GRAMPAL: A Morphological Processor for Spanish implemented in Prolog*

Antonio Moreno
Dep. de Lingüística
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
Cantoblanco, Madrid, SPAIN
Phone: +34 1 397.41.09
Fax: +34 1 397.39.30
`sandoval@ccuam3.sdi.uam.es`

José M. Goñi
Dep. Matemática Aplicada a las TT.II.
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
Ciudad Universitaria, Madrid, SPAIN
Phone: +34 1 336.72.87
Fax: +34 1 336.72.89
`jmg@mat.upm.es`

Abstract

A model for the full treatment of Spanish inflection for verbs, nouns and adjectives is presented. This model is based on feature unification and it relies upon a lexicon of allomorphs both for stems and morphemes. Word forms are built by the concatenation of allomorphs by means of special contextual features. We make use of standard Definite Clause Grammars (DCG) included in most Prolog implementations, instead of the typical finite-state approach. This allows us to take advantage of the declarativity and bidirectionality of Logic Programming for NLP.

The most salient feature of this approach is simplicity: A really straightforward rule and lexical components. We have developed a very simple model for complex phenomena.

Declarativity, bidirectionality, consistency and completeness of the model are discussed: all and only correct word forms are analysed or generated, even alternative ones and gaps in paradigms are preserved. A Prolog implementation has been developed for both analysis and generation of Spanish word forms. It consists of only six DCG rules, because our *lexicalist* approach –i.e. most information is in the dictionary. Although it is quite efficient, the current implementation could be improved for analysis by using the non logical features of Prolog, especially in word segmentation and dictionary access.

Keywords: Applications of Logic Programming to NLP, Computational Morphology.

---

*This work has been partially supported by the Spanish *Plan Nacional de I+D*, under the Research Project *An Architecture for para Natural Language Interfaces with User Modeling* (TIC91-0217C02-01).

1 Introduction

The successful treatment of morphological phenomena in some languages by means of finite state automata appears to have led to the idea that this model is the most efficient and universal way to deal with morphology computationally. Although there exist good finite-state processors for Spanish -like [Martí, 1986], [Meya, 1986] or [Tzoukermann & Liberman, 1990]- we think that some phenomena can be handled more elegantly using a context-free approach, particularly if the morphological component is to be included as a part of a syntax grammar. Our model has been implemented in standard DCG using a logic programming approach instead of a plain finite-state one.

It is well-known that the so-called non-concatenative processes are the most difficult single problem that morphological processors must deal with. Experience has shown that it is not easy for any approach. Unification-based morphology uses suppletion (i.e. alternative allomorphs for a lemma) and feature description as a general mechanism for handling those processes. Two-level morphology uses instead rules that match lexical representations (lemmas) with surface representations (actual spelling forms). The latter has been been claimed to be more elegant, but it is obvious that often the two-level model contains many rules needed for a very few cases.

The pure two-level/finite-state automata model is not very adequate for treating certain non-concatenative processes, and in such cases one is required to depart from this approach, for example by adding an extension in which two-level rules are retained under the control of feature structures [Trost, 1990]. Moreover, every language has irregularities that can only be treated as suppletive forms, e.g. `soy` (*I am*), `era` or `fui` (*I was*). Since suppletion is needed anyway, and since it is a much simpler approach than rules, we consider that the "elegance" objection is not well-founded[1].

On the other hand, our goal is to generate and recognize all (and only) well-formed inflected forms, and thus we do not accept "*missing forms*" for defective verbs (see below), but do accept duplicate but correct forms.

2 Major issues in Spanish computational morphology

Spanish morphology is not a trivial subject. As an inflectional language, Spanish shows a great variety of morphological processes, particularly non-concatenative ones. We will try to summarize the outstanding problems which any morphological processor of Spanish has to deal with:

[1]See the next section for further discussion of the adequacy of the two-level model for Spanish, including defective forms (i.e. null forms in the conjugation) and alternative correct forms.

1. A highly complex verb paradigm. For simple tenses, we consider 53 inflected forms (see Table 1), excluding the archaic Future Subjunctive, but including the duplicate Imperfect Past Subjunctive (6 forms). If we add the 45 possible forms for compound tenses, then 98 inflected forms are possible for each verb.

2. The frequent irregularity of both verb stems and endings. Very common verbs, such as `tener` (*to have*), `poner` (*to put*), `poder` (*to be able to*), `hacer` (*to do*), etc., have up to 7 different stems: `hac-er`, `hag-o`, `hic-e`, `ha-ré`, `hiz-o`, `haz`, `hech-o`. This example shows internal vowel modification triggered by different morphemes having the same external form: `hag-o`; `hiz-o`, `hech-o` (The first `/-o/` is first person singular present indicative morpheme; the second `/-o/` is third singular preterit indicative morpheme; and the third `/-o/` is past participle morpheme – an irregular one, by the way). As well as these non-concatenative processes, there exist other, very common, kinds of internal variation, as illustrated by the following example.

   [e] → [ie]: `quer-er` (*to want*) → `quier-o` (*I want*)

   2,300 out of 7,600 verbs in our dictionary are classified as irregular, and 5,300 as regular –i.e. only one stem for all the forms as in `am-ar` — `am-o`, etc. (*to love*).

3. Gaps in some verb paradigms. In the so-called *defective verbs* some forms are missing or simply not used. For instance, meteorological verbs such as `llover`, `nevar` (*to rain, to snow*), etc. are conjugated only in third person singular. Other ones are more peculiar, like `abolir` (*to abolish*) that lacks first, second and third singular and third plural present indicative forms, all present subjunctive forms, and the second singular imperative form. In other verbs, the compound tenses are excluded from the paradigm, like in `soler` (*to do usually*).

4. Duplicate past participles: a number of verbs have two alternative forms, both correct, like `impreso`, `imprimido` (*printed*). In such cases, the analysis has to treat both.

5. There exist some highly irregular verbs that can be handled only by including many of their forms directly in the lexicon (like `ir` (*to go*), `ser` (*to be*), etc).

6. Nominal inflection can be of two major types: with grammatical gender (i.e. concatenating the gender morpheme to the stem) and with inherent gender (i.e. without gender morphemes). Most pronouns and quantifiers belong to the first class, but nouns and adjectives can be in any of the two classes, with a different distribution: 4% of the nouns have grammatical gender and 92% have inherent gender, while 70% of the adjectives are in the first group. Some nouns and adjectives present alternative correct forms for plural –e.g. for `bambú` (*bamboo*), `bambú-s` and, `bambú-es`.

7. There is a small group (3%) of invariant nouns with the same form for singular and plural, e.g. `crisis`. On the other hand, 30% of the adjectives present the same form for masculine and feminine, e.g. `azul` (*blue*). There exist also *singularia tantum*, where only the singular form is used, like `estrés` (*stress*); and *pluralia tantum*, where only the plural form is allowed, e.g. `matemáticas`, (*mathematics*).

8. In contrast with verb morphology, nominal processes do not produce internal change in the stem caused by the addition of a gender or plural suffix, although there can be many allomorphs produced by spelling changes: `luz`, `luc-es` (*light, lights*).

For a detailed description of all verb and nominal phenomena, including a classification into paradigmatic models, see [Moreno, 1991].

All these phenomena suggest that there is no such a universal model (e.g. two-level, unification, or others) for (surface) morphology. Instead, we have approaches more suited for some processes than others. The computational morphologist must decide which is more appropriate for a particular language. We support the idea that unification and feature-based morphology is more adequate for languages, such as Spanish and other Latin languages, that have alternative stems triggered by specific suffixes, missing forms in the paradigm, and duplicate correct forms.

3 The model

It is well known that morphological processes are divided into two types: processes related to the phonological and/or graphic form (morpho-graphemics), and processes related to the combination of morphemes (morpho-syntax). Each model treats these facts from its particular perspective. Two-level morphology uses phonological rules and continuation classes (in the lexical component). Mixed systems such as [Bear, 1986] or [Ritchie et. al., 1987] have different sets of rules.

As we stated before, our model relies on a context-free feature-based grammar, that is particularly well suited for the morpho-syntactic processes. For morpho-graphemics, our model depends on the storage –or computation– of all the possible allomorphs both for stems and endings. This feature permits that both analysis and synthesis be limited to morpheme concatenation, as the general and unique mechanism. This simplifies dramatically the rule component.

We present some examples of dictionary entries: two verbal ending entries (allomorphs) for the past participle morphemes and two allomorph stems for *imprimir*, compatible with those endings.

```
vm(no,part,nofin,[2,3],99,reg) --> [ido].
vm(no,part,nofin,[2,3],99,part1) --> [o].
```

```
vl(imprimir,v,3,[100],[reg]) --> [imprim].
vl(imprimir,v,3,[99],[part1]) --> [impres].
```

Where vm and vl stands for the values of the "morphological category" that we are using to drive the DCG rule invocation. All the dictionary entries are coded with a predicate that corresponds to its morphological category. The full inventory of such categories follows:

w For complete inflected word forms.

wl For words (nouns and adjectives) that can accept a number morpheme.

vl For verb lexemes (stems).

nl For nominal -nouns and adjectives- lexemes.

vm For verb morphemes.

ng For nominal gender morphemes.

nn For nominal number morphemes.

For reference, and to check the meaning of the examples, a short self-description of the arguments of those predicates follows:

```
w(Lemma, Category, Pers_Num, Tense_Mood).
w(Lemma, Category, Gender, Number).
wl(Lemma, Category, Number_Type_List, Gender, Number).

vl(Lemma, Category, Conjugation, Stem_Type_List,
   Suffix_Type_List).
vm(Pers_Num, Tense_Mood, Finiteness, Conjugation_List,
   Stem_Type, Suffix_Type).

nl(Lemma, Category, Gender_Type_List, Number_Type_List,
   Gender, Number).
ng(Gender_Type, Gender, Number).
nn(Number_Type, Number).
```

We have introduced some contextual atomic features that impose restrictions on the concatenation of morphemes through standard unification rules. Such features are never percolated up to the parent node of a rule. Multi-valued atomic features are permitted in the unification mechanism, being interpreted as a disjunction of atomic values. We represent this disjunction as a Prolog list. Disjunction of values is used only for contextual features (*stem_type*, *suffix_type*, *conjugation*, *gender_type* and *number_type*) just to improve storage efficiency, since this device is actually not needed if different entries were encoded in the lexicon.

In the conjugation table (Table 1), the *stem_type* values of the grammatical features person-number and tense-mood are displayed in boldface. For example, **sing_1** means first person, singular number; while **pres_ind** means present tense, indicative mood.

	sing_1	sing_2	sing_3	plu_1	plu_2	plu_3	—
pres_ind	11	12	13	14	15	16	
impf_ind	21	22	23	24	25	26	
indf_ind	31	32	33	34	35	36	
fut_ind	41	42	43	44	45	46	
pres_subj	51	52	53	54	55	56	
impf_subj	61	62	63	64	65	66	
cond	71	72	73	74	75	76	
imper		82	83		85	86	
inf							00
ger							90
part							99

Table 1: Conjugation table.

Each of the 49 inflected forms[2] is represented by a numeric code[3], and the additional value `100` is used as a shorthand for the disjunction of all of them (used for regular verbs; see the entry for `imprim` above). The contextual feature *stem_type* (`stt`) is used to identify the verb stem and ending corresponding to each form, and the contextual feature *suffix_type* (`sut`) distinguishes among several allomorphs of the inflectional morpheme by means of a set of values:

```
reg        pres       pret1  pret2
fut_cond   imp_subj   imper  infin
ger        part1      part2
```

Since this value set is much smaller than the *stem_type set*, we have chosen an alphabetic code. With the combination of both features, and the addition of a third feature `conj` (conjugation), we can state unequivocally which is the correct sequence of stem and ending for each case (see examples above, where `imprim` only matches `ido` for all features, and `impres` matches `o`, thus preventing ill-formed concatenations –for these morphemes– such as `imprim-o` or `impres-ido`).

[2]The codes 83 and 86 stand for the *courtesy* imperative: `imprima usted`, `impriman ustedes`. These word forms are the same as the 53 and 56 ones.

[3]Actually, this number encodes a particular combination of person, number, tense and mood features.

In the same fashion, we have two special contextual features for the nominal inflection, nut (number_type) and get (gender_type), to identify the various allomorphs for the plural and gender morphemes, and associate them with the proper nominal stems. The following examples show those contextual features both in nominal morphemes and in nominal lexeme entries:

```
/*      NOUN AND ADJECTIVE MORPHEMES      */
ng(mas1,masc,sing) --> [o].
ng(mas2,masc,sing) --> [e].
ng(fem,fem,sing)   --> [a].

nn(plu1,plu) --> [s].
nn(plu2,plu) --> [es].

/*      SOME ENTRIES FOR NOUNS      */
nl(presidente, n, [mas2,fem], [plu1], _, _) --> [president].

wl(doctor, n, [plu2], masc, sing) --> [doctor].
nl(doctor, n, [fem], [no], masc, sing) --> [doctor].

wl(bambu1, n, [plu1, plu2], masc, sing) --> [bambu1].
```

These entries allow the analysis/generation of the word forms presidente, presidenta, presidentes and presidentas for the lemma presidente; doctor, doctora, doctores and doctoras for doctor; and bambú, bambús and bambúes for bambú.

The grammatical features (*category, lemma, tense, mood, person, number* and *gender* are the only features that are delivered to the w node, and from this level can be used by a syntactic DCG grammar.

A unification-based system relies very much on the lexical side. It is needed a robust and large dictionary, properly coded. Additionally, our model depends on the accessibility of all possible allomorphs, so their storage is also necessary. Fortunately, there is no need for typing all of them by hand, since this would be an impractical, time consuming and error-prone task. Morpho-graphemics for Spanish is quite regular and we have formalized and implemented the automatic computation of the allomorphs of any verb from the infinitive form.

The formalized description of the morphological phenomena of Spanish was presented in [Moreno, 1991], where some interesting and well founded linguistic generalizations are made: Paradigms[4] for verbs are described to capture regularities in the inflectional behaviour of the Spanish verbs, and the same is done with nouns.

[4]These are not the traditional ones, since they capture the problems arising in written language, such as diacritical marks, different surface letters for the same phoneme, etc.

All the *lemmas* belonging to a particular paradigmatic model not only share most of contextual and grammatical features but also have the same allomorph number and distribution. For instance, our model 11 has three allomorph stems, and their distribution is as follows:

```
vl(salir, 3, [0,12,13,14,15,16,21,22,23,24,25,26,
              31,32,33,34,35,36,61,62,63,64,65,66,
              82,85,90,99],[reg])                    --> [sal].
vl(salir,3,[11,51,52,53,54,55,56,63,86],[reg])       --> [salg].
vl(salir,3,[41,42,43,44,45,46,71,72,73,74,75,76],
           [fut_cond])                               --> [sald].
```

In [Goñi et. al., 1994] regular-expression based rules are devised to compute automatically these allomorphs, capturing morpho-graphemic generalizations in the paradigmatic models.

4 The grammar

The rule component of the model is quite small, because most of the information is in the lexicon. In particular, inflected verb forms are analysed or generated by two rules. Actually, only one rule is needed, but as we used the value 100 for the stt feature for regular verbs instead of a disjunction of all the possible stt values, we split the rule in two:

```
/**/
/*            VERB INFLECTION RULES          */
/**/
w(Lex, Cat, PerNum, TensMood) -->
            vl(Lex, Cat, Conj, SttL, SutL),
            vm(PerNum, TensMood, _,  ConjL, Stt, Sut),
        {
               member(Conj,ConjL),
               member(Stt, SttL),
               member(Sut,SutL)
        }.

w(Lex, Cat, PerNum, TensMood) -->
            vl(Lex, Cat, Conj, [100], SutL),
            vm(PerNum, TensMood, _, ConjL, _, Sut),
        {
               member(Conj,ConjL),
               member(Sut,SutL)
        }.
```

Nominal inflection is a bit more complicated, because of the combination of two inflectional morphemes (gender and number) in some cases. Our model needs the 4 rules shown to handle this. The first one is for singular words, when the stem has to be concatenated to a gender suffix (`niñ-o`, `niñ-a`); the second is for plural words, where an additional number suffix is added (`niño-s`); the third builds plurals from an allomorph stem and a plural morpheme (`león / leon-es`); and the fourth rule validates as words the singular forms (wl) obtained from the first rule without further concatenation:

```
/**/
/*      NOUN AND ADJECTIVE INFLECTION RULES    */
/**/

wl(Lex, Cat, [plu1], Gen, Num)
        --> nl(Lex, Cat, GetL, _, _, _), ng(Get, Gen, Num),
        {
                member(Get, GetL)
        }.

w(Lex, Cat, Gen, Num) -->
        wl(Lex, Cat, NutL, Gen, _), nn(Nut, Num),
        {
                member(Nut, NutL)
        }.

w(Lex, Cat, Gen, Num) -->
        nl(Lex, Cat, _, NutL, Gen, _), nn(Nut, Num),
        {
                Nut = plu2,
                member(Nut, NutL)
        }.

w(Lex, Cat, Gen, Num) -->
        wl(Lex, Cat, _, Gen, Num).
```

The predicate `member` included in the procedural part of the DCG rule implements disjunction in atomic contextual features, although it could have been eliminated with a different encoding of the lexical entries.

5 The Processor

The grammar rules are stated using the DCG formalism included in most Prolog implementations, thus we have used the DCG interpreter both for parsing and generating word forms. Since the interpreter is supplied with morphemes included in the dictionary for its proper operation, a segmenter has to be included to provide the parser with candidate word segmentations. This is achieved by means of a non-deterministic predicate that finds all the possible segmentations of a word. This is one of the efficiency drawbacks of the current implementation of GRAMPAL.

To avoid such inefficiency the system could be augmented with a *letter trie* index –or *trie*– [Aho et. al., 1983] to the lexical entries. With this device, segmentation will be no longer non-deterministically blind and the search would be efficiently guided. Generation does not have those efficiency problems, and the system is bidirectional without any change in the rules.

6 Conclusions

A Prolog prototype, GRAMPAL, was developed to intensively test the model, both as analyser and as generator. This processor implemented in Prolog has shown that logic programming can be used successfully to handle the Spanish inflectional morphology. We have also implemented a C version of GRAMPAL, but it needs separate components for analysis and generation, due to the lack of reversibility that Logic Programming has provided us with.

The model presented is based on two basic principles:

- Empirical rigour: all and only correct forms are analysed and generated, whether regular or not; gaps in verb paradigms are observed; suppletive forms are considered valid, and so on. It is important to stress that GRAMPAL does not overgenerate or overanalyse.

- Simplicity and generalization: GRAMPAL employs a really straightforward rule component, that captures the logical generalization of the combination of a stem and an ending to form a inflected word. "Standard scientific considerations such as simplicity and generality apply to grammars in much the same way as they do to any other theories about natural phenomena. Other things being equal, a grammar with seven rules is to be preferred to one with 93 rules" [Gazdar and Mellish, 1989].

The current dictionary has a considerable size: 43.000 *lemma* entries[5], including 24.400 nouns, 7.600 verbs, and 11.000 adjectives. The model could be used for derivative morphology and compounds as well, but this has not been done yet, since further linguistic analysis must be done to specify the features needed to permit derivatives and compounds.

[5]In these figures are neither included closed categories, nor allomorphs for verb and nominal morphemes.

References

[Aho et. al., 1983] Aho, A.V.; Hopcroft, J.E. and Ullman, J.D. (1983). Tries. *In Data Structures and Algorithms, ch. 5, sec. 3, pp. 163–169. Addison Wesley.*

[Antworth, 1990] Antworth, E. (1990). *PC-KIMMO: A Two-level Processor for Morphological Analysis.* Academic Computing Department, Summer Institute of Linguistics. Dallas, TX.

[Bear, 1986] Bear, J. (1986). A Morphological Recogniser with Syntactic and Phonological Rules. *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING 86), pp. 272–276.*

[Gazdar and Mellish, 1989] Gazdar, F. and Mellish, C.S. (1989). *Natural Language Processing in Prolog.* Addison Wesley.

[Goñi et. al., 1994] Goñi, J.M.; González, J.C. and López, J. (1994). A Framework for Lexical Representation. *Technical Report UPM/DIT/LIA 5/94. Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, 1994.*

[Koskenniemi, 1985] Koskenniemi, K. (1985). A general two-level computational model for word-form recognition and production. *In Karlsson, F. (ed): Computational Morphosyntax, pp. 1–18. Dept. of Linguistics. University of Helsinki.*

[Martí, 1986] Martí, M.A. (1986). Un sistema de análisis morfológico por ordenador. *Procesamiento del Lenguaje Natural, n. 4, pp. 104–110.*

[Meya, 1986] Meya, M. (1986). Análisis morfológico como ayuda a la recuperación de información. *Procesamiento del Lenguaje Natural, n. 4, pp. 91–103.*

[Moreno, 1991] Moreno, A. (1991). Un modelo computacional basado en la unificación para el análisis y la generación de la morfología del español. *Tesis Doctoral. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1992.*

[Ritchie et. al., 1987] Ritchie, G.; Pulman, S.; Black, A. and Russell, G. (1987). A Computational Framework for Lexical Description. *Computational Linguistics, vol. 13, n. 3–4, pp. 290–307.*

[Tzoukermann & Liberman, 1990] Tzoukermann, E. and Liberman, M. (1990). A Finite-State Morphological Processor for Spanish. *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING 90), vol. 3, pp. 277–281.*

[Trost, 1990] Trost, H. (1990). The application of two-level morphology to non-concatenative German morphology. *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING 90), vol.2, pp. 371–376.*