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'The pig killing is no offence'
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## Setting the scene

- Human languages are full of multiword expressions (MWEs)
$\rightarrow$ Difficult for humans $\Longrightarrow$ difficult for computers
- Language technology has made enormous advances
- Language technology still has trouble dealing with MWEs

| Detect language | Hungarian | English | Fre | $\checkmark$ | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ | Portuguese | French | English |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Nem erőszak a disznótor. $\times \quad$ The pig's butt is not violence.
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## 1. Linguistic notions



Call a spade a spade
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## Multiword expressions

Words that belong together

## Des mots qui vont bien ensemble

- Related notions
$\rightarrow$ Collocations
$\rightarrow$ Metaphors
$\rightarrow$ Compounds
$\rightarrow$ Constructions
$\rightarrow$ Phrasemes
$\rightarrow$ Named entities
$\rightarrow$ Terminology
$\rightarrow$...
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Multiword expressions

1. Contain at least two component words which are lexicalised
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3. Display some degree of lexical, morphological, syntactic or semantic idiosyncrasy

- Lexicalised components (in boldface)
$\rightarrow$ en He takes the/a/this shower
$\rightarrow$ en She took the cake 'she won' $\neq$ ?She took this cake
$\rightarrow$ Components that cannot be replaced nor omitted


## Working definition

Multiword expressions

1. Contain at least two component words which are lexicalised
2. Include a head and at least one other syntactically related word
3. Display some degree of lexical, morphological, syntactic or semantic idiosyncrasy

- Syntactic backbone: dependency
$\rightarrow$ fr suite à 'after' $\rightarrow$ fixed (UD)
$\rightarrow$ fr ne parle pas 'do not speak'
$\rightarrow$ Recurrent dependency subgraphs


## Working definition

## Multiword expressions

1. Contain at least two component words which are lexicalised
2. Include a head and at least one other syntactically related word
3. Display some degree of lexical, morphological, syntactic or semantic idiosyncrasy

- Idiosyncrasy
$\rightarrow$ en flower child 'hippie' $\rightarrow$ semantically non compositional
$\rightarrow$ en truth be told 'honestly' $\rightarrow$ syntactically irregular


## Working definition

## Multiword expressions

1. Contain at least two component words which are lexicalised
2. Include a head and at least one other syntactically related word
3. Display some degree of lexical, morphological, syntactic or semantic idiosyncrasy

In short: Exceptions that occur when words get together

## MWE categories

- Broad definition $\rightarrow$ heterogeneous configurations
- UD-inspired taxonomy based on syntactic function



## Computational tasks

"MWE processing is composed of two main subtasks that are often confused in the literature: MWE discovery and MWE identification"
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## Computational tasks

## text

$a b c a b c$ a bcbba
bcac bc bacb b ba

$a b c a b c$ a bcbba
bcac bc bacb bba
downstream task
anotated text

## Why study MWEs in NLP?

- A whole lot of them
$\rightarrow$ Up to 44\% Open Wordnet entries
$\rightarrow$ One MWE every 20 tokens (PARSEME-FR)
- Flowing like a river
- Getting to the meaning
- There is beauty in chaos
- MWEs in the era of LLMs
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## Why study MWEs in NLP?

- A whole lot of them
- Flowing like a river
- Getting to the meaning
- There is beauty in chaos
- MWEs in the era of LLMs
$\rightarrow$ Role of linguistics in NLP
$\rightarrow$ Data curation, evaluation protocols


## 2. Discovery of MWEs



Ivory towers not made of ivory

## Challenges in MWE discovery

- MWE discovery: association scores, patterns, substitution, ...
$\rightarrow$ (Choueka, 1988; Church and Hanks, 1990; Smadja, 1993; Justeson and Katz, 1995)
- Distinguish idiomatic from topical co-occurrence
$\rightarrow$ en dry run 'rehearsal' vs. dry summer


## Challenges in MWE discovery

- MWE discovery: association scores, patterns, substitution, ...
$\rightarrow$ (Choueka, 1988; Church and Hanks, 1990; Smadja, 1993; Justeson and Katz, 1995)
- Distinguish idiomatic from topical co-occurrence
$\rightarrow$ en dry run 'rehearsal' vs. dry summer
Challenge:

1. Compositionality continuum
$\rightarrow$ en swimming pool is a pool for swimming
$\rightarrow \mathrm{fr}$ carte bleue lit. 'card blue' $\Rightarrow$ 'credit card' is a card but it is not blue
$\rightarrow \mathrm{pt}$ pé-quente lit. 'foot-hot' $\Rightarrow$ 'lucky person' is neither hot nor a foot

## Compositionality prediction

- Compositionality prediction for MWE discovery
$\rightarrow$ Some method generates MWE candidates
$\rightarrow$ Each candidate gets a compositionality prediction
$\rightarrow$ Less compositional $\Longrightarrow$ lexicon entry


## Compositionality prediction

- Compositionality prediction for MWE discovery
$\rightarrow$ Some method generates MWE candidates
$\rightarrow$ Each candidate gets a compositionality prediction
$\rightarrow$ Less compositional $\Longrightarrow$ lexicon entry


## Graded compositionality

- Given a word combination
$\rightarrow$ ivory tower 'privileged situation'
- Proportion of whole's meaning predictable from components?
$\rightarrow$ Comp(ivory_tower, ivory, tower) $=10 \%$
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## Nominal compounds dataset

## Question

$\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ How to build a dataset with reference compositionality scores?

- 180 nominal compounds in French, Portuguese and English

```
\(\rightarrow\) en pocket book 'small book'
\(\rightarrow\) fr petite nature lit. 'small nature' \(\Rightarrow\) 'fragile person'
\(\rightarrow\) pt gato pingado lit. 'cat dropped' \(\Rightarrow\) 'few people'
```


## Compositionality annotation

- Out-of-context annotation of each compound
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- Scale from 0 (totally idiomatic) to 5 (totally compositional)
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5. In your opinion, is the meaning of a pocket book always literally related to pocket?

6. Given your previous replies, would you say that a pocket book is always literally a b


## Compositionality annotation

- Out-of-context annotation of each compound
- Scale from 0 (totally idiomatic) to 5 (totally compositional)
$\rightarrow$ Head (book), modifier (pocket), compound (pocket book)
- Average across 15-20 crowdsourcing workers

5. In your opinion, is the meaning of a pocket book always literally related to pocket?

6. Given your previous replies, would you say that a pocket book is always literally a b


|  | compound | head | mod. | compound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\tilde{n}}{0} \end{aligned}$ | match nul | $4.4 \pm 1.3$ | $2.2 \pm 2.3$ | $2.5 \pm 2.1$ |
|  | mort né | $4.6 \pm 1.1$ | $3.5 \pm 1.8$ | $3.2 \pm 2.0$ |
|  | carte grise | $4.5 \pm 0.9$ | $3.2 \pm 2.0$ | $3.1 \pm 1.9$ |
|  | second degré | $1.7 \pm 1.9$ | $2.4 \pm 2.1$ | $1.4 \pm 1.9$ |
|  | grippe aviaire | $4.6 \pm 1.4$ | $3.8 \pm 1.9$ | $3.6 \pm 1.9$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{+}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{N}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{c} \end{aligned}$ | eau chaude | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | eau potable | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | matière grasse | $4.8 \pm 0.4$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | poule mouillée | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | téléphone portable | $4.9 \pm 0.5$ | $4.9 \pm 0.3$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |

## Resulting scores

|  | compound | head | mod. | compound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{+}{む} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{N}{0} \\ & \stackrel{N}{0} \end{aligned}$ | match nul | $4.4 \pm 1.3$ | $2.2 \pm 2.3$ | $2.5 \pm 2.1$ |
|  | mort né | $4.6 \pm 1.1$ | $3.5 \pm 1.8$ | $3.2 \pm 2.0$ |
|  | carte grise | $4.5 \pm 0.9$ | $3.2 \pm 2.0$ | $3.1 \pm 1.9$ |
|  | second degré | $1.7 \pm 1.9$ | $2.4 \pm 2.1$ | $1.4 \pm 1.9$ |
|  | grippe aviaire | $4.6 \pm 1.4$ | $3.8 \pm 1.9$ | $3.6 \pm 1.9$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{+}{む} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\vdots}{\leftrightarrows} \end{aligned}$ | eau chaude | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | eau potable | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | matière grasse | $4.8 \pm 0.4$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | poule mouillée | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | téléphone portable | $4.9 \pm 0.5$ | $4.9 \pm 0.3$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |

- Analyses confirm linguistic intuitions
- Alternative ways to get compositionality scores: future work
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## Question

$\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ How to use word embeddings to predict compositionality?

## Static word embeddings

- Distributional hypothesis: co-occurence $\approx$ meaning (Harris, 1954)
$\rightarrow$ Embed usual contexts of occurrence in corpora
- Vectors in d-dimensional space: mathematical operations


## Underlying hypothesis



## police $\oplus$ car

## Underlying hypothesis

ivory_tower


# ivory $\oplus$ tower 

## Prediction method

- Combine: $\overrightarrow{w_{1}} \oplus \overrightarrow{w_{2}}=\overrightarrow{w_{1}}+\overrightarrow{w_{2}}$
- Compare: $\left.p c=\operatorname{cosine}\left(\overrightarrow{w_{1}} \vec{w}_{2}, \overrightarrow{w_{1}} \oplus \overrightarrow{w_{2}}\right)\right)$



## Evaluation protocol



## Compositionality prediction results

|  | $\oplus$ combination functions $\left(\overrightarrow{w_{1}} \oplus \overrightarrow{w_{2}}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | uniform | max-sim | geom | arith | head | mod |
| English | .726 | .730 | .677 | .718 | .555 | .677 |
| French | .702 | .693 | .699 | .703 | .617 | .645 |
| Portuguese | .602 | .590 | .580 | .598 | .558 | .486 |
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## Compositionality prediction results

$\oplus$ combination functions $\left(\overrightarrow{w_{1}} \oplus \overrightarrow{w_{2}}\right)$

|  | uniform | max-sim | geom | arith | head | mod |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| English | .726 | .730 | .677 | .718 | .555 | .677 |
| French | .702 | .693 | .699 | .703 | .617 | .645 |
| Portuguese | .602 | .590 | .580 | .598 | .558 | .486 |

- Factors influencing prediction:
$\rightarrow$ 1B-word corpus, lemmatisation, frequent compounds (Cordeiro et al., 2019)
- Useful in downstream task: MWE identification (scholivet et al., 2018)


## 3. Identification of MWEs



Looking for needles in a haystack

## Challenges in MWE identification



MWE identification is not rocket science 'easy'!
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## Challenges in MWE identification

1. Discontinuities
$\rightarrow$ fr prendre tout cela en compte 'take all this into account'
$\rightarrow$ pt tirei mais da metade das fotos 'I took more than half of the photos'
2. Ambiguity
$\rightarrow$ en the exam was a piece of cake
$\rightarrow$ en I ate a piece of cake and left
3. Variability
$\rightarrow$ en truth be told 'honestly' $\rightarrow$ ?truth was told
$\rightarrow$ en put/puts/putting a/his/her/my/our finger on 'understand'
$\rightarrow$ en decisions which we made

## Research questions
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$\rightarrow$ Model patterns of discontinuity, ambiguity, variability
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## Research questions

MWE identification

- Corpus-based machine learning methods
$\rightarrow$ Model patterns of discontinuity, ambiguity, variability
$\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ How do we annotate MWEs across many languages?
$\rightarrow$ Resources
$\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ How can we build MWE identifiers from annotated corpora?
$\rightarrow$ Methods

PARSEME: a science odyssey


## Verbal MWE annotation

## Question

$\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ How do we annotate MWEs across many languages?

- Verbal MWEs: hardest and most interesting
- Fully cross-lingual unified terminology and guidelines
- Community of volunteers
$\rightarrow$ Coordination, training, infrastructure, documentation, etc.


## PARSEME annotation guidelines

```
LApply test S.1 - [1HEAD: Unique verb as functional syntactic head of the whc
    NO }=>\mathrm{ Apply the VID-specific tests }=>\mathrm{ VID tests positive?
    YES }=>\mathrm{ Annotate as a VMWE of category VID
    NO }=>\mathrm{ It is not a VMWE, exit
    \ YES }=>\mathrm{ Apply test S.2 - [1DEP: Verb v has exactly one lexicalized dependent d?]
        NO = Apply the VID-specific tests = VID tests positive?
            \ YES }=>\mathrm{ Annotate as a VMWE of category VID
            NO = It is not a VMWE, exit
            \ YES }=>\mathrm{ Apply test S.3 - [LEX-SUBJ: Lexicalized subject?]
            \ YES }=>\mathrm{ Apply the VID-specific tests }=>\mathrm{ VID tests positive?
            YES }=>\mathrm{ Annotate as a VMWE of category VID
```

- Linguistic tests + decision flowcharts
- 141 printed pages, examples in 29 languages, 33 authors, ...


## PARSEME corpora

| References | \#lang | \#sent | \#token | \#VMWE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| v1.0 (Savary et al., 2017) <br> http://hdl.handle.net/11372/LRT-2282 | 18 | 274,376 | 5.4 M | 62,218 |
| v1.1 (Ramisch et al., 2018a) <br> http://hdl.handle.net/11372/LRT-2842 | 20 | 280,838 | 6.1 M | 79,326 |
| v1.2 (Ramisch et al., 2020) <br> http://hdl.handle.net/11234/1-3367 | 14 | 279,785 | 5.5 M | 68,503 |
| V1.3 (Savary et al., 2023a) <br> http://hdl.handle.net/11372/LRT-5124 | 26 | 455,629 | 9.3 M | 127,498 |

## PARSEME shared tasks

- Three editions in 2017, 2018, and 2020
- A framework to evaluate MWE identification
- 7 to 12 teams each edition
$\rightarrow$ Rankings and analyses
- Focus on unseen MWEs (2020 edition)
$\rightarrow$ Generalisation of systems


## MWE identification systems

## Question

$\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ How can we build MWE identifiers from annotated corpora?

- Veyn: sequence tagging (Scholivet and Ramisch, 2017; Zampieri et al., 2018)
- Seen2Seen: handcrafted + optimised rules (Pasquer et al., 2020b)


## Veyn: modelling discontinuities
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- Literal occurrence
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## A note on ambiguity (Savary et al., 2019)

- Literal occurrence
$\rightarrow$ en you can look it up in the dictionary
$\rightarrow$ en to see the clouds, you must look up
- Coincidental occurrence
$\rightarrow$ en how do you look when you wake up?

|  | German | Greek | Basque | Polish | Portug. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| IDIOMATIC | 3,823 | 2,405 | 3,823 | 4,843 | 5,536 |
| COINCIDENTAL | 24 | 126 | 1110 | 203 | 668 |
| LITERAL | 79 | 52 | 91 | 98 | 258 |
| Rate Lit/(Lit+Idio) | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

## Seen2Seen: focus on variants

1. Extract list of normalised MWEs annotated in training corpus $\rightarrow$ en she made many bad decisions $\rightarrow$ \{decision, make $\}$
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## Seen2Seen: focus on variants

1. Extract list of normalised MWEs annotated in training corpus
2. Locate all matching co-occurrences in the test corpus
3. Filter by applying a combination of rules
4. Select the optimal filter combination on dev

Second best (among 9) at PARSEME shared task 1.2


## Current state of affairs

|  | Seen2Seen |  | MTLB-struct |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| Arabic |  | 50.99 |  | 60.49 |
| Bulgarian |  | 65.76 |  | 73.89 |
| Czech |  | 74.18 |  | 84.27 |
| German | 69.09 | 71.41 | 76.17 | 72.96 |
| Greek | 66.93 | 66.31 | 72.62 | 71.66 |
| English |  | 59.96 |  | 65.65 |
| Spanish |  | 55.6 |  | 55.86 |
| Basque | 76.94 | 82.18 | 80.03 | 80.69 |
| Farsi |  | 71.90 |  | 86.37 |
| French | 78.63 | 78.79 | 79.42 | 80.36 |
| Irish | 26.89 | 26.67 | 30.07 |  |
| Hebrew | 42.90 | 46.91 | 48.3 | 45.56 |
| Hindi | 53.99 | 58.7 | 73.62 | 72.57 |


|  | Seen2Seen |  | MTLB-struct |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| Croatian |  | 75.39 |  |  |
| Hungarian |  | 32.02 |  |  |
| Italian | 64.92 | 65.05 | 63.76 | 63.35 |
| Lithuanian |  | 48.95 |  | 54.12 |
| Maltese |  | 16.54 |  | 13.69 |
| Polish | 81.85 | 82.53 | 81.02 | 80.51 |
| Portuguese | 72.79 | 74.06 | 73.34 | 73.95 |
| Romanian | 82.25 | 74.87 | 90.46 |  |
| Slovene |  | 41.84 |  | 35.84 |
| Serbian |  | 62.08 |  | 65.57 |
| Swedish | 70.68 | 82.25 | 71.58 | 77.06 |
| Turkish | 63.46 | 65.07 | 69.46 | 70.72 |
| Chinese | 49.28 | 35.07 | 69.63 | 63.18 |
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|  | Seen2Seen |  | MTLB-struct |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| Croatian |  | 75.39 |  |  |
| Hungarian |  | 32.02 |  |  |
| Italian | 64.92 | 65.05 | 63.76 | 63.35 |
| Lithuanian |  | 48.95 |  | 54.12 |
| Maltese |  | 16.54 |  | 13.69 |
| Polish | 81.85 | 82.53 | 81.02 | 80.51 |
| Portuguese | 72.79 | 74.06 | 73.34 | 73.95 |
| Romanian | 82.25 | 74.87 | 90.46 |  |
| Slovene |  | 41.84 |  | 35.84 |
| Serbian |  | 62.08 |  | 65.57 |
| Swedish | 70.68 | 82.25 | 71.58 | 77.06 |
| Turkish | 63.46 | 65.07 | 69.46 | 70.72 |
| Chinese | 49.28 | 35.07 | 69.63 | 63.18 |

## 4. Conclusions



Curtain falls

## Theoretical contributions

- Concept definitions
$\rightarrow$ Multiword expressions (Ramisch, 2015; Ramisch and Villavicencio, 2018)
$\rightarrow$ Literal and coincidental occurrences (Savary et al., 2019)
- Task definitions
$\rightarrow$ MWE discovery and identification (Constant et al., 2017)
$\rightarrow$ Compositionality prediction (Cordeiro et al., 2019)
- Annotation guidelines
$\rightarrow$ Nominal compound compositionality (Ramisch et al., 2016a)
$\rightarrow$ Verbal MWEs across languages (Savary et al., 2017)
$\rightarrow$ French functional expressions (Ramisch et al., 2016b)
$\rightarrow$ French MWEs across categories (Candito et al., 2021)


## Methodological and empirical contributions

- MWE identification framework
$\rightarrow$ Corpus formats (Ramisch et al., 2018a)
$\rightarrow$ Evaluation metrics (Savary et al., 2017)
$\rightarrow$ Generalisation (Ramisch et al., 2020)
$\rightarrow$ Significance (Ramisch et al., 2023)
$\rightarrow$ Interoperability with UD (Savary et al., 2023b)
- Experimental results
$\rightarrow$ Explicit MWE encoding helps parsing (Nasr et al., 2015; Scholivet et al., 2018)
$\rightarrow$ Word embeddings can model compositionality (Cordeiro et al., 2016a, 2019)
$\rightarrow$ Neural models can identify discontinuous MWEs (Zampieri et al., 2018, 2019)
$\rightarrow$ Handcrafted rules work almost as well (Pasquer et al., 2020b,a)
$\rightarrow$...


## Resources and software

- Compositionality datasets in 3 languages (Ramisch et al., 2016a)
- Literal and coincidental occurrences in 5 languages (Savary et al., 2019)
- PARSEME corpora in 26 languages (Savary et al., 2018, 2023a)
$\rightarrow$ Brazilian Portuguese version (Ramisch et al., 2018b)
- Sequoia corpus with MWEs + NEs in French (Candito et al., 2021)
- mwetoolkit extensions (Cordeiro et al., 2015, 2016b; Ramisch, 2020)
- MWE identifiers (Zampieri et al., 2018; Pasquer et al., 2018, 2020b)


## Open science <br> GPL or Creative Commons licences, repositories, FAIR principles

## (Un)related contributions

- Interpretable supersense-based embeddings (Aloui et al., 2020)
- Specialised frame extraction (Cárdenas and Ramisch, 2019)
- Cross-lingual UD parsing with typology (Scholivet et al., 2019)
- Epidemiological event extraction (Bouscarrat et al., 2020, 2021)


## (Un)related contributions

- Interpretable supersense-based embeddings (Aloui et al., 2020)
- Specialised frame extraction (Cárdenas and Ramisch, 2019)
- Cross-lingual UD parsing with typology (Scholivet et al., 2019)
- Epidemiological event extraction (Bouscarrat et al., 2020, 2021)


## Ongoing supervisions

- Cognitive models of multiword sequence processing (Pinto-Arata)
- Unsupervised sense and frame induction (Mosolova)
- Language models and lexical semantics (Ivan)



## 5. Future research



Time will tell

## PARSEME 2030

- Corpus development
$\rightarrow$ More (typologically diverse) languages
$\rightarrow$ Better annotations, better guidelines
$\rightarrow$ Regular releases
- Enhanced MWE descriptions: non-verbal MWEs
- In-context fine-grained MWE semantics
$\rightarrow$ Link with MWE lexicons
$\rightarrow$ Link with lexical functions
https://gitlab.com/parseme/corpora/wikis/


## Semantic lexicon induction

- Sense and frame induction for single words and MWEs
$\rightarrow$ Trade-off between contextual and static embeddings
- Semi-supervised clustering
$\rightarrow$ Weak supervision from Wiktionary
$\rightarrow$ Contextual embeddings from language models
- Lexicons are interpretable and cover diverse phenomena

SELEXINI (ANR, 2022-2026)
https://selexini.lis-lab.fr

## Universality and diversity

- Reconcile language diversity and NLP
$\rightarrow$ Synergies between PARSEME and similar initiatives (e.g. UD)
$\rightarrow$ Establish clearer links between MWEs and construction grammar
$\rightarrow$ Ground language technology on language typology research
- Highly multilingual environment
pt Pára o mundo que eu quero descer! 'Stop the world, I want to get off!'



## Harder, better, faster, stronger


"Then it doesn't matter which way you go," said the Cat.
"-so long as I get somewhere," Alice added as an explanation.
"Oh, you're sure to do that," said the Cat, "if you only walk long enough."

## Muito obrigado!
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## Backup slides

## Words and tokens：first things first

－Tokens：result of a computational process
$\rightarrow$ Split the text into minimal units for further processing
－Lexemes：elementary units of meaning for linguistic description
$\rightarrow$ Linguistic notion：basic block of a language＇s lexicon
－Ideally，lexemes＝tokens，but：
－Compounds：whitespace
－Contractions：don＇t
－Orthography conventions：pre－existing，part－of－speech tag
－Challenging tokenisation：获取到
－Multiword tokens can be MWEs（wallpaper，snowman）
－Multi－token words are not always MWEs（Anna＿＇s，aujourd＿＇hui）

## Notation and glossing

lexicalised components
$\xrightarrow[\text { nie zagrzać miejsca }]{ }$ w pracy not warm place at work.
'not to stay long at work.' $\qquad$ idiomatic translation source - (PARSEME 1.2 guidelines)

|  | compound | head | mod. | compound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | brass ring | $3.9 \pm 2.0$ | $3.7 \pm 1.9$ | $3.7 \pm 1.8$ |
|  | fish story | $4.8 \pm 0.4$ | $1.5 \pm 1.8$ | $1.7 \pm 1.8$ |
|  | tennis elbow | $4.3 \pm 1.3$ | $2.2 \pm 1.8$ | $2.5 \pm 1.8$ |
|  | engine room | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $4.9 \pm 0.3$ | $4.9 \pm 0.3$ |
|  | climate change | $4.8 \pm 0.4$ | $4.9 \pm 0.3$ | $5.0 \pm 0.2$ |
|  | insurance company | $4.9 \pm 0.5$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | match nul | $4.4 \pm 1.3$ | $2.2 \pm 2.3$ | $2.5 \pm 2.1$ |
|  | mort né | $4.6 \pm 1.1$ | $3.5 \pm 1.8$ | $3.2 \pm 2.0$ |
|  | carte grise | $4.5 \pm 0.9$ | $3.2 \pm 2.0$ | $3.1 \pm 1.9$ |
|  | matière grasse | $4.8 \pm 0.4$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | poule mouillée | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | téléphone portable | $4.9 \pm 0.5$ | $4.9 \pm 0.3$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | pavio curto | $1.6 \pm 1.8$ | $1.1 \pm 1.9$ | $1.9 \pm 2.3$ |
|  | sexto sentido | $4.0 \pm 1.4$ | $2.5 \pm 2.1$ | $2.8 \pm 2.2$ |
|  | gelo-seco | $3.2 \pm 1.6$ | $3.2 \pm 1.8$ | $3.0 \pm 2.1$ |
|  | sentença judicial | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | tartaruga-marinha | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |
|  | vôo internacional | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.0 \pm 0.0$ |

## Corpus preparation

CUPT format - extension of UD's CoNLL-U


- Edition 1.2: split into train/dev/test
$\rightarrow 300$ unseen VMWEs in the test wrt. train+dev parts


## Annotating MWEs

## Consistency checks

| abrir camino |  | Notes added: 0 Generate JSON |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sximped Después de 15 años de lucha contra las leyes de obediencia debida y puntd que se reabrieran las causas penales contra los genocidas y abrimos un camino ine |  |  |
| un extraordinario triunfo popular. [ib |  |  |
| VID En el transcurso del de el viaje cambiarán la forma de Isaac, le dará | Annotate as VID (idiom) | is tesoros que ıe le permitirán luchar |
| contra las hordas de criaturas, descu | Annotate as LVC.full (light-verb) | 1 supervivencia. ${ }^{6}$ |
| VID Sin embargo, la aparición recie | Annotate as LVC.cause (light-verb) | ımo el descenso del de |
| el desempleo y el aumento de la con para una nueva etapa con una polític | Annotate as IRV (reflexive) | s, le abren el camino |
|  | Annotate as VPC.full (verb-particle) | as altos. $\square^{\text {c }}$ |
| abrir plazo VID (1) | Annotate as VPC.semi (verb-particle) |  |
|  | Annotate as MVC (multi-verb) |  |
| abrir él pasar VID (1) | Annotate as IAV (adpositional) |  |
|  | Custom annotation |  |



## PARSEME shared tasks

## Question

$\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ How can we evaluate systems that identify MWEs automatically?

- PARSEME shared tasks
$\rightarrow$ Evaluation metrics
$\rightarrow$ Significance analyses


## Evaluation metrics

- Precision, recall and F-measure
$\rightarrow$ MWE-based: predictions with perfect span match
$\rightarrow$ Token-based: predictions with partial match
- Account for discontinuous, nesting, single-token MWEs


## Example

Gold: make segmentation decisions in order to split sentences into lexical units System: make segmentation decisions in order to split sentences into lexical units

- MWE-based:
?
- Token-based:
?


## Evaluation metrics

- Precision, recall and F-measure
$\rightarrow$ MWE-based: predictions with perfect span match
$\rightarrow$ Token-based: predictions with partial match
- Account for discontinuous, nesting, single-token MWEs


## Example

Gold: make segmentation decisions in order to split sentences into lexical units System: make segmentation decisions in order to split sentences into lexical units

- MWE-based:

$$
T P=1 \quad P=1 / 4 \quad R=1 / 3 \quad F=2 / 7 \approx 0.28
$$

- Token-based:
?


## Evaluation metrics

- Precision, recall and F-measure
$\rightarrow$ MWE-based: predictions with perfect span match
$\rightarrow$ Token-based: predictions with partial match
- Account for discontinuous, nesting, single-token MWEs


## Example

Gold: make segmentation decisions in order to split sentences into lexical units
System: make segmentation decisions in order to split sentences into lexical units

- MWE-based:

$$
T P=1 \quad P=1 / 4 \quad R=1 / 3 \quad F=2 / 7 \approx 0.28
$$

- Token-based:

$$
T P=5 \quad P=5 / 7 \quad R=5 / 7 \quad F=5 / 7 \approx 0.71
$$

## Evaluation metrics

- Precision, recall and F-measure
$\rightarrow$ MWE-based: predictions with perfect span match
$\rightarrow$ Token-based: predictions with partial match
- Account for discontinuous, nesting, single-token MWEs


## Example

Gold: make segmentation decisions in order to split sentences into lexical units System: make segmentation decisions in order to split sentences into lexical units

- MWE-based:

$$
T P=1 \quad P=1 / 4 \quad R=1 / 3 \quad F=2 / 7 \approx 0.28
$$

- Token-based:

$$
T P=5 \quad P=5 / 7 \quad R=5 / 7 \quad F=5 / 7 \approx 0.71
$$

- Phenomenon-specific evaluation metrics: discontinuous, variants, unseen


## VarIDE: candidate extraction + filtering

1. Candidates: combinations with lemmas + POS sequence identical to annotated VMWEs in the training corpus
2. Absolute features: candidate length, syntactic relations, etc.
3. Comparative features: compared to (other) annotated VMWEs
4. Filtering: NaiveBayes classifier
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1. Candidates: combinations with lemmas + POS sequence identical to annotated VMWEs in the training corpus
2. Absolute features: candidate length, syntactic relations, etc.
3. Comparative features: compared to (other) annotated VMWEs
4. Filtering: NaiveBayes classifier

- Ranked 5th out of 13 submissions at PARSEME shared task 1.1
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## Significance analyses

- Only 2/40 surveyed papers report significance
- Tool to estimate p-values for two CUPT predictions
$\rightarrow$ https://gitlab.com/parseme/significance
- Compare all system pairs and metrics of PARSEME 1.2
$\rightarrow 2,728$ p-values, 783 above $\alpha=0.05$ (29\%)

| Systems |  | TRAVIS-multi | Seen2Unseen | TRAVIS-mono |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F1 | 0.6911 | 0.6892 | 0.6709 |
| MTLB-STRUCT | 0.7158 | 0.025 | 0.038 | 0.0 |
| TRAVIS-multi | 0.6911 |  | $\underline{0.464}$ | $\underline{0.081}$ |
| Seen2Unseen | 0.6892 |  |  | $\underline{0.103}$ |

P-values for MWE-based F1 in Swedish

## Ambiguity of MWEs

Question
$\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ Is idiomatic/compositional ambiguity frequent in corpora?

- Verbal MWEs, 5 languages
- Corpus with idiomatic occurrences annotated (Ramisch et al., 2018a)
- Automatically extract candidates for literal occurrences
- Fine-grained manual annotation


## Annotation of literal readings

1. COINCIDENTAL: candidate contains the correct lexemes, but dependencies are not the same as in the idiomatic occurrence.

- The lexemes do the job 'to achieve the required result' co-occur in why you like the job and do a little bit [...], but they do not form a connected dependency tree

2. LITERAL-MORPH: candidate is a literal occurrence; differences from idiomatic occurrence are morphological

- The MWE get going 'continue' requires a gerund going, which does not occur in At least you get to go to Florida

3. LITERAL-SYNT: candidate is a literal occurrence; differences from idiomatic occurrence are syntactic

- The MWE to have something to do with selects the preposition with, absent in [...] we have better things to do.

4. LITERAL-OTHER: candidate is a literal occurrence; differences from idiomatic occurrence are semantic or extra-linguistic

- we've come out of it good friends is an LO of the MWE to come of it 'to result', but it is unclear what kind constraint could distinguish it from an IO.


## Idiomaticity rate analysis

German Greek Basque Polish Portug.

| Idiomatic | 3,823 | 2,405 | 3,823 | 4,843 | 5,536 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Literal cand. | 926 | 451 | 2,618 | 332 | 1,997 |
| ERR-FALSE-IDIOMATIC | $21.5 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| ERR-SKIPPED-IDIOMATIC | $27.0 \%$ | $47.5 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ |
| NONVERBAL-IDIOMATIC | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| MISSING-CONTEXT | $0.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| WRONG-LEXEMES | $40.1 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $26.7 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $38.1 \%$ |
| COINCIDENTAL | $2.6 \%$ | $27.9 \%$ | $42.4 \%$ | $61.1 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ |
| LITERAL | $8.5 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ |
| $\hookrightarrow$ LITERAL-MORPH | $0.8 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |
| $\hookrightarrow$ LITERAL-SYNT | $1.5 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| $\hookrightarrow$ LITERAL-OTHER | $6.3 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $20.2 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ |

Idiomaticity rate

## Idiomaticity rate analysis

German Greek Basque Polish Portug.

| Idiomatic | 3,823 | 2,405 | 3,823 | 4,843 | 5,536 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Literal cand. | 926 | 451 | 2,618 | 332 | 1,997 |
| ERR-FALSE-IDIOMATIC | $21.5 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| ERR-SKIPPED-IDIOMATIC | $27.0 \%$ | $47.5 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ |
| NONVERBAL-IDIOMATIC | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| MISSING-CONTEXT | $0.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| WRONG-LEXEMES | $40.1 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $26.7 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $38.1 \%$ |
| COINCIDENTAL | $2.6 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 4 \%}$ | $61.1 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ |
| LITERAL | $8.5 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 5 \%}$ | $3.5 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ |
| $\hookrightarrow$ LITERAL-MORPH | $0.8 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |
| $\hookrightarrow$ LITERAL-SYNT | $1.5 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| $\hookrightarrow$ LITERAL-OTHER | $6.3 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $20.2 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ |
| Idiomaticity rate | $98 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $96 \%$ |

## Dataset analyses

FR-comp dataset



## Dataset analyses



ㅁ [\#20] cerf volant

literally: flying deer


## Empirical findings

- Explicit MWE encoding helps parsing (Nasr et al., 2015; Scholivet et al., 2018)
- Word embeddings can predict compositionality (Cordeiro et al., 2016a)
$\rightarrow$ 1B-word corpus, lemmatisation, frequent compounds (Cordeiro et al., 2019)
- Neural models can identify MWEs (Zampieri et al., 2018, 2019)
$\rightarrow$ Also in non-standard language (Zampieri et al., 2022)
- Handcrafted rules work almost as well (Pasquer et al., 2020b,a)
- ...

