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In this chapter, we deal with two types of Czech verbal MWEs: light verb constructions and verbal idiomatic constructions. Many verbal MWEs are characterized by the possibility of being paraphrased by single words. We explore paraphrasability of Czech verbal MWEs by single verbs in a semiautomatic experiment using word embeddings. Further, we propose a lexicographic representation of the obtained paraphrases enriched with morphological, syntactic and semantic information. We demonstrate one of its practical application in a machine translation experiment.

1 Introduction

Multiword expressions (MWEs) are widely acknowledged as a serious challenge for both foreign speakers and many NLP tasks (Sag et al. 2002). Out of various MWEs, those that involve verbs are of great significance as verbs represent the syntactic center of a sentence. Baldwin & Kim (2010) distinguish the following four types of verbal MWEs:

- verb-particle constructions (also referred to as particle verbs, or phrasal verbs), e.g., catch up, put on, swallow down;
• prepositional verbs, e.g., come across, refer to;

• light-verb constructions (also referred to as verb-complement pairs, or support verb constructions), e.g., do a report, give a kiss, make an attempt;

• verb-noun idiomatic constructions (also referred to as VP idioms), e.g., spill the beans, pull strings, shoot the breeze.

In this chapter, we focus on two particular types of Czech verbal MWEs: light-verb constructions (LVCs) and idiomatic verbal constructions (IVCs) as they also represent MWEs in Czech in contrast to the first two types that are primarily expressed as single prefixed verbs.

We explore the possibility of expressing these two types of MWEs by single synonymous verbs, which is considered to be one of their prototypical features, see e.g. Chafe (1968) and Fillmore et al. (1988). The motivation for this work lies in the fact that paraphrases greatly assist in a wide range of NLP applications such as information retrieval (Wallis 1993), machine translation (Madnani & Dorr 2013; Callison-Burch et al. 2006; Marton et al. 2009) or machine translation evaluation (Kauchak & Barzilay 2006; Zhou et al. 2006; Barančíková et al. 2014).

The content of this chapter is an extended version of Barančíková & Kettnerová (2017). In addition, it is further explored with IVCs and linguistic properties of LVCs and IVCs relevant to the paraphrasing task are discussed in detail. The new version of the dictionary of paraphrases is larger and it provides a more elaborated set of morphological, syntactic and semantic features, including information on aspects and aspectual counterparts of verbs.

This chapter is structured as follows. First, linguistic properties of LVCs and IVCs are discussed (§2) and related work on their paraphrases is introduced. Second, a paraphrasing model is proposed, namely the selection of LVCs and IVCs, an automatic extraction of candidates for their paraphrases and their manual evaluation are described in detail (§3). Third, the resulting data and their representation in a dictionary of paraphrases are introduced (§4). Finally, in order to present one of the many practical applications of this dictionary, a random sample of paraphrases of LVCs is used in a machine translation experiment (§5).

2 Linguistic properties of LVCs and IVCs

Both LVCs and IVCs represent verbal multiword units: they are composed of separate words that, however, refer to an extralinguistic reality as a whole. Their
linguistic properties relevant for their paraphrasability by single verbs are introduced below.

### 2.1 Light-verb constructions

The theoretical research on light-verb constructions is characterized by an enormous diversity in terms and analyses used, see esp. Amberber et al. (2010) and Alsina et al. (1997). Here, we use the term LVC for a multiword unit within which the verb – not retaining its full semantic content – provides grammatical functions and to which the main predicative content is contributed by a noun; as a result, such a multiword unit serves as a single predicative unit, see e.g. Algeo (1995), Alsina et al. (1997) and Butt (2010).\(^1\) In contrast to IVCs, predicative nouns in LVCs have the same meanings as in nominal structures, meanings of light verbs are rather impoverished when compared with their full verb counterparts, see §2.2.

In the Czech language, the central type of LVCs are represented by LVCs in which predicative nouns are expressed as a direct or indirect object of a light verb (e.g., *dostat strach* ‘to get fear’ ⇒ ‘to become afraid’, *vzdát úctu* ‘to pay tribute’, and *vyvolat pobouření* ‘to provoke indignation’ ⇒ ‘to cause uproar’). The LVCs in which a predicative noun occupies an adverbial of the light verb, (e.g., *dát do pořádku* ‘to put in order’, *mít pod kontrolou* ‘to have under control’, *mít na starosti* ‘to have on care’ ⇒ ‘to be responsible’) are more syntactically and morphologically fixed than the central type of LVCs (Radimský 2010).

As single predicative units, most LVCs have their single predicative counterparts by which they can be paraphrased. A single verb paraphrase can be either morphologically related, or non-related with the predicative noun representing the nominal component of the paraphrased LVC. For example, the LVCs *dát políbek* and *dát pusu* ‘give a kiss’ can be both paraphrased by the verb *políbit* ‘to kiss’, which is morphologically related only with the nominal component of the first LVC. There is no synonymous verb morphologically related to the nominal component of the second LVC.

In contrast to their single predicative paraphrases, LVCs manifest greater flexibility in their modification, compare e.g. adjectival modifiers of the LVC *dát políbek* ‘give a kiss’ and the corresponding adverbial modifiers of its single verb paraphrase *políbit* ‘to kiss’: *dát vášnivý/něžný/letmý/manželský/majový/smrtící políbek* ‘give a passionate/tender/fleeting/marriage/May/fatal kiss’ vs. *vášnivé/...\(^1\)Besides predicative nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs can also serve as predicative elements. These cases are left aside here.
něžně/letmo/*manželsky/*májově/*smrtně políbit ‘to kiss passionately/tenderly/fleetingly/marriagely/Mayly/?fatally’. Easier modification of LVCs is often considered a motivation for their use (Brinton & Akimoto 1999).

Another motivation lies in the possibility to structure the expressed event in a more subtle way than what single verbs allow. For example, in Czech various combinations of the grammatical aspect of light verbs and the number of predicative nouns allow for the expression of several meanings that cannot be expressed with single verbs; these cases require lexical modification, see Table 1.

Finally, in many cases, the selection of different light verbs allows for per-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LVC</th>
<th>Single verb paraphrase</th>
<th>Lexical modification</th>
<th>Example$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| sg & pf | pf                   | no                   | Petr dal Janě polibek.  
‘Peter gave a kiss to Jane.’  
$\sim$ Petr Janu políbil.  
‘Peter kissed Jane.’ |
| pl & impf | impf               | no                   | Petr dával Janě polibky.  
‘Peter gave kisses to Jane.’  
$\sim$ Petr Janu líbal.  
‘Peter was kissing Jane.’ |
| pl & pf | pf                   | yes                  | Petr dal Janě polibky.  
‘Peter gave several kisses to Jane.’  
$\sim$ Petr Janu několikrát políbil.  
‘Peter kissed Jane several times.’ |
| sg & impf | impf               | yes                  | Petr Janě dával polibek.  
‘Peter was giving a kiss to Jane.’  
$\sim$ Petr Janu právě líbal.  
‘Peter was just kissing Jane.’ |

---

$^a$Let us emphasize that the single verb paraphrases of the last two combinations require to be lexically modified – by the words několikrát ‘several times’ and právě ‘just’, respectively.
spectivization of the expressed event from the point of view of its different participants, see esp. Kettnerová & Lopatková (2015). For example, besides the light verb *dát* ‘to give’, the noun *polibek* ‘kiss’ can select the light verb *dostat* ‘to get’ as well. The LVC *dát polibek* ‘to give a kiss’ promotes a kisser in the subject position while the LVC *dostat polibek* ‘to get a kiss’ puts a kissee into this position. Both these LVCs are paraphrasable by a single verb *políbit* ‘to kiss’, however, with different values of the grammatical voice: the LVC *dát polibek* ‘to give a kiss’ can be paraphrased by the verb *políbit* ‘to kiss’ in the active voice (e.g., *Petr dal Janě polibek.* ‘Peter gave a kiss to Jane.’ ~ *Petr Janu políbil.* ‘Peter kissed Jane.’) while the LVC *dostat polibek* ‘to get a kiss’ requires the passive voice of the verb *políbit* ‘to kiss’ (e.g., *Jana dostala od Petra polibek.* ‘Jane got a kiss from Peter.’ ~ *Jana byla políbena od Petra.* ‘Jane was kissed by Peter.’)

**LVCs in NLP.** One of the trending topics concerning LVCs in the NLP community is their automatic identification. In this task, various statistical measures often combined with information on syntactic and/or semantic properties of LVCs are employed, see e.g. Bannard (2007) and Fazly et al. (2005). The automatic detection benefits especially from parallel corpora representing valuable sources of data in which LVCs can be automatically recognized via word alignment, see e.g. Chen et al. (2015), de Medeiros Caseli et al. (2010), Sinha (2009), Zarrieß & Kuhn (2009). However, work on paraphrasing LVCs is still not extensive. For example, a paraphrasing model has been proposed within the Meaning↔Text Theory (Žolkovskij & Mel’čuk 1965); its representation of LVCs by means of lexical functions and rules applied in the paraphrasing model are thoroughly described in Alonso-Ramos (2007). Further, Fujita et al. (2004) presents a paraphrasing model which takes advantage of semantic representation of LVCs by lexical conceptual structures. As with our method proposed in §3, their model also takes into account several morphological and syntactic features of LVCs, which have turned out to be highly relevant for the paraphrasing task.

### 2.2 Idiomatic Verbal Constructions

Despite their low frequency, IVCs form a substantial part of a lexis, see e.g. Baldwin & Kim (2010), Sag et al. (2002) and Cowie (2001). Similarly to LVCs, definitions of idioms vary depending on diverse purposes of their description, see e.g. Healy (1968), Fraser (1970), van der Linden (1992) and Nunberg et al. (1994).

Here, we define an IVC as a verbal multiword unit that exhibits strong lexical co-occurrence restrictions so that at least one of its parts cannot be used with
the same meaning outside the given multiword unit. The idiomatic meaning of individual components of IVCs is reflected in the fact that they are only rarely interchangeable with words of similar meanings. IVCs thus represent highly conventionalized multiword units, see e.g. Everaert et al. (2014), Granger & Meunier (2008) and Cowie (2001). IVCs can exhibit the following specific properties, see e.g. Burger et al. (2007), Čermák (2001) and Everaert et al. (2014):

- markedness at the syntactic and/or morphological level: e.g., 
  \[\text{vzít za své} \Rightarrow \text{‘to be no more’} \] 
  (syntactically marked as the reflexive adjective \(\text{své} \) does not modify any noun), and 
  \[\text{nalít někomu čistého vín} \Rightarrow \text{‘to tell someone the honest truth’} \] 
  (morphologically marked due to the partitive genitive of the noun \(\text{vín} \) ‘wine’, which is highly restricted in contemporary Czech);

- figuration: e.g., 
  \[\text{vstát z mrtvých} \Rightarrow \text{‘raise the dead’} \] 
  (as it involves a metaphor), 
  \[\text{pověsit se někomu na krk} \Rightarrow \text{‘to hang around someone’s neck’} \] 
  (as it involves a metonymy);

- fixedness at syntactic and/or morphological level: e.g., 
  \[\text{postavit někoho na nohy} \Rightarrow \text{‘to put someone back on his feet’} \] 
  (syntactically fixed as it cannot be transformed into the passive structure), and 
  \[\text{přijít na jiné myšlenky} \Rightarrow \text{‘to find something else to think about’} \] 
  (morphologically fixed as the noun \(\text{myšlenka} \) ‘idea’ can have only the plural form);

- proverbiality: IVCs are typically used for recurrent socially significant situations, implying often their subjective evaluation (e.g., 
  \[\text{vidět někomu do duše} \Rightarrow \text{‘to see right through someone’} \] );

- informality: IVCs are typically of informal register (e.g., 
  \[\text{strčit si něco za klobouk} \Rightarrow \text{‘to stick it up one’s jumper’} \] ).

Some IVCs can be paraphrased by a single word verb, see e.g. the IVC \(\text{podat někomu pomocnou ruku} \Rightarrow \text{‘to give someone helping hand’} \) and its single verb paraphrase \text{pomoci} ‘to help’. However, many IVCs are paraphrasable rather by a whole syntactic structure, see e.g. the IVC \(\text{mít slovo} \Rightarrow \text{‘to have a word’} \) ⇒ ‘to be someone’s turn to speak’.

**IVCs in NLP.** There is considerable work focused on automatic identification of idioms in the text and their extraction (Cook et al. 2007; Li & Sporleder 2009;
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Muzny & Zettlemoyer 2013; Peng et al. 2015; Katz 2006). However, little attention has been paid to paraphrases of idioms. Let us introduce two works focused on paraphrases of idioms. First, Pershina et al. (2015) identifies synonymous idioms based on their dictionary definitions and their occurrences in tweets. Similarly, Liu & Hwa (2016) generate paraphrases of idioms using dictionary entries. However, there are no lexical resources available for NLP applications providing information on idioms in Czech.

3 Paraphrase model

In this section, the process of extracting paraphrases is described in detail. First, we present the selection of LVCs and IVCs (§3.1). For their paraphrasing, we had initially intended to use some of the existing resources, however, they turned out to be completely unsatisfactory for our task.

First, we used the Paraphrase DataBase (PPDB) (Ganitkevitch & Callison-Burch 2014), the largest paraphrase database available for the Czech language. PPDB was created automatically from large parallel data. Unfortunately, there were only 54 candidates for single verb paraphrases of LVCs present. A manual analysis of these candidates showed that only 2 of them were detected correctly, the rest was noise in PPDB. Similarly for idioms, PPDB contained a correct single verb paraphrase for only 6 IVCs from our data (i.e. about 1%). As this number is clearly insufficient, we chose not to use parallel data for paraphrasing.

Therefore, we adopted another approach to the paraphrasing task applying word2vec (Mikolov et al. 2013), a neural network model. Word2vec is a group of shallow neural networks generating word embeddings, i.e. representations of words in a continuous vector space depending on the contexts in which they appear. In line with the distributional hypothesis (Harris 1954), semantically similar words are mapped close to each other (measured by the cosine similarity) so we can expect LVCs and IVCs to have similar vector space distribution to their single verb paraphrases.

Word2vec computes vectors for single tokens. As both LVCs and IVCs represent multiword units, their preprocessing was thus necessary: each LVC and IVC had to be first identified and connected into a single token (§3.2). Particular settings of our model for an automatic extraction of candidates for single verb paraphrases are described in §3.3.

The advantage of this approach is that only monolingual data – generally easily obtainable in a large amount – is necessary for word embeddings training. The disadvantage is that not only paraphrases can have similar word embeddings.
Antonyms and words with more specific or even different meaning can appear in similar contexts as well. Therefore, a manual evaluation of the extracted candidates is necessary (§3.4).

3.1 Data selection

3.1.1 LVCs selection

Three different datasets of LVCs – containing together 2,389 unique LVCs\textsuperscript{2} – were used in our experiment. As all the datasets were manually created, they allow us to achieve the desired quality of the resulting data.

The first dataset resulted from the experiment examining the native speakers’ agreement on the interpretation of light verbs (Kettnerová et al. 2013). This dataset consists of both LVCs in which predicative nouns are expressed as a direct or indirect object by a prepositionless case (e.g. \textit{položit otázku} ‘put a question’) and LVCs in which predicative nouns are expressed as an adverbial by a simple prepositional case (e.g., \textit{dát do pořádku} ‘put in order’) or by a complex prepositional group (e.g., the verb \textit{přejít} ‘go’ plus the complex prepositional group \textit{ze smíchu do pláče} ‘from laughing to crying’).

The second dataset resulted from a project aiming to enhance the high coverage valency lexicon of Czech verbs VALLEX\textsuperscript{3} with the information on LVCs (Kettnerová et al. 2016). In this case, only the predicative nouns expressed as the direct object by the prepositionless accusative were selected. For identification of LVCs, the modified test of coreference was applied (Kettnerová & Bejček 2016). As the frequency and saliency have been taken as the main criteria for their selection, the resulting set represents a valuable source of LVCs for Czech.

The third small dataset is represented by LVCs in which the predicative noun is expressed as an adverbial. These LVCs were obtained from the VALLEX lexicon as a result of manual analysis of verbal multiword units marked as idioms. As these multiword units were treated inconsistently in the annotation, including not only IVCs but sometimes also LVCs with predicative nouns in adverbial positions, the obtained dataset had to be manually selected.

As in the VALLEX lexicon, information on aspectual counterparts of the given verbs is available, we have used it to expand these datasets by adding missing aspectual counterparts. The overall number of LVCs in the datasets is presented below in Table 2. The union of LVCs from these datasets has been used in the paraphrase candidates extraction task.

\textsuperscript{2}When counting aspectual counterparts separately, the number increases to 3,509 unique LVCs

\textsuperscript{3}http://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/vallex/3.0/
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3.1.2 IVCs selection

The dataset of IVCs was extracted from the VALLEX lexicon after the manual filtering of LVCs with predicative nouns in adverbial positions, see the third dataset in §3.1.1. From the obtained IVCs, those IVCs that include the highly polysemous pronoun *to* ‘it’ were removed as their automatic identification could be unreliable. The final set consists of 595 IVCs (counting aspectual counterparts separately 621 IVCs), see the statistics provided in Table 2.

Table 2: The number of LVCs and IVCs, verbs and nominal components in the three datasets described in §3.1.1, before (first number) and after (second number) the aspectual counterparts expansion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>LVCs</th>
<th>IVCs</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Nominal components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>726/1,167</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>49/84</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>1,640/2,366</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>126/131</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>104/106</td>
<td>595/621</td>
<td>310/324</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>2,389/3,509</td>
<td>595/621</td>
<td>417/446</td>
<td>1444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* The numbers do not add up due to a small overlap among the datasets.

3.2 Data preprocessing

We used four large lemmatized and POS-tagged corpora of Czech texts: SYN2000 (Čermák et al. 2000), SYN2005 (Čermák et al. 2005), SYN2010 (Křen et al. 2010) and CzEng 1.0 (Bojar et al. 2011). These corpora were further extended with the data from the Czech Press – a large collection of contemporary news texts containing more than 2,000 million lemmatized and POS-tagged tokens. The overall statistics on all datasets is presented in Table 3.

To generate LVCs and IVCs paraphrases, all the selected LVCs and IVCs (§3.1) had to be automatically identified in the given corpora. For their identification, we started with verbs. First, all verbs in the corpora were detected. From these verbs, only those verbs that represent parts of the selected LVCs and IVCs were further processed. For each selected verb, each noun phrase in the context ± 4 words from the given verb was identified based on POS tags and extracted in case the verb and the given noun phrase can combine in some of the selected LVCs or IVCs.

Further, as word embeddings are generated for single words, each detected noun phrase was connected with its respective verb into a single word unit. In
cases where some verb could combine with more than one noun phrase into LVCs or IVCs, or in cases where a particular noun phrase could be connected with more than one verb, we followed the principle that every verb should be connected to at least one noun phrase in order to maximize the number of identified LVCs and IVCs. For example, if there were two verbs $v_1$ and $v_2$ in a sentence and $v_1$ had a candidate noun phrase $c_1$, while $v_2$ had two candidate noun phrases $c_1$ and $c_2$, $v_1$ was connected with $c_1$ and $v_2$ with $c_2$. In case this principle was not sufficient, a verb was assigned the closest noun phrase on the basis of word order. When each noun phrase was connected maximally with one verb and each verb was connected maximally with one noun phrase, we have joined the noun phrases to their respective verbs into single word units with the underscore character and deleted the noun phrases from their original positions in sentences.

Further, to compensate sparsity of LVCs and IVCs in the data, after identifying a verb from the selected LVCs and IVCs in the data, its aspectual counterpart – if relevant – has been automatically added. For example, after detecting the imperfective verb $vcházet^{\text{impf}}$ ‘enter’ in the data and the prepositional noun phrase $do\ dějin$ ‘to history’ in its context, not only the given imperfective verb, but also its perfective counterpart $vejít^{\text{pf}}$ have been connected with the given noun phrase into the resulting unit $vcházet\_vejít\_do\_dějin$. We refer to such an artificially constructed unit as an abstract unit from now on. The abstract unit $vcházet\_vejít\_do\_dějin$ then replaced the verb $vcházet$ in the sentence, while the noun phrase $do\ dějin$ was deleted from the sentence. Each LVC and IVC identified in the data is thus represented by a single abstract unit representing also its relevant aspectual counterparts.

On this basis, almost 7 million instances of LVC and IVC abstract units were generated in the corpora, see Table 4. The rank and frequency of the most and the least common ones are presented in Table 5.
Table 4: The number of LVCs and IVCs detected in the data. The first row shows the total number of LVC and IVC abstract units identified in the data. The second row represents the number of their unique instances. The third row provides the number of those unique units with higher frequency than 100 occurrences. The last row shows the number of unique LVCs and IVCs without aspectual counterparts expansion, i.e. after splitting the generated abstract units back to a single verb–a single noun phrase pairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LVCs</th>
<th>IVCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abstract units</td>
<td>6,541,394</td>
<td>374,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique abstract units</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique abstract units &gt; 100</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique MWEs</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: The ranking of LVC and IVC abstract units identified in the data, based on their frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>abstract unit</th>
<th>frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>LVC</td>
<td>mít_problém</td>
<td>211,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'have a problem'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>LVC</td>
<td>mít_možnost</td>
<td>207,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'have a possibility'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>mít_na_mysli</td>
<td>43,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'have in mind'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>chytnout_chytat_chytit_za_špatný_konec</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'get hold of the wrong end of the stick'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>LVC</td>
<td>přechodit_přecházet_přejít_ze_smíchu_do_pláče</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'go from laughing to crying'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Paraphrases of VMWEs: the case of Czech light verbs and idioms
3.3 Word2vec model

To the resulting data, we applied gensim, a freely available word2vec implementation (Řehůřek & Sojka 2010). In particular, we used a model of vector size 500 with continuous bag of word (CBOW) training algorithm and negative sampling.

As it is impossible for the model to learn anything about a rarely seen word, we set a minimum number of word occurrences to 100 in order to limit the size of the vocabulary to reasonable words. Even though we increased frequencies of LVCs and IVCs by the unified representation for their aspectual counterparts, this limit still filtered more than 300 rarely used LVC and 50 IVC abstract units; the resulting number is provided in the third row of Table 4.

After training the model, for each of 1,361 LVC and 153 IVC abstract units with more than 100 occurrences we extracted 30 words with the most similar vectors. From these 30 words, we selected up to 15 single verbs closest to a given LVC or IVC abstract unit. These verbs were taken as candidates for single verb paraphrases of LVCs or IVCs in that abstract unit. On average, there were 7 candidates for each LVC abstract unit and 10 candidates for each IVC abstract unit.

Before the manual evaluation of the candidates, the abstract units were divided back to individual IVCs or LVCs and their paraphrase candidates were again enriched with their aspectual counterparts from the VALLEX lexicon. This way, annotators could select a paraphrase with a proper aspect for each verbal MWE.

3.4 Annotation process

In this section, the annotation process of the candidates for single verb paraphrases of LVCs and IVCs is thoroughly described. Let us repeat that word2vec generates semantically similar words depending on the context in which they appear. However, not only words having the same meaning can have similar space representations, but words with an opposite meaning, more specific meaning or even different meaning can be extracted as they can appear in similar contexts as well. Manual processing of the extracted single verbs was thus necessary for evaluating the results of the adopted method.

In the manual evaluation, two annotators were asked to indicate for each instance of the unique paraphrase candidates of an LVC or IVC whether it represents a single verb paraphrase of the given LVC or IVC, or not. For example, the single word verbs upřednostňovat and preferovat ‘to prefer’ were indicated as paraphrases of the LVC dávat přednost ‘to give a preference’. Similarly, for the IVC prásknout do bot ‘to bang to the shoes’ ⇒ ‘to take to one’s heels’, the single verbs utéci ‘to run away’ and zdrhnout ‘to make off’ among others were chosen as paraphrases.
Moreover, single verbs antonymous to LVCs or IVCs were marked as well since they can also function as paraphrases in a modified context. For example, for the LVC *vypovídat pravdu* ‘to tell the truth’ the antonymous verb *lhát* ‘to lie’ was selected as well, as the sentence *Nevypovídá pravdu.* ‘He is not telling the truth.’ can be paraphrased as *Lže.* ‘He is lying.’

Further, when the annotators determined a certain candidate as a single verb paraphrase of an LVC or IVC, they took into account the following four morphological, syntactic and semantic aspects.

First, they had to pay special attention to the morphosyntactic expression of arguments. As Czech encodes syntactic relations via morphological forms, changes in the morphological expression of arguments reflect different perspectives from which the event denoted by an LVC or IVC on the one hand and its single verb paraphrase on the other hand is viewed. For example, the single verb *potrestat* ‘to punish’ paraphrases the LVC *dostat trest* ‘to get a punishment’, however, the morphological forms of the punisher and the punishee, two semantic roles evoked by the given LVC and the single verb, differ. In the LVC *dostat trest* ‘to get punishment’, the punishee (*Petr* ‘Peter’) is expressed by the nominative and the punisher (*otec* ‘father’) has the form of the prepositional group *od*+genitive (e.g., *Petr*<sub>nom</sub> *dostal od otece*<sub>od+gen</sub> *trest*. ‘Peter got punishment from his father.’), while with its single verb paraphrase *potrestat* ‘to punish’ the nominative encodes the punisher and the accusative expresses the punishee (e.g., *otec*<sub>nom</sub> *Petra*<sub>acc</sub> *potrestal.* ‘Father punished Peter.’).

Second, the annotators had to take into account differences between the syntactic structure of a sentence created by an LVC or IVC and by its respective paraphrase. Particularly, the difference between sentences with a subject and subjectless sentences had to be indicated. For example, the LVC *dojít k oddělení* ‘to happen to the separation’ ⇒ ‘the separation happens’ is paraphrasable by the single verb *oddělit se* ‘to separate’, although the LVC forms a subjectless structure, the syntactic structure of its single verb paraphrase needs a subject.

Third, in some cases the reflexive morpheme *se/si*, marking usually intransitive verbs, has to be added to a single verb paraphrase so that its meaning corresponds to a meaning of its respective multiword counterpart. For example, the IVC *vejít do dějin* ‘to come into history’ ⇒ ‘to go down in history’ can be paraphrased by the verb *proslavit* only on the condition that the reflexive morpheme *se* is attached to the verb lemma *proslavit* se ‘to achieve fame’.

Lastly, some verbs function as paraphrases of particular LVCs or IVCs only if nouns in these LVCs or IVCs have certain adjectival modifications. These paraphrases were paired with appropriate adjectives during the annotation. For ex-
ample, if the LVC provozovat praxi ‘to run a practice’ is to be paraphrased by the single verb ordinovat ‘to see patients’, the adjective lékařský ‘medical’ has to modify the noun praxe ‘practice’.

The above given four features are not mutually exclusive – they can combine. For example, the verb zaměstnat ‘to hire’ is a paraphrase of the LVC nalézt uplatnění ‘to find an use’ but both the reflexive morpheme se and the adjectival modification pracovní ‘working’ are required.

To summarize, for each identified single verb paraphrase \( v \) of an LVC or IVC \( l \), the annotators have chosen from the following options:

- \( v \) is a paraphrase of \( l \)
  e.g., mit zájem ‘to be interested’ and chtít ‘to want’;

- \( v \) is an antonym of \( l \) (the modification of the context is necessary)
  e.g., zaznamenat propad ‘to experience a drop’ and stoupnout ‘to rise’;

- \( v \) is a paraphrase of \( l \) but changes in the morphosyntactic expression of arguments are necessary
  e.g., dostat nabídku ‘to get an offer’ and nabídnout ‘to offer’;

- \( v \) is a paraphrase of \( l \) but the change in a sentence structure is required
  e.g., dojít k poruše ‘to happen to the failure’ ⇒ ‘the failure happens’ and porouchat se ‘to breakdown’;

- \( v \) is a paraphrase of \( l \) but the modification of the verb lemma by the reflexive morpheme se/si is necessary
  e.g., nést název ‘bear a name’ and nazývat se ‘to be called’;

- \( v \) is a paraphrase of \( l \) only if a noun component of \( l \) is modified by a particular adjectival modification
  e.g., podat oznámení ‘to make an announcement’ can be paraphrased as žalovat ‘to sue’ only if the noun oznámení is modified with the adjective trestní ‘criminal’;

- \( v \) is a not a paraphrase of \( l \).

As a result of the annotation, for 1,421 of 2,954 LVCs identified in the data (48.1%) and for 200 of 353 IVCs (56.6%) at least one single verb paraphrase was found. The highest number of single verb paraphrases indicated for one multi-word unit was nine and that was the LVC provést řez ‘to make an incision’ and the LVC dát do pořádku ‘to put in order’. The total number of the indicated single
verb paraphrases of LVCs and IVCs was 2,912 and 498, respectively, see Table 6 providing results of the annotation including the frequency of the additional morphological, syntactic and semantic features used in the annotation.

Table 6: The basic statistics on the annotation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>LVC</th>
<th>IVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no constraints</td>
<td>2063</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ antonymous</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ reflexive morpheme</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ morphosyntactic change</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ syntactic change</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ an adjective</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>2912</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Dictionary of paraphrases

3,410 single verbs indicated by the annotators as paraphrases or antonyms of 1,421 LVCs and 200 IVCs (§3.4) form the lexical stock of ParaDi 2.0, a dictionary of single verb paraphrases of Czech multiword units of the selected types.5

The format of ParaDi 2.0 has been designed with respect to both human and machine readability. The dictionary is thus represented as a plain table in the TSV format, as it is a flexible and language-independent data format.

Each lexical entry in the dictionary describes an individual LVC or IVC, providing the following information:

(i) type – the type of the given verbal multiword expression with the following three possible values: LVC (indicating an LVC with the predicative noun in the direct or indirect object position), ILVC (representing an LVC with the predicative noun in the adverbial position), or IVC;

(ii) verb – a lemma of the verbal component of the given multiword unit;

(iii) reflexive – the reflexive morpheme of the lemma, if relevant;

4 The columns do not add up as the features are not mutually exclusive as mentioned earlier.

5 ParaDi 2.0 is freely available at the following URL: http://hdl.handle.net/11234/1-2377.
While the information provided in the columns (i)-(viii) concerns multiword units, the information given in (ix)-(xiii) is relevant for their single verb paraphrases. A single verb paraphrase can appear in several columns if it is relevant. For example, the verb paraphrase zalíbit se ‘to find appealing’ of the LVC nalézt zalíbení ‘to find a delight’ ⇒ ‘to find appealing’ is present in both columns reflexive and voice_change as it represents the verb paraphrase, which requires both adding the reflexive morpheme se to the verb lemma and changes in the morphosyntactic expression of its arguments.

5 Machine translation experiment

In this section, we show how the dictionary providing high quality data can be integrated into an experiment with improving statistical machine translation quality. If translated separately, multiword expressions often cause errors in machine translation. For example, IVCs have been reported to negatively affect statistical machine translation systems which might achieve only half of the BLEU score (Papineni et al. 2002) on the sentences containing IVCs compared to those that do not (Salton et al. 2014).
We took advantage of the ParaDi dictionary in a machine translation experiment in order to verify its benefit for one of the key NLP tasks. We experimented only with LVCs as we expected quality of LVC translations higher than those of IVCs due to their weaker lexical markedness and their more common use as their higher frequencies in the data suggested (see Table 4).

We selected 50 random LVCs from the dictionary. For each of them, we randomly extracted one sentence from our data containing the given LVC. This set of sentences is referred to as BEFORE. By substituting the LVC for its first paraphrase, i.e. the closest paraphrase in the vector space, we have created a new dataset, referred to as AFTER. We have translated both these datasets – BEFORE and AFTER – to English using two freely available MT systems – *Google Translate*\(^6\) (GT) and *Moses*.\(^7\)

We used crowdsourcing for evaluation of the resulting translations. Six annotators were presented randomly a Czech source sentence either from the dataset BEFORE or from AFTER and their English translations in a randomized order. The annotation interface is displayed in Figure 1. For each translated sentence, the annotators had to indicate its quality, allowing for the same ranking of more than one translated sentences.

We collected almost 300 comparisons. The inter-annotator agreement measured by Krippendorff’s alpha (Krippendorff 2007), a reliability coefficient developed to measure the agreement between judges, has achieved 0.58, i.e. a moder-

---

\(^6\)http://translate.google.com
\(^7\)http://quest.ms.mff.cuni.cz/moses/demo.php
ate agreement. The results of replacing the selected verbal MWEs by their single verb paraphrases in machine translation are very promising: annotators clearly preferred translations of AFTER (i.e. the translations with single verbs) to BEFORE (i.e. with LVCs), in 45% of cases for Moses and in 44% of cases for Google Translate. The results are consistent for both translation systems, see Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Moses</th>
<th>GT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTER</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIE</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the example in Table 8 illustrates that even minimal change in a source sentence can substantially change its translations as both the translation models are phrase-based. Based on this fact, we can expect that the evaluation of the translations was not affected only by differences between translations of LVCs and their respective single verb paraphrases but by overall low quality of the translations, which is inevitably reflected in the lower inter-annotator agreement, typical of machine translation evaluation (Bojar et al. 2013). The judges unanimously agreed that the translations of the AFTER source sentence are better than the translations of the BEFORE source sentence. Both systems exhibited a tendency to translate the LVC *dáť branku* literally word by word, resulting in incorrect translations of the BEFORE source sentence.

6 Conclusion

We have explored the paraphrasability of Czech light-verb constructions and idiomatic verbal constructions. We have shown that their single verb paraphrases are automatically obtainable from large monolingual data with a manual verification in a significantly larger scale than from paraphrase tables generated from parallel data. Our semiautomatic experiment further revealed that although these verbal multiword units exhibit different linguistic properties, the possibility to...
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Table 8: An example of translated sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>BEFORE</th>
<th>AFTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>Fotbalisté Budějovic opět nedali branku</td>
<td>Fotbalisté Budějovic opět neskórovali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Footballers of Budějovice didn’t make a goal again.’</td>
<td>‘Footballers of Budějovice didn’t score again.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTER</td>
<td>Footballers Budějovice again did.not.give gate</td>
<td>Footballers Budějovice again did.not.score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT</td>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>Footballers Budejovice again not given goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFTER</td>
<td>Footballers did not score again Budejovice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>Footballers Budějovice again gave the gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFTER</td>
<td>Footballers Budějovice score again</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paraphrase them is very similar; for about one half of the selected light-verb constructions and idiomatic verbal constructions single verb paraphrases have been detected.

The results of our experiment form the lexical stock of a new version of the freely available ParaDi dictionary. We have demonstrated one of its possible applications, namely an experiment with improving machine translation quality. However, the dictionary can be used in many other NLP tasks (text simplification, information retrieval, etc.). We have used largely language independent methods, a similar dictionary can be thus created for other languages as well.
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GT</td>
<td>Google Translate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVCS</td>
<td>idiomatic verbal constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVCS</td>
<td>light-verb constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Machine Translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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