

# Recycling Lingware in a Multilingual MT System

Manny Rayner  
David Carter

Ivan Bretan  
Robert Eklund  
Mats Wirén

Steffen Leo Hansen  
Sabine Kirchmeier-Andersen  
Christina Philp  
Finn Sørensen  
Hanne Erdman Thomsen

SRI International  
Suite 23, Millers Yard  
Cambridge CB2 1RQ  
United Kingdom

Telia Research AB  
Spoken Language Processing  
S-136 80 Haninge  
Sweden

Handelshøjskolen i København  
Institut for Datalogivistik  
Dalgas Have 15  
DK-2000 Frederiksberg  
Denmark

manny@cam.sri.com  
dmc@cam.sri.com

Ivan.P.Bretan@telia.se  
Robert.H.Eklund@telia.se  
Mats.G.Wiren@telia.se

slh.id@cbs.dk

## Abstract

We describe two methods relevant to multilingual machine translation systems, which can be used to port linguistic data (grammars, lexicons and transfer rules) between systems used for processing related languages. The methods are fully implemented within the Spoken Language Translator system, and were used to create versions of the system for two new language pairs using only a month of expert effort.

## 1 Introduction

The basic idea of this paper is simple and uncontroversial. All natural languages are in some sense similar (some are obviously very similar), so software written to process one language ought to some extent to be applicable to other languages. If the languages  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are similar enough, then it should be easier to recycle software applicable to  $L_1$  than to rewrite it from scratch for  $L_2$ .

This paper describes two related approaches in this general direction, which have been successfully applied within the Spoken Language Translator (SLT) project (Rayner and Carter, 1997). The first is the most obvious: we start with a functioning grammar and lexicon for  $L_1$ , and port it to the similar language  $L_2$ . This is not, of course, a novel idea, but we think that we have refined it in a number of ways. In particular, we show that it is practically feasible in the case of sufficiently close languages to generalize an existing grammar for  $L_1$  to

cover both  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  (i.e. produce a single grammar which through the setting of a single parameter becomes valid for either language). We also describe a method which makes it possible to port the language-dependent lexicon for  $L_1$  so as to maximize sharing of data between the systems for the two languages.

The second idea is specifically related to translation. Suppose we have already developed sets of transfer rules for the two language-pairs  $L_1 \rightarrow L_2$  and  $L_2 \rightarrow L_3$ . We describe a method which allows us to compose the two sets of rules off-line to create a new set for the pair  $L_1 \rightarrow L_3$ .

Both methods might be said to operate according to the principle memorably described by Mary Poppins as "Well begun is half done". They do not solve either problem completely, but automatically take care of most of the drudgery before any human has to become involved. In each case, the initial result is a machine-written set of linguistic data (lexicon entries and transfer rules) which is not quite adequate as it stands; a system expert can however clean it up into satisfactory shape in a small fraction of the time that would have been required to write the relevant rules and lexicon entries from scratch.

The practical experiments we describe have been carried out using versions of the SLT system involving the languages English, French, Swedish and Danish. Initial results are extremely promising. In particular, we were able to combine both methods to create fairly credible Swedish-to-French and English-to-Danish spoken language translation systems<sup>1</sup> us-

<sup>1</sup>In fact we do not currently use a Danish speech synthesizer, but it would be straightforward to incorporate

ing only a few person-weeks of expert effort.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 gives a very brief overview of the relevant aspects of the SLT system. Section 3 describes the methods we have developed for porting linguistic descriptions between closely related languages. Section 4 summarizes the transfer composition method. Section 5 describes preliminary experiments.

## 2 An overview of the SLT system

The SLT system has been described in detail elsewhere (most recently (Rayner and Bouillon, 1995; Rayner and Carter, 1997)), so this section will only provide the minimum information necessary to understand the main body of the paper.

The language-processing (translation) part of the system is supplied with N-best sentence hypotheses by the system's recognizer, and itself uses a hybrid architecture, which combines rules and trainable statistical models. To summarize the argument from (Rayner and Bouillon, 1995), there are good reasons for requiring both these components to be present. Rules are useful for capturing many kinds of regular linguistic facts that are independent of any particular domain of application, prime examples being grammatical agreement and question-formation. In contrast, there are other types of phenomena which intuitively are more naturally conceptualized as idiosyncratic and domain-dependent: the most obvious examples here are word-choice problems.

The system uses two translation mechanisms, applied bottom-up in parallel (Rayner and Carter, 1997). The primary, rule-based translation mechanism performs transfer at the level of Quasi-Logical Form (QLF), a type of predicate/argument style notation (Alshawi et al., 1991). The source- and target-language grammars provide a declarative definition of a many-to-many mapping between surface form and QLF. The grammars are domain-independent, and can be compiled to run efficiently either in the direction surface form  $\rightarrow$  QLF (analysis) or QLF  $\rightarrow$  surface form (generation). In transfer, unification-based rules are used to define a space of possible candidate translations; domain-dependent, statistically trained preferences then select the most preferred candidate translation. This division of effort has the important consequence of allowing the transfer rules to be fairly simple, since much of the complexity is "factored out" into the trained preferences.

In order to deal with the brittleness inherent in any rule-based system, a second, much less sophisticated

cated translation method is also used, which simply maps surface phrases from the source language into possible target-language counterparts. We refer to the backup method as "word-to-word" (WW) translation. The two methods are combined, roughly speaking, by using rule-based QLF transfer to translate as much as possible, filling in any gaps with applications of the WW rules.

The parts of the system of central interest here are the rule-based components, in particular the morphologies, grammars, lexica and transfer rules. Morphologies are written in a variant of two-level morphology (Carter, 1995), and grammars in a unification-based formalism (Alshawi (ed), 1992). The lexicon for each language is divided into three main parts:

- Domain-independent function (closed class) word entries are written directly in terms of definitions of suitable feature-value assignments, and can from a software-engineering standpoint be regarded as part of the grammar.
- A collection of language-dependent but domain-independent macros define the feature-value assignments needed for each type of regular content-word, e.g. "count noun", "transitive verb" and so on. These macros are called *paradigm macros*.
- Content word entries, which in general may be domain-dependent, are defined in terms of these lexical macros. An entry of this kind contains the following information: the name of the relevant macro, the base surface form of the word, the associated logical-form (QLF) constant, and if necessary a pointer to the correct inflectional type (conjugation or declension).

Structurally, transfer rules have much in common with lexicon entries. (Bear in mind that conventional bilingual and monolingual dictionaries have similar structures too). A small set of domain-independent transfer rules encode cross-linguistic divergences significant enough that they need to be represented at the QLF level: these rules may contain arbitrary pieces of QLF form. The majority of the transfer rules, however, are "atomic": they associate a logical-form constant from the source language with one or more logical-form constants from the target language. Transfer rules of this type have a close connection with the macro-defined monolingual content-word lexicon, and may also be domain-dependent.

### 3 Porting grammars and lexica between closely related languages

The original version of the Core Language Engine had a single language description for English, written by hand from scratch (Pulman, 1992; Rayner, 1994). Subsequently, language descriptions have been developed for Swedish (Gambäck and Rayner, 1992), French and Spanish (Rayner, Carter and Bouillon, 1995). In each of these cases, the new language description was created by manually editing the relevant files for the closest existing language. (The Swedish and French systems are modified versions of the original English one; the Spanish system is modified from the French one). There are however some serious drawbacks to this approach. Firstly, it requires a considerable quantity of expert effort; secondly, there is no mechanism for keeping the resulting grammars in step with each other. Changes are often made to one grammar and not percolated to the other ones until concrete problems show up in test suites or demos. The net result is that the various grammars tend to drift steadily further apart.

When we recently decided to create a language description for Danish, we thought it would be interesting to experiment with a more principled methodology, which explicitly attempts to address the problems mentioned above. The conditions appeared ideal: we were porting from Swedish, Swedish and Danish being an extremely closely related language pair. The basic principles we have attempted to observe are the following:

- Whenever feasible, we have tried to arrange things so that the linguistic descriptions for the two languages consist of shared files. In particular, the grammar rules files for the two languages are shared. When required, rules or parts of rules specific to one language are placed inside macros whose expansion depends on the identity of the current language, so that the rule expands when loaded to an appropriate language-specific version.
- When files cannot easily be shared (in particular, for the content-word lexica), we define the file for the new language in terms of declarations listing the explicit differences against the corresponding file for the old language. We have attempted to make the structure of these declarations as simple as possible, so that they can be written by linguists who lack prior familiarity with the system and its notation.

Although we are uncertain how much generality to claim for the results (Swedish and Danish, as already

noted, are exceptionally close), we found them encouraging. Four of the 175 existing Swedish grammar rules turned out to be inapplicable to Danish, and two had to be replaced by corresponding Danish rules. Five more rules had to be parameterized by language-specific macros. Some of the morphology rules needed to be rewritten, but this only required about two days of effort from a system specialist working together with a Danish linguist. The most significant piece of work, which we will now describe in more detail, concerned the lexicon.

Our original intuition here was that the function-word lexicon and the paradigm macros (cf Section 2) would be essentially the same between the two languages, except that the surface forms of function words would vary. To put it slightly differently, we anticipated that it would make sense as a first approximation to say that there was a one-to-one correspondence between Swedish and Danish function-words, and that their QLF representations could be left identical. This assumption does indeed appear to be borne out by the facts. The only complication we have come across so far concerns definite determiners: the feature-value assignments between the two languages need to differ slightly in order to handle the different rules in Swedish and Danish for determiner/noun agreement. This was handled, as with the grammar rules, by introduction of a suitable call to a language-specific macro.

With regard to content words, the situation is somewhat different. Since word choice in translation is frequently determined both by collocational and by semantic considerations, it does not make as much sense to insist on one-to-one correspondences and identical semantic representations. We consequently decided that content-words would have a language-dependent QLF representation, so as to make it possible to use our normal strategy of letting the Swedish-to-Danish translation rules in general be many-to-many, with collocational preferences filtering the space of possible transfers.

The remarks above motivate the concrete lexicon-porting strategy which we now sketch. All work was carried out by Danish linguists who had a good knowledge of computational linguistics and Swedish, but no previous exposure to the system. The starting point was to write a set of word-to-word translation rules (cf Section 2), which for each Swedish surface lexical item defined a set of possible Danish translations. The left-hand side of each WW rule specified a Swedish surface word-form and an associated grammatical category (verb, noun, etc), and the right-hand side a possible Danish translation. An initial "blank" version of the rules was created

automatically by machine analysis of a corpus; the left-hand side of the rule was filled in correctly, and a set of examples taken from the corpus was listed above. The linguist only needed to fill in the right-hand side appropriately with reference to the examples supplied.

The next step was to use the word-to-word rules to induce a Danish lexicon. As a first approximation, we assumed that the possible grammatical (syntactic/semantic) categories of the word on the right-hand side of a WW rule would be the same as those of the word on its left-hand side. (Note that in general a word will have more than one lexical entry). Thus lexicon entries could be copied across from Swedish to Danish with appropriate modifications. In the case of function-words, the entry is copied across with only the surface form changed. For content-words, the porting routines query the linguist for the additional information needed to transform each specific item as follows.

If the left-hand (Swedish) word belongs to a lexical category subject to morphological inflection, the linguist is asked for the root form of the right-hand (Danish) word and its inflectional pattern. If the inflectional pattern is marked as wholly or partly irregular (e.g. with strong verbs), the linguist is also queried for the values of the relevant irregular inflections. All requests for lexical information are output in a single file at the end of the run, formatted for easy editing. This makes it possible for the linguist to process large numbers of information requests quickly and efficiently, and feed the revised declarations back into the porting process in an iterative fashion.

One particularly attractive aspect of the scheme is that transfer rules are automatically generated as a byproduct of the porting process. Grammar rules and function-words are regarded as interlingual; thus for each QLF constant  $C$  involved in the definition of a grammar rule or a function-word definition, the system adds a transfer rule which maps  $C$  into itself. Content-words are not interlingual. However, since each target lexical entry  $L$  is created from a source counterpart  $L'$ , it is trivial to create simultaneously a transfer rule which maps the source QLF constant associated with  $L'$  into the target QLF constant associated with  $L$ .

## 4 Transfer composition

The previous sections have hopefully conveyed some of the flavour of our translation framework, which conceptually can be thought of as half-way between transfer and interlingua. We would if possible like to move closer to the interlingual end; however, the

problems touched on above mean that we do not see this as being a realistic short-term possibility. Meanwhile, we are stuck with the problem that dogs all multilingual transfer-based systems: the number of sets of transfer rules required increases quadratically in the number of system languages. Even three languages are enough to make the problem non-trivial.

In a recent paper (Rayner *et al.*, 1996), we described a novel approach to the problem which we have implemented within the SLT system. Exploiting the declarative nature of our transfer formalism, we compose (off-line) existing sets of rules for the language pairs  $L_1 \rightarrow L_2$  and  $L_2 \rightarrow L_3$ , to create a new set of rules for  $L_1 \rightarrow L_3$ . It is clear that this can be done for rules which map atomic constants into atomic constants. What is less obvious is that complex rules, recursively defined in terms of translation of their sub-constituents, can also be composed. The method used is based on program-transformation ideas taken from logic programming, and is described in detail in the earlier paper. Simple methods, described in the same paper, can also be used to compose an approximate transfer preference model for the new language-pair.

The rule composition algorithm is not complete; we strongly suspect that, because of recursion effects, the problem of finding a complete set of composed transfer rules is undecidable. But in practice, the set of composed rules produced is good enough that it can be improved quickly to an acceptable level of performance. Our methodology for performing this task makes use of rationally constructed, balanced domain corpora to focus the effort on frequently occurring problems (Rayner, Carter and Bouillon, 1995). It involves making declarations to reduce the overgeneration of composed rules; adding hand-coded rules to fill coverage holes; and adjusting preferences. The details reported in (Rayner *et al.*, 1996).

## 5 Experiments

We will now present results for concrete experiments, where we applied the methods described above so as to rapidly construct translation systems for two new language pairs. All of the translation modules involved operate within the same Air Travel Inquiry (ATIS; (Hemphill *et al.*, 1990)) domain as other versions of SLT, using a vocabulary of about 1500 source-language stem entries, and have been integrated into the main SLT system to produce versions which can perform credible translation of spoken Swedish into French and spoken English into Danish respectively.

	Swe → Fre	Eng → Swe
Fully acceptable	29.4%	56.5%
Unnatural style	16.3%	7.75%
Minor syntactic errors	15.2%	11.75%
Major syntactic errors	2.0%	4.75%
Partial translation	7.0%	8.75%
Nonsense	22.9%	5.0%
Bad translation	7.0%	4.0%
No translation	0.2%	1.5%

Table 1: Translation results for Swedish → French and English → Swedish on unseen speech data

### 5.1 Swedish → English → French

This section describes an exercise which involved using transfer composition to construct a Swedish → French translation system by composing Swedish → English and English → French versions of the system. The total expert effort was about two person-weeks. We start by summarizing results, and then sketch the main points of the manual work needed to adjust the composed rule-sets.

We used a corpus of 442 previously unseen spoken utterances, and processed the N-best lists output for them by the speech recognizer. The results are as given in Table 1; for comparison, we also give the results for English → Swedish, the language pair to which we have devoted the most effort (and which does not involve any transfer composition).

Thus almost 30% (top row) of the translations produced were completely acceptable, with another 30% or so (rows 2-3) having only minor problems, giving a total of 60% that would probably be acceptable in practical use. A further 9% (rows 4-5) contained major errors but also some correct information, while nearly all the remaining 30% (bottom 3 rows) were clearly unacceptable, consisting either of nonsense or of a translation that made some sense but was wrong. The reasons for these 30% of outright failures, compared to only about 10% for English → Swedish, are firstly, that recognizer performance is slightly less good for Swedish than for English, owing to less training data being available; second, that Swedish and French differ more than English and Swedish do; thirdly, that transfer rules for both the component pairs (Swedish → English and English → French) have had much less work devoted to them than English → Swedish; and last but not least, of course, that transfer composition is being used.

When cleaning up the automatically composed

Swedish → French rule-set, the task on which we spent most effort was that of limiting overgeneration of composed transfer rules. The second most important task was manual improvement of the composed transfer preference model. The methods used are described in more detail in (Rayner *et al*, 1996).

### 5.2 English → Swedish → Danish

This section briefly describes a second series of experiments, in which we converted an English → Swedish system into an English → Danish system using the methods described earlier. The total investment of system expert effort was again around two person-weeks.

About half the effort was used to port the Swedish language description to Danish, employing the methods of Section 3. After this, we carried out two rounds of testing and bug-fixing on the Swedish → Danish translation task. For this, we used a Swedish representative corpus, containing 331 sentences representing 9385 words from the original Swedish corpus. These tests uncovered a number of new problems resulting from previously unnoted divergences between the Swedish and Danish grammars. About half the problems disappeared after the addition of 20 or so small hand-coded adjustments to the morphology, function-word lexicon, transfer rules and transfer preferences.

After the second round of bug-fixing, 95% of the Swedish sentences received a Danish translation, and 79% a fully acceptable translation. (When measuring results on representative corpora, we count coverage in terms of “weighted scores”. The weight assigned to sentence is proportional to the number of words it represents in the original corpus: that is, its length in words times the number of sentences it represents). Most of the translation errors that did occur were minor ones. Finally, we composed the English → Swedish and Swedish → Danish rules to create a English → Danish rule-set, and used this, after a day’s editing by an expert, to test English → Danish translation using a representative text corpus (we will present results for unseen speech input at the workshop). Our results, using the same scheme as above, were as given in Table 2.

## 6 Conclusions and further directions

We have demonstrated that it is practically feasible in the case of sufficiently close languages to generalize an existing grammar for one language to produce a grammar which, through the setting of a single parameter, becomes valid for either language. As well as providing major efficiency gains over writing a grammar for the second language from scratch, this

	Eng → Dan
Fully acceptable	52.5%
Unnatural style	0.4%
Minor syntactic errors	24.4%
Major syntactic errors	0.7%
Partial translation	0.0%
Nonsense	0.9%
Bad translation	10.7%
No translation	10.3%

Table 2: Translation results for English → Danish on representative text data

technique means that subsequent enhancements to the grammar, in those areas where the characteristics of the two languages are equivalent, will apply automatically to both of them.

We have also described an algorithm for composition of transfer rules. We have demonstrated that it can be used to automatically compose non-trivial sets of transfer rules containing on the order of thousands of rules, and shown that by small adjustments the performance can be improved to a level only slightly inferior to that of a corresponding set of hand-coded rules. Our experience is that the amount of work involved in using these methods is only a fraction of that needed to develop similar rules from scratch.

### Acknowledgements

The Danish-related work reported here was funded by SRI International and Handelshøjskolen i København. Other work was funded by Telia Research AB under the SLT-2 project. We would like to thank David Milward and Steve Pulman for helpful comments.

### References

- Agnäs, M-S., Alshawi, H., Bretan, I., Carter, D., Ceder, K., Collins, M., Crouch, R., Digalakis, V., Ekholm, B., Gambäck, B., Kaja, J., Karlgren, J., Lyberg, B., Price, P., Pulman, S., Rayner, M., Samuelsson, C. and Svensson, T. 1994. Spoken Language Translator: First Year Report. SRI Technical Report CRC-043<sup>2</sup>
- Alshawi, H., D. Carter, B. Gambäck and M. Rayner. 1991. Transfer through Quasi Logical Form. Proc. ACL-91.
- Alshawi, H. (ed.) 1992. The Core Language Engine. MIT Press.
- Carter, D. 1995. Rapid Development of Morphological Descriptions for Full Language Processing Systems. Proceedings of 7th European ACL. Also SRI Technical Report CRC-047
- Gambäck, B., and M. Rayner. The Swedish Core Language Engine. Proc. 3rd Nordic Conference on Text Comprehension in Man and Machine, Linköping, Sweden. Also SRI Technical Report CRC-025.
- Hemphill, C.T., J.J. Godfrey and G.R. Doddington. 1990. The ATIS Spoken Language Systems pilot corpus. Proc. DARPA Speech and Natural Language Workshop, Hidden Valley, Pa., pp. 96-101.
- Pulman, S. 1992. Unification-Based Syntactic Analysis. In (Alshawi (ed), 1992).
- Rayner, M. 1994. English linguistic coverage. In (Agnäs et al., 1994).
- Rayner, M. and Bouillon, P. 1995. Hybrid Transfer in an English-French Spoken Language Translator. Proceedings of IA '95, Montpellier, France. Also SRI Technical Report CRC-056.
- Rayner, M., P. Bouillon and D. Carter. 1995. Using Corpora to Develop Limited-Domain Speech Translation Systems. Proc. Translating and the Computer 17. Also SRI Technical Report CRC-059.
- Rayner, M., D. Carter and P. Bouillon. 1996. Adapting the Core Language Engine to French and Spanish. Proc. NLP-IA, Moncton, New Brunswick. Also SRI Technical Report CRC-061.
- Rayner, M., and D. Carter. 1997 Hybrid language processing in the Spoken Language Translator. Proc. ICASSP-97, Munich, Germany. Also SRI Technical Report CRC-064.

<sup>2</sup>All SRI Technical Reports listed are available through WWW from <http://www.cam.sri.com>