentially the same thing as branching processes. Finally, in Sect. 3.3, we take a more general approach to placing probabilities on grammars, which leads to Gibbs distributions, a role for Besag’s pseudolikelihood method (Besag 1974, 1975), various computational issues, and, all in all, an active area of research in computational linguistics.

3.1 Regular Grammars

We will focus on right-linear grammars, but the treatment of left-linear grammars is more or less identical. It is convenient to work with a *normal form*: all rules are either of the form $A \rightarrow bB$ or $A \rightarrow b$, where $A, B \in N$ and $b \in T$. It is easy to show that every right-linear grammar has an equivalent normal form in the sense that the two grammars produce the same language. Essentially nothing is lost.

3.1.1 Probabilities. The grammar G can be made into a probabilistic grammar by assigning to each non terminal $A \in N$ a probability distribution p over productions of the form $A \rightarrow \alpha \in R$: for every $A \in N$

$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha \in (N \cup T)^+ \\ \text{s.t. } (A \rightarrow \alpha) \in R}} p(A \rightarrow \alpha) = 1 \quad (1)$$


Recall that Ψ_G is the set of parse trees generated by G (see Sect. 2). If G is linear, then $\psi \in \Psi_G$ is characterized by a sequence of productions, starting from S . It is, then, straightforward to use p to define a probability P on Ψ_G : just take $P(\psi)$ (for $\psi \in \Psi_G$) to be the product of the associated production probabilities.

Example 3: Consider the right-linear grammar $G_3 = (T_3, N_3, S, R_3)$, with $T_3 = \{a, b\}$, $N_3 = \{S, A\}$ and the productions (R_3) and production probabilities (p):

- $S \rightarrow aS \quad p = 0.80$
- $S \rightarrow bS \quad p = 0.01$
- $S \rightarrow bA \quad p = 0.19$
- $A \rightarrow bA \quad p = 0.90$
- $A \rightarrow b \quad p = 0.10$

The language is the set of strings ending with a sequence of at least two bs . The grammar is ambiguous: in general, a sequence of terminal states does not uniquely identify a sequence of productions. The sentence $aabbbb$ has three parses (determined by the placement of the production $S \rightarrow bA$), but the most

likely parse, by far, is $S \rightarrow aS, S \rightarrow aS, S \rightarrow bA, A \rightarrow bA, A \rightarrow bA, A \rightarrow b$ ($P = 0.8 \cdot 0.8 \cdot 0.19 \cdot 0.9 \cdot 0.1$), which has a *posterior* probability of nearly 0.99. The corresponding parse tree is shown below.



3.1.2 Inference. The problem is to estimate (see *Estimation: Point and Interval*) the transition probabilities, $p(\cdot)$, either from parsed data (examples from Ψ_G) or just from sentences (examples from L_G). Consider first the case of parsed data ('supervised learning'), and let $\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_n \in \Psi$ be a sequence taken iid according to P . If $f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi)$ is the counting function, counting the number of times transition $A \rightarrow \alpha \in R$ occurs in ψ , then the likelihood function (see *Likelihood in Statistics*) is

$$L = L(p; \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{A \rightarrow \alpha \in R} p(A \rightarrow \alpha)^{f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi_i)} \quad (2)$$

The maximum likelihood estimate is, sensibly, the relative frequency estimator:

$$\hat{p}(A \rightarrow \alpha) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{A \rightarrow \beta \in R} f(A \rightarrow \beta; \psi_i)} \quad (3)$$

The problem of estimating p from sentences ('unsupervised learning') is more interesting, and more important for applications. Recall that $\mathcal{Y}(\psi)$ is the yield of ψ , that is, the sequence of terminals in ψ . Given a sentence $w \in T^+$, let Ψ_w be the set of parses which yield w : $\Psi_w = \{\psi \in \Psi: \mathcal{Y}(\psi) = w\}$. Imagine a sequence ψ_1, \dots, ψ_n , iid according to P , for which only the corresponding yields, $w_i = \mathcal{Y}(\psi_i)$ $1 \leq i \leq n$, are observed. The likelihood function is

$$L = L(p; w_1, \dots, w_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{\psi \in \Psi_{w_i}} \prod_{A \rightarrow \alpha \in R} p(A \rightarrow \alpha)^{f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi_i)} \quad (4)$$

As is usual with hidden data, there is an EM-type iteration for climbing the likelihood surface—see Baum (1972) and Dempster et al. (1977):

$$t+1(A \rightarrow \alpha) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n E_{\hat{p}_t}[f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi) | \psi \in \Psi_{w_i}]}{\sum_{A \rightarrow \beta \in R} \sum_{i=1}^n E_{\hat{p}_t}[f(A \rightarrow \beta; \psi) | \psi \in \Psi_{w_i}]} \quad (5)$$

Needless to say, nothing can be done with this unless we can actually evaluate, in a computationally feasible way, expressions like $E_{\hat{p}}[f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi) | \psi \in \Psi_w]$. This is one of several closely related computational problems that are part of the mechanics of working with regular grammars.

3.1.3 Computation. A sentence $w \in T^+$ is *parsed* by finding a sequence of productions $A \rightarrow bB \in R$ which yield w . Depending on the grammar, this corresponds more or less to an interpretation of w . Often, there are many parses and we say that w is ambiguous. In such cases, if there is a probability p on R then there is a probability P on Ψ , and a reasonably compelling choice of parse is the most likely parse:

$$\arg \max_{\psi \in \Psi_w} P(\psi) \quad (6)$$

This is the *maximum a posteriori* (MAP) estimate of ψ —obviously it minimizes the probability of error under the distribution P . (Of course, in those cases in which Eqn. (6) is small, P does little to make w unambiguous.)

What is the probability of w ? How are its parses computed? How is the most likely parse computed? These computational issues turn out to be more-or-less the same as the issue of computing $E_{\hat{p}}[f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi) | \psi \in \Psi_w]$ that came up in our discussion of inference. The basic structure and cost of the computational algorithm is the same for each of the four problems—compute the probability of w , compute the set of parses, compute the best parse, compute $E_{\hat{p}}$. In particular, there is a simple dynamic programming solution to each of these problems, and in each case the complexity is of the order $n \cdot |R|$, where n is the length of w , and $|R|$ is the number of productions in G —see Jelinek (1997), Geman and Johnson (2000). The existence of a dynamic programming principle for regular grammars is a primary reason for their central role in state-of-the-art speech recognition systems.

3.2 Context-free Grammars

Despite the successes of regular grammars in speech recognition, the problems of language understanding and translation are generally better addressed with the more structured and more powerful context-free grammars. Following our development of probab-

istic regular grammars in the previous section, we will address here the interrelated issues of fitting context-free grammars with probability distributions, estimating the parameters of these distributions, and computing various functionals of these distributions.

The context-free grammars $G = (T, N, S, R)$ have rules of the form $A \rightarrow \alpha$, $\alpha \in (N \cup T)^+$, as discussed previously in Sect. 2. There is again a normal form, known as the Chomsky normal form, which is particularly convenient when developing probabilistic versions. Specifically, one can always find a context-free grammar G' , with all productions of the form $A \rightarrow BC$ or $A \rightarrow a$, $A, B, C \in N$, $\alpha \in T$, which produces the same language as G : $L_{G'} = L_G$. Henceforth, we will assume that context-free grammars are in the Chomsky normal form.

3.2.1 Probabilities. The goal is to put a probability distribution on the set of parse trees generated by a context-free grammar in Chomsky normal form. Ideally, the distribution will have a convenient parametric form, that allows for efficient inference and computation.

Recall from Sect. 2 that context-free grammars generate labeled, ordered trees. Given sets of nonterminals N and terminals T , let Ψ be the set of finite trees with:

- (a) root node labeled S ;
- (b) leaf nodes labeled with elements of T ;
- (c) interior nodes labeled with elements of N ;
- (d) every nonterminal (interior) node having either two children labeled with nonterminals or one child labeled with a terminal.

Every $\psi \in \Psi$ defines a sentence $w \in T^+$: read the labels off of the terminal nodes of ψ from left to right. Consistent with the notation of Sect. 3.1 we write $\mathcal{Y}(\psi) = w$. Conversely, every sentence $w \in T^+$ defines a subset of Ψ , which we denote by Ψ_w , consisting of all ψ with yield w ($\mathcal{Y}(\psi) = w$). A context-free grammar G defines a subset of Ψ , Ψ_G , whose collection of yields is the language, L_G , of G . We seek a probability distribution P on Ψ which concentrates on Ψ_G .

The time-honored approach to probabilistic context-free grammars is through the production probabilities $p : R \rightarrow [0, 1]$, with

$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha \in N^2 \cup T \\ s.t. (A \rightarrow \alpha) \in R}} p(A \rightarrow \alpha) = 1 \quad (7)$$

Following the development in Sect. 3.1, we introduce a counting function $f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi)$, which counts the number of instances of the rule $A \rightarrow a$ in the tree ψ , i.e., the number of nonterminal nodes A whose daughter nodes define, left-to-right, the string α . Through f , p induces a probability P on Ψ :

$$P(\psi) = \prod_{(A \rightarrow \alpha) \in R} p(A \rightarrow \alpha)^{f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi)} \quad (8)$$

It is clear enough that P concentrates on Ψ_G , and we shall see shortly that this parameterization, in terms of products of probabilities p , is particularly workable and convenient. The pair, G and P , is known as a probabilistic context-free grammar, or PCFG for short. (Notice the connection to branching processes—Harris (1963): Starting at S , use R , and the associated probabilities $p(\cdot)$, to expand nodes into daughter nodes until all leaf nodes are labeled with terminals—i.e., with elements of T .)

3.2.2 Inference. As with probabilistic regular grammars, the production probabilities of a context-free grammar, which amount to a parameterization of the distribution P on Ψ_G , can be estimated from examples. In one scenario, we have access to a sequence ψ_1, \dots, ψ_n from Ψ_G under P . This is ‘supervised learning,’ in the sense that sentences come equipped with parses. More practical is the problem of ‘unsupervised learning,’ wherein we observe only the yields, $\mathcal{Y}(\psi_1), \dots, \mathcal{Y}(\psi_n)$.

In either case, the treatment of maximum likelihood estimation is essentially identical to the treatment for regular grammars. In particular, the likelihood for fully observed data is again Eqn. (2), and the maximum likelihood estimator is again the relative frequency estimator Eqn. (3). And, in the unsupervised case, the likelihood is again Eqn. (4) and this leads to the same EM-type iteration given in Eqn. (5).

3.2.3 Computation. There are again four basic computations: find the probability of a sentence $w \in T^+$, find a $\psi \in \Psi$ (or find *all* $\psi \in \Psi$) satisfying $Y(\psi) = w$ (‘parsing’); find

$$\arg \max_{\substack{\psi \in \Psi \text{ s.t.} \\ \mathcal{Y}(\psi) = w}} P(\psi)$$

(‘maximum *a posteriori*’ or ‘optimal’ parsing); compute expectations of the form $E_{p_i}[f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi) | \psi \in \Psi_w]$ that arise in iterative estimation schemes like (5). The four computations turn out to be more-or-less the same, as was the case for regular grammars (Sect. 3.1.3) and there is again a common dynamic-programming-like solution—see Lari and Young (1990, 1991), Geman and Johnson (2000).

3.3 Gibbs Distributions

There are many ways to generalize. The coverage of a context-free grammar may be inadequate, and we may hope, therefore, to find a workable scheme for placing probabilities on context-sensitive grammars, or perhaps even more general grammars. Or, it may be preferable to maintain the structure of a context-free grammar, especially because of its dynamic programming principle, and instead generalize the class of probability distributions away from those induced (parameterized) by production probabilities. But

nothing comes for free. Most efforts to generalize run into nearly intractable computational problems when it comes time to parse or to estimate parameters.

Many computational linguists have experimented with using Gibbs distributions, popular in statistical physics, to go beyond production-based probabilities, while nevertheless preserving the basic context-free structure. Next we take a brief look at this particular formulation, in order to illustrate the various challenges that accompany efforts to generalize the more standard probabilistic grammars.

3.3.1 Probabilities. The sample space is Ψ_G , the set of trees generated by a context-free grammar G . Gibbs measures are built from sums of more-or-less simple functions, known as ‘potentials’ in statistical physics, defined on the sample space. In linguistics, it is more natural to call these features rather than potentials. Suppose, then, that we have identified M linguistically salient features f_1, \dots, f_M , where $f_i: \Psi_G \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$, through which we will characterize the fitness or appropriateness of a structure $\psi \in \Psi_G$. More specifically, we will construct a class of probabilities on Ψ_G which depend on $\psi \in \Psi_G$ only through $f_1(\psi), \dots, f_M(\psi)$. Examples of features are the number of times a particular production occurs, the number of words in the yield, various measures of subject-verb agreement, and the number of embedded or independent clauses.

Gibbs distributions have the form

$$P_\theta(\psi) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^M \theta_i f_i(\psi) \right\} \quad (9)$$

where $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$ are parameters, to be adjusted ‘by hand’ or inferred from data. $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M)$, and where $Z = Z(\theta)$ (known as the ‘partition function’) normalizes so that $P_\theta(\Psi) = 1$. Evidently, we need to assume or ensure that $\sum_{\psi \in \Psi_G} \exp \{ \sum_{i=1}^M \theta_i f_i(\psi) \} < \infty$. For instance, we had better require that $\theta_1 < 0$ if $M = 1$ and $f_1(\psi) = |\mathcal{Y}(\psi)|$ (the number of words in a sentence), unless of course $|\Psi_G| < \infty$.

3.3.2 Relation to probabilistic context-free grammars. Gibbs distributions are much more general than probabilistic context-free grammars. In order to recover PCFG’s, consider the special feature set $\{f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi)\}_{A \rightarrow \alpha \in R}$. The Gibbs distribution Eqn. (9) takes on the form

$$P_\theta(\psi) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left\{ \sum_{A \rightarrow \alpha \in R} \theta_{A \rightarrow \alpha} f(A \rightarrow \alpha; \psi) \right\} \quad (10)$$

Evidently, then, we get the probabilistic context-free grammars by taking $\theta_{A \rightarrow \alpha} = \log_e p(A \rightarrow \alpha)$, where p is a system of production probabilities consistent with Eqn. (7), in which case $Z = 1$. But is Eqn. (10) more general? Are there probabilities on Ψ_G of this form

that are not PCFGs? The answer turns out to be no, as was shown by Chi (1999) and Abney et al. (1999): given a probability distribution P on Ψ_G of the form of Eqn. (10), there always exists a system of production probabilities p under which P is a PCFG.

3.3.3 Inference. The feature set $\{f_i\}_{i=1, \dots, M}$ can be accommodate arbitrary linguistic attributes and constraints, and the Gibbs model Eqn. (9), therefore, has great promise as an accurate measure of linguistic fitness. But the model depends critically on the parameters $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1, \dots, M}$, and the associated estimation problem is, unfortunately, very hard. Indeed, the problem of unsupervised learning appears to be all but intractable.

Let us suppose, then, that we observe $\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_n \in \Psi_G$ (‘supervised learning’), iid according to \hat{P}_θ . In general, the likelihood function, $\prod_{i=1}^n P_\theta(\psi_i)$, is more or less impossible to maximize. But if the primary goal is to select good parses, then perhaps the likelihood function asks for too much, or even the wrong thing. It might be more relevant to maximize the likelihood of the observed parses, *given the yields* $\mathcal{Y}(\psi_1), \dots, \mathcal{Y}(\psi_n)$:

$$\prod_{i=1}^n P_\theta(\psi_i | \mathcal{Y}(\psi_i)) \quad (11)$$

Maximization of Eqn. (11) is an instance of Besag’s remarkably effective pseudolikelihood method (Besag 1974, 1975), which is commonly used for estimating parameters of Gibbs’s distributions. The computations involved are generally much easier than what is involved in maximizing the ordinary likelihood function. Take a look at the gradient of the logarithm of Eqn. (11): the θ_j component is proportional to

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_j(\psi_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E_\theta [f_j(\psi) | \mathcal{Y}(\psi) = \mathcal{Y}(\psi_i)] \quad (12)$$

and $E_\theta [f_j(\psi) | \mathcal{Y}(\psi)]$ can be computed directly from the set of parses of the sentence $\mathcal{Y}(\psi)$. (In practice there is often massive ambiguity, and the number of parses may be too large to feasibly consider. Such cases require some form of pruning or approximation.)

Thus gradient ascent of the pseudolikelihood function is (at least approximately) computationally feasible. This is particularly useful since the Hessian of the logarithm of the pseudolikelihood function is non-positive, and therefore there are no local maxima. What is more, under mild conditions pseudolikelihood estimators (i.e., maximizers of Eqn. (11)) are consistent; (Chi 1998).

Bibliography

Abney S, McAllester D, Pereira F 1999 Relating probabilistic grammars and automata. In: *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, pp. 542–9

- Baum L E 1972 An inequality and associated maximization techniques in statistical estimation of probabilistic functions of Markov processes. *Inequalities* 3: 1–8
- Besag J 1974 Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series D* 36: 192–236
- Besag J 1975 Statistical analysis of non-lattice data. *The Statistician* 24: 179–95
- Chi Z 1998 *Probability models for complex systems*. PhD thesis, Brown University
- Chi Z 1999 Statistical properties of probabilistic context-free grammars. *Computational Linguistics* 25(1): 131–60
- Chomsky N 1957 *Syntactic Structures*. Mouton, The Hague
- Dempster A, Laird N, Rubin D 1977 Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 39: 1–38
- Fu K S 1974 *Syntactic Methods in Pattern Recognition*. Academic Press, New York
- Fu K S 1982 *Syntactic Pattern Recognition and Applications*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ
- Gazdar C, Klein E, Pullum G, Sag I 1985 *Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar*. Blackwell, Oxford, UK
- Geman S, Johnson M 2000 Probability and statistics in computational linguistics, a brief review. Internal publication, Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University
- Harris T E 1963 *The Theory of Branching Processes*. Springer, Berlin
- Hopcroft J E, Ullman J D 1979 *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages and Computation*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA
- Jelinek F 1997 *Statistical Methods for Speech Recognition*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA
- Kaplan R M, Bresnan J 1982 Lexical functional grammar: A formal system for grammatical representation. In: Bresnan J (ed.) *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, Chap. 4, pp. 173–281
- Kay M, Gawron J M, Norvig P 1994 *VerbMobil: A Translation System for Face-to-face Dialog*. CSLI Press, Stanford, CA
- Lari K, Young S J 1990 The estimation of stochastic context-free grammars using the inside-outside algorithm. *Computer Speech and Language* 4: 35–56
- Lari K, Young S J 1991 Applications of stochastic context-free grammars using the inside-outside algorithm. *Computer Speech and Language* 5: 237–57
- Pollard C, Sag A 1987 *Information-based Syntax and Semantics*. CSLI Lecture Notes Series No.13. University of California Press, Stanford, CA
- Shieber S M 1986 *An Introduction to Unification-based Approaches to Grammar*. CSLI Lecture Notes Series. University of California Press, Stanford, CA

S. Geman and M. Johnson

Probabilistic Thinking

1. Introduction

Some people have enjoyed playing games that involved at least a component of chance ever since civilizations—as we know them—emerged in human history.

12082

Copyright © 2001 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.
International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences

Many of these people apparently had a fairly good intuitive idea of what we might now term the ‘probabilities’ or ‘odds’ of various outcomes associated with these games. Alternatively, at least some people (whom in hindsight we might now label ‘superstitious’) believed that the outcomes of these games could indicate something about the favorability of the world in general toward the gambler (a belief that may exist even today—at least on an implicit basis—for chronic gamblers), specifically the favorability or unfavorability of a particular god that was involved with a particular game.

In the last 600 years or so people have proposed systematic ways of evaluating probabilities—e.g., in terms of equally likely outcomes in games of chance or in terms of subjective belief. In the last 150 years or so scientific endeavor has started to make specific use of probabilistic thinking, and in the last 100 years or so probabilistic ideas have been applied to problems of everyday life. (see Gigerenzer et al. 1989). Currently, for example, jurors are often asked to determine manufacturer or company liability on the basis of differential rates of accidents or cancers; in such judgments, jurors cannot rely on deterministic reasoning that would lead to a specification of exactly which negative outcome is due to what; nor can they rely on ‘experience’ in these contexts in which they have had none. Thus, it is extraordinarily important to understand—if indeed generalizations about such thinking are possible—how it is that people think about and evaluate probabilities, and in particular the problems that they (we) have. The major thesis presented here is that both the thinking and the problems can be understood in terms of *systematic deviations* from the normative principles of probabilistic reasoning that have been devised over the past five or so centuries. These deviations are not inevitable; it is certainly possible for people to think about probabilities coherently (at least on occasion); nevertheless, *when* deviations occur, they tend to be of the systematic nature to be described here; they occur most often when people are engaged in what is termed ‘automatic’ or ‘associational’ thinking, as opposed to ‘reflective’ and ‘comparative’ thinking. (These terms will be made more precise later in this article.)

2. A Brief History (of Thought)

Beginning in early infancy, we develop intuitions about space, time, and number (at least to the extent of ‘one, two, three, many’). These intuitions are essentially correct. They remain throughout our lives basically unaltered except for small variations, and they form the foundation of far more sophisticated mathematical systems that have been developed over the past thousands of years. Moreover, their importance in our lives has been clear throughout those millennia.

ISBN: 0-08-043076-7