

# **Grammar Knowledge Transfer for Building RMRSs over Dependency Parses in Bulgarian**

**Kiril Simov and Petya Osenova**

Linguistic Modelling Department, IICT,  
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

DELPH-IN, Sofia, 2012



DELPH-IN Summit, Sofia, 2012

# Plan of the Talk

- Goal
- Related Work
- RMRS analysis
- Conclusions and Future Work



# Goal

- Create a pipeline for RMRS analysis of Bulgarian
- We rely on the Bulgarian HPSG resource grammar BURGER, and on a dependency parser (Malt Parser – Nivre et al. 2006), trained on the BulTreeBank data



# Related Work

Our work is inspired by:

- (Copestake, 2003; 2007) on MRS and RMRS
- The previous work on transfer of dependency analyses into RMRS structures described in:
  - (Spreyer and Frank, 2005) for TIGER treebank of German, and
  - (Jakob et al, 2010) Prague Dependency Treebank of Czech (PDT)



# RMRS

In the paper we follow the representation of RMRS used in (Jakob et al, 2010), which defines an RMRS structure as a quadruple:

*< hook, EP-bag, argument set, handle constraints >*



# Bulgarian Language Pipeline

- BURGER – Bulgarian Resource Grammar
- Language Processing Pipeline:
  - Tokenization and sentence boundary identification
  - POS tagging with 97.98 % accuracy (680 tags)
  - Lemmatization with 95.23 % accuracy
  - Dependency Parsing with 87.6 % labeled parsing accuracy (17 tags)
  - RMRS analysis over dependency parsing



# Bulgarian Dependency Tagset

<b>adjunct</b> 12009	Adjunct (optional verbal argument)	<b>subj</b> 14064	Subject
<b>clitic</b> 2263	Short forms of the possessive pronouns	<b>pragadjunct</b> 1612	Pragmatic adjunct
<b>comp</b> 18043	Complement (argument of non-finite verbs, copula, auxiliaries)	<b>punct</b> 28134	Punctuation
<b>conj</b> 6342	Conjunction in coordination	<b>xadjunct</b> 1826	Clausal adjunct
<b>conjarg</b> 7005	Argument (second, third, ...) of coordination	<b>xcomp</b> 4651	Clausal complement
<b>indobj</b> 4232	Indirect Object	<b>xmod</b> 2219	Clausal modifier
<b>marked</b> 2650	Marked (clause, introduced by a subordinator)	<b>xprepcomp</b> 168	Clausal complement of preposition
<b>mod</b> 42706	Modifier	<b>xsubj</b> 504	Clausal subject
<b>obj</b> 7248	Object (direct argument of a non-auxiliary verbal head)		



# Input for RMRS

The information for the RMRS structures is based on the following linguistic annotation:

- the lemma (*Lemma*) for the given wordform;
- the morphosyntactic tag (*MSTag*) of the wordform, and
- the dependent relations in the dependency tree
- In cases of quantifiers we have access to the lexicon used in BURGER





# Rules for RMRS

- Two types:

- $\langle \textit{Lemma}, \textit{MSTag} \rangle \rightarrow \textit{EP-RMRS}$

The rules of this type produce an RMRS including an elementary predicate

- $\langle \textit{DRMRS}, \textit{Rel}, \textit{HRMRS} \rangle \rightarrow \textit{HRMRS}'$

The rules of this type unite the RMRS constructed for a dependent node (*DRMRS*) into the current RMRS for a head node (*HRMRS*)



Examples: verb **чета** (*'read-I', I read*)

Rule:

$\langle \text{Lemma, Vp} \rangle \rightarrow$

$\langle 11:a1:e1, \{ 11:a1:lemma\_v\_rel(e1) \}, \{ a1:ARG1(x1) \}, \{ \} \rangle$

... **чета (чета, Vp)** ...

$\langle 11:a1:e1, \{ 11:a1:чета\_v\_rel(e1) \}, \{ a1:ARG1(x1) \}, \{ \} \rangle$



Examples: verb читаю я ('*read him her*' I read it to him) (1)

Rule:

$\langle \langle l2:a2:x2, \{\}, \{a2:ARG2(x2)\}, HC1 \rangle, \text{comp}, \langle l1:a1:e1, \{ l1:a1:lemma\_v\_rel(e1) \mid R \}, ARGs, HC2 \rangle \rangle$

$\rightarrow$

$\langle l1:a1:e1, \{ l1:a1:lemma\_v\_rel(e1) \mid R \}, \{ a1:ARG2(x2) \} \cup ARGs, HC1 \cup HC2 \rangle$



Examples: verb чета му я (*'read him her'* I read it to him) (2)

<l2:a2:x2, {}, {a2:ARG2(x2)}, {}> ,

comp,

< l1:a1:e1, { l1:a1:чета\_v\_rel(e1) }, { a1:ARG1(x1) }, {} >

→

< l1:a1:e1,

{ l1:a1:чета\_v\_rel(e1) },

{ a1:ARG1(x1), a1:ARG2(x2) },

{ } >



Examples: verb чета му я (*'read him her'* I read it to him) (3)

<l3:a3:x3, {}, {a3:ARG2(x3)}, {}>

is incorporated in a similar way:

< l1:a1:e1,  
    { l1:a1:чета\_v\_rel(e1) },  
    { a1:ARG1(x1), a1:ARG2(x2), a1:ARG3(x3) },  
{} >



*момче му я четe* (Boy him-dative her-accusative read, ‘A boy reads it to him’)

Rule:

$\langle \langle l2:a2:x2, \{l2:a2:lemma\_n\_rel(x1)|R1\}, ARGs2, HC2 \rangle, subj, \langle l1:a1:e1, \{ l1:a1:lemma\_v\_rel(e1) | R2 \}, ARGs1, HC1 \rangle \rangle$

$\rightarrow$

$\langle l1:a1:e1, \{ l1:a1:lemma\_v\_rel(e1), l2:a2:lemma\_n\_rel(x1) | R1 \cup R2 \}, \{ a1:ARG1(x1) \} \cup ARGs1 \cup ARGs2, HC1 \cup HC2 \rangle$



*момче му я четe* (Boy him-dative her-accusative read, ‘A boy reads it to him’)

< ‘момче’ > subj < ‘му я четe’ >

→

< 12:a4:e1,

{ 11:a1:момче\_n\_rel(x1), 12:a4:чета\_v\_rel(e1) },

{ a4:ARG1(x1), a4:ARG2(x2), a4:ARG3(x3) },

{ } >



*момче му чете книга* (Boy him-dative  
reads book, 'A boy reads a book to him')

< 'момче' > subj <'му чете' > and

< 'книга' > obj <'му чете' >

→

< l2:a3:e1,

{ l1:a1:момче\_n\_rel(x1), l2:a3:чета\_v\_rel(e1),  
l3:a4:книга\_n\_rel(x2) },

{ a3:ARG1(x1), a3:ARG2(x2), a3:ARG3(x3) }, {} >





# Algorithm

The dependency tree is traversed two times:

1. Top-down for each lexical node the RMRS on the basis of lemma and morphosyntactic information is constructed
2. Then bottom-up the RMRS for the dependent elements are incorporated within the head RMRS



# Conclusions and Future Work

- We have developed a pipeline which produces RMRS analysis for Bulgarian sentences
- We have exploited it in Bulgarian-English SMT
- Improving the RMRS details and accuracy
- Using RMRS analysis to support the deep analysis with BURGER

