
Learning the joint distribution of two sequences using little or no paired data

Soroosh Mariooryad^{* ‡}
David Kao

Matt Shannon^{† ‡}
Daisy Stanton
Google, Mountain View, California, USA

Siyuan Ma
Eric Battenberg

Tom Bagby
RJ Skerry-Ryan

Abstract

We present a noisy channel generative model of two sequences, for example text and speech, which enables uncovering the association between the two modalities when limited paired data is available. To address the intractability of the exact model under a realistic data setup, we propose a variational inference approximation. To train this variational model with categorical data, we propose a KL encoder loss approach which has connections to the wake-sleep algorithm. Identifying the joint or conditional distributions by only observing unpaired samples from the marginals is only possible under certain conditions in the data distribution and we discuss under what type of conditional independence assumptions that might be achieved, which guides the architecture designs. Experimental results show that even tiny amount of paired data (5 minutes) is sufficient to learn to relate the two modalities (graphemes and phonemes here) when a massive amount of unpaired data is available, paving the path to adopting this principled approach for all seq2seq models in low data resource regimes.

A classical ASR approach treats the process of generating speech as a noisy channel. In this framing, text is drawn from some distribution and statistically transformed into speech audio; the speech recognition task is then to invert this generative model to infer the text most likely to have given rise to a given speech waveform. This generative model of speech was historically successful (Baker, 1975; Jelinek, 1976; Rabiner, 1989), but has been superseded in modern discriminative systems by directly modeling the conditional distribution of text, given speech (Graves et al., 2006; Amodei et al., 2016). The direct approach has the advantage of allowing limited modeling power to be solely devoted to the task of interest, whereas the generative one can be extremely sensitive to faulty assumptions in the speech audio model despite the fact that this is not the primary object of interest. However the generative approach allows learning in a principled way from untranscribed speech audio, something fundamentally impossible in the direct approach. We explore a noisy channel joint model of text and speech for learning from a corpus consisting of relatively large amounts of text-only and speech-only data, but little or no parallel (text, speech) data. We cope with the sensitivity of generative modeling to faulty modeling assumptions by trying to make the generative model as accurate as possible, and cope with the intractable inference problem using an approximate variational posterior of text given speech. An analogous formulation in the other direction can be adopted for TTS models.

1 INTRODUCTION

Learning the joint or conditional distribution of two sequences appears in many machine learning applications such as automatic speech recognition (ASR), text-to-speech (TTS) synthesis, machine translation, optical character recognition, and text summarization. When there is limited or no paired data, we would like to learn these distributions from large amounts of unpaired data. While the proposed approach is generally applicable to all these seq2seq problems, we ground the discussions primarily on text and speech for ASR and TTS applications.

Similar to discrete latent variable models, when our variational approach infers a discrete quantity (e.g., text), the typical stochastic gradient variational Bayes approach (Kingma and Welling, 2014) is not applicable. We propose a new optimization procedure applicable to the discrete case (§2.1).

The large body of work on leveraging speech-only and text-only data resources to build ASR and TTS systems rely on the close connection between the two modalities. However, the feasibility and necessary conditions to doing so is not well understood theoretically. Here we formalize the problem as identifying the joint text and speech distribution by only observing its marginal samples, and try to make a dent in this problem. Particularly, we hypothesize that certain conditional independence assumptions are required

^{*}soroosh@google.com

[†]mattshannon@google.com

[‡]These authors contributed equally.

to recover the joint and present preliminary identifiability proofs for a constrained variation of the problem.

Our core contributions are:

- Describing the noisy channel model of joint distribution in §2.
- Deriving a variational noisy channel model in §2.
- The KL encoder loss to train discrete latent variable models in §2.1.
- Preliminary discussions on identifiability given no paired data in §3.
- Experiments demonstrating breaking a grapheme substitution cipher with no paired data, and learning to relate speech and text with limited paired data in §4.

2 MODEL

In this section we describe our joint model of two sequences and how to train it. The two sequences $x = [x_s]_{s=0}^{S-1}$ and $y = [y_t]_{t=0}^{T-1}$ may be different lengths ($S \neq T$) and may each have discrete or continuous values. For example, the first sequence x might be text consisting of a sequence of graphemes and the second sequence y a sequence of mel spectrogram frames in an application related to speech recognition and synthesis, or x might be text and y a sequence of image patches corresponding to printed characters in an application related to optical character recognition.

We assume we have a mix of paired and unpaired data. Specifically we assume the corpus is generated by repeatedly and independently sampling a sequence pair (x, y) from the *true distribution* (or *data distribution*) $p_T(x, y)$ and then keeping only x with probability α , only y with probability β , or both x and y with probability γ , where $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1$. We refer to γ as the *paired fraction*. We are interested in the regime $\gamma \ll 1$, including the extreme case $\gamma = 0$ where there is no paired data.

One advantages of generative modeling is that it provides a principled way to use unpaired data during parameter estimation (Cooper and Freeman, 1970). The model $p_\lambda(x, y)$ defines a joint distribution over the two sequences x and y with parameters λ , which in turn defines marginals $p_\lambda(x)$ and $p_\lambda(y)$. If the marginals are tractable then we may estimate λ by minimizing the cross-entropy

$$-\sum_u p_T(u) \log p_\lambda(u) \quad (1)$$

where u is “whatever is observed” for a given example, be that x or y or (x, y) . In practice the expectation over $p_T(u)$ is replaced with samples from the training corpus yielding a form of maximum likelihood estimation. We may write (1) concisely as the KL divergence $\text{KL}(p_T(u) \parallel p_\lambda(u))$ with

the understanding that the unknown but irrelevant additive constant $\sum_u p_T(u) \log p_T(u)$ is not computed in practice. This KL divergence can in turn be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(p_T(u) \parallel p_\lambda(u)) = & \alpha \text{KL}(p_T(x) \parallel p_\lambda(x)) \\ & + \beta \text{KL}(p_T(y) \parallel p_\lambda(y)) \\ & + \gamma \text{KL}(p_T(x, y) \parallel p_\lambda(x, y)) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Thus this loss incentivizes the model to match both the marginal and joint distributions of the data.

The generative model used in this work is a form of noisy channel model. We factorize $p_\lambda(x, y)$ in terms of a *prior* $p_\lambda(x)$ and *decoder* $p_\lambda(y|x)$. We typically use recurrent autoregressive models with step-by-step end-of-sequence decisions for both the prior and decoder, using attention to incorporate the conditioning information x for the decoder (see §4.2.1). The noisy channel model allows directly computing $p_\lambda(x)$ and $p_\lambda(x, y)$. The marginal $p_\lambda(y)$ is tractable for simple models such as a Markovian prior and decoder. When the marginal is not tractable, we introduce a *variational posterior* (or *encoder*) $q_\nu(x|y)$ and replace $\text{KL}(p_T(y) \parallel p_\lambda(y))$ in (2) with the upper bound

$$\text{KL}(p_T(y)q_\nu(x|y) \parallel p_\lambda(x, y)) \quad (3)$$

This is the conventional negative *evidence lower bound objective* (*ELBO*) (Beal and Ghahramani, 2000) up to a constant. In contrast to variational latent variable models such as *variational autoencoders* (*VAEs*) (Kingma and Welling, 2014), here the space modeled by the prior and variational posterior is grounded by observed data. In the case x is text and y is speech, $p_\lambda(y|x)$ is a TTS model and $q_\nu(x|y)$ is an ASR model.

2.1 KL encoder loss

To cope with discrete-valued x , we propose a novel variant of the wake-sleep algorithm (Hinton et al., 1995). In this section we describe this approach.

We first review why discrete x is more challenging than continuous x . The expression (3) involves an expectation over $q_\nu(x|y)$. If x is a sequence of continuous values of known length then this expectation can be reparameterized, allowing low variance finite sample approximations to the gradient of this term with respect to ν (Kingma and Welling, 2014). However if x is discrete this is not possible. There have been many alternative methods proposed to compute finite sample approximations to the gradient, including REINFORCE (Williams, 1992), RELAX (Grathwohl et al., 2018) and many others. In our application, this challenge applies even if x has continuous values, since the length of x is unknown and discrete.

We solve this problem by modifying the loss used to train the variational posterior. Instead of minimizing $\text{KL}(p_T(y)q_\nu(x|y) \parallel p_\lambda(x, y))$ with respect

to the encoder parameters ν , we instead minimize $KL(p_\lambda(x, y) \| p_T(y)q_\nu(x|y))$ with respect to ν . We continue to train the generative model parameters λ as before. This training procedure is reminiscent of the wake-sleep algorithm (Hinton et al., 1995), where the λ updates and ν updates correspond to the wake phase and sleep phase respectively. We refer to this approach as *KL encoder loss* training since the variational posterior appears in the right “KL” argument to the KL divergence, as opposed to the conventional ELBO for which the variational posterior appears in the left “reverse KL” argument to the KL divergence. The conventional ELBO and KL encoder loss have the same non-parametric optimal variational posterior, namely $\hat{q}(x|y) = p_\lambda(x|y)$. The two approaches place different computational demands on q_ν and p_λ . The conventional approach requires tractable reparameterized samples and log prob computations for $q_\nu(x|y)$ and tractable log prob computations for $p_\lambda(x, y)$. The KL encoder loss approach requires tractable log prob computations for $q_\nu(x|y)$ and tractable samples for $p_\lambda(x, y)$.

The use of different objectives for different parts of the model is reminiscent of GAN training, but note that here the losses are cooperative rather than adversarial, in the sense that making the variational posterior optimal improves both the variational loss and the generative loss, whereas making the critic optimal in classic GAN training makes the generator loss worse. Nevertheless, there is no guarantee that the training dynamics of the (generative, variational) system are convergent in general.*

2.2 Model training summary

We now summarize our training procedure. The loss l^{gen} used to learn the parameters λ of the generative model $p_\lambda(x, y) = p_\lambda(x)p_\lambda(y|x)$ and loss l^{var} used to learn the parameters ν of the variational posterior $q_\nu(x|y)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} l_{\lambda; \nu}^{\text{gen}} &= -\alpha \sum_x p_T(x) \log p_\lambda(x) \\ &\quad - \beta \sum_{x, y} p_T(y) q_\nu(x|y) [\log p_\lambda(x, y) - \log q_\nu(x|y)] \\ &\quad - \gamma \sum_{x, y} p_T(x, y) \log p_\lambda(x, y) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$l_{\nu; \lambda}^{\text{var}} = - \sum_{x, y} p_\lambda(x, y) \log q_\nu(x|y) \quad (5)$$

*If the learning rate used for the generative parameters λ is set sufficiently small relative to the learning rate used for the variational parameters ν , and the variational posterior is sufficiently flexible, then the variational posterior is able to remain essentially optimal throughout training and so the training dynamics are effectively just gradient descent on (2) with respect to λ , which has well-behaved training dynamics.

In practice each loss is approximated with a stochastic mini-batch approximation based on the training corpus in the natural way, using the α term for examples where only x is observed, the β term for examples where only y is observed, and the γ term for examples where both x and y are observed. We perform simultaneous gradient descent on (λ, ν) based on the gradients $(\partial l_{\lambda; \nu}^{\text{gen}} / \partial \lambda, \partial l_{\nu; \lambda}^{\text{var}} / \partial \nu)$.

We find three experimental tricks helpful for training. Firstly, samples from autoregressive models can suffer from small errors compounding over time, particularly when trained with maximum likelihood estimation / KL. This only weakly penalizes unrealistic next-step samples because KL is a “covering” rather than “mode-seeking” divergence (Bishop, 2006, Section 10.1.2). A commonly used trick for both non-autoregressive (Parmar et al., 2018; Kingma and Dhariwal, 2018) and autoregressive (Weiss et al., 2021) models is to adjust the temperature of the distribution. The prior, decoder and variational posterior are all trained with KL, and we apply temperature adjustment when sampling from these models during both training and decoding. For example, for the variational posterior we recursively sample from $\frac{1}{Z_\nu(x_{0:t-1}, y)} (q_\nu(x_t | x_{0:t-1}, y))^{\frac{1}{T}}$ instead of $q_\nu(x_t | x_{0:t-1}, y)$. Typically $T = 0.5$.

Secondly, at random initialization the generative model and variational posterior are both very suboptimal, and the noisy gradients from the β term of l^{gen} may swamp the small but consistent signal from the paired data γ term when training the decoder. To alleviate this, we pre-train with the β term omitted from l^{gen} , effectively ignoring the y -only data. Finally, we optionally ignore the ELBO term throughout training when updating the prior $p_\lambda(x)$. In the regime where α is small this could prevent the model learning important information about $p_T(x)$ present in the y -only data, but in the regime we consider here where there is plenty of x -only data, it slightly helps to stabilize training.

3 IDENTIFIABILITY

In this section we discuss the challenges that exist when little or no paired data is available. We mainly focus on the case of no paired data.

We first define identifiability given no paired data. We say a generative model $p_\lambda(x, y)$ is *identifiable given no paired data* if matching the marginals implies matching the joint, that is if $p_\lambda(x) = p_{\lambda_T}(x)$ for all sequences x and $p_\lambda(y) = p_{\lambda_T}(y)$ for all sequences y implies $p_\lambda(x, y) = p_{\lambda_T}(x, y)$ for all sequences x and y . We do not require $\lambda = \lambda_T$. We may think of λ_T as the true parameters and λ as the model parameters being learned.

Even in the case where the model is identifiable, local optima may be a substantial impediment to learning. These local optima are quite a generic feature of learning from little or no paired data. For example, if we set $\alpha = \gamma = 0$

in (2) then x becomes a latent variable, and so the loss is invariant under permutations of the categories or dimensions used for x . This symmetry over permutations means that it is impossible even in principle to recover the true mapping between x and y . Since (2) is continuous in (α, β, γ) , small α and γ values will have multiple spurious local optima as the remnants of the spurious global optima which exist at $\alpha = \gamma = 0$.

We now discuss the need to restrict the power of the decoder. If the decoder $p_\lambda(y|x)$ is very flexible then it may be possible for it to completely ignore x yet still obtain a perfect marginal $p_\lambda(y) = p_T(y)$. Clearly this learns nothing about the true mapping between x and y . We therefore restrict the power of the decoder so that it is forced to use x . In contrast we try to make the prior and variational posterior as flexible as possible in order to ensure accurate modeling and as tight a variational bound as possible.

3.1 Time locality

One widely applicable way to limit decoder power is by assuming *time locality*. We say a decoder has strict time locality if the overall probability can be written as a product of time-local factors

$$p_\lambda(y|x) = \prod_{t=0}^{T-1} f_t(y_{t-L:t+L}, x_{\bar{s}(t)-K:\bar{s}(t)+K}) \quad (6)$$

where *time constants* $K, L \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\bar{s} : \{0, \dots, T-1\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, S-1\}$ is a function aligning each position in y to a position in x . For example, the decoder $p_\lambda(y|x) = \prod_t p_\lambda(y_t|x_{\bar{s}(t)})$ which is independent over time and for which each y_t only depends on a single x_s is strictly time local with $K = L = 0$. We refer to a decoder as time local if (6) holds approximately. If we assume that the true marginal $p_T(y)$ has long-range correlations which mean it is either not time local, or is time local with time constant much greater than L , then the only way for the model as a whole to capture these correlations across time in its marginal $p_\lambda(y)$ is to induce them from corresponding correlations across time in x . This provides the generative model with an incentive to uncover how x maps to y .

Time locality is an intuitively reasonable assumption in many seq2seq problems such as speech recognition and synthesis, optical character recognition and machine translation (with non-monotonic \bar{s}). It thus forms a promising middle ground as a weak enough assumption to have wide applicability but a strong enough assumption to potentially support learning the joint with little or no paired data.

3.2 A worked example of identifiability

To help guide our intuition surrounding identifiability in more complicated cases, we now examine identifiability in the case of a Markovian prior and time-independent

and time-synchronous decoder with no paired data available. In this case $p_\lambda(x, y) = \prod_t p_\lambda(x_t|x_{t-1})p_\lambda(y_t|x_t)$. Let $B_{ij} = p_\lambda(x_0 = i, x_1 = j)$, $O_{ip} = p_\lambda(y_t = p|x_t = i)$, $D_{pq} = p_\lambda(y_0 = p, y_1 = q)$ and $\mathbb{1}$ be a vector of ones. We assume that the prior is a stationary distribution, that is $B\mathbb{1} = B^T\mathbb{1} = b$ and that $b_i > 0$ for all i . The prior is easy to learn from unpaired data, and so we assume $p_T(x_0 = i, x_1 = j) = B_{ij}$. Let $C_{pq} = p_T(y_0 = p, y_1 = q)$ and $c = C\mathbb{1} = C^T\mathbb{1}$. In this case we can conveniently express the relationship between the y marginals and x marginals as a matrix multiplication $D = O^T B O$.

We first consider the case where O is a permutation matrix, corresponding to a *substitution cipher*. We assume x is English text represented as a series of graphemes. For example, the ciphertext y might be `wi jtvwjpvwjbjhji jgvw`, corresponding to some English plaintext x . It is well-known that this simple cipher can be broken by frequency analysis, by tabulating the frequency of grapheme n-grams in the ciphertext and looking for grapheme n-grams with similar frequencies in conventional English text. We may codify this by considering the singular value decompositions of B and C . We show in §A that as long as the singular values of B are distinct and non-zero then we can completely recover O and have identifiability given no paired data. The plaintext above is the `cat sat on the mat`.

Secondly we consider the case where O is not restricted to be a permutation matrix but where the x and y alphabets both have size two, say $x_s, y_t \in \{0, 1\}$. Since $O\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}$, there are only two degrees of freedom in O , say

$$O = \begin{bmatrix} \eta & 1 - \eta \\ \zeta & 1 - \zeta \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

We first consider cases where we do not have identifiability, which may be particularly helpful for building general intuition. The first degenerate case is where B is low rank, that is $B = bb^T$ and x_0 and x_1 are independent. In this case O is never identifiable, since any (η, ζ) on the line $\eta b_0 + \zeta b_1 = c_0$ results in the same unigram marginal $p_\lambda(y_0)$ and so the same overall marginal $p_\lambda(y)$ due to independence over time. This is a simple example of needing correlations over time in x that are longer than the decoder can model on its own in order to have identifiability. The second degenerate case we consider is where $b_0 = \frac{1}{2}$. In this case

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{00} & B_{01} \\ B_{01} & B_{00} \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

This obeys the symmetry that swapping 0s and 1s does not change the probability of a sequence under the prior. Intuitively this means we have no way to distinguish which x symbol maps to a given y symbol, just like in the case where x is a latent variable which is never observed. Formally (η, ζ) and (ζ, η) result in the same marginal $p_\lambda(y)$ for all y . Technically we do still have identifiability if $\eta = \zeta$, but this case is practically uninteresting because it means x and

y are completely independent. Otherwise we do not have identifiability when $b_0 = \frac{1}{2}$. By considering sequences of length two and three, we show in §A that if B is full rank and $b_0 \neq \frac{1}{2}$ then we do have identifiability given no paired data. The general pattern in this simple case is that the time locality assumption is sufficient to ensure identifiability unless the marginal $p_\lambda(x)$ obeys one of a finite list of a specific symmetries that make identification impossible.

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Breaking a substitution cipher

We first apply the proposed approach to the task of breaking a substitution cipher as outlined in §3.2. In this case the marginal $p_\lambda(y)$ is fully tractable and we do not have to use a variational approximation. This investigates the ability of the proposed approach to learn from no paired data.

The experimental setup is as follows. Our training data is a randomly chosen subset of 2000 utterances from the LibriTTS corpus (Zen et al., 2019). For each example, we derive plaintext x by lowercasing and removing punctuation from the text transcript and pass this through a fixed permutation of the 27-character grapheme alphabet to obtain ciphertext y . This yields a total of roughly 140000 grapheme tokens. We set $\gamma = 0$ and $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1}{2}$, using half the data for collecting bigram frequencies B_{ij} on the plaintext and half for collecting bigram frequencies C_{pq} on the ciphertext. Length 2 statistics appear to be sufficient for this task. We learn the observation matrix $O \in \mathbb{R}^{27 \times 27}$, parameterized in terms of its logits using a softmax for each row to ensure that O is stochastic, to minimize the bigram loss $l = \sum_{p,q} C_{pq} \log([O^\top B O]_{pq})$.

Training finds the correct mapping O between plaintext and ciphertext for roughly 80% of training runs. Training success is very binary, typically either succeeding essentially perfectly with near-zero $\text{KL}(p_T(y) \| p_\lambda(y))$ and decoding error rate, or failing with a large KL divergence value and error rate. This suggests that the training loss can potentially serve as an indicator of when training fails. These results demonstrate that learning from zero paired data is possible with the proposed approach, as well as highlighting the substantial challenge that local optima present in this regime. Further experimental details and results are given in §B.1.

4.2 Learning to relate spoken and written language

We apply the proposed approach to learning the relationship between spoken and written language from little paired data. We represent spoken language using phoneme sequences derived from audio. We model the joint distribution of the grapheme sequence and phoneme sequence and evaluate the model on utterance-level *grapheme-to-phoneme* ($g2p$) and *phoneme-to-grapheme* ($p2g$) tasks.

4.2.1 Experimental setup

Our experimental setup is as follows. We use LibriTTS (Zen et al., 2019). The phoneme sequence for each utterance is obtained by forced alignment using the decoder graph of possible verbalizations and pronunciations of the text transcript, discarding any timing information. We limit training to utterances with grapheme and phoneme sequences of at most 96 tokens, yielding 166 hours of data. We randomly partition the training set based on a hash of the string-valued utterance key, selecting a fraction γ of utterances as our paired speech-text examples and evenly splitting the rest into text-only and speech-only datasets, that is $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1-\gamma}{2}$. Output distribution temperature (described in §2.2) $T = 0.5$ is used during training. Decoding is performed by stochastic sampling from $p_\lambda(y|x)$, also with $T = 0.5$. We pre-train (described in §2.2) for 100000 steps (though far fewer steps typically suffice). We compute *phoneme error rate* (*PER*) for a generative model with x a grapheme sequence and y a phoneme sequence, and *character error rate* (*CER*) for a generative model with x a phoneme sequence and y a grapheme sequence. To compute CER, each grapheme sequence is normalized by lowercasing and removing punctuation.

The prior, decoder and variational posterior are all modeled autoregressively. We use a recurrent neural net (RNN)-based architecture for the prior. The decoder and variational posterior are each parameterized as a seq2seq model with monotonic attention, similar to *listen, attend and spell* (*LAS*) (Chan et al., 2016) and Tacotron (Wang et al., 2017). To impose time locality on the decoder $p_\lambda(y|x)$ as discussed in §3, the input to the final RNN predicting the distribution over y_t consists only of glimpses of x chosen by the attention mechanism and does not directly include any information about $y_{<t}$. No such constraint is imposed on the variational posterior $q_\nu(x|y)$ to ensure it remains as flexible as possible. Detailed model architectures are given in §B.2.1.

4.2.2 Experimental results

Figure 1 shows the phoneme and character error rates for utterance-level $g2p$ and $p2g$ on the LibriTTS test set at various paired supervision levels (γ from 0.0005 to 1), both for a reference model trained only on the available paired data (blue bars) and for the proposed semi-supervised generative model (red bars). We can see that the proposed approach is able to make effective use of unpaired data to improve its predictions. Even very small amounts of paired data (5 minutes) are sufficient to effectively learn the association between spoken and written language. Numeric values are given in Table 6 and Table 7 in §B.2.2.

4.2.3 Initialization

When approaching $\gamma = 0$ (no paired data), the model exhibited more sensitivity to random initializations and $\gamma = 0.0002$ (2 minutes of paired data) was the cutoff at




Figure 1: Phoneme (p) and grapheme (g) prediction error rates at varying paired fractions (γ), for a reference supervised-only model (blue) and the proposed generative model consuming both paired and unpaired data (red).

which the model was never able to recover from poor local optima. This aligns with local optima issue discussed in §3. To investigate the effect of initialization, we pre-trained the decoder $p_\lambda(y|x)$ with a small amount of paired data (50 minutes) and then continued training using only unpaired data. This gave metric improvements similar to the results reported in Figure 1. This suggests that fully unpaired training ($\gamma = 0$) could be attainable with better initialization or optimization methods.

4.2.4 Ablations

Table 1 lists several ablation studies. When predicting y_t , making the decoder more powerful by allowing a receptive field to $y_{<t}$, either to y_{t-1} only, or to a summary of $y_{<t}$ provided by the attention RNN state (see §B.2.1) degrades the performance particularly at very low supervision levels. Note that the weaker proposed decoder imposes stricter time locality and the results support our hypothesis on the importance of time locality for recovering the joint from unpaired samples (see §3). Pre-training the generative model was crucial to obtaining well-behaved training dynamics. Sampling at full temperature ($T = 1$) demonstrates the issue discussed in §2.2 with samples from KL-trained models and shows that lowering the temperature is an effective remedy. This issue is a particular problem at very low paired fractions, presumably due to the increased reliance on accurate encoder samples when learning from y -only data. Finally, the prediction metrics worsens when we update the prior weights using the ELBO as hypothesized in §2.2.

4.2.5 Samples

Here we present a sample of the model for utterance-level p2g task in Table 2. In this example `Buck Mulligan` is a rare proper noun that appears both in text-only and speech-only samples, but it is never observed in paired data. Therefore, the supervised-only model is unable to predict it correctly. However the proposed model is able to correctly associate between its phoneme and grapheme representations, although it is never presented with the pair.

5 RELATED WORK

In the past few years, remarkable progress has been made in supervised ASR (Gulati et al., 2020; Han et al., 2020; Chan et al., 2021) and TTS (Wang et al., 2017; Shen et al., 2018; Ren et al., 2021) systems, powered by availability of massive parallel text and speech corpora, like LibriSpeech (Panayotov et al., 2015) and LibriTTS (Zen et al., 2019). Due to scarcity of such resources across all languages, there has been a great interest in leveraging non-parallel data (i.e., unspoken text and untranscribed speech) which are readily available at larger scales, without the need for manual transcription.

Toward this goal, self-supervision with various self-consistency training objectives has been proven to be an effective way to pre-train speech encoder for ASR (e.g., CPC (Oord et al., 2018), wav2vec (Schneider et al., 2019), vq-wav2vec (Baevski et al., 2020a), wav2vec 2.0 (Baevski et al., 2020b), HuBERT (Hsu et al., 2021), W2v-BERT (Chung et al., 2021)), and text / phoneme encoder for TTS (e.g., (Hayashi et al., 2019), PnG BERT (Jia et al., 2021)). But, these pre-trained models need to be fine-tuned with par-

Ablation condition	supervised minutes (paired fraction γ)							
	5 min ($\gamma=0.0005$)		10 min ($\gamma=0.001$)		20 min ($\gamma=0.002$)		50 min ($\gamma=0.005$)	
	PER	CER	PER	CER	PER	CER	PER	CER
Only supervised	49.6	60.6	34.2	45.7	18.8	20.2	11.0	13.5
Proposed (semi-supervised)	9.4	9.5	7.2	4.5	5.6	4.2	3.6	3.8
y_t w/ receptive field to y_{t-1}	64.7	32.5	20.3	20.5	9.6	10.5	7.6	10.2
y_t w/ receptive field to $y_{<t}$	55.6	48.5	13.0	12.3	7.5	10.8	4.1	4.3
no $p_\lambda(x, y)$ pre-training	121.2	187.4	114.1	204.8	112.1	216.0	119.2	210.5
$T = 0.8$	73.2	217.0	70.5	5.6	3.4	3.8	3.6	4.1
$T = 1$	111.5	196.6	112.6	217.3	11.6	187.8	8.8	5.9
update $p_\lambda(x)$ with ELBO	100.6	173.8	63.3	18.3	9.7	7.0	3.9	4.4

Table 1: Ablation studies at various supervision rates. *Proposed* corresponds to $T = 0.5$, y_t w/o receptive field to $y_{<t}$, pre-trained $p_\lambda(x, y)$, and no update of $p_\lambda(x)$ with ELBO.

Sequence type	Sequence value
input phonemes	/sil b v k m v l @ g @ n sil w A: k @ N f O: r\ w @ ` d @ g E n sil r\ eI z d h I z h { n dz sil/
ground truth graphemes	<i>Buck Mulligan, walking forward again, raised his hands.</i>
supervised-only prediction	<i>Buc-mullgaan, walking forward again, raised his hands.</i>
semi-supervised prediction	<i>Buck Mulligan, walking forward again, raised his hands.</i>

Table 2: Sample of an utterance-level p2g prediction.

allel data to tailor the representations to the task of interest (e.g., paralinguistics (Shor et al., 2022), speaker verification (Chen et al., 2022a), or ASR (Hsu et al., 2021)). Semi-supervised training is an alternative approach for extracting useful information from both speech-only and text-only datasets for ASR (Li et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2021a) and TTS (Chung et al., 2019).

The shared information between the two modalities, referred to as the “common form” in Taylor (2009), comprises a sequence of words, giving rise to variations of graphemic symbols in written form (e.g., Dr. versus doctor) and also variations in spoken form (e.g., prosodic inflections).

The recent developments in textless NLP models aims at uncovering parts of this connection from speech-only data (Lakhotia et al., 2021; Borsos et al., 2022). Learning to associate the spoken and written language with little or no parallel data has been extensively explored but remains unsolved. At a high level we categorize the current approaches into three groups. The first family of models use weight sharing in a multi-task speech / text representation learning setup to encourage alignment between the modalities in the encoded representation, which is always accompanied by some form of supervised objective on paired data to force that alignment (e.g., SpeechT5 (Ao et al., 2021), SLAM (Bapna et al., 2021), MAESTRO (Chen et al., 2022b)). The

second family are primarily based on the back translation technique first adopted for machine translation (Sennrich et al., 2016) to incorporate monolingual data in a target language, by pairing them with automatic translation to the source language to generate synthetic paired data. This is closely related to speech chain theory that hypothesizes a connection between speech perception and production with a reinforcing feedback loop (Denes et al., 1993). This connection has motivated the joint training of ASR / TTS models in an auto-encoding setting on non-parallel data (Tjandra et al., 2017), with the limitation of not being able to the back-propagate to the ASR model when speech is auto-encoded, due to non-differentiable ASR textual outputs, which was later remedied by a straight-through gradient estimation (Tjandra et al., 2019). To avoid the mismatches between synthetic and real speech a similar cycle-consistency approach has been adopted on output of an ASR encoder (Hayashi et al., 2018; Hori et al., 2019). The use of pre-trained TTS as data augmentation (Rosenberg et al., 2019) or to guide self-supervised speech representation (Chen et al., 2021b) can also be considered variations of this technique. All of the models under this category are also trained with some amount of paired data. The third family of models is based on distribution matching, minimizing some divergence when mapping unpaired data to the other modality, including adversarially matching the phoneme distribution

output by a speech encoder and phonemes derived from a text corpus (Liu et al., 2018; Baevski et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022a) to build unsupervised ASR models. The tokens discovered by Baevski et al. (2021) have also been used as conditioning input to build an unsupervised TTS model (Liu et al., 2022b). The distribution matching family is the most principled approach and is the only one that has some success in zero paired data setup to the best of our knowledge. It is interesting to note that Baevski et al. (2021) also impose a strict time locality assumption (successive phonemes output by the generator network are assumed to be conditionally independent given the speech waveform). We discussed the potential importance of this assumption in §3.

6 DISCUSSION

We formulated the problem of utilizing unpaired data in seq2seq problems as a joint identifiability problem by only observing unpaired samples from the marginals, with little or no paired data, and presented a generative modeling approach to this problem, a form of distribution matching. The objective function is simply the maximum likelihood, or its lower bound (ELBO), without any extra ad hoc losses. Interestingly, the ELBO objective in the β term of (4) results in an optimization solution with some similarity to the back translation technique, but with key differences. For instance Tjandra et al. (2019) explore several decoding strategies including greedy and beam search for back translation and our formulation suggests stochastic sampling as the principled decoding strategy (the second term in (4)). Also, the variational noisy channel formulation in (3) yields both direct optimization with reverse KL divergence to the generative distribution with reparameterized samples, when output is fixed length and continuous (e.g., spectrograms), and also KL encoder loss described in 2.1. Furthermore, this work highlights time locality as the key to do so, which can guide the architecture choices. The experimental results in Figure 1 show that even tiny amount (5 minutes) of paired data is sufficient to enable learning the association between unpaired data.

Accurate density modeling is crucial for this type of generative modeling. For instance uncalibrated $\log p_\lambda(y|x)$ can adversely affect the balance in the second (ELBO) term of l^{gen} . To examine the potential of the proposed approach without such concerns, we have only experimented with phoneme and grapheme with categorical distribution, which is universal. This is not a common task to be able to do comparisons with other methods. But, it served as nice test bed for this novel approach. A natural question is how these results hold when we move to end-to-end ASR and TTS, for which we would need accurate speech density estimation. Alternatively, given the success of tokenized speech representation a natural extension of this work is to use such representations (Lakhotia et al., 2021; Zeghidour

et al., 2021). Also, the masked language model (MLM)-based pre-trained models under uniform masking regime (Ghazvininejad et al., 2019) can be interpreted as probability distributions estimated with maximum likelihood, and hence it can be directly plugged into our formulation, either as $p_\lambda(x)$ or $p_T(y)$ in (4) and (5), making this generative modeling approach also nicely amenable to the commonly adopted pre-training / fine-tuning workflow.

Finally, similar conditional independence structure appears in other problems (e.g., machine translation) and the approach and discussions here could be more widely applicable.

References

- Amodei, D., Ananthanarayanan, S., Anubhai, R., Bai, J., Battenberg, E., Case, C., Casper, J., Catanzaro, B., Cheng, Q., Chen, G., et al. (2016). Deep speech 2: End-to-end speech recognition in english and mandarin. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 173–182. PMLR.
- Ao, J., Wang, R., Zhou, L., Liu, S., Ren, S., Wu, Y., Ko, T., Li, Q., Zhang, Y., Wei, Z., et al. (2021). SpeechT5: Unified-modal encoder-decoder pre-training for spoken language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07205*.
- Baevski, A., Hsu, W.-N., Conneau, A., and Auli, M. (2021). Unsupervised speech recognition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34.
- Baevski, A., Schneider, S., and Auli, M. (2020a). vq-wav2vec: Self-supervised learning of discrete speech representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Baevski, A., Zhou, Y., Mohamed, A., and Auli, M. (2020b). wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:12449–12460.
- Baker, J. (1975). Stochastic modeling for automatic speech recognition. *Speech Recognition*, pages 521–542.
- Bapna, A., Chung, Y.-a., Wu, N., Gulati, A., Jia, Y., Clark, J. H., Johnson, M., Riesa, J., Conneau, A., and Zhang, Y. (2021). SLAM: A unified encoder for speech and language modeling via speech-text joint pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.10329*.
- Battenberg, E., Skerry-Ryan, R., Moryay, S., Stanton, D., Kao, D., Shannon, M., and Bagby, T. (2020). Location-relative attention mechanisms for robust long-form speech synthesis. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6194–6198. IEEE.
- Beal, M. J. and Ghahramani, Z. (2000). The variational Kalman smoother. *Gatsby Computational Neuroscience Unit, University College London, Tech. Rep. GCNU TR01-003*.

- Bishop, C. M. (2006). *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. Springer.
- Borsos, Z., Marinier, R., Vincent, D., Kharitonov, E., Pietquin, O., Sharifi, M., Teboul, O., Grangier, D., Tagliasacchi, M., and Zeghidour, N. (2022). Audiolm: a language modeling approach to audio generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.03143*.
- Chan, W., Jaitly, N., Le, Q., and Vinyals, O. (2016). Listen, attend and spell: A neural network for large vocabulary conversational speech recognition. In *2016 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 4960–4964. IEEE.
- Chan, W., Park, D., Lee, C., Zhang, Y., Le, Q., and Norouzi, M. (2021). SpeechStew: Simply mix all available speech recognition data to train one large neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.02133*.
- Chen, Z., Chen, S., Wu, Y., Qian, Y., Wang, C., Liu, S., Qian, Y., and Zeng, M. (2022a). Large-scale self-supervised speech representation learning for automatic speaker verification. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6147–6151. IEEE.
- Chen, Z., Rosenberg, A., Zhang, Y., Zen, H., Ghodsi, M., Huang, Y., Emond, J., Wang, G., Ramabhadran, B., and Mengibar, P. J. M. (2021a). Semi-supervision in ASR: Sequential mixmatch and factorized TTS-based augmentation. In *Proc. Interspeech*, pages 736–740.
- Chen, Z., Zhang, Y., Rosenberg, A., Ramabhadran, B., Moreno, P., Bapna, A., and Zen, H. (2022b). MAESTRO: Matched speech text representations through modality matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.03409*.
- Chen, Z., Zhang, Y., Rosenberg, A., Ramabhadran, B., Wang, G., and Moreno, P. (2021b). Injecting text in self-supervised speech pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.12226*.
- Chung, Y.-A., Wang, Y., Hsu, W.-N., Zhang, Y., and Skerry-Ryan, R. (2019). Semi-supervised training for improving data efficiency in end-to-end speech synthesis. In *ICASSP 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6940–6944. IEEE.
- Chung, Y.-A., Zhang, Y., Han, W., Chiu, C.-C., Qin, J., Pang, R., and Wu, Y. (2021). W2v-BERT: Combining contrastive learning and masked language modeling for self-supervised speech pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.06209*.
- Cooper, D. B. and Freeman, J. H. (1970). On the asymptotic improvement in the out-come of supervised learning provided by additional nonsupervised learning. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 100(11):1055–1063.
- Denes, P. B., Denes, P., and Pinson, E. (1993). *The speech chain*. Macmillan.
- Ghazvininejad, M., Levy, O., Liu, Y., and Zettlemoyer, L. (2019). Mask-predict: Parallel decoding of conditional masked language models. In *Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*.
- Grathwohl, W., Choi, D., Wu, Y., Roeder, G., and Duvenaud, D. (2018). Backpropagation through the void: Optimizing control variates for black-box gradient estimation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Graves, A., Fernández, S., Gomez, F., and Schmidhuber, J. (2006). Connectionist temporal classification: labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 369–376.
- Gulati, A., Qin, J., Chiu, C.-C., Parmar, N., Zhang, Y., Yu, J., Han, W., Wang, S., Zhang, Z., Wu, Y., et al. (2020). Conformer: Convolution-augmented transformer for speech recognition. In *Interspeech*.
- Han, W., Zhang, Z., Zhang, Y., Yu, J., Chiu, C.-C., Qin, J., Gulati, A., Pang, R., and Wu, Y. (2020). Contextnet: Improving convolutional neural networks for automatic speech recognition with global context. In *Interspeech*.
- Hayashi, T., Watanabe, S., Toda, T., Takeda, K., Toshinwal, S., and Livescu, K. (2019). Pre-trained text embeddings for enhanced text-to-speech synthesis. In *INTER-SPEECH*, pages 4430–4434.
- Hayashi, T., Watanabe, S., Zhang, Y., Toda, T., Hori, T., Astudillo, R., and Takeda, K. (2018). Back-translation-style data augmentation for end-to-end ASR. In *2018 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 426–433. IEEE.
- Hinton, G. E., Dayan, P., Frey, B. J., and Neal, R. M. (1995). The "wake-sleep" algorithm for unsupervised neural networks. *Science*, 268(5214):1158–1161.
- Hori, T., Astudillo, R., Hayashi, T., Zhang, Y., Watanabe, S., and Le Roux, J. (2019). Cycle-consistency training for end-to-end speech recognition. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6271–6275. IEEE.
- Hsu, W.-N., Tsai, Y.-H. H., Bolte, B., Salakhutdinov, R., and Mohamed, A. (2021). HuBERT: How much can a bad teacher benefit ASR pre-training? In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6533–6537. IEEE.
- Jelinek, F. (1976). Continuous speech recognition by statistical methods. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 64(4):532–556.
- Jia, Y., Zen, H., Shen, J., Zhang, Y., and Wu, Y. (2021). Png BERT: augmented bert on phonemes and graphemes for neural TTS. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.15060*.
- Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. (2014). Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.

- Kingma, D. P. and Dhariwal, P. (2018). Glow: Generative flow with invertible 1x1 convolutions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- Kingma, D. P. and Welling, M. (2014). Auto-encoding variational Bayes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Lakhotia, K., Kharitonov, E., Hsu, W.-N., Adi, Y., Polyak, A., Bolte, B., Nguyen, T.-A., Copet, J., Baevski, A., Mohamed, A., and Dupoux, E. (2021). On generative spoken language modeling from raw audio. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1336–1354.
- Li, B., Sainath, T. N., Pang, R., and Wu, Z. (2019). Semi-supervised training for end-to-end models via weak distillation. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 2837–2841. IEEE.
- Liu, A. H., Hsu, W.-N., Auli, M., and Baevski, A. (2022a). Towards end-to-end unsupervised speech recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02492*.
- Liu, A. H., Lai, C.-I. J., Hsu, W.-N., Auli, M., Baevski, A., and Glass, J. (2022b). Simple and effective unsupervised speech synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02524*.
- Liu, D.-R., Chen, K.-Y., Lee, H.-y., and Lee, L.-s. (2018). Completely unsupervised phoneme recognition by adversarially learning mapping relationships from audio embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.00316*.
- Oord, A. v. d., Li, Y., and Vinyals, O. (2018). Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*.
- Panayotov, V., Chen, G., Povey, D., and Khudanpur, S. (2015). LibriSpeech: an ASR corpus based on public domain audio books. In *IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5206–5210. IEEE.
- Parmar, N., Vaswani, A., Uszkoreit, J., Kaiser, L., Shazeer, N., Ku, A., and Tran, D. (2018). Image transformer. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4055–4064. PMLR.
- Rabiner, L. R. (1989). A tutorial on hidden markov models and selected applications in speech recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 77(2):257–286.
- Ren, Y., Hu, C., Tan, X., Qin, T., Zhao, S., Zhao, Z., and Liu, T.-Y. (2021). FastSpeech 2: Fast and high-quality end-to-end text to speech. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Rosenberg, A., Zhang, Y., Ramabhadran, B., Jia, Y., Moreno, P., Wu, Y., and Wu, Z. (2019). Speech recognition with augmented synthesized speech. In *2019 IEEE automatic speech recognition and understanding workshop (ASRU)*, pages 996–1002. IEEE.
- Schneider, S., Baevski, A., Collobert, R., and Auli, M. (2019). wav2vec: Unsupervised pre-training for speech recognition. In *Interspeech*.
- Sennrich, R., Haddow, B., and Birch, A. (2016). Improving neural machine translation models with monolingual data. *Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Shen, J., Pang, R., Weiss, R. J., Schuster, M., Jaitly, N., Yang, Z., Chen, Z., Zhang, Y., Wang, Y., Skerry-Ryan, R., et al. (2018). Natural tts synthesis by conditioning wavenet on mel spectrogram predictions. In *2018 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 4779–4783. IEEE.
- Shor, J., Jansen, A., Han, W., Park, D., and Zhang, Y. (2022). Universal paralinguistic speech representations using self-supervised conformers. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 3169–3173. IEEE.
- Taylor, P. (2009). *Text-to-speech synthesis*. Cambridge university press.
- Tjandra, A., Sakti, S., and Nakamura, S. (2017). Listening while speaking: Speech chain by deep learning. In *2017 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, pages 301–308. IEEE.
- Tjandra, A., Sakti, S., and Nakamura, S. (2019). End-to-end feedback loss in speech chain framework via straight-through estimator. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6281–6285. IEEE.
- Wang, Y., Skerry-Ryan, R., Stanton, D., Wu, Y., Weiss, R. J., Jaitly, N., Yang, Z., Xiao, Y., Chen, Z., Bengio, S., et al. (2017). Tacotron: Towards end-to-end speech synthesis. In *Interspeech*.
- Weiss, R. J., Skerry-Ryan, R., Battenberg, E., Miao, S., and Kingma, D. P. (2021). Wave-tacotron: Spectrogram-free end-to-end text-to-speech synthesis. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5679–5683. IEEE.
- Williams, R. J. (1992). Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3):229–256.
- Zeghidour, N., Luebs, A., Omran, A., Skoglund, J., and Tagliasacchi, M. (2021). Soundstream: An end-to-end neural audio codec. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 30:495–507.
- Zen, H., Dang, V., Clark, R., Zhang, Y., Weiss, R. J., Jia, Y., Chen, Z., and Wu, Y. (2019). LibriTTS: A corpus derived from LibriSpeech for text-to-speech. In *Interspeech*.

Learning the joint distribution of two sequences using little or no paired data: supplementary material

A IDENTIFIABILITY: DETAILS

In this section we give more details about identifiability following on from the discussion in §3.

We first give details about the singular value decomposition-based approach when O is a permutation matrix, corresponding to a substitution cipher. Compute the singular value decomposition of the plaintext bigram frequencies B and the ciphertext bigram frequencies C as

$$B = U_x \Lambda_x V_x^\top \quad (9)$$

$$C = U_y \Lambda_y V_y^\top \quad (10)$$

where U_x, V_x, U_y, V_y are real orthogonal matrices and Λ_x and Λ_y are real diagonal matrices with entries increasing along the diagonal. We know that C must also equal $O^\top B O = (O^\top U_x) \Lambda_x (O^\top V_x)^\top$ which is also a singular value decomposition of C . Standard results on the uniqueness of the singular value decomposition, which can be obtained by considering the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $C C^\top$ and $C^\top C$, show that $\Lambda_x = \Lambda_y = \Lambda$ and that, if the singular values are all distinct and non-zero, then the left and right singular vectors are determined up to sign, that is $U_y = O^\top U_x S$ and $V_y = O^\top V_x T$ for two diagonal matrices S and T with 1s or -1 s along their diagonal. Thus $O = U_x S U_y^\top = V_x T V_y^\top$. Since $O \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}$, we have $S U_y^\top \mathbb{1} = U_x^\top \mathbb{1}$, which allows us to recover S , and similarly T . Thus O is identifiable given no paired data in this case as long as the singular values are distinct.

Bigram binary identifiability details. We wish to show that if B is full rank and $b_0 \neq \frac{1}{2}$ then we have identifiability given no paired data. We first consider sequences of length two. We suppose that $O^\top B O = O_\top^\top B O_\top$ for some O, O_\top and ask whether this implies $O = O_\top$. The expression $O^\top B O$ is a quadratic function of η and ζ . By explicitly expanding in terms of η and ζ , it may be verified that the only possible solutions are

$$O = \begin{bmatrix} c_0 & c_1 \\ c_0 & c_1 \end{bmatrix} \pm \det(O_\top) \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & -b_1 \\ -b_0 & b_0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

where the determinant $\det(O_\top)$ is also equal to $\det(C)/\det(B)$. In some cases one of these solutions will have a negative entry and so not represent a valid decoder, in which case we have identifiability. This is more likely when O_\top has large determinant. As before we also technically have identifiability in the uninteresting case where $\eta = \zeta$. Thus in general based on sequences of length two alone we cannot uniquely identify O . Now consider sequences of length three. Define the trigram distributions

$$B_{ijk} = p_\lambda(x_0 = i, x_1 = j, x_2 = k) \quad (12)$$

$$C_{pqr} = p_\Gamma(y_0 = p, y_1 = q, y_2 = r) \quad (13)$$

$$D_{pqr} = p_\lambda(y_0 = p, y_1 = q, y_2 = r) = \sum_{i,j,k} B_{ijk} O_{ip} O_{jq} O_{kr} \quad (14)$$

We suppose that $\sum_{i,j,k} B_{ijk} O_{ip} O_{jq} O_{kr} = \sum_{i,j,k} B_{ijk} (O_\top)_{ip} (O_\top)_{jq} (O_\top)_{kr}$ for some O, O_\top and ask whether this implies $O = O_\top$. We only need to worry about distinguishing the two solutions in (11). By plugging in these two solutions into (14) it can be shown that if

$$\sum_{i,j,k} B_{ijk} (b^\perp)_i (b^\perp)_j (b^\perp)_k \neq 0 \quad (15)$$




Figure 2: The performance of the learned models across 50 random training runs sorted by increasing final training loss. Performance is measured by the training loss, which is the bigram KL divergence $\text{KL}(p_T(y_0, y_1) \parallel p_\lambda(y_0, y_1))$, and the decoding error rate. Training success is very binary and there is a strong correlation between training loss and error rate.

where $b^\perp = [-b_1, b_0]$ then $O = O_T$. The above holds for general prior distributions $p_\lambda(x)$. If $p_\lambda(x)$ is Markovian then $B_{ijk} = B_{ij}B_{jk}/b_j$ and the condition (15) is equivalent to $b_0 \neq \frac{1}{2}$. Thus if B is full rank and $b_0 \neq \frac{1}{2}$ then we have identifiability given no paired data. This holds for any choice of O specifying the decoder.

It is also interesting to consider the form of loss landscape under (2) in the case of a Markovian prior and time-independent and time-synchronous decoder. In the case where the x and y alphabets both have size two and B is full rank, it can be shown that there are at most three stationary points, one saddle point corresponding to the *unigram initialization* $O = \mathbb{1}c^\top$ which has the correct unigram marginals for y but which ignores x , and up to two local minima related to the two solutions discussed in the identifiability discussion above. We examined the case of larger alphabets experimentally in §4.

B EXPERIMENTS: DETAILS

B.1 Breaking a substitution cipher: details

In this section we give further details of the experiments breaking a substitution cipher described in §4.1. To initialize O , we take the *unigram initialization* $O = \mathbb{1}c^\top$, where c is the observed ciphertext unigram frequencies, and apply a small random normal perturbation to the logits to break symmetry since the unigram initialization is a stationary point. For optimization we use an initial phase of stochastic gradient descent with learning rate 10 to get in roughly the right region of parameter space followed by Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with learning rate 0.01 to converge to the precise local optimum, since we find this works substantially better than either optimizer on its own. To investigate the effect of random initialization, we perform 50 training runs, sort by the achieved training loss, and plot the training loss $\text{KL}(p_T(y_0, y_1) \parallel p_\lambda(y_0, y_1))$ and decoding error rate in Figure 2. The binary nature of success or failure mentioned in §4.1 is clearly visible. This is somewhat encouraging since it suggests that the training loss can potentially serve as a reliable detector of when to discard a training run, at least when the generative model matches the true generating process well as here.

Examples of the O learned when training succeeds and fails are shown in Figure 3. The symbol table used is

```
00000000001111111111222222222
0123456789012345678901234567
^_eaouiutnhsrdlmcwfygpbvkvxqjz
```

where $\hat{_}$ is a start-of-sequence and end-of-sequence symbol and $_$ is the space character. Note the grouping of vowels then consonants. The matrix O learned at various stages of training for a successful training run is shown in Figure 4. For coherence in this case Adam was used throughout. This shows how the association for common symbols is learned earlier in training, potentially unlocking additional known contexts in which to learn rarer symbols.




Figure 3: Examples of learned O for singular value decomposition (left), a successful gradient descent run (middle) and a failed gradient descent run (right). The vertical axis is the plaintext grapheme x_t and the horizontal axis is the ciphertext grapheme y_t (with columns reordered so that the true mapping is the identity). Thus each row represents the learned probability distribution $p_\lambda(y_t|x_t)$ for a particular x_t . The SVD solution is not perfect due to its sensitivity to the plaintext and ciphertext coming from distinct utterances. The failed run finds a suboptimal local minimum in the training loss, and essentially the same O is found by multiple different failed training runs. In this case the failed run appears to have learned to map vowels to consonants and consonants to vowels.

Module	Hyperparameters
One-hot	
Causal Conv1D	filters = 128, kernel size = 8, activation = ReLU
RNN w/ GRU cells	units = 128, zoneout probability = 0.01
Dropout	dropout rate = 0.05
Dense	units = 128, activation = ReLU

Table 3: Summary of the autoregressive prior $p_\lambda(x)$ architecture and hyperparameters.

B.2 Learning to relate spoken and written language: details

B.2.1 Model architecture and training hyperparameters

Prior The prior $p_\lambda(x)$ is parameterized by an RNN-based autoregressive model, with a causal convolutional preprocessing of past samples. The detailed building blocks of this architecture is summarized in Table 3.

Decoder parameterization The decoder $p_\lambda(y|x)$ architecture is adopted from the Tacotron model (Wang et al., 2017) with some differences. We use a stack of two 1D convolution layers as input encoder, and the recurrent GMM attention model extract glimpse of the encoded input to feed to the decoder LSTM. When predicting y_t no receptive field to $y_{<t}$ is allowed. The details of this architecture is listed in Table 4. Note that a more powerful decoder with receptive field to past samples did not make a difference on prediction metrics of the supervised-only model. So, for simplicity, we kept the decoder consistent between the supervised-only and semi-supervised setups.

Variational posterior parameterization The variational posterior $q_\nu(x|v)$ is very similar to the decoder, but slightly more powerful by allowing prediction of x_t to have receptive field to $x_{<t}$ via state of the attention LSTM, and also having a skip connection from input to decoder RNN. The details of this architecture is listed in Table 5.

Training We use separate Adam optimizers (Kingma and Ba, 2014) for generative parameters λ and variational parameters ν . The generative optimizer learning rate is piecewise constant of values of $1e-3$, $5e-4$, $3e-4$, $1e-4$, $5e-5$, changing every 50 000 steps, and fixed after 200 000 steps. The variational optimizer uses fixed higher learning rate of $3e-3$ to keep the variational posterior up to date with respect to generative parameters. Both optimizer apply gradient clipping.

B.2.2 Experimental results: details

The numerical values of prediction errors for supervised-only and semi-supervised models are reported in Table 6 and Table 7 respectively.




Figure 4: The matrix O learned after various numbers of training steps for a successful training run. By step 50, a tentative mapping of vowels to vowels and consonants to consonants has been learned. By step 100, the correspondence for the space character and a few of the most common individual vowels and consonants has been tentatively, and by step 150 clearly, learned. Clear knowledge of a few symbols opens up contexts for learning the association of other symbols based on their statistical properties, and learning progresses rapidly for less and less common symbols through steps 200 and 250.

Finalizing the precisely correct association for very rare consonants such as z takes many steps.

Module	Hyperparameters
Input encoder	One-hot Conv1D: filters = 128, kernel size = 8, activation = ReLU Conv1D: filters = 128, kernel size = 8, activation = ReLU
Autoregressive decoder	Causal Conv1D filters = 64, kernel size = 12, activation = ReLU attention LSTM units = 64 montonic GMM attention (Battenberg et al., 2020) →num components = 5, num heads = 1, units = 32 →init offset bias = 1.0, init scale bias = 5.0 decoder LSTM (units = 64) →input to decoder LSTM: only the attention glimpse

Table 4: Summary of the autoregressive decoder $p_\lambda(y|x)$ architecture and hyperparameters.

Module	Hyperparameters
Input encoder	One-hot Conv1D: filters = 128, kernel size = 8, activation = ReLU Conv1D: filters = 128, kernel size = 8, activation = ReLU
Autoregressive posterior	Causal Conv1D filters = 64, kernel size = 12, activation = ReLU attention LSTM units = 64 montonic GMM attention (Battenberg et al., 2020) →num components = 5, num heads = 1, units = 64 →init offset bias = 1.0, init scale bias = 5.0 decoder LSTM (units = 64) →input to decoder LSTM: attention glimpse, attention RNN state, x_{t-1}

Table 5: Summary of the autoregressive variational posterior $q_\nu(x|v)$ architecture and hyperparameters.

paired minutes (fraction)	dev		test	
	PER / %	CER / %	PER / %	CER / %
5 ($\gamma=0.0005$)	47.8	61.6	49.6	60.6
10 ($\gamma=0.001$)	33.2	46.9	34.2	45.7
20 ($\gamma=0.002$)	19.0	21.7	18.8	20.2
50 ($\gamma=0.005$)	12.1	14.6	11.0	13.5
100 ($\gamma=0.01$)	7.2	11.9	6.8	10.5
199 ($\gamma=0.02$)	5.0	9.6	5.6	10.0
498 ($\gamma=0.05$)	3.4	5.7	3.3	6.6
996 ($\gamma=0.1$)	2.8	4.5	2.5	3.9
9960 ($\gamma=1$)	0.9	2.1	1.3	1.7

Table 6: Phoneme and character error rates for utterance-level g2p and p2g at various paired supervision rates γ on LibriTTS dev and test sets for supervised-only approach.

paired minutes (fraction)	dev		test	
	PER / %	CER / %	PER / %	CER / %
5 ($\gamma=0.0005$)	11.7	25.6	9.4	9.5
10 ($\gamma=0.001$)	11.1	5.3	7.2	4.5
20 ($\gamma=0.002$)	6.3	4.7	5.6	4.2
50 ($\gamma=0.005$)	4.2	3.7	3.6	3.8
100 ($\gamma=0.01$)	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.2
199 ($\gamma=0.02$)	3.0	2.8	2.6	2.9
498 ($\gamma=0.05$)	3.0	3.1	2.3	3.6
996 ($\gamma=0.1$)	2.2	3.2	2.3	2.8

Table 7: Phoneme and character error rates for utterance-level g2p and p2g at various paired supervision rates γ on LibriTTS dev and test sets for the proposed semi-supervised generative modeling approach.