Towards Czech-Russian Parallel Treebank

Natalia Klyueva and David Mareček Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics Charles University in Prague

AEPC, Tartu, Estonia 2010

Outline

- Where it all started
- Treebanks PDT and SynTagRus
- Treebank compilement

Where it all started

- Rule-Based MT system between Czech and Russian "Česílko":
 - We had dictionary, parallel corpus, taggers
 - We wanted to have: syntactic transfer module
 - Create rules out of a head or use syntactically annotated treebanks?
- Related projects: PCEDT, SMULTRON
- Used annotated Russian data form the SynTagRus and generated dependency trees for a Czech text with the help of PDT tools

Two giants of syntactic information

• PDT for Czech

- 115,884 sentences from newspapers and journals
- Morphological, analytical and tectogrammatical levels of annotation
- I,500,000 words annotated on the analytical level
- tools for automatic processing of "raw" texts available

SynTagRus for Russian

- 32,000 sentences from newspaper articles, prose.
- 460,000 words with deep syntactic annotation
- SynTagRus is not an open-source

SynTagRus: a sentence visualized in sTred



PDT:a sentence visualized in Tred



Process of a Treebank Compilement

- Choose a portion of data from SynTagRus that is translated into Czech (Novel "The Faculty" by I. Grekova, 460 sentences annotated)
- Sentence and Word alignment
- Process the raw Czech text
- Convert SynTagRus format into PDT style
 - XML -> PML
 - Syntactic functions -> Afuns or functors from PDT

Processing the Czech text

tokenization

- tagging and lemmatization using Morce tagger
- parsing with McDonald's MST parser
- automatic conversion to tectogrammatical trees using mainly rule-based scripts, which are included in a TectoMT framework: <u>https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/tectomt/</u>

Processing the Russian text

- Format transfer of SynTagRus XML-based to Prague Markup Language (PML)
- Adapting annotation:
 - Russian tagset was left as it was
 - Transformation of Russian syntactic functions into Czech analytical/tectogrammatical functors

Format Transfer

CVTЬ</W>

«W DOM="1" FEAT="S ЕД МУЖ РОД НЕОД" ID="2" КЅNAME="ДОКУМЕНТ" LEMMA="ДОКУМЕНТ" LINK="КВАЗИАГЕНТ"> <HOM FEAT="S ED MYX POD HEOD" KSNAME="DOKYMEHT" LEMMA="DOKYMEHT"/> документа</\//> «W DOM=" root" FEAT="А КР ЕД ЖЕН" ID="3" KSNAME="ПРОСТОЙ1" LEMMA="ПРОСТОЙ"> <HOM FEAT="А КР ЕД ЖЕН" KSNAME="ПРОСТОЙ1" LEMMA="ПРОСТОЙ"/>

проста</W>:

W DOM="3" FEAT="V НЕСОВ ИЗЪЯВ НЕПРОШ ЕД 3-Л" ID="4" KSNAME="СОЗДАВАТЬСЯ" LEMMA="СОЗДАВАТЬСЯ" <how feat="v несов изъяв непрош ед 3-л" кsname="создаваться" Lemma="создаваться"/> <НОМ FEAT="V НЕСОВ СТРАД ИЗЪЯВ НЕПРОШ ЕД 3-Л" KSNAME="СОЗДАВАТЬ" LEMMA="СОЗДАВАТЬ"/>

создает ся</\/>

«W DOM="6" FEAT="ADV" ID="5" KSNAME="COBEPWEHHO" LEMMA="COBEPWEHHO" LINK="огранич"> <НОМ FEAT="А КР ЕД СРЕД" КЅΝАМЕ="СОВЕРШЕННЫЙ" LEMMA="СОВЕРШЕННЫЙ"/>

<HOM FEAT="ADV" KSNAME="COBEPWEHHO" LEMMA="COBEPWEHHO"/>

совершенно</W>

«W DOM="8" FEAT="A ED ЖЕН ИМ" ID="6" КУЛАМЕ="НОВЫЙ" LEMMA="НОВЫЙ" LINK="ONDED"> <ном FEAT="А ЕД ЖЕН ИМ" KSNAME="НОВЫЙ" LEMMA="НОВЫЙ"/>

новая</W>

✓W DOM="8" FEAT="А ЕД ЖЕН ИМ" ID="7" KSNAME="ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ" LEMMA="ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ" LINK="ОПС <ном FEAT="А ЕД ЖЕН ИМ" KSNAME="ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ" LEMMA="ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ"/>

государственная</W>

W DOM="4" FEAT="S ЕД ЖЕН ИМ НЕОД" ID="8" КSNAME="СТРУКТУРА" LEMMA="СТРУКТУРА" LINK="предик"> <HOM FEAT="S ED ЖЕН ИМ НЕОД" KSNAME="СТРУКТУРА" LEMMA="СТРУКТУРА"/>

структура</W>

«W DOM="10" FEAT="ADV" ID="9" KSNAME="ФОРМАЛЬНО" LEMMA="ФОРМАЛЬНО" LINK="ОБСТ"> <НОМ FEAT="А КР ЕД СРЕД" КЅNAME="ФОРМАЛЬНЫЙ" LEMMA="ФОРМАЛЬНЫЙ"/> <hom feat="adv" ksname="формально" lemma="формально"/>

<LM id="SRussianA-syntagrus-s5-w4">

<m>

<form>coздает cя</form>

<lemma>CO3ДABATьCЯ</lemma>

<tag>V НЕСОВ ИЗЪЯВ НЕПРОШ ЕД 3-Л</tag>

</m>

<ord>4</ord>

<children>

<LM id="SRussianA-syntagrus-s5-w8">

<m>

<form>crpykrypa</form>

<lemma>CTPYKTYPA</lemma>

<tag>S EД ЖЕН ИМ НЕОД</tag>

</m>

<ord>8</ord>

<children>

<LM id="SRussianA-syntagrus-s5-w6">

<m>

<form>HoBag</form>

<lemma>HOBЫЙ</lemma>

<tag>A EД ЖЕН ИМ</tag>

</m>

<ord>6</ord>

Morphological layer

- Morphological systems of Czech and Russian are very similar
- Czech: lemma + morphological tag, which has 15 positions filled with a morphological category:

• Russian: lemma + semi-positional tag:

Никто не хочет делиться с соседом НИКТО НЕ ХОТЕТЬ ДЕЛИТЬСЯ С СОСЕД S ЕД МУЖ ИМ ОД PART V НЕСОВ ИЗЪЯВ НЕПРОШ ЕД 3-Л V НЕСОВ ИНФ PR S ЕД МУЖ ТВОР ОД

Word Alignment

- Words in Czech and Russian sentences are automatically aligned with GIZA++(1-to-1)
- Word alignment was run on this corpus and a parallel Czech-Russian corpus (almost 100,000 sentences)
- 100 sentences from the treebank evaluated: precision = 85%

Analytical layer(1)

• For Russian:

- Syntactic functions(ru) are referred to corresponding analytical functions(cz):
 - Predicative *he reads*
 - 1-compl *translate a book*
 - Atributive *house we leave in*
 - Adverbial to be at home
 - Coord *milk and cream*
 - Auxiliary *will buy*

Pred Object Atv Adv Coord

Aux • 78 syntactic functions in SynTagRus, 23 afuns in PDT

 Incorrespondences: intersection with tectogrammatical layer

Analytical layer(2)



Tectogrammatical layer(1)

- Differences of annotation schemes:
 - The syntactic layer of annotation for Russian is more deep and semanticalized, and it is one layer.
 - PDT distincts shallow and deep syntax. Syntactic features belong to the analytical layer and more semantics ones to the tectogrammatical layer.
- Decision for the unmatching functors: rules
 - Ru: 1-compl in Acc. \rightarrow Cz: Patient,
 - Ru: 1-compl in Ins. \rightarrow Cz: Means.

Analytical and tectogrammatical layers



Comparison with PCEDT

• People:

- PCEDT : many people involved into a project
- Czech-Russian Treebank only 2.
- Corpus size: 53,000 vs. 460 sentences
- Translations:
 - PCEDT: as close to the original as possible
 - Czech-Russian: Novel translation
- What did help us: dependency based approach for both Czech and Russian Treebanks, languages' relatedness.

Conclusion and Plans for Future

- 460 sentences only a start. The treebank is suitable for comparative linguistic studies, not as the data for the Machine Translation
- A lot to improve:
 - Quality. Develop rules for tectogrammatical annotation
 - Quantity. Add new texts and even experiment with the automatic annotation of Czech-Russian corpus

Thank you