

Re: CYK & Context-Free Expressions

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.theory/2008-05/msg00017.html>

- *From:* Chris F Clark <cfc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 02 May 2008 23:50:01 -0400
-

Rock Brentwood <markwh04@xxxxxxxx> writes:

On Apr 26, 11:14 am, Chris F Clark <c...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

If you can show how to create a derivation tree using your model, then you can call that process "parsing",

Don't you think it's a little disingenuous to reply with a suggestion directly to the very thing being suggested?

I don't understand that sentence. However, my intention is not to be disingenuous. I have tried to understand your postings, but find them too terse and notationally dense (particularly with notations and terms) that I have no prior background in. Then, you draw conclusions that seem contrary to material that I do think I understand and you state that the common definitions upon which the results I understand are based are flawed.

The particular example the is most striking is your remarks on the complexity of "parsing". If I understand you right, you have made remarks about being able to parse in linear time (over what I assume are general context free grammars), and yet at the same time refer to the n^3 bound for Earley parsing. I'm assuming that this is because there is something buried in your works that has escaped me.

So, what I'm trying to understand is how you can make both claims. And, in particular, what your definition of "parsing" is that it allows you to make both statements and how (or whether it covers the aspects of "parsing" that are relevant to me). In particular, I am interested in "parsing" as it imposes a structure upon an input sentence, because that is what allows one to take unstructured input and structure it—the structure that is relevant for me is a derivation tree, since that tree captures the nature of the inputs I wish to structure.

Re: CYK & Context-Free Expressions

There are lots of examples
like that in the archive you're discussing!

What archive is this? If you mean the web pages pointed to in your previous post, I followed the ones that reported the results you published at the RelMiCS conference. However, I only found only what appeared to me to be slide sets with little explanatory material. And, perhaps, for the researchers you were sharing the results with the notation was obvious. It wasn't for me. If I recall correctly, I got to about slide 3 before I came to a slide with notation that wasn't clear and for which I could find no explanation. Somewhere between the 6th and 15th page (I can't recall how far I got before coming to the point I had to give up), the notation became completely inscrutable to me due to the notation that had not been explained and for which I could not guess a reasonable interpretation.

If you want, I can come up with specific examples. Perhaps, if you explain enough of the notation, I will be able to follow the points you are making, and your results will be as obvious as you claim. That would be a welcome result.

Sincerely,
-Chris

Chris Clark Internet: christopher.f.clark@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
Compiler Resources, Inc. or: compres@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
23 Bailey Rd Web Site: <http://world.std.com/~compres>
Berlin, MA 01503 voice: (508) 435-5016
USA fax: (978) 838-0263 (24 hours)

.