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ABSTRACT

There have been various results in English-to-Korean Machine Translation reported, but so far no attention has been paid to the problems of lexical transfer of pronominal anaphors and/or resolving pronominal reference and a default pronoun translation has been considered instead. In this paper we argue that pronouns cannot be handled trivially in English-to-Korean translation and one cannot bypass the task of resolving anaphoric reference if aiming at good and natural translation. In addition, we propose practical transfer rules for English-to-Korean anaphor translation and outline an anaphora resolution model for an English-to-Korean MT system in operation.

RESUMEN

En este artículo se consideran los problemas de la transferencia lexical de pronombres y la resolución anafórica en la traducción automática (TA), sobretodo desde el punto de vista de la traducción inglés-coreano. Después de introducir el problema general de la transferencia léxica, los autores argumentan la necesidad de la resolución anafórica en la traducción inglés-coreano, describen brevemente su sistema de TA y proponen reglas prácticas para la transferencia lexical de pronombres. Finalmente, se presenta un modelo de resolución anafórica que se realizará en el sistema de traducción automática.
1. LEXICAL TRANSFER IN MACHINE TRANSLATION

In transfer-based Machine Translation (MT) systems, lexical transfer consists of the replacement of a lexical item by a target lexical item. In case there is only one target language equivalent, lexical transfer does not seem to be a very critical problem. Equally unproblematic for lexical transfer are many-to-one translations. Unfortunately, in most of the language pairs there are a number of cases of one-to-many lexical item mappings available. The lexical transfer phase appears to be the most crucial step in MT because most of the difficult problems are caused by lexical differences between two languages.

According to [Hutchins & Somers 92] one-to-one lexical correspondences are expected to be common only in technical texts. We found out that even technical texts cannot be safe enough in lexical transfer. In reality, restricted sublanguages cannot always escape from the tough general language problems. In English-to-Korean translation, for instance, we face additional lexical transfer problems arising from the different possible alternatives when translating English pronouns\(^1\). And whereas in availability of choices lexical transfer usually requires inspection of surrounding text, in our case the correct choice of a pronoun depends on the information of its antecedent\(^2\), i.e., the correct lexical transfer depends on successful anaphora\(^3\) resolution.

2. TRANSLATION OF PRONOMINAL ANAPHORS

Assuming English to be a source language, English pronominal anaphors can be translated in different ways, depending on the target language.

Consider the translation of the pronoun "it" into different target languages. If the target language is French, Spanish or Italian, we have to choose between a feminine or masculine pronoun. If we translate into German, Greek and Slavic languages, then we have one more gender choice - neuter.

In some languages the pronoun 'it' has to be translated directly by its referent. In English to Malay translation for instance, there is a tendency of replacing 'it' with its referent. As an

---

\(^1\)In this paper we only consider pronouns in 3rd person singular and plural. Pronouns in 1st and 2nd person in Korean are socially dependent, rare in technical sublanguages and are not subject to our current investigations.

\(^2\)Also termed "reifier" which is used as a synonym throughout the paper.

\(^3\)Given the complexity of the problem, we have concentrated on pronominal type of anaphora and later in our paper zero reference.
illustration, consider the following English text and its translation into Malay. In the Malay translation the anaphor \textit{it} is translated by its referent \textit{structure (struktur)}.

For Malay texts, out of the 5 acceptable structures, we chose only one structure as the stable schema because \textit{it} gave the highest percentage.

Bagi teks bahasa Malaysia, daripada 5 struktur yang diterima, kami hanya memilih satu struktur sahaja sebagai skema stabil kerana \textit{struktur} tersebut memberikan peratusan tertinggi

Very often pronominal anaphors are simply omitted in the target language. For example, though the English personal pronouns have their correspondences in Spanish, they are frequently not translated because of the typical Spanish elliptical zero-subject constructions. As an illustration, consider the following parallel English and Spanish texts [Korea 94].

Songgyunkwan is located near the Tachangno Street, on the campus of Songgyunkwan university. \textit{It} was originally the National Confucian Academy.

Songgyunkwan está en el campus de la Universidad Songgyunkwan, cerca de la called Tachangno. Originalmente fue la Academia Nacional Confuciana.

Regarding English-to-Korean translation, the English pronouns can be omitted elliptically, translated by a definite noun phrase, by their referent, or by one or two possible Korean pronouns, depending on the syntactic information, the type and semantic class of the noun the anaphor refers. In section 4 we propose practical rules for lexical transfer of pronominal anaphors.

3. ANAPHORA RESOLUTION AND MACHINE TRANSLATION

The correct lexical transfer of anaphors in Machine Translation for target languages which mark the pronoun gender, requires anaphora resolution. Pronominal anaphoric reference has to be resolved before we decide which of the possible pronouns to use, because they take the gender of their antecedents.

Replacing a pronominal anaphor with its referent also implies that the translator (program) must be first able to recognize the referent. Even in cases of omitting the pronoun to be translated, usually the referent must be identified because of possible grammatical agreement(s) in the target language. In other words, we face inevitably the problem of
Anaphora resolution is a complicated problem in natural language processing. Considerable research has been done by computational linguists ([Carbonel & Brown 88], [Dahl & Ball 90], [Ruderking & Gehrke 87], [Hayes 81], [Hobbs 78], [Ingria & Stallard 89], [Rich & LuperFoy 89], [Robert 89]), but no complete theory has emerged which offers a resolution procedure with success guaranteed. Most approaches developed - even if we restrict our attention to pronominal anaphora, from purely syntactic ones to highly semantic and pragmatic ones, only provide a partial treatment of the problem.

Anaphora resolution within the domain of Machine Translation (MT) has its specific aspects. It also reflects two essential topics in Machine Translation: ambiguity in an MT context and translation of discourse instead of isolated sentences. Anaphora can be viewed as a sort of ambiguity, in that the antecedent of a given pronoun might be uncertain and referential relations are one of the means that constitute coherence of texts.

At least two English to Korean Machine Translation (MT) systems have been reported so far in operation ([Kim & Choi 93], [Lee & Kim 93]), but none of them has paid attention to the problems of lexical transfer of pronominal anaphors and/or resolving pronominal reference and default translation has been used for handling pronouns.

4. DO WE NEED ANAPHORA RESOLUTION IN ENGLISH-TO-KOREAN MACHINE TRANSLATION?

In Korean MT community, not much attention has been drawn to anaphora resolution problems. This is partly due to the complicated problem of anaphora resolution. But it is also due to the biased assumption that anaphoric expressions in the source language can be easily mapped to the corresponding anaphors in the target (Korean) language, or in many cases they can be simply ignored in the transfer phase.

Whereas in most European language pairs anaphora resolution is "compulsory" (or else we risk of rendering in certain cases quite unacceptable translations), there are certain cases in Korean where anaphora resolution may seem "optional".

Consider the sentences [Hutchins & Somers 92]:

(1) The monkey ate the banana because it was hungry.
(2) The monkey ate the banana because it was ripe.
In each case the pronoun "it" refers to something different: in (1) the monkey, in (2) the banana and in (3) - to the abstract notion of time. If we have to translate the above sentences in German, then anaphora resolution is inevitable, since the pronouns take the gender of their antecedents and since the German words "Affe" - (masculine, "monkey"), "Banana" (feminine, "banana") and "es" (neutral - "it" for time notion) are in different gender.

Consider the translation of the sentences (1)-(3) from English to Korean and their literal descriptions in English.

(1') 먹이어서 흥분이 있는 바나니를 맛었다.
hungry-CAUSAL monkey-NOMINATIVE banana-ACCUSATIVE eat-PAST,DECLARATIVE.
(2') 익어서 흥분이 있는 바나니를 맛었다.
ripe-CAUSAL monkey-NOMINATIVE banana-ACCUSATIVE eat-PAST,DECLARATIVE.
(3') 티타임이어서 흥분이 있는 바나니를 맛었다.
tea time-CAUSAL monkey-NOMINATIVE banana-ACCUSATIVE eat-PAST,DECLARATIVE.

Note that in the above Korean translations there are no pronouns. These examples might seem encouraging that we could translate from English to Korean, bypassing the tough problem of anaphora resolution. However, such a conclusion would be too misleading.

The assumption that anaphoric expressions in the source language can be easily mapped to the corresponding anaphors in the target language, or in many cases they can be simply ignored in the transfer phase, is unfounded. It is not hard to find English sentences for which anaphora resolution is necessary in order to get their correct translation into Korean. Consider the sentences:

(4a) Although programmers usually write good programs, they may still make a mistake.
(4b) Although programs are usually written by good programmers, they may still contain mistakes.

In Korean, there are two types of pronominals corresponding to "they", one for human beings and the other for non-human beings. In order to assign the proper Korean pronominals to the English pronominal "they", the system should be able to resolve "they" between the two possible referents, "programmers" and "programs".
hora resolution becomes a more serious business when we aim at achieving high-quality translation. The translation of (4a) and (4b) into Korean with the successful assignment of nouns may still sound awkward to Koreans, because in Korean it is stylistically more natural not to explicitly mention anaphors in subordinate clauses that are coreferential with pronominal expressions in the main clause. It is somewhat similar to English participle constructions whose subject is "understood." The best translation of (4b) in Korean could be rendered in English literally as:

(5) Being usually written by good programmers, programs may still contain mistakes.

So if we are able to get the translation of (4a) and (4b) without overt pronominals, we are more likely to get better translation. This being so, anaphora resolution is very crucial in English-to-Korean MT because we must resolve the pronominal "they" to replace it by proper noun expressions.

Moreover, "optional" anaphora resolution means preserving anaphoric ambiguity in case no anaphora resolution is undertaken. It may seem that carrying ambiguities over translation is more "authentic" from the point of view of having a mirror translation of the source text. Resolving anaphoric ambiguity means that during the translation process text is not fully understood. Generally speaking, however, analysis is aimed at producing an unambiguous intermediate representation [Isabelle & Bourbeau 85].

Moreover, a system strongly relying on the "ambiguity preservation" method, in addition to bringing no computational advantage when ambiguity-preserving situations must be notified dynamically, is extremely vulnerable in situations where (i) the lexicon is growing while the system is in use or (ii) when additional languages must be introduced ([Nirenburg et al. 92]). Every new word sense added to the lexicon carries the potential of ruining the possibility of retaining ambiguity in translation for all previous entries. All this means that extra attention must be paid to the maintenance of the lexicons.

ENGLISH-TO-KOREAN MACHINE TRANSLATION AND MATES

We are currently investigating the anaphor lexical transfer problem and anaphora resolution reversibility with regards to possible extension of our English-to-Korean translation system MATES/EK. MATES/EK has been developed through a co-research done by KAIST and SERI (Systems Engineering Research Institute) from 1988 to 1992, and is still under evolution in
result (parse tree) into an intermediate representation, and then transforms it into a Korean syntactic structure to construct a Korean sentence [Choi 94 et al]. MATES/EK has the following features:

- **Morphological Analysis Using N-gram:**

Category ambiguities are resolved by combining the N-gram and the rules.

- **Augmented Context Free Grammars for English Syntactic Analysis:**

An augmented context free grammar has been defined for general English syntactic analysis and the analyzer is implemented using Generalized parsing algorithm [Tomita 87].

- **Lexical Semantic Structure (LSS) to represent the intermediate representation:**

The result of the syntactic structure is transformed into an intermediate representation LSS, which is a dependency structure that is relatively independent to specific languages. In LSS, the constituents in a sentence are combined only in head-dependent relation based on the lexical categories, and there are no order relation between the constituents. Hence LSS is desirable for translation between English and Korean, two languages with fairly different syntactic structures.

- **Grammar Writing Language and its Environment:**

MATES/EK runs a series of tree transformations on the LSS structure from the English syntactic structure, in order to get a structure specific to Korean syntactic structure. To do this, we developed a grammar writing language, in which the rules describe the tree transformations, and its supporting system. During the tree transformation operations the system looks up in the English-Korean bilingual dictionary in order to get the Korean lexemes.

- **Development Supporting Tools:**

Taking into account the continuously growing property of an MT system, we developed a set of development supporting tools for grammar writing and editing, dictionary updating and translation testing.
ATES/EK consists of a set of dictionaries, a set of grammar rules and processing modules. Translation is carried out as sequential processing stages: English morphological analysis, English syntactic analysis, English semantic analysis, English-Korean lexical transfer, English-to-Korean structural transformation, Korean syntactic structure generation and Korean morphological generation. Figure 1 depicts the overall configuration of MATES/EK.

Figure 1. The system configuration of MATES/EK

This system is tested on 1,708 sentences, whose length is less than 26 words selected from 2500 sentences in the IEEE computer magazine September 1991. It shows about 95 percent of success rate for sentences shorter than 15 words, about 90 percent for 18 words, 80 percent for 21 words, and 75 percent for 26 words. This is a quite encouraging result since the magazine contains various kinds of texts of various styles.

6. LEXICAL TRANSFER RULES FOR ENGLISH-TO-KOREAN ANAPHOR TRANSLATION

Though MATES/EK has demonstrated very encouraging results, it is far from being a perfect automatic translator. We have not incorporated lexical transfer rules for pronominal anaphors and anaphora resolution module yet, and there are certain cases of complex and/or subsequent sentences in which the system will not produce the most natural translation.

We studied various texts from a Computer Science English corpus prepared for Machine Translation and on the basis of our observations we proposed practical anaphor translation rules for the needs of the lexical transfer in English to Korean Machine Translation. These...
syntactic information, the type and semantic class of the noun the anaphor refers to, and can be very helpful for the lexical choice during the transfer. We do not regard the described set of rules as complete; however, it provides a good starting point and gives an idea of the direction of our current research efforts. The following major cases are concerned:

5.1 Complex Sentence I (main clause + subordinate clause)

When the subordinate clause in a complex sentence follows the main clause, the anaphor in the subordinate clause should not be translated.

(8) Cashes are one of the most important ideas in computer architecture because they can substantially improve performance by the use of memory.

메모리 사용에 의한 성능을 향상시킬 수 있도록 개발된 컴퓨터 구조에서

memory use-INSTRUMENTAL performance-ACCUSATIVE substantially improve-CAUSAL

cache-NOMINATIVE architecture-LOCATIVE most important ideas-among one-DECLARATIVE.

5.2 Complex Sentence II (subordinate clause + main clause)

If the subordinate clause in a complex sentence is followed by the main clause, the anaphor(s) in the main clause is realized as the noun phrase(s) in the subordinate the anaphor refers to.

(9) As processors get faster, they will lose more and more of their performance to the memory system.

프로세서가 빠르면 특정 프로세서의 메모리 시스템에 대한 성능이 상실될 것이다.

processor-NOMINATIVE fast-CONDITIONAL processor-POSSESSIVE memory system-

DIRECTIVE performance-NOMINATIVE lose-FUTURE-DECLARATIVE.

5.3 Generalized Quantifiers

If the anaphor refers to generalized quantifiers, it is translated into definite description patterns such as "그런 (kuren: 'such' or 'that') +

nominal".
(10) Although many approaches may be technologically feasible, they must also be economically feasible to be applied in a market economy.

(11) The child is in the room, and it is playing with a doll.

(12) There was a nice banquet on a ship. Her name was 'Pearl de Mer'.

(13) When the system executes the erroneous instructions with certain data values, they cause a failure and the error becomes effective.
Every other case

In every other case, use the default translations: "he"-کو (ku), "she"-کو (kunyo), "it"-کو (kugol) and "they"-کو (kugotul).

(14) Mr. Han went out at 3:00 in the afternoon and he will come back late in the evening.

Mr. Han- NOMINATIVE afternoon 3:00- TEMPORAL go out-PAST, CONJUNCTIVE he- NOMINATIVE evening late return FUTURE DECLARATIVE.

He rules 5.1-5.7 are to be integrated into the lexical transfer module of MATES. These practical rules are based on available information about the referent and before applying them, antecedents should have been already identified.

The above rules are given in priority order and can be easily described in a more formal way.

ANAPHRORA RESOLUTION MODEL

We have seen that the correct lexical transfer of English pronouns in Korean requires identifying their antecedents, i.e. anaphora resolution. In addition, since we are aiming at extending MATES into a system that can handle discourse translation (initially handling anaphoric references), we are studying different anaphora resolution strategies. At this stage, we have chosen a simplified version of our integrated anaphora resolution model proposed in [Mitkov 94]. Full implementation of this model, including center tracking inference engine, seems too costly for the immediate goals of our English to Korean translation system.

The main idea is that given the complexity of the problem, we think that to secure a comparatively successful handling of anaphora resolution one should adhere to the following guidelines: focus on a domain (sublanguage) rather than focus on a particular natural
bonell & Brown 88], [Rich & LuperFoy 88]), ([Preuß et al 94]) do express the idea of a two-level approach", or "distributed architecture", but their ideas a) do not seem to preclude enough discourse and heuristical knowledge and/or b) do not concentrate on and stipulate a concrete domain, and thus risk being too general. We have tried nevertheless to port some of their ideas into our proposal.

Anaphora resolution model integrates modules containing different types of knowledge - syntactic, semantic, domain, discourse and heuristical (Figure 2).

**Figure 2: An integrated anaphora resolution architecture**

The syntactic module, for example, knows that the anaphor and antecedent must agree in number, gender and person. It checks if the c-command constraints hold and establishes joint reference. In cases of syntactic parallelism, it prefers the noun phrase with the same syntactic role as the anaphor, as the most probable antecedent. It knows when cataphora is possible and can indicate syntactically topocalized noun phrases, which are more likely to be antecedents than non-topocalized ones.

The semantic module checks for semantic consistency between the anaphor and the possible antecedents with it being a space for the better guidance with the about

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEURISTIC KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>DOMAIN KNOWLEDGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain Heuristics</td>
<td>Tracking Center</td>
<td>Domain Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENTIAL EXPRESSION FILTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANAPHORA RESOLVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTECEDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYNTACTIC KNOWLEDGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjoint Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Command Constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataphora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic Parallelism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic Topicalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMANTIC KNOWLEDGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Parallelism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>session by minning author execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lang context-time form uniform parse sentence, llot and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
semantics or the animacy of the candidate. In cases of semantic parallelism, it prefers the noun phrase, having the same semantic role as the anaphor, as a most likely antecedent. Finally, it generates a set of possible antecedents whenever necessary.

The domain knowledge module is practically a knowledge base of the concepts of the considered domain and the discourse knowledge module knows how to track the center of the current discourse segment.

The heuristical knowledge module can sometimes be helpful in assigning the antecedent. It has a set of useful rules (e.g. the antecedent is to be located preferably in the current sentence or in the previous one) and can forestall certain impractical search procedures.

The use of common sense and world knowledge is in general commendable, but it requires a huge knowledge base and set of inference rules. At the present stage of our project, however, we do not envisage the development of this module.

The syntactic and semantic modules usually filter the possible candidates and do not propose an antecedent (with the exception of syntactic and semantic parallelism). Usually the proposal for an antecedent comes from the domain, heuristical, and discourse modules. The latter plays an important role in tracking the center and proposes it in many cases as the most probable candidate for an antecedent.

The referential expression filter is very useful in filtering out impersonal 'it'-expression (e.g. "it is important", "it is necessary", "it should be pointed out" etc.), where 'it' is not anaphoric.

Initially, we envisage the implementation of the syntactic, semantic and heuristical modules, which together with the referential expression filter alone are helpful in solving practically most of the cases in our sublanguage.

A CONCLUDING NOTE

In our paper we have shown the importance of the correct lexical transfer and anaphora resolution in English-to-Korean Machine Translation. We would like to point out that the raised issues apply with equal importance to Korean text generation since the proposed lexical transfer rules, if correspondingly modified, can be regarded as lexical choice rules for generating Korean anaphoric expressions.
ANEXO: EJEMPLOS

El resultado del análisis de una oración con extraposición.

La estructura phrase considerada es:

```
phrase(Posi,Posd,Posn,Nucleo,Features,Coms,Exts,Mizqs,Mders)
```

Posi: posición de la primera palabra anterior del sintagma.

Posd: posición de la última palabra del sintagma.

Posn: posición de la palabra núcleo del sintagma.

Nucleo: forma base y acepción de la palabra núcleo.

Features: características del sintagma.

Coms: slot frame.

Exts: huecos extrapuestos.

Mizq: modificadores por la izquierda.

Mder: modificadores por la derecha.

Cada modificador en la forma slotllenado(sintagma modificador).

La oración analizada es:

```
Os quiero ver de negro.
```

La estructura phrase obtenida para la frase completa es:

```
posizq: 0
posder: 5
posnucleo: 2
```
las siguientes condiciones.

I. P y N tienen características de concordancia incompatibles.
II. P está en el dominio del argumento de N.
III. P está en el dominio adjunto de N.
IV. P está en el argumento de una palabra núcleo H, N no es un pronombre, y N está contiene en H.
V. P está en el dominio de sintagma nominal de N.
VI. P es el determinante de un nombre Q, y N está contenido en Q.

Condición III: María llegó con ella.
Condición IV: Este es el hombre que dijo que él escribió.

El segundo algoritmo consiste en identificar un posible sintagma nominal que actúa como antecedente para un pronombre anafórico. Tomaremos como pronombres anafóricos los pronombres reflexivos. El concepto de hueco argumento (o complemento) mayor usado en la formulación del algoritmo se define en base a la jerarquía de huecos argumento siguiente:

subj > agent > obj > (obj), (obj)

donde subj es el hueco sujeto, agent es el agente de una oración pasiva, obj es el hueco objeto directo, iobj es el hueco objeto indirecto y pobj es el objeto de un complemento preposicional de un verbo.

Asumimos las definiciones de dominio del argumento, dominio adjunto y dominio del sintagma nominal.

Un sintagma nominal N es un posible antecedente para un pronombre anafórico A si N y A tienen incompatibilidades de concordancia y se cumple una de las siguientes cinco condiciones:

I. A está en el dominio del argumento de N, y N llena un slot argumento mayor que el que A.
II. A está en el dominio adjunto de N.
III. A está en el dominio de sintagma nominal de N.
IV. N es el argumento de un verbo V, hay un sintagma nominal Q en el dominio del argumento en el dominio adjunto de N de manera que Q no lleva determinante, y A es i) un argumento Q, o ii) A es un argumento de una preposición PREP y PREP es un adjunto de Q.
V. A es el determinante de un nombre Q, y i) Q está es el dominio del argumento de N y tiene un hueco argumento mayor que Q, o ii) Q está en el dominio adjunto de N.
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