Defining the Word

Daniel Zeman, Kilian Evang, Petya Osenova (and Martin Haspelmath)





Why

- NLP assumes a word-like unit
- Difficult to define cross-linguistically
 - Especially for spoken data, unwritten languages, or some writing systems (Chinese)
 - Linguists have been arguing since (at least) 1930's, no satisfactory outcome

• Picking a definition (or not picking any) impacts all levels of annotation

Why

- NLP assumes a word-like unit
- Difficult to define cross-linguistically
 - Especially for spoken data, unwritten languages, or some writing systems (Chinese)
 - Linguists have been arguing since (at least) 1930's, no satisfactory outcome
- Picking a definition (or not picking any) impacts all levels of annotation
- If we can find a reasonable definition, we probably cannot force everyone to use it
 - Compatibility with legacy tools, resources etc.

Why

- NLP assumes a word-like unit
- Difficult to define cross-linguistically
 - Especially for spoken data, unwritten languages, or some writing systems (Chinese)
 - Linguists have been arguing since (at least) 1930's, no satisfactory outcome
- Picking a definition (or not picking any) impacts all levels of annotation
- If we can find a reasonable definition, we probably cannot force everyone to use it
 - Compatibility with legacy tools, resources etc.
- BUT:
 - Guidance for new languages that do not have a strong (or any) tradition
 - Or for tricky phenomena within a language
 - Or at least a principled method of documenting the deviations

How

Martin Haspelmath (2023). Defining the word. In *Word*, 69:3, pp. 283–297, Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.2023.2237272

- A recent proposal
- Claims to have overcome some shortcomings of previous definitions
- We decided to test it on UD languages
- We organized a survey in summer fall 2023
- Identified difficult points that are not addressed in the paper
- Going to do a second survey, better instructions

Prerequisities

Haspelmath's definition of *word* relies on a number of other concepts. Some of them he defines in a possibly surprising way.

- Free form
- Morph
 - Delimiting morphs
 - Recognizing "same" morphs
- Root
 - Recognizing roots
 - Classifying roots (object, property, action)
- Affix
- Clitic
- Compound

Free Form

A form (=non-empty sequence of phonemes) that can occur alone (at least as a response to a question).

- He is going home.
- he
- **ૠ** he is
- 🚟 he is going
- 💥 home
- pes 'dog'
- **#** the dog (while dog itself is not a free form)
- **38** ouch!

Morph

Smallest meaningful (lexical or grammatical) segment. Non-empty! MH avoids the term morpheme.

- **#** dog-s (lit. dog-Plur)
- **Serificial Problem** ps-ů (lit. dog-**Plur.Gen**)
- Köpek-ler-in (lit. dog-Plur-Gen)
- **#** en-large-ment-s
- **Description** ob-děl-at (lit. PREF-do-Inf) 'cultivate'

Morph

Smallest meaningful (lexical or grammatical) segment. Non-empty! MH avoids the term morpheme.

- **#** dog-s (lit. dog-**Plur**)
- **Serificial Problem** ps-u (lit. dog-Plur.Gen)
- Köpek-ler-in (lit. dog-Plur-Gen)
- **#** en-large-ment-s
- **Description** ob-děl-at (lit. PREF-do-Inf) 'cultivate'
- = zu-m (lit. to-Def.Masc,Neut.Sing.Dat) (= zu dem 'to the')
- **=** zu-r (lit. to-Def.Fem.Sing.Dat) (= zu der 'to the')
- **1** ? *au* (= à *le* 'to the')
- **1** ? à (= a a 'to the')

"Same" Morph

- Same or compatible meaning
 - Not the same: I can swim vs. This can is empty
 - Not the same: I have two book-s (plural) vs. She book-s the flights (third person singular present)

"Same" Morph

- Same or compatible meaning
 - Not the same: Kan I can swim vs. This can is empty
 - Not the same: I have two book-s (plural) vs. She book-s the flights (third person singular present)
- Same form or just phonological changes
 - **! -ed** [d] or [t] or [əd] (past tense)
 - Träne-n (lit. teardrop-Plur) and Burg-en (lit. castle-Plur) ... phonological variants
 - Mutter (lit. mother.Sing) and Mütter (lit. mother.Plur) ... not the same meaning
 - Mariante Sohn (lit. son. Sing) and Söhn-e (lit. son-Plur) ... phonological variants?
 - **pes** (lit. dog.**Sing.Nom**) and **ps-a** (lit. dog-**Sing.Acc**) ... phonological variants
 - **matk-**a (lit. mother-**Sing.Nom**) and matc-e (lit. mother-**Sing.Dat**)
 - converse ev-ler (lit. house-Plur) and araba-lar (lit. car-Plur)

Free Morph vs. Bound Morph

Free morph

- A morph that is a free form, i.e., it can occur alone.
- 🔀 nice
- 💥 ouch!
- Compared ev 'house' ... may have affixes (ev-ler, ev-ler-de) but they are not required
- \longrightarrow $d\mathring{u}m$ 'house' ... may have affixes (dom-y, dom-ech) but they are not required

Bound morph

- A morph that always occurs in company of other morphs.
- knouse ... needs article (a house, the house) or plural suffix (house-s)
 - The articles and plural suffix are bound morphs as well
- Adpositions
 - Although in some languages debatable (answer to a question about the preposition?)
- My se to-ho ne-boj-íme 'We are not afraid of this'

Root

- Contentful morph (denoting object, property, or action)
- Can occur in a free form without another contentful morph
 - This does not mean that the root itself is free
- Root categories matter (to distinguish affixes from clitics)
 - object / property / action
- Avoid POS categories such as NOUN / ADJ / VERB
 - Improperty root large as ADJ, but also in VERB (enlarge) or NOUN (enlargement)
- BUT:
 - Sometimes a root is not itself clearly in one category
 - **I** plyn 'gas' vs. plyn-out 'flow'
 - Abstract nouns are not objects are they properties?
 - But they behave the same way.
 - matk-a, matk-y, matc-e 'mother'
 - lásk-a, lásk-y, lásc-e 'love'

Root

- Pronouns do they count as object roots?
 - Probably yes
- Numerals do they count as property roots?
 - Probably yes

Affix

- Bound morph that accompanies roots of one category
- Not necessarily adjacent to the root there can be other affixes (but not roots or clitics) in between
- Inflectional affixes, derivational/lexical affixes
- converse ev-ler-de (lit. house-Plur-Loc) 'in houses'
- *** re-place-ment**
- **Selection** Josef-ov-ými (lit. Josef-Poss-Plur.Ins) 'Josef's'
- **E** *geo-grafía* 'geography'
- Він см-іяв-ся (Vin sm-ijav-sja) (lit. He laugh-Past-Refl) 'He laughed'

Defining the Word 10/14

Clitic

- Bound morph that accompanies roots of different categories
- (This definition is different from what people may think a clitic is.)
- **Unclear:** What does it mean that a clitic accompanies a root? What if there are multiple roots in the free form where the clitic occurs?
- **L** b-át se (lit. fear-Inf Reflex)
- My se <u>medvěd</u>-a ne-boj-íme 'We are not afraid of a bear'
- reanimar-se 'to revive oneself'
- **se** ha pod-ido observ-ar 'it could have been observed'
- **se** hab-ía comenz-ado a investig-ar 'one had begun to investigate'

Compound

- Two or more roots immediately adjacent (without linking material, i.e., no non-root morphs in between)
- The non-head root cannot be modified separately by a nominal or an adjective.
- = Auto-bahn (lit. car-way) 'highway'
- **38** credit card
- Not compounds:
- Liebe-s-brief (lit. love-Gen-letter) 'love letter'
- **I** ruk-o-pis (lit. hand-o-write) 'manuscript'

Defining the Word 12/14

Word

- Free form (may or may not be root)
- Root with all required affixes (and possibly with other affixes)
- Compound with all required affixes (and possibly with other affixes)

• Clitic

Martin Haspelmath (p.c.): "My take at the moment is that dependencies should ultimately be notated at the morph level, and that the lexicon vs. syntax distinction is illusory (along the lines of Jackendoff)."