# Research and Development in Natural Language Processing at BBN Laboratories in the Strategic Computing Program

BBN Laboratories, Inc. Cambridge, MA 02238

STAFF: Ralph Weischedel (Principal Investigator), Remko Scha, Edward Walker, Damaris Ayuso, Andrew Haas, Erhard Hinrichs, Robert Ingria, Lance Ramshaw, Varda Shaked, David Stallard

# 1 Background

BBN's responsibility is to conduct research and development in natural language interface technology. This responsibility has three aspects:

- o to demonstrate state-of-the-art technology in a Strategic Computing application, collecting data regarding the effectiveness of the demonstrated heuristics,
- o to conduct research in natural language interface technology, as itemized in the description of JANUS later in this note, and
- o to integrate technology from other natural language interface contractors, including USC/Information Sciences Institute, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Massachusetts.

Of the three initial applications described in the overview, the Fleet Command Center Battle Management Program (FCCBMP) has been the application providing the domain in which our work is being carried out. The FCCBMP encompasses the development of expert system capabilities at the Pacific Fleet Command Center in Hawaii, and the development of an integrated natural language interface to these new capabilities as well as to the existing data bases and graphic display facilities. BBN is developing a series of increasingly sophisticated natural language understanding systems which will serve as an integrated interface to several facilities at the Pacific Fleet Command Center: the Integrated Data Base (IDB), which contains information about ships, their readiness states, their capabilities, etc.; the Operations Support Group Prototype (OSGP), a graphics system which can display locations and itineraries of ships on maps; and the Force Requirements Expert System (FRESH) which is being built by Texas Instruments.

The target users for this application are naval officers involved in decision

1

making at the Pacific Fleet Command Center; these are executives whose effort is better spent on navy problems and decision making than on the details of which software system offers a given information capability, how a problem should be divided to make use of the various systems, or how to synthesize the results from several sources into the desired answer. Currently they do not access the data base or OSGP application programs themselves; instead, on a round-the-clock basis, two operators act as intermediaries between the Navy staff and the computers. The utility of a natural language interface in such an environment is clear.

The starting point for development of the natural language interface system at the Pacific Fleet Command Center was the IRUS system, which has been under development at BBN for a number of years. A new version of this system, IRUS-86, has been installed in the FCCBMP testbed area at the Pacific Fleet Command Center for demonstration. Further basic research on the problems of natural language interfacing is continuing, and the results of this and future research will be incorporated into a next generation natural language interface system called JANUS, to be delivered to the Pacific Fleet Command Center at a later date. JANUS will share most of its domain-dependent data with IRUS-86, and it will share other modules as well; IRUS-86 will therefore be able to evolve gradually into the final version of JANUS.

#### 2 IRUS-86: The Initial Test Bed System

The architecture of IRUS [Bates 83] is a cascade consisting of a sequence of translation modules:

- o An ATN parser which produces a syntactic tree.
- o A semantic interpreter which produces a formula of the meaning representation language MRL.
- o A postprocessor for resolving anaphora and ellipsis.
- A translation module which produces a formula of the relational data base language ERL ("Extended Relational Language").
- o A translation module which produces a sequence of commands for the underlying data base access system.

IRUS-86, the version of IRUS which is now installed at the Pacific Fleet Command Center, is a version of IRUS which is extended in several ways. Two of these extensions are especially worth mentioning:

o IRUS-86 uses the NIKL system [Moser 83] to represent its domain model, i.e., the relationships between the predicates and relations of the meaning representation language MRL. The NIKL domain model supports the system's treatment of semantic anomaly, anaphora, and nominal compounds. o IRUS-86 contains a new module which exploits this NIKL domain model to simplify MRL expressions; this makes it possible to translate complex MRLexpressions into ERL constants, thus allowing for significant divergences between the input English and the structure of the underlying data base [Stallard 86].

In addition to accessing the NIKL domain model, the parser, semantic interpreter and MRL-to-ERL translator access other knowledge sources which contain domaindependent information:

- o the lexicon,
- o the semantic interpretation rules for individual concepts,
- o the MRL-to-ERL mapping rules for individual MRL constants, which introduce the details of underlying system structure, such as file and field names.

To port IRUS to the navy domain, the relevant domain-dependent data had to be supplied to the system. This task is being accomplished by personnel at the Naval Ocean Systems Center (NOSC). In August, 1985, BBN provided NOSC with an initial prototype system containing small example sets of lexical entries, semantic interpretation rules, and MRL-to-ERL rules; using acquisition tools provided by BBN, NOSC personnel have been entering the rest of the data.

IRUS-86 was delivered to the FRESH developers at Texas Instruments in January 1986, was installed in a test bed area of the Pacific Fleet Command Center in April 1986, and will be demonstrated in June 1986. Currently, the lexicon and the domaindependent rules of the system only cover a relatively small part of the OSGP capabilities and the files and attributes of the Integrated Data Base. Once enough data have been entered so that the system covers a sufficiently large part of the data base, it will be tried out in actual use by Navy personnel. This will enable us to gather data about the way the system performs in a real environment, and to finetune the system in various respects. For instance, IRUS-86 makes use of shallow heuristic methods to address some aspects of natural language understanding such as anaphora and ellipsis for which general solutions are still research issues. The FCCBMP application provides a test bed in which such heuristic methods can be evaluated, and enhancements to them developed and tested, as part of the evolutionary technological growth intended to continue throughout the Natural Language Technology effort of the Strategic Computing Program.

#### BBN Laboratories Incorporated

# **3** Functional Goals for JANUS

1

The IRUS-86 system excels by its clean, modular structure, its broad syntactic/semantic coverage, its sophisticated domain model, and its systematic treatment of discrepancies between the English lexicon and the data base structure. We thus expect that it will demonstrate considerable utility as an interface component in the FCCBMP application. Nevertheless, IRUS-86 shares with other current systems several limitations which should be overcome if natural language interfaces are to become truly "natural". In developing JANUS, the successor of IRUS-86, we shall attempt to overcome some of those limitations. The areas of increased functionality we are considering are: semantics and knowledge representation, ill-formedness, discourse, cooperativeness, multiple underlying systems, and knowledge acquisition.

#### 3.1 <u>Semantics and Knowledge Representation</u>

IRUS-86, like most other current systems, represents sentence meanings as formulas of a logical language which is a slight extension of first-order logic. As a consequence, many important phenomena in English have no equivalent in the meaning representation language, and cannot be dealt with correctly, e.g., modalities, propositional attitudes, generics, collective quantification, and context-dependence. Thus, one foregoes one of the most important potential assets of a natural language interface: the capacity of expressing complex semantic structures in a succinct and comfortable way.

In JANUS, we will therefore adopt a new meaning representation language which combines features from PHILIQA1's enriched lambda-calculus [Scha 76] with ideas underlying Montague's Intensional Logic [Montague 70], and possibly a distributed quote-operator [Haas 86]. It will have sufficient expressive power to incorporate a version of Carlson's treatment of generics [Carlson 79], a version of Scha's treatment of quantification [Scha 81], Montague's treatment of modality, and various possible approaches to propositional attitudes and context-dependence.

In adopting a higher order logic as proposed, one confronts problems of formula simplification and the need to apply meaning postulates to reduce the semantic representation of an input sentence to an expression appropriate to the underlying system, e.g., a relational algebra expression in the case that the underlying system is a data base. To do this, we will investigate the limited inference mechanisms of KL-TWO [Moser 83, Vilain 85], following up on our previous work [Stallard 86]. The advantage of these inference mechanisms is their tractability; discovering their power and limitations in this complex problem domain should be an interesting result.

#### 3.2 Discourse

The meaning of a sentence depends in many ways on the context which has been set up by the preceding discourse. IRUS and other systems, however, currently ignore most of these dependencies, and employ a rather shallow model of discourse structure. To allow the user to exploit the full expressive potential of a natural language interaction, the system must track topics, reference times, possible antecedents for anaphora, etc.; it must be able to recognize the constituent units of a discourse and the subordination or coordination relations obtaining between them. A substantial amount of work has been done already on several of these issues, much of it by BBN researchers [Sidner 85, Hinrichs 81, Polanyi 84, Grosz 86]. Research in this area continues under a separate DARPA-funded contract. We expect to be able to integrate some of the results of that research in the JANUS system.

#### 3.3 Ill-formedness

A natural interface system should be forgiving of a user's deviations from its expectations, be they misspellings, typographical errors, unknown words, poor syntax, incorrect presuppositions, fragmentary forms, or violated selection restrictions. Empirical studies show that as much as 25% of the input to data base query systems is ill-formed.

IRUS currently handles some classes of ill-formedness by using a combination of shallow heuristics and user interaction. It can correct for typographical misspellings, for omitted determiners or prepositions, and for some ungrammaticalities, like determiner-noun and subject-verb disagreement. The JANUS system will employ a more general approach to ill-formedness that will handle a larger class of ungrammatical constructions and a larger class of word selection problems, and that will also explore correcting several types of semantic ill-formedness.

These capabilites have major implications for the control of the understanding process, since considering such possibilities can exponentially expand the search space. Maintaining control will require care in integrating the ill-formedness capability into the rest of the system, and also making maximal use of the guidance that can be derived from a model of the discourse and user's goals to constrain the search.

# 3.4 Cooperativeness

A truly helpful system should not react to the literal meaning of a sentence, but to its perceived intent. If in the context of a given application it is possible to characterize the goals that a user may be expected to be pursuing through his interaction with the system, the system should try to infer from the user-input what the underlying goal could be. A system can do this by accessing a goal-subgoal hierarchy which links the speech acts expressed by individual utterances to the global goals that the user may have. This strategy has been applied successfully to rather small domains [Allen 83, Sidner 85]. We wish to investigate whether it carries over to the FCCBMP applications.

# 3.5 Modelling the Capabilities of Multiple System

The way in which IRUS-86 decides whether an input sentence translates into an IDB query or an OSGP command may be refined. There is a need for work on what kind of knowledge would be necessary to interface smoothly and intelligently to multiple underlying systems. A reasoning component is needed that can determine which underlying system or systems can best fulfill a user's request. Such a reasoning component would have to combine a model of the capabilities of the underlying systems with a model of the user goals and current intentions in the discourse context in order to choose the correct system(s). Such a model would also be useful for providing supporting information to the user.

#### 3.6 Knowledge Acquisition

Further research is also called for to expand the power of the knowledge acquisition tools that are used in adding to the lexicon, the set of case frame rules, the model of domain predicates, and the set of transformation rules between the Meaning Representation Language and the languages of the underlying systems. The acquisition tools available in IRUS, unlike those in some other systems, are not tied to the specific fields and relations in the underlying database. The acquisition tools should work on the higher level of the domain model, since that provides a more general and transportable result. The knowledge acquisition facilities for JANUS will also need to be redesigned to support and to make maximal use of the power of the new meaning representation language based on intensional logic.

# 4 New Underlying Technologies

# 4.1 Coping with Ambiguity

The new functionalities we described in the previous section, and the techniques we intend to use to achieve them, raise an issue which has important consequences for the design of JANUS: we will be faced with an explosion in the number of interpretations that the system will have to process; every sentence will be manifold ambiguous. One source of this phenomenon is the improvement of the semantic coverage and the broadening of the discourse context. Distinctions and ambiguities which so far were ignored will be dealt with: for instance, different interpretation and scopes of quantifiers will be considered, and different antecedents for pronouns. Even more serious is the processing of ill-formed sentences, which may require trying out all partial interpretations to see which one can be extended to a complete interpretation after relaxing one or more constraints.

To cut down on the processing of spurious interpretations, it is very important that interpretations of sentences and their constituents be tested for plausibility at an early stage. Different techniques must probably be used in conjunction:

- Simplification transformations may show that an interpretation is absurd, by reducing it to TRUE or FALSE or the empty set.
- The discourse context and the model of the user's goals impose constraints on expected sentences.

#### 4.2 Parallel Parsing

Since some of the techniques that we intend to use to fight the ambiguity explosion are themselves rather computation-intensive, it is clearly unavoidable that the improved system functionality that we aim for will lead to a considerable increase in the amount of processing required. To avoid a serious decrease of the new system's response times, we will therefore move it to a suitable parallel machine such as BBN's Butterfly or Monarch, running a parallel Common Lisp. This in itself has rather serious consequences for the software design. It means that from the outset we will keep parallelizability of the software in mind.

We have begun to address this issue in the area of syntax. A new declarative grammar is being written, which will ultimately have a coverage of English larger than the current RUS grammar; the grammar is written in a side-effect-free formalism (a context-free grammar with variables) so that different parsing algorithms may be explored which are easily parallelizable. The first such algorithm was implemented in May 1986 on BBN's Butterfly.

### 5 Contributions from Other Sites

## 5.1 ISI/UMass: Generation

We should not expect that JANUS will always be able to assess correctly which interpretation of a sentence is the intended one. In light of such situations, it is very important that the system can give a paraphrase of the input to the user, which shows the system's interpretation. This may be done either explicitly or as part of the answer. To be able to develop such capabilities, work on Natural Language Generation is needed. At USC/ISI a project directed by William Mann and Norman Sondheimer is underway to develop the generation system PENMAN, using the NIGEL systemic grammar. PENMAN will be integrated to become the generation component of JANUS. PENMAN itself consists of several subcomponents. Some of these, specifically the "text planning" component, will be developed through joint work between USC/ISI and David McDonald at the University of Massachusetts, based on the latter's experience with the MUMBLE system.

# 5.2 UPenn: Cooperation and Clarification

Under the direction of Aravind Joshi and Bonnie Webber at the University of Pennsylvania, several focussed studies have been carried out to investigate various aspects of cooperative system behaviour and clarification interactions. (For more detail, see their paper in this issue.) As part of the Strategic Computing Natural Lanauge effort, UPenn will eventually develop this into a module which can be integrated into JANUS to further enhance its capabilities.

BBN Laboratories Incorporated

i L

.

# References

[Allen 83]	<ul> <li>Allen, J.F.</li> <li>Recognizing Intentions from Natural Language Utterances.</li> <li>In M. Brady and R.C. Berwick (editors), Computational Models of Discourse, pages 107-166. Massachusetts Institute Technology Press, 1983.</li> </ul>
[Bates 83]	<ul> <li>Bates, M. and Bobrow, R.J.</li> <li>A Transportable Natural Language Interface for Information Retrieval.</li> <li>In Proceedings of the 6th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference.</li> <li>ACM Special Interest Group on Information Retrieval and American Society for Information Science, Washington, D.C., June, 1983.</li> </ul>
[Carlson 79]	Carlson, G. <i>Reference to Kinds in English.</i> Garland Press, New York, 1979.
[Grosz 86]	Grosz, B.J. and Sidner, C.L. The Structures of Discourse Structure. In L. Polanyi (editor), <i>Discourse Structure</i> . Ablex Publishers, Norwood, NJ, 1986.
[Haas 86]	Haas, A.R. A Syntactic Theory of Belief and Action. <i>Artificial Intelligence</i> , 1986. Forthcoming.
[Hinrichs 81]	Hinrichs, E. Temporale Anaphora im Englischen. 1981. Unpublished ms., University of Tuebingen.
[Montague 70]	Montague, R. Pragmatics and Intensional Logic. Synthese 22:68-94, 1970.
[Moser 83]	<ul> <li>Moser, M.G.</li> <li>An Overview of NIKL, the New Implementation of KL-ONE.</li> <li>In Sidner, C. L., et al. (editors), Research in Knowledge Representation for Natural Language Understanding - Annual Report, 1 September 1982 - 31 August 1983, pages 7-26. BBN Laboratories Report No. 5421, 1983.</li> </ul>
[Polanyi 84]	Polanyi, L. and Scha, R. A Syntactic Approach to Discourse Semantics. In <i>Proceedings of Int'l. Conference on Computational Linguistics.</i> Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 1984.

# BBN Laboratories Incorporated

[Scha 76]	Scha, R.J.H. Semantic Types in PHLIQA1. In Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. 1976.
[Scha 81]	<ul> <li>Scha, R.J.H.</li> <li>Distributive, Collective and Cumulative Quantification.</li> <li>Formal Methods in the Study of Language, Part 2.</li> <li>Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam, 1981, pages 483-512.</li> <li>Reprinted in: J.A.G. Groenendijk, T.M.V. Janssen and M.B.J. Stokhof (editors). Truth, Interpretation and Information. GRASS 3. Dordrecht, Foris, 1984.</li> </ul>
[Sidner 85]	Sidner, C.L. Plan parsing for intended response recognition in discourse. <i>Computational Intelligence</i> 1(1):1-10, February, 1985.
[Stallard 86]	<ul> <li>Stallard, D.G.</li> <li>A Terminological Simplification Transformation for Natural Language Question-Answering Systems.</li> <li>In Proceedings of the 24th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Association for Computational Linguistics, June, 1986.</li> </ul>
[Vilain 85]	<ul> <li>Vilain, M.</li> <li>The Restricted Language Architecture of a Hybrid Representation System.</li> <li>In Proceedings of IJCA185, pages 547-551. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence, Inc., Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, Inc., Los Angeles, CA, August, 1985.</li> </ul>