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Abstract

We describe a syntactically annotated parallel corpus containing typologically partly different languages, namely English, Swedish and Turkish. The corpus consists of approximately 300,000 tokens in Swedish, 160,000 in Turkish and 150,000 in English, containing both fiction and technical documents. We build the corpus by using the Uplug toolkit for automatic structural markup, such as tokenization and sentence segmentation, as well as sentence and word alignment. In addition, we use basic language resource kits for the linguistic analysis of the languages involved. The annotation is carried out on various layers from morphological and part of speech analysis to dependency structures. The tools used for linguistic annotation, e.g., HunPos tagger and MaltParser, are freely available data-driven resources, trained on existing corpora and treebanks for each language. The parallel treebank is used in teaching and linguistic research to study the relationship between the structurally different languages. In order to study the treebank, several tools have been developed for the visualization of the annotation and alignment, allowing search for linguistic patterns.

1. Introduction

Language resources such as linguistically annotated corpora are central components in empirical language studies and natural language processing as they contain authentic language data, which both humans and machines can study and learn from. In the past years, methods have been developed to build parallel corpora automatically, and to reuse translational data from such corpora for applications. One of the most well-known parallel corpora is Europarl (Koehn, 2002) which is a collection of material including 11 European languages taken from the proceedings of the European Parliament. The largest parallel corpus of today covering a variety of domains for above 20 languages is the JRC-Acquis Multilingual Parallel Corpus (Steinberger et al., 2006) consisting of documents of legislative text. Another often used resource is the Bible translated to a large number of languages and collected and annotated by Resnik et al. (1999). The OPUS corpus (Tiedemann and Nygaard, 2004) is another example of a freely available parallel language resource.

In the past few years, efforts have been made to annotate parallel texts with syntactic structure to build parallel treebanks. A parallel treebank is a parallel corpus where the sentences in each language are syntactically analyzed, and the sentences and words are aligned. In the treebanks, the syntactic annotation usually follows a syntactic theory, often based on constituent and/or dependency structure (Abeillé, 2003). The Prague Czech-English Dependency Treebank (Čmejrek et al., 2004) is one of the earliest parallel treebanks, containing dependency annotation. The English-German parallel treebank (Cyrus et al., 2003) is another resource with multi-layer linguistic annotation including part of speech, constituent structures, functional relations, and predicate-argument structures. The Linköping English-Swedish Parallel Treebank, also called LinES (Ahrenberg, 2007), currently under development, contains approximately 1,200 sentence pairs, annotated with part of speech and dependency structures. Stockholm MUltilingual TTreebank, also called SMULTRON (Gustafson-Čapková et al., 2007), is a parallel treebank consisting of 1,000 sentences aligned in English, German and Swedish and annotated with constituent structures. In most parallel treebanks, we find English and other structurally similar languages. In the treebank we present in this paper, the user may study structurally dissimilar languages, which also presents challenges for the structural annotation of different language types. The goal of our work is to build a linguistically analyzed, representative language resource for less studied language pairs dissimilar in language structure to be able to study the relations between these languages by researchers, teachers and students.

In this paper, we present a parallel treebank consisting of English, Swedish and Turkish texts. The treebank contains various annotation layers from part-of-speech tags and morphological features to dependency annotation where each layer is automatically annotated, the sentences and words are aligned, and partly manually corrected. We build the corpus automatically using a basic language resource kit (BLARK) for the languages involved and appropriate tools for the automatic alignment and correction of data. The goal is to reuse existing tools as far as possible and develop new ones if necessary for corpus creation, annotation, alignment and visualization.

The work presented in this paper is part of the project Supporting Research Environment for Less Explored Languages, supported by the Swedish Research Council and the Faculty of Languages at Uppsala University. In the next section we describe the data included in the treebank, and in section 3 we give an overview of the method used to create the treebank. In section 4, we give examples of how researchers and students use the resource and in section 5 we conclude the paper and give directions for future research.

2. Treebank Data

The treebank consists of the Swedish-Turkish parallel treebank presented previously (Megyesi et al., 2008) extended with English texts. The corpus data for each language consists of original texts, both fiction and technical documents, and their translations
Table 1: Corpus data.

| Type of Text                                      | English | Swedish | Turkish |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| The White Castle (O. Pamuk)                       | -       | 58 684  | 44 176  |
| Sofie’s world (J. Gaardner)                       | 7 280   | 7 393   | 5 651   |
| The royal physician’s visit (PO Enquist)         | 23 323  | 20 780  | 16 983  |
| Islam and Europe (I Karlsson)                    | -       | 61 529  | 58 353  |
| Info about Sweden (Migration Office)             | -       | 26 649  | 28 139  |
| Pregnancy and Giving Birth                       | 1 382   | 1 076   | 1 221   |
| Exercise and Food                                | 711     | 616     | 685     |
| Psychological Issues                             | 348     | 385     | 330     |
| Retirement                                       | -       | 3 770   | 4 267   |
| Dublin                                           | 496     | 451     | 469     |
| UN Declaration of Human Rights                   | 1 911   | 1 831   | 1 604   |
| What is unicode                                  | 514     | 539     | 424     |
| Gospel of Luke                                   | 32 238  | 32 238  | -       |
| Gospel of Matthew                                | 29 564  | 29 247  | -       |
| Gospel of Mark                                   | 18 872  | 18 888  | -       |
| Gospel of John                                   | 24 209  | 24 625  | -       |
| Total                                            | 140 848 | 288 701 | 162 302 |

Table 1: Corpus data.

3. Treebank Development

The texts are processed by various tools developed for each language separately. At the same time, we use the same structural markup and format for all languages. The processing tools are implemented in a framework with a graphical user interface, UplugConnector (Megyesi and Dahlqvist, 2007) which is based on the modules in the Uplug toolkit (Jörg Tiedemann, 2003). Our goal is to produce user-friendly tools to make the annotation, alignment and correction easy for people with less computer skills. The corpus annotation procedure is illustrated in Figure 1. Independently of language, the original texts are scanned and proof-read, cleaned up and automatically processed. During formatting, the texts are encoded using UTF-8 (Unicode) and marked up structurally using XML Corpus Encoding Standard (XCES) and Tiger XML.

The texts are tokenized, the sentences are segmented, the tokens are morphologically analyzed with part of speech and inflectional features. For the morphosyntactic annotation, external morphological analyzers and part-of-speech taggers are used for the specific languages. The English and Swedish texts are annotated with the HunPoS tagger (Halácsy et al., 2007), an open source reimplementation of the Trigrams ‘n’ Tags tagger (Brants, 2000), with an average accuracy of 96-97% (Megyesi, 2008). The Turkish material is morphologically analyzed using a Turkish analyzer (Oflazer, 1994) and a disambiguator which automatically learns morphological disambiguation rules from a decision list induction algorithm achieving an accuracy of approximately 96% (Yuret and Türe, 2006).

For the syntactic description, we chose dependency rather than constituent structures, as the former has been shown to be well suited for both morphologically rich and free word order languages such as Turkish, and for morphologically simpler languages, like English and Swedish.

All data is annotated syntactically using MaltParser (Nivre et al., 2006a), trained on the Penn Treebank for English.
on the Swedish treebank Talbanken05 (Nivre et al., 2006b), and on the Metu-SabancıTurkish Treebank (Oflazer et al., 2003), respectively. MaltParser is one of the best performing dependency parsers for English, Swedish and Turkish, see the CoNLL-X shared task on multilingual dependency parsing (Buchholz and Marsi, 2006), with a labeled dependency accuracy of 84.6% for Swedish and 65.7% for Turkish.

The output from the syntactic parser is in both XCES and Tiger XML. From the Tiger XML format, the syntactic notation may be visualized with tools like Tiger Search. Figure 2 illustrates the representation of the Swedish sentence “But he listened attentively.” as represented in Tiger XML format.

```xml
- <id="s7">
- <graph root="p7_3">
- <terminal>
  <id="w7_1" word="But" postag="CC" />
  <id="w7_2" word="he" postag="PRP" />
  <id="w7_3" word="listened" postag="VBD" />
  <id="w7_4" word="attentively" postag="RB" />
  <id="w7_5" word="." postag="." />
</terminal>
- <nonterminals>
  - <id="p7_1" word="But" postag="CC" />
    <edge idref="w7_1" label="-.-" />
  </nt>
  - <id="p7_2" word="he" postag="PRP" />
    <edge idref="w7_2" label="-.-" />
  </nt>
  - <id="p7_3" word="listened" postag="VBD" />
    <edge idref="w7_3" label="-.-" />
  </nt>
  - <id="p7_4" word="attentively" postag="RB" />
    <edge idref="w7_4" label="-.-" />
  </nt>
  - <id="p7_5" word="." postag="." />
    <edge idref="w7_5" label="-.-" />
</graph>
</>
```

Figure 2: An English sentence “But he listened attentively” represented in Tiger XML format.

In order to produce a gold standard as part of the corpus, thereby making it useful for training and evaluation, we manually correct the morphosyntactic annotation in each language, focusing on texts for which translations exist for all languages.

After the linguistic analysis, the sentences are aligned automatically, and the words are linked to each other in the language pairs. We use standard techniques for the establishment of links between source and target language segments. Sentences are aligned by using the length-based approach (Gale and Church, 1993). The sentence aligned data is sent for manual correction to a student who speaks both languages. Results show that between 67% and 94% of the sentences were correctly aligned by the automatic aligner depending on the text type in Swedish and Turkish (Megyesi and Dahlqvist, 2007). We calculated the correctness of the sentence alignment results for the first chapter of the novel White Castle written by Orhan Pamuk. Not surprisingly, the easiest alignment with 87.3% correctness is the one-to-one mapping between a Swedish and a Turkish sentence. Linking with most errors occurs when several Swedish sentences should have been attached to a single Turkish sentence. The accuracy for the 2-1 alignment between Swedish and Turkish is 33% and for 3-1 is 0%. The 1-0 mapping in the same translation direction also fails in all cases. Evaluation of the sentence alignment results for the other language pairs is in progress.

Words are aligned using the clue alignment approach (Jörg Tiedemann, 2003), and the toolbox for statistical machine translation GIZA++ (Och and Ney, 2003), also implemented in Uplag. Results show that the word aligner aligned approximately 69% of the words correctly in Swedish and Turkish (Megyesi and Dahlqvist, 2007) estimated on 7 000 word pairs in Swedish and Turkish sorted by decreasing frequency taken from the novel White Castle written by Orhan Pamuk. The errors in the majority of cases (61%) are due to grammatical differences where multi-word units in Swedish or English often constitute one token in Turkish. We find, for example, unaligned prepositions in prepositional phrases in Swedish and English when it should have been linked to the single noun token with a certain case in Turkish.

We are currently extending the treebank with Hindi by including the Uppsala Hindi Corpus consisting of 108,235 tokens (Saxena et al., 2008) to create the Uppsala multilingual treebank. The common part in all four languages at the moment is approximately 5,000 tokens which we hope to be able to extend soon. The low number of joint tokens depends on the lack of texts that are translated to all the languages involved.

4. Applications in Research and Teaching

The treebank is used by researchers, teachers and students in linguistics and Turkish to carry out empirical and contrastive studies. The students can use the corpus directly in their own learning to study various observed linguistic patterns and vocabulary from real texts taken from different genres and different language types. The corpus also serves as a learning platform for testing hypotheses concerning the morphological and syntactic aspects of Turkish

Figure 3: Dependency analysis for the Swedish sentence.

4. Applications in Research and Teaching

The treebank is used by researchers, teachers and students in linguistics and Turkish to carry out empirical and contrastive studies. The students can use the corpus directly in their own learning to study various observed linguistic patterns and vocabulary from real texts taken from different genres and different language types. The corpus also serves as a learning platform for testing hypotheses concerning the morphological and syntactic aspects of Turkish
grammar. Further, it helps the students to practice translation between Swedish, English and Turkish. All this is possible due to the fact that the English-Swedish-Turkish parallel texts are available in annotated form. The morpho-syntactic annotations and the alignment are visualized in graphical user interface using pop-up windows. A search tool has been also developed to help the students to create concordance lists. They can search for whole words, beginnings of words, parts of words or ends of words in all languages. The concordance lists display whole sentences in which the target item appears and it is highlighted. The selected sentences are aligned with their translational equivalents. This form of displaying the linguistic data is considered to be more suitable for learning than KWIC lists in which only the immediate environment of the target item is shown. Figure 4 shows a search result for the Turkish word marked in red color with its morphosyntactic feature in the sentence and its Swedish translation.

5. Conclusion and Future Work
We have presented the English-Swedish-Turkish parallel treebank consisting of over 100,000 words in each language. The treebank contains morphological and syntactic annotation using dependency structures. The corpus is automatically created by reusing and adjusting existing tools for the linguistic analysis, the automatic alignment and its visualization. The corpus is under development and partly manually corrected.

In the near future, we are going to use the various linguistic annotations to improve the automatic word alignment, and manually correct the output from the best performing word alignment model(s). In addition, we plan to enlarge the manually corrected part of the corpus to be used as gold standard.
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Figure 4: Example taken from the visualization tool.