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Abstract
This paper describes the acquisition, preprocessing, segmentation, and alignment of an Amharic-English parallel corpus. It will be helpful for machine translation of a low-resource language, Amharic. We freely released the corpus for research purposes. Furthermore, we developed baseline statistical and neural machine translation systems; we trained statistical and neural machine translation models using the corpus. In the experiments, we also used a large monolingual corpus for the language model of statistical machine translation and back-translation of neural machine translation. In the automatic evaluation, neural machine translation models outperform statistical machine translation models by approximately six to seven Bilingual Evaluation Understudy (BLEU) points. Besides, among the neural machine translation models, the subword models outperform the word-based models by three to four BLEU points. Moreover, two other relevant automatic evaluation metrics, Translation Edit Rate on Character Level and Better Evaluation as Ranking, reflect corresponding differences among the trained models.
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1. Introduction
To automate the intricate task of translation, researchers have followed different approaches. The earliest attempt was to use rule-based systems, which are criticized for being tedious and expensive to develop. Alternative empirical approaches such as Statistical Machine Translation (SMT) and Neural Machine Translation (NMT) came when parallel corpora were more and more available. Such methods take advantage of the authentic translations made by human translators in parallel corpora. They rely on machine learning to build translation models by taking parallel corpora as training data.

For empirical machine translation, we need a parallel corpus (bitext), a text that has a parallel translation in another language. Machine translation models are trained on a parallel corpus. Some international and governmental institutions provide such texts for public use. For instance, the Canadian Hansard corpus (Roukos S. et al., 1995) consists of parallel texts in English and French, drawn from official records of the proceedings of the Canadian Parliament. Similarly, the Eurorap corpus (Koehn and Monz, 2005), extracted from the proceedings of the European Parliament, contains parallel corpora for twenty-one European languages. The United Nations (UN) Parallel Corpus (Ziemski et al., 2016) is available in six official UN languages. The current version of the parallel corpus consists of manually translated UN documents between 1990 and 2014.

Other parallel corpora have been made from movie subtitles, like the OpenSubtitles corpus (Lison and Tiedemann, 2016), or from general web text, like the ParaCrawl corpus (Bañón et al., 2020). The Open Parallel Corpus (OPUS) (Tiedemann, 2012) collects parallel corpora from sources such as open-source software documentations and religious books. Large numbers of parallel corpora are available for dominant international languages such as English, German, and French. Nevertheless, there is a scarcity of available parallel corpora for low-resource languages. The deficiency impedes the progress of machine translation for such languages.

We considered different sources to develop a parallel corpus for Amharic-English translation. The existing corpora were either small or had poor quality; they were mainly collected from the web. Although considering the web as a corpus, which is motivated for practical reasons of getting more extensive data with open access and low cost, may sound good, such sources are inaccurate. Moreover, as Amharic is not standardized, one may face many spelling variations in these sources and expect typographical errors. This calls for manual or automatic editing. Therefore, we collected our corpora from edited documents such as newspapers, magazines, and textbooks. We also normalized the text and made some automatic spelling error corrections.

Amharic is a Semitic language that serves as the official language of Ethiopia. Although it plays several roles in the government, it is considered a low-resource language because of its lack of essential tools and resources for natural language processing (Gezmu et al., 2018a; Tracey and Strassel, 2020).

Amharic uses a syllabic writing system, Ethiopic. Each Amharic letter systematically conflates a consonant and vowel (e.g., ራ /ba/ and ዁ /bu/). Sometimes consonants and vowels can be written as bare consonants (e.g., ራ /ba/) or bare vowels (e.g., ኲ /a/ in እር ኲ /agar/). Some phonemes with one or more homophonic...
script representations and peculiar labiovelars sometimes compromise the consistency of the writing system. In Amharic orthography, there is no case difference. It is written from left to right. In present-day Amharic writings, words are delimited by plain space. Like other Semitic languages, Amharic words are highly inflectional and have a root-pattern morphology (Fabri et al., 2014). Therefore, Amharic lexicons cannot contain all word forms; the available bilingual lexicons contain only lemmas of common words. This hinders us to use sentence aligners that require bilingual lexicons.

Thus, in this research, we compiled a parallel corpus [1] for Amharic-English machine translation by extending the Ge’ez Frontier Foundation’s news corpus made available for research purposes. We collected additional bilingual documents from various sources to compile the corpus. We also trained and evaluated NMT and SMT models using the corpus.

2. Related Work
There were attempts to compile parallel corpora for Amharic-English machine translation. The most notable ones are the “Amharic-English bilingual corpus”, “English-Ethiopian languages parallel corpora” (Abate et al., 2018), the “Low Resource Languages for Emergent Incidents: Amharic representative language pack” (LORELEI-Amharic) (Tracey and Strassel, 2020), and the OPUS collection (Tiedemann, 2012). The European Language Resource Association (ELRA) hosts the Amharic-English bilingual corpus, containing a small parallel text from legal and news domains. Abate et al. (2018) compiled small-sized English-Ethiopian languages parallel corpora. Linguistic Data Consortium developed the LORELEI-Amharic corpus. Although LORELEI-Amharic is larger than Amharic-English bilingual corpus and English-Ethiopian languages parallel corpora, it is still not sufficient to train machine translation models with competitive performance (Koehn and Knowles, 2017) [2]. Besides, the parallel text was collected from discussion forums, news wires, and weblogs. Discussion forums and weblogs are susceptible to spelling mistakes. The problem worsens as there is no readily available spell checker to assist Amharic writers.

In the OPUS collection, there are parallel corpora for Amharic and English. For this language pair, however, some of the corpora have a few hundred parallel sentences (e.g., Tatoeba, GlobalVoices, and TED2020); some use archaic language (e.g., Tanzil and bibleuedin); and others contain misaligned parallel sentences (e.g., MultiCCAligned and JW300).

The lack of clean, sizable, readily available, and contemporary-language parallel corpora impede the progress in Amharic-English machine translation.

There were few attempts in Amharic-English machine translation using small-sized corpora (Teshome and Besacier, 2012; Teshome et al., 2015; Ashengo et al., 2021). Still, their corpora are not readily available for the research community.

3. Corpus Preparation
We created a new parallel corpus by extending the existing news corpus made available for research purposes by Ge’ez Frontier Foundation. We collected, preprocessed, and segmented and aligned sentences of additional bilingual documents from various sources to compile the corpus.

3.1. Data Sources
We identified potential data sources that could serve as a basis for building a parallel corpus. We have considered newswires, magazines, and the Bible to get extensive data with open access. Major newswires such as Deutsche Welle, BBC, and Ethiopian News Agency provide news articles in Amharic and English. Besides, the Ethiopian Herald and the Ethiopian Reporter publish bilingual news articles in Amharic and English. In these newswires, the translations are intended for the local public. Because of this, only a tiny portion of the English news articles are translated into Amharic, or vice versa. For instance, in the Ethiopian News Agency, approximately one news story out of ten has a rough translation (Argaw and Asker, 2005).

Watchtower (ウェアック, in Amharic) and Awake (オーケー magazines in Amharic) have been published since 2006. They are available for the public; they have adequate sentence-by-sentence translations. Watchtower mainly discusses religious issues. Unlike Watchtower, Awake contains articles on general interest topics such as nature, geography, and family life. So it corresponds more to news articles.

The Bible is the most translated and readily available book. It is translated with great care and has high coverage of vocabulary (Chew et al., 2006). Additionally, its content reflects the everyday living of human beings like love, war, and politics. However, older translations of the Bible used archaic languages. Fortunately, we found out the recent translations of the Bible use the contemporary language. For example, the Standard Version and the New World Translation use the modern-day language in both Amharic and English.

Therefore, we selected text from Awake and Watchtower magazines, the Bible, and newswires. Then, we preprocessed the text as a preparation step for the following sentence segmentation and alignment activities.

3.2. Preprocessing
The preprocessing of the text involves spelling correction and normalization. In addition, we removed boilerplates such as headers, footers (including footnotes), and verse numbers (in the Bible).

[1]The corpus is available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.24352/ub.ovgu-2018-145
In the text, we observed different types of misspellings: misspellings result from missed out spaces, replacing letters with visually similar characters (e.g., ø and ø), and typographical errors. We could not use our rule-based Amharic spelling corrector (Mekonnen, 2012) because of its limitations. Instead, we developed another spelling corrector (Gezmu et al., 2018b) that has a better performance measured with the benchmark test set†[Gezmu et al., 2021a]. We employed the spelling corrector primarily to correct the first two types of spelling errors. Since the intensive manual intervention is needed to select the correct spelling from the plausible suggestions for typographical errors, we have not corrected the typographical errors in the current version of the corpus.

Different styles of punctuation marks have been used in Amharic text. For instance, for double quotation mark, two successive single quotation marks or similar symbols (e.g., « «, « or ») are used; for end-of-sentence punctuation (» “Amharic full stop”) two successive Amharic word separator ( ) that give the same appearance are used. Thus, the normalization of punctuation is a nontrivial matter. We normalized all types of double quotes, all single quotes, question marks (e.g., ? and i), word separators (e.g., : and ;), full stops (e.g., : and ;), exclamation marks (e.g., ! and !), hyphens (e.g., – and –), and commas (e.g., , and ,).

3.3. Sentence Segmentation
Segmentation of sentences essentially involves the disambiguation of end-of-sentence punctuation. To do so, we identified end-of-sentence punctuation marks. We considered end-of-sentence punctuation ( for Amharic and period for English) and question marks as a sentence boundary. The exceptions are abbreviations, initials of names, clitics, Uniform Resource Locators (URLs), e-mail addresses, and hashtags. Thus, to retain them we created a list of known abbreviations and clitics; and regular expressions for URLs, e-mail addresses, and hashtags. After sentence segmentation, we deleted duplicate sentences.

3.4. Sentence Alignment
Amharic has a rich morphology; it is practically impossible for Amharic lexicons to contain all word forms. Therefore, it is beneficial to use a sentence aligner that does not require any bilingual lexicon. Hence, we used the Bilingual Sentence Aligner‡[Moore, 2002] to align sentences in the bilingual documents. Table 1 shows the number of sentences aligned in each bilingual document. The corpus is comprised of approximately 83% of the Watchtower magazine and Bible text that can be considered as a “belief and thought” domain (Burnard, 2007). The remaining 17% of the Awake magazine and news articles is in the “world affairs” domain (Burnard, 2007).

After merging and shuffling the aligned sentences, we divided them into the training, validation (development), and test sets. Table 2 shows the statistics of each dataset.

4. Baseline Systems
During recent years, there are many improvements over SMT, such as hierarchical phrase-based SMT (Chiang, 2007) and syntax-based SMT (Galley et al., 2004; Galley et al., 2006), and NMT like Universal Transformers (Dellghani et al., 2019). Nevertheless, we relied on baseline systems for both approaches to evaluate them objectively.

4.1. Baseline SMT System
Our phrase-based SMT baseline system had settings that were typically used by Ding et al. (2016), Williams et al. (2016), Koehn and Knowles (2017), and Sennrich and Zhang (2019). We used the Moses (Koehn et al., 2007) toolkit to train phrase-based SMT models. First, we used GIZA++ (Och, 2003) and the grow-diag-final-and heuristic for symmetrization for word alignment. Then, we used the phrase-based reordering model (Koehn et al., 2003) with three different orientations: monotone, swap, and discontinuous reordering in backward and forward directions conditioned on the source and target languages.

We used five-gram language models smoothed with the modified Kneser-Ney (Kneser and Ney, 1995). The system applied KenLM (Heafield, 2011) language modeling toolkit for this purpose. Initially, we have not used big monolingual corpora for language models. This is because they are no longer the exclusive advantages of phrase-based SMT, as NMT can also benefit from them (Sennrich and Zhang, 2019). Afterward, to prove this claim, we used the Contemporary Amharic Corpus†[CIMO] (CIMO) (Gezmu et al., 2018b) for English-to-Amharic translation.

The feature weights were tuned using Minimum Error Rate Training (MERT) (Och, 2003). We also used the k-best batch Margin Infused Relaxed Algorithm

---

†The test set is available at: https://github.com/andmek/ErrorCorpus
‡The implementation is available at: https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/download/details.aspx?id=52608

Table 1: The number of sentences (segments) aligned in each bilingual document.
Table 2: The number of sentences (segments), tokens, and types in each dataset.

| Dataset   | Sentences | English Tokens | Amharic Tokens | English Types | Amharic Types |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Test      | 2500      | 46154          | 34689          | 5842          | 11644         |
| Validation| 2864      | 53818          | 39980          | 6470          | 13068         |
| Training  | 140000    | 2574538        | 1930220        | 33589         | 155824        |
| Total     | 145364    | 2674510        | 2004889        | 45901         | 180536        |

(MIRA) for tuning (Cherry and Foster, 2012) by selecting the highest-scoring development run with a return-best-dev setting.

In decoding, we applied the default normal stack search algorithm.

4.2. Baseline NMT System

To train NMT models, we used the encoder-decoder architecture implemented with Transformers Vaswani et al. (2017). We tuned the hyperparameters of our NMT baseline system following Vaswani et al. (2017), Deng et al. (2018), Gezmu et al. (2021b), and Gezmu and Nürnberger (2022). The hyperparameters include the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2015) with varied learning rate over the course of training, dropout (Srivastava et al., 2014) rate of 0.1, label smoothing (Szegedy et al., 2016) of value 0.1, batch size of 1024, six Transformer blocks with eight heads, filter size of 2048, and hidden size of 512. We used tensor2tensor library to implement the system.

The situation of training NMT models is complex because the training of NMT models is usually non-deterministic and hardly ever converges (Popel and Bojar, 2018). Most research in NMT does not specify any stopping criteria. Some mention only an approximate number of days elapsed to train the models (Bahdanau et al., 2015) or the exact number of training steps (Vaswani et al., 2017). We trained, thus, each NMT model for 250000 steps following Vaswani et al. (2017).

For decoding, we used a single model obtained by averaging the last twelve checkpoints. Following Wu et al. (2016), we used a beam search with a beam size of four and a length penalty of 0.6.

5. Experiments and Evaluation

We evaluated the performance of the SMT and NMT systems. We also made a comparison of word-based and subword-based NMT models. The experiments used the same datasets for each system.

5.1. Datasets and Preprocessing

We trained our models on the benchmark dataset – the Amharic-English parallel corpus explained in Section 3. The training set consists of 140000 sentence pairs; the validation and test sets have 2864 and 2500 sentence pairs.

We tokenized the English datasets with Moses’ tokenizer script; we modified Moses’ script to tokenize the Amharic datasets. Next, to share named-entities between the languages, the Amharic datasets were transliterated with a transliteration scheme, Amharic transliteration for machine translation which is fully discussed in (Gezmu et al., 2021b).

We removed sentence pairs with extreme length ratios of more than one to nine and sentences longer than eighty tokens for the phrase-based SMT baseline. For word-based NMT models, we used a shared vocabulary of the top forty-four thousand most frequent tokens (tokens that appear five or more times in the corpus). We set this optimum vocabulary size because it will be too large to fit our GPU’s memory if we include less frequent tokens. Besides, we used the word-piece method (Schuster and Nakajima, 2012) [Wu et al., 2016], which is similar to Byte Pair Encoding (Gage, 1994; Senrich et al., 2016b), to segment words in the datasets for subword-based NMT models. We used the word-piece implementation in tensor2tensor library. Furthermore, since the vocabulary size in word-piece has an impact on the performance of the NMT models, we trained models with different vocabulary sizes (Wu et al., 2016; Denkowski and Neubig, 2017; Cherry et al., 2018; Ding et al., 2016).

5.2. Evaluation

Eventually, translation outputs of the test sets were detokenized and evaluated with a case-sensitive Bilingual Evaluation Understudy (BLEU) metric (Papineni et al., 2002). For consistency, we used the metric’s implementation made by Post (2018), sacreBLEU. To fill the limitations of BLEU (Callison-Burch et al., 2006; Reiter, 2018), we also used Better Evaluation as Ranking (BEER) (Stanojevic and Sima’an, 2014) and Translation Edit Rate on Character Level (CharacTER) (Wang et al., 2016) metrics. Unlike BLEU and BEER, the smaller the CharacTER score, the better. Moreover, the Amharic outputs were not back transliterated to use these automatic metrics effectively.

6. Results

Table 3 shows the performance results of the SMT and NMT systems with BLEU, BEER, and CharacTER.
Table 3: Performance results of SMT and NMT models.

| Translation Direction       | System                | BLEU  | BEER   | CharacTER |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------|-----------|
| Amharic-to-English          | NMT-1K                | 32.2  | 0.575  | 0.536     |
|                             | NMT-2K                | 32.2  | 0.575  | 0.536     |
|                             | NMT-4K                | 32.8  | 0.577  | 0.530     |
|                             | NMT-8K                | 33.0  | 0.576  | 0.527     |
|                             | NMT-16K               | 32.9  | 0.574  | 0.528     |
|                             | NMT-32K               | 32.2  | 0.570  | 0.539     |
|                             | NMT-Word-Based        | 28.8  | 0.537  | 0.588     |
|                             | SMT-MERT              | 26.0  | 0.514  | 0.629     |
|                             | SMT-MIRA              | 23.2  | 0.494  | 0.705     |
| English-to-Amharic          | NMT-1K                | 25.5  | 0.558  | 0.520     |
|                             | NMT-2K                | 25.7  | 0.554  | 0.525     |
|                             | NMT-4K                | 26.1  | 0.557  | 0.517     |
|                             | NMT-8K                | 26.4  | 0.555  | 0.521     |
|                             | NMT-16K               | 26.7  | 0.555  | 0.520     |
|                             | NMT-32K               | 26.7  | 0.552  | 0.523     |
|                             | NMT-Word-Based        | 23.0  | 0.514  | 0.585     |
|                             | SMT-MERT              | 20.0  | 0.502  | 0.643     |
|                             | SMT-MIRA              | 19.2  | 0.484  | 0.704     |

Table 4: Performance results of English-to-Amharic translation using the CACO corpus.

| System         | BLEU  | BEER   | CharacTER |
|----------------|-------|--------|-----------|
| SMT            | 20.0  | 0.502  | 0.643     |
| SMT + CACO     | 21.2  | 0.508  | 0.628     |
| NMT            | 26.7  | 0.555  | 0.520     |
| NMT + CACO     | 27.8  | 0.563  | 0.501     |

TER metrics. The SMT system achieved better scores when feature weights were tuned using MERT than batch MIRA. Thus, we took the phrase-based SMT system tuned with MERT as our baseline. Likewise, the NMT baseline systems use vocabulary sizes of eight thousand (8K) and sixteen thousand (16K) in Amharic-to-English and English-to-Amharic translation directions. Example Amharic-to-English translation outputs are given at the appendix.

In both translation directions, NMT models with subword units score the highest values of all. The NMT baseline models outperform the SMT baseline models by approximately six to seven BLEU. Among the NMT models, the subword-based models outperform the word-based models by three to four BLEU. The BEER and CharacTER metrics as well reflect corresponding differences.

Even though big monolingual corpora are not integral components of NMT, both SMT and NMT can benefit from them. Table 4 shows the results of English-to-Amharic translation using the CACO corpus for language model of the baseline SMT system, and back-translation of the baseline NMT system to produce synthetic training data [Sennrich et al., 2016a, He et al., 2016, Cheng et al., 2016, Qin, 2020]. Both systems gained more than one BLUE scores by using CACO. The baseline NMT model attained the optimum result when we randomly drew three times the size of the original training data from the CACO corpus and generated synthetic data by translating it to English.

7. Conclusions

We collected, preprocessed, segmented, and aligned Amharic-English parallel sentences from various sources. In doing so, we addressed different issues such as normalization and spelling correction. The corpus will be helpful for machine translation of a low-resource language, Amharic. Therefore, we freely released the corpus for research purposes. Also, we developed baseline SMT and NMT systems; we trained SMT and NMT models using the corpus. Additionally, we used a large monolingual corpus for the language model of SMT and back-translation of NMT in the experiments. As a result, NMT models outperform SMT models by approximately six to seven BLEU in the automatic evaluation. Besides, among the NMT models, the subword models outperform the word-based models by three to four BLEU. Moreover, two other relevant automatic evaluation metrics, CharacTER and BEER, reflect corresponding differences among the trained models.

We recommend future work to increase the size of the corpus by extracting text from scanned documents. In addition, we are engaged in doing additional experiments with other word segmentation methods for subword-based translations.
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Appendix: Example Translation Outputs

The following examples show the reference translations and the translated English sentences using NMT and SMT systems.

Reference: About that time, my parents asked me to come back home.
NMT-Word-Based: About that time, I asked my parents to go to their home.
NMT-Subword-Based: About that time, my parents asked me to return home.
SMT-MERT: About that time, my parents returned home.
SMT-MIRA: About that time, my parents returned home.

Reference: 2. Can we really live forever?
NMT-Word-Based: 2. Can we really live forever?
NMT-Subword-Based: 2. Can we really live forever?
SMT-MERT: Really, we can live forever?
SMT-MIRA: Live forever?

Reference: Sandra quickly discovered that she had been scammed.
NMT-Word-Based: Sandra saw that she was dying right away.
NMT-Subword-Based: Sandra immediately recognized that she was mistaken.
SMT-MERT: Sandra immediately.
SMT-MIRA: Sandra immediately.

Reference: Distressing circumstances can have a terrible impact on us.
NMT-Word-Based: When distressing situations strike, they may feel emotionally.
NMT-Subword-Based: Distressing situations can cause anxiety.
SMT-MERT: When distressing situations can emotional.
SMT-MIRA: When distressing situations emotional.

Reference: Olive oil is used copiously, as it is produced there on a large scale.
NMT-Word-Based: Olive oil is used in abundant value.
NMT-Subword-Based: The olive oil is so extensive that it pushes on the abundant possible.
SMT-MERT: As the bulk of olive oil for the benefit of the.
SMT-MIRA: Olive oil as a in the.

Reference: Six years later, the whole world economy collapsed.
NMT-Word-Based: Six years later, the entire world economy was destroyed.
NMT-Subword-Based: Six years later, the global economy sank into the world.
SMT-MERT: Six years later, the entire world economy have been shattered.
SMT-MIRA: Six years later the global economy have been shattered.

Reference: We also need to remember that Jesus said: “you must love your neighbor as yourself.”
NMT-Word-Based: We must remember that Jesus state: “you must love your neighbor as yourself.”
NMT-Subword-Based: Keep in mind that Jesus also said: “you must love your neighbor as yourself.”
SMT-MERT: Jesus said: “you must love your neighbor as yourself,” that we keep in mind.
SMT-MIRA: Jesus said: “you must love your neighbor as yourself” that we keep in mind.
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