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Abstract

Language resources can be classified under several categories. To be able to query and operate on all (or most of) these categories using a single digital tool would be very helpful for a large number of researchers working on languages. We describe such a tool in this paper. It is different from other such tools in that it allows querying and transformation on different kinds of resources (such as corpora, lexicon and language models) with the same framework. Search options can be given based on the kind of resource being queried. It is possible to select a matched resource and open it for editing in the specialized interfaces with which that resource is associated. The tool also allows the extracted or modified data to be saved separately, apart from having the usual facilities like displaying the results in KeyWord-In-Context (KWIC) format. We also present the notation used for querying and transformation, which is comparable to but different from the Corpus Query Language (CQL).

1. Introduction

Language resources form the backbone of Natural Language Processing (NLP) and many other disciplines. As the number of types, size and complexity of these resources increases, it becomes harder to keep track of all these resources and to access them. Researchers might also be interested in finding similar documents or linguistic units in all the resources available. This scenario brings out the urgent requirement for an integrated tool for accessing language resources (Singh, 2006). Such a tool should not only allow search and browsing, it should also allow them to be transformed in various ways, either in place or via a copy. If this tool could be connected to other tools and interfaces, then its usefulness will be further enhanced. We describe such a tool in this paper.

There have been previous attempts at building a general tool for accessing language resources, but the focus usually was on certain kinds of resources, say either corpora (Cunningham et al., 2000; Cunningham et al., 2003; Novák, 2007; Mirosk, 2006) or lexicon (Havasi et al., 2005; Lenci et al., 2000). The variety of resources handled by the tool described in this paper is more than most of the other tools.

To give one example, language models, though very useful language resources, have not been included in the list of resources handled by the other resource access tools. There are tools for compiling language models (Stolcke, 2002), but not for browsing or querying them.

One of the tools that is perhaps the most similar to the tool being described here is Sketch Engine\(^1\). It provides a wide variety of functionalities to access corpora. Some of these are:

- Searching word, lemma, root, POS tag of current word
- Left and right context upto a window size of 15
- A GUI to specify these options
- One can also directly give a CQL query.

This is similar to Jaxe\(^2\), where one can provide XPath directly or use a GUI for providing attributes and values which get converted to an XPath based query internally.

Apart from CQL based querying, another usual practice is to have a query tool for syntactically annotated corpora such that the data is converted internally to relational database and the query is written using SQL (Kallmeyer, 2000). Yet another tool TigerSearch\(^3\) is also meant for linguistically annotated corpora.

The tool that we describe here is meant to be an integrated digital tool for accessing various kinds of language resources such as corpora, lexicon and language models. It allows resources to be searched in batch mode with many useful options and conditions. The resources currently handled include raw text, syntactically annotated corpora, corpora in XML format, bilingual dictionaries and n-gram models of various kinds. The matched documents can be saved at some other location. It is also possible to extract the matching portions and save them separately. A transformation option allows the retrieved documents to be modified. Also, certain kinds of documents (like syntactically annotated corpora) can be opened in their own annotation interfaces and can be edited directly. In the case of corpora, the matched sentences can be alternatively shown in the KWIC format. The tool also provides more general and user-friendly facilities for searching syntactically annotated corpora and the corpora in XML format. Some basic statistics about the documents can also be displayed. Matched documents can be converted to some other supported format.

Another facility is to select one document and find all the similar documents based on contextual-distributional similarity. Many more extensions are being implemented and the tool has the potential to become a single interface through which a large variety of resources can be easily searched, accessed, analyzed and edited. Even in the

\(^{1}\)http://www.sketchengine.co.uk/

\(^{2}\)http://jaxe.sourceforge.net/

\(^{3}\)http://www.ims.uni-stuttgart.de/projekte/TIGER/TIGERSearch
present form, the tool can be highly useful to linguists as well as computational linguists.

2. Types of Resources

In general, most of the language resources can be classified in the following broad categories: corpora, lexicon, language models, grammars, evaluation data (Nilsson and Nivre, 2008) and learnt models. Each of them has a wide variety in terms of structure, format, etc. The importance of this is demonstrated by the fact that there are regular special conferences and workshops on ways of merging different kinds of annotation and of integrating different kinds of lexicon. However, not so much attention has been paid to the last three categories, which are also very important, as any researcher who has to conduct frequent experiments can testify.

Our tool can be currently used to access and modify corpora, lexicon and language models, but since it is part of a larger system called Sanchay\(^4\), it can be extended for other kinds of resources too as it already has APIs for some such resources like evaluation data and learnt models.

The tools mentioned in the previous section are geared towards efficiency as they are potentially meant to be used for very large corpora. In contrast, our tool is meant more for languages which are resource scarce, i.e., the size of the targeted resources is not likely to be very large. The focus in our case is more on allowing easy access to a wide variety of resources rather than efficient searching of very large corpora.

For syntactically annotated corpora, Sanchay accepts input in as raw text (to start annotation), as POS tagged data with one sentence on one line and with word and tag separated by a slash, as tagged and chunked data in a nested bracket form similar to the one used by linguists, as annotated data in Shakti Standard Format (SSF)\(^5\) and as text in XML format. Sanchay can output the results in all these formats too.

For language models, the standard ARPA format is used, in addition to an internal binary format. For dictionaries, the format used is Dictionary Standard Format (DSF) that is used for dictionaries like Shabdaanjali\(^6\). However, for all the resources, we are planning to shift to XML as the default format.

3. Resource Access Scenarios

The first requirement of resource access, especially from the point of view of building an integrated digital tool is to develop well designed exhaustive Application Development Interfaces (APIs) for parsing and manipulating these resources. The second task is to connect these APIs with each other. Then there have to be graphical user interfaces for different kinds of resources, which in turn have to be connected to the APIs and to each other. The design of Sanchay in general, and this tool in particular, is based on these ideas.

However, evaluation data and learnt models (excluding language models) are yet to be supported by this tool. Still, it would not be very difficult to provide support for them because most of the required components already exist either as modules of Sanchay or as external libraries.

We have already discussed the general utility of this tool, but some of the specific scenarios in which this tool can be useful are listed below:

- A linguist is trying to find patterns and to extract and save them somewhere
- An annotator made some mistake and has to correct that mistake in all the annotated files
- A computational linguist needs data for training a classifier such that the data consists of certain patterns
- Someone wants to browse, search and edit a bilingual dictionary
- Someone wants to analyze \(n\)-gram language models and get some insights

\(^4\)http://sanchay.co.in
\(^5\)A human readable text format to represent trees with attributes. It is so named because it was initially used for a Machine Translation system called Shakti.
\(^6\)http://litr.c.lit.ac.in/onlineServices/Dictionaries/Dict_Frame.html
Someone wants to browse, search and edit XML documents

After searching for some pattern, someone wants to view the results in KWIC format

An annotator wants to browse, search and edit syntactically annotated documents

After manual annotation, an annotation adjudicator wants to perform a ‘sanity check’ on the data

After finding some document as a result of a search, someone wants to find contextually-distributionally similar documents

The demos for these scenarios can be seen at http://ltrc.iit.ac.in/anil/sanchay/integrated-resource-access-tool/. Figures 2-4 illustrate three of these.
4. Generalized Query and Transformation

The resource access method can be specified in terms of the following parameters:

- The type of resource being accessed
- The input and output formats
- The input and output locations
- The language and encoding: Important for languages which are not well supported on computers. Uses the Sanchay language and encoding support mechanism (Singh, 2008)
- The query (for searching as well as transformation), which depends on the type of the resource
- Additional options such as specifying whether the resource is to be displayed in an editor or not, whether...
the results have to be displayed in KWIC format or not, whether the matching data is to be saved separately or not.

To use the tool, the user has to go through the following steps, even though the exact sequence of the steps would, of course, vary depending on the requirements and the kind of resources being accessed:

- Enter the text or regular expression or query to be searched and transformed
- Enter the replacement text or (if applicable)
- Click on the Find button to get a list of matching documents
- Double click on one of them to open it in the interface associated with that kind of resource
- Perform operations within that document
- So on for other documents
- Save the results after replacement or extraction, if applicable

The query for a resource like an n-gram language model would specify the text or regular expression to be searched, the size of the n-gram (unigram, bigram etc.) and frequency or probability range. For lexicon, the query would include the lexical item (possibly a regular expression) and attributes like the part-of-speech category. For syntactically annotated corpora, the query can be relatively more complex. The annotated data is stored in a tree like structure where every node can have a feature structure consisting of attribute-value pairs. This simple structure allows many different kinds of syntactically annotated resources to be stored in the same format. The tree structure can be used to represent one particular kind of information such as chunks, phrase structure or dependency structure. Other kinds of information can be represented through attributes of the nodes. For example, the base tree can represent chunks whereas phrase structure and dependency structure can be represented implicitly via attributes. The APIs in Sanchay allow, for example, the dependency tree to be generated using the information stored in the attributes, i.e., a chunk tree can be easily converted to a dependency tree and vice-versa (see Figure 1), without losing any information.

Irrespective of the kind of information, the resources stored using this representation can be queried in terms of the tree nodes and their attributes. For queries we use a ‘dot notation’ for tree nodes and attributes that is somewhat similar to CQL. The notation is extended to express transformation rules and return values (on the right hand side) as shown in the examples below:

1. C.l = ‘मे’ AND C.t = ‘PSP’
2. C.l = ‘मे’ AND C.t = ‘PSP’ ->
   C.A[1].a[‘drel’] = ‘क1’
3. C.l = ‘का’ | ‘क’ | ‘क’ AND C.t = ‘PSP’ ->
   C.A[1].a[‘drel’] = ‘र6:C.A[1].N[1].a[‘name’]
4. C.l = ‘ने’ AND C.t = ‘PSP’ ->
   C.A[1].a[‘drel’] and C.l

In the above examples, C is the current node (i.e., the node being searched), A[1] is the ancestor at the distance of 1 (i.e., the parent node), N[1] is the following sibling at a distance of one (i.e., the next node), l is the lexical data (i.e., the word or text, depending on the depth of the node), t is the parf-of-speech (POS) tag and a[‘drel’] is the value of the attribute ‘drel’ (dependency relation).

Thus, the first query above searches for the word ‘नें’ (ne) with the POS tag PSP (post-position). The second query searches for the same word, but it also specifies a transformation such that the ‘drel’ attribute of the parent node is assigned the value ‘क1’ (kartA, or roughly, agent). The third query searches for the words ‘का’, ‘क’ and ‘क’ (ka, ke and ki) having the tag PSP. It also specifies a transformation such that the ‘drel’ attribute of the parent node is assigned the value ‘र6’ (genitive) and this relation is pointed to the node next to the parent node by using ‘.’ as the separator between the relation label and the relation reference or pointer. Figure 5 show a sentence before and after the application of these two transformations.

In the last query above, the variables on the right hand side represent return values.

This notation (for data as well as for queries) allows a wide variety of annotated corpora (including those with some semantic annotation) to be searched and transformed easily. The notation is much simpler than XPath queries, making it easier to use for those not familiar with XML.

5. Some Other Details

The tool, like other parts of Sanchay, is implemented completely in Java and is platform independent. A clear separation has been maintained between the underlying API and the front end. As mentioned earlier, resources searched can be directly opened in the annotation interfaces or in a text editor and edited. There is also a facility to search for similar documents and to compare two similar documents. For similarity, a two step algorithm is used. First, the context models of words in the documents are created. Then, one of the several distributional similarity measures (e.g., relative entropy) is used to calculate the similarity of two documents.

The language-encoding facility provided by Sanchay (Singh, 2008) is used for languages which may not be supported on some operating systems.

6. Conclusion and Future Work

We described a single tool to allow access to different kinds of language resources. The tool works for annotated corpora, language models and dictionaries. It accepts data in several formats and can be used to save data in these formats. Resources can be queried using a query language that allows transformations using a simple intuitive syntax. It is possible to open the matched documents in the associated editing or annotation interfaces and work on them. Matched data can be extracted and saved in a different location.
Many extensions are planned to make it more general. The most important ongoing extension is the online version of this tool, so that the resources can be accessed through a browser. Support for a lot of other formats and kinds of resources (especially ontologies like WordNet and Concept-Net) will also be added. Other facilities in Sanchay, like automatic annotation, n-gram compilation, word list compilation, dictionary FST (Finite State Transducer), approximate string search, different kinds of similarities etc. will also be connected with this tool. Another extension which is partially implemented is to allow access to resources from a BASH like shell in Sanchay. This would be useful for more experienced users.
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