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Abstract

We introduce FipsCoView, an on-line interface for dictionary-like visualisation of collocations detected from parallel corpora using a syntactically-informed extraction method.

1 Introduction

Multilingual (parallel) corpora—e.g., Europarl (Koehn, 2005)—represent a valuable resource for tasks related to language production that is exploitable in a wide variety of settings, such as second language learning, lexicography, as well as human or automatic translation. We focus on lexicographic exploitation of such resources and present a system, called FipsCoView,¹ which is specifically aimed at supporting the work of lexicographers who compile multilingual collocation resources.

Collocation, a rather ill-defined linguistic concept referring to a large and heterogeneous sub-class of multi-word expressions, is understood here as a combination of words that produces natural-sounding speech and writing (Lea and Runcie, 2002) and that has syntactic and semantic properties which cannot be entirely predicted from those of its components and therefore has to be listed in a lexicon (Evert, 2004). Collocations are particularly interesting from a translation point of view, and our system can also be used to facilitate the task of translators looking for the right translation of a word in context.

The usage scenario is the following. Given a word, like money, our system provides a concise and intuitive presentation of the list of collocations with that word, which have previously been detected in the source language version of the parallel corpus. By selecting one of the items in this list, e.g., money laundering, users will be able to see the contexts of that item, represented by the sentences in which it occurs. In addition, users can select a target language from the list of other languages in which the multilingual corpus is available² and visualise the target language version of the source sentences.

This presentation enables users to find potential translation equivalents for collocations by inspecting the target sentences. Thus, in the case of French, the preferred equivalent found is blanchiment d’argent, lit., ‘money whitening’, rather than the literal translation from English, *lavage d’argent. In the case of Italian, this is riciclaggio di denaro, lit., ‘recycling of money’, rather than the literal translation ?lavaggio di soldi, also possible but much less preferred. Access to target sentences is important as it allows users to see how the translation of a collocation vary depending on the context. Besides, it provides useful usage clues, indicating, inter alia, the allowed or preferred morphosyntactic features of a collocation.

In this paper, we present the architecture of FipsCoView and outline its main functionalities. This system is an extension of FipsCo, a larger fully-fledged off-line system, which, in turn, is integrated into a complex framework for processing multi-word expressions (Seretan, 2009). While the off-line system finds direct applicability in our on-going projects of large-scale multilingual syntac-

¹Available at http://tinyurl.com/FipsCoView.

²Europarl includes 11 languages: French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, English, Dutch, German, Danish, Swedish, Greek, Finnish. Note that our tool is not tailored to this specific corpus.
tic parsing (Wehrli, 2007) and syntax-based machine translation (Wehrli et al., 2009), the on-line version is designed to offer access to the derived collocation resources to a broader community.

2 Architecture and Main Functionalities

Figure 1 shows the architecture of FipsCoView. The main system modules are the collocation extraction module, the search & visualisation module, the concordancing and the sentence alignment modules.

The processing flow is pipelined. The key module of the system, collocation extraction, relies on a syntax-based methodology that combines lexical statistics with syntactic information provided by Fips, a deep symbolic parser (Wehrli, 2007). This methodology is fully described and evaluated in Seretan (2011). In principle, the extraction takes place only once, but new corpora can be processed later and results are cumulated. The sentence alignment (Nerima et al., 2003) is performed partially, i.e., only for the sentences actually displayed by the concordancing module. It is done on the fly, thus eliminating the need of pre-aligning the corpora.

The role of the concordancing module is to present the sentence contexts for a selected collocation (cf. scenario described in §1). The words in this collocation are highlighted for readability. The list of sentences is displayed in the order given by the syntactic variation of collocations, that is, the collocation instances for which the distance between the components is larger are displayed first. This functionality is designed to support the work of users inspecting the syntactic properties of collocations.

The search & visualisation module takes as input the word entered by the user in the system interface, performs a search in the database that stores the collocation extraction results, and provides a one-page presentation of the collocational information related to the sought word. Users can set visualisation parameters such as the minimal frequency and association score, which limit the displayed results according to the number of occurrences in the corpus and the “association strength” between the component words, as given by the lexical association measure used to extract collocations. The measure we typically use is log-likelihood ratio (Dunning, 1993); see Pecina (2008) for an inventory of measures.

Depending on these parameters, the automatically created collocation entry is more or less exhaustive (the output adapts to the specific user’s purpose). A different sub-entry is created for each part of speech of the sought word (for instance, report can either be a noun or a verb). Under each sub-entry, collocations are organised by syntactic type, e.g., adjective-noun (comprehensive report), noun-noun (initiative report), subject-verb (report highlights), verb-object (produce a report). To avoid redundancy, only the collocating words are shown. The sought word is understood and is replaced by a tilde character, in a paper dictionary style. Unlike in paper dictionary presentations, the online presentation benefits from the HTML environment by using colours, adapting the font size so that it reflects the association strength (the most important combinations are more visually salient), displaying additional information such as score and frequency, and using hyper-links for navigating from one word to another.

With respect to similar systems (Barlow, 2002; Scott, 2004; Kilgarriff et al., 2004; Charest et al., 2007; Rayson, 2009; Fletcher, 2011), our system uniquely combines parallel concordancing with collocation detection based on deep syntactic processing. It is available for English, French, Spanish and Italian and it is being extended to other languages.
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