Intersection

- construct D s.t. $L(D) = L(D_1) \cap L(D_2)$
- state-pair ("cross-product") construction
  - intersected DFA: $|Q| = |Q_1| \times |Q_2|$









Linguistic Example

- DFA *A*: all interpretations of "he hopes that this works"



- DFA *B*: all legal English category sequences (simplified)



what do these states mean?

what will $A \cap B$ mean?

Linguistic Example

- intersection by state-pair ("product") construction







- cleanup: he hopes that this works



- this is part-of-speech tagging! (with a bigram model)

Union

- easy, via De Morgan's Law: $L_1 \cup L_2 = \neg (\neg L_1 \cap \neg L_2)$
- or, directly, from the product construction again
- what are the final states?
  - could end in either language: $Q_2 \times F_1 \cup Q_1 \times F_2$
  - same De Morgan: $\neg ((Q_1 \backslash F_1) \cap (Q_2 \backslash F_2)) = \neg (\neg F_1 \cap \neg F_2)$

Non-Deterministic FSAs

- L = { *all strings of repeated instances of* ab *or* aba }
  - hard to do with a deterministic FSA!
  - e.g., abababaababa



- epsilon transition (no symbol)



- there is algorithm to determinize a DFA
  - blow up the state-space exponentially

Determinization Example

- determinization by subset construction (2^n)



Minimization and Equivalence

- each DFA (and NFA) can be reduced to an equivalent DFA with minimal number of states
  - based on "state-pair equivalence test"
  - can be used to test the equivalence of DFAs/NFAs





Advantages of Non-Determinism

- union (and intersection also?)
- concatenation: $L_1L_2 = \{ xy \mid x \text{ in } L_1, y \text{ in } L_2\}$
- membership problem
  - much harder: exp. time => rather determinize first
- complement problem (similarly harder)
- but is NFA more expressive than DFA?
  - NO, because you can always determinize an NFA
- NFA: more "intuitive" representation of a language
- mDFA: "compact (but less intuitive) encoding"

FSAs vs. Regular Expressions

- RE operators: R^*, R_1+R_2, R_1R_2
- RE => NFA (by recursive translation; easy)
- NFA => RE (by state removal; more involved)







- RE <=> NFA <=> DFA <=> mDFA

Wrap-up

- machineries: (infinite) languages, DFAs, NFAs, REs
  - why and when non-determinism is useful
- constructions/algorithms
  - state-pair construction: intersection and union
    - quadratic time/space
  - subset construction: determinization
    - exponential time/space
  - briefly mentioned: minimization and RE <=> NFA
    - see Hopcroft et al textbook for details

Quick Review

- how to detect if a DFA accepts any string at all?
  - how about empty string?
  - how about all strings?
- how about an NFA?
- how to design a *reversal* of a DFA/NFA?

Finite-State Transducers

- FSAs are "acceptors" (set of strings as a language)
- FSTs are "converters"
  - compactly encoding set of string pairs as a relation
- capitalizer: { <cat, CAT>, <dog, DOG>, ...}
- pluralizer: {<cat, cats>, <fly, flies>, <hero, heroes>...}

Formal Definition

- a finite-state transducer *T* is a tuple (Q, Σ, Γ, I, F, δ) such that:

- Q is a finite set, the set of *states*;
- Σ is a finite set, called the *input alphabet*;
- Γ is a finite set, called the *output alphabet*;
- I is a subset of Q, the set of *initial states*;
- F is a subset of Q, the set of *final states*; and
- $\delta \subseteq Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\epsilon\}) \times (\Gamma \cup \{\epsilon\}) \times Q$ is the *transition relation*.





Examples

- text-to-sound: {<c a t, K AE T>, <d o g, D AW G>, <b e a r, B EH R>, <b a r e, B EH R>...}
  - (easy for Spanish/Italian, medium for French, hard for English!)
- POS tagger: {<I saw the cat, PRO V DT N>, ...}
- transliterator: { <b u s h, 布什>, <o b a m a, 奥巴马>, ...}
  bu shi *ao ba ma*
- translator: { <he is in the house, el está en la casa>, <he is in the house, está en la casa>, ... }
- notice the many-to-many relation (not a function)
- but is this real translation? NO, there are no reorderings!
  - FSMs are best for morphology; we need CFGs for syntax

Non-Determinism in FSTs

- ambiguity



character "c" pronounced as either K sound or S sound

- optionality

  - important because in/out often have different lengths

- delayed decision via epsilon transition



"input word, output pronunciation"

Central Operation: Composition



- language processing is often in cascades
  - often easier to tackle small problems separately
- each step: T(A) is the relation (*set of string pairs*) by A
  - <x, y> in T(A) means $x \sim_A y$
- compose (A, B) = C
  - <x, y> in T(C) iff. ∃ z: <x, z> in T(A) and <z, y> in T(B)

Simple Example

- pluralizer + capitalizer

FST A pluralizes :



{<act, acts>
<cat, cats>
<aat, aats>
⋮ }

FST B capitalizes :



{ <act, ACT>
<ccc, CCC>
<acts, ACTS>
⋮ }

FST compose(A, B) does both:



How to do composition?





How to do composition?





composition is like intersection?

- both use cross-product ("state-pair") construction
- indeed: intersection is a special case of composition
  - FSA is a special FST with identity output! (a => a:a)
  - $A \cap B = proj_{in}$ (Id(A) ◦ Id(B))
- what about FSAs composed with FSTs?
  - FSA ◦ FST --- get output(s) from certain input(s)
    - <x, z>: ∃ y s.t. <x, y> in T(Id(A)) and <y,z> in T(B)
    - but y=x => <x, z>: x in L(A) and <x,z> in T(B)
  - FST ◦ FSA --- get input(s) for certain output(s)

Get Output

e.g., pluralize "cat"

A:



{<cat, cat>}

B:



{<cat, cats>,
<act, acts>,
... }

Compose (A, B) includes <x, y> if $\exists z$: <x, z> $\in$ A & <z, y> $\in$ B



FST {<cat, cats>}

throw away input labels



FSA {cats}

Get Input

- morphological analysis (e.g. what is "acts" made from)



Multiple Outputs



- text-to-sound: {<c a t, K AE T>, <d o g, D AW G>, <b e a r, B EH R>, <b a r e, B EH R>...}
- translator: { <he is in the house, el está en la casa>, <he is in the house, está en la casa>, ... }

POS Tagging Revisited

- he hopes that this works









Redo POS Tagging via composition

FST A: sentence



FST B: lexicon



FST C: POS bigram LM



$\text{proj}_{\text{out}}(A \circ B \circ C) =$



Q: how about $A \circ (B \circ C)$? what is $B \circ C$?