



HAL
open science

Automatic recognition of French expletive pronoun occurrences

Laurence Danlos

► **To cite this version:**

Laurence Danlos. Automatic recognition of French expletive pronoun occurrences. International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, 2005, Jeju, South Korea. pp.73–78. hal-01104967

HAL Id: hal-01104967

<https://hal.science/hal-01104967>

Submitted on 11 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Automatic recognition of French expletive pronoun occurrences

Laurence DANLOS

Université Paris 7

2 Place Jussieu

F-75005 Paris

danlos@linguist.jussieu.fr

Abstract

We present a tool, called ILIMP, which takes as input a raw text in French and produces as output the same text in which every occurrence of the pronoun *il* is tagged either with tag [ANA] for anaphoric or [IMP] for impersonal or expletive. This tool is therefore designed to distinguish between the anaphoric occurrences of *il*, for which an anaphora resolution system has to look for an antecedent, and the expletive occurrences of this pronoun, for which it does not make sense to look for an antecedent. The precision rate for ILIMP is 97,5%. The few errors are analyzed in detail. Other tasks using the method developed for ILIMP are described briefly, as well as the use of ILIMP in a modular syntactic analysis system.

1 Introduction

A lot of research is dedicated to anaphora resolution since it is a crucial issue, for example, for Information Retrieval or Text Summarization. Among anaphora, third person pronouns are quite frequent and therefore widely studied. Pronoun *il* in French, *it* in English, can be used either "impersonally" ("expletively") (*il pleut, it rains*) or anaphorically (*il est violet, it is purple*). Therefore, authors who have developed a pronoun resolution system acknowledge that the impersonal pronoun occurrences must be recognized first, before dealing with anaphoric pronouns.

There exists a number of works on the English pronoun *it*, among them (Lapin, Leass, 1994), (Kennedy, Bogurev, 1996) and (Evans 2001). However, no work has been done on the French pronoun *il*¹. This paper presents a tool, ILIMP, which is designed to mark any occurrence of *il* with either tag [IMP] or tag [ANA] (for impersonal or anaphoric use, respectively). This tool is rule based (as it is the case for Lapin and Leass' system); it works on raw texts (contrarily to Lapin and Leass' system which relies on a syntactic analysis).

If ILIMP is imperative for an anaphora resolution system, it is also a tool which can be integrated into a processing chain within a modular approach to syntactic analysis. First, it should be noted that [IMP] and [ANA] can be viewed as an enhancement of the part-of-speech tag set generally used in taggers: the tag "pronoun" would be replaced by two tags, "anaphoric pronoun" versus "impersonal (expletive) pronoun". It is known that the richer the tag set is, the better would the syntactic analysis based on tagging be (Nasr, 2004). Moreover, it will be shown that tools derived from ILIMP can be used for other linguistic annotations.

Section 2 presents the method, which is based, on linguistic grounds, on a French linguistic resource, the Lexicon-Grammar, and on computational grounds, on a tool, Unitex. Section 3 presents the realization of ILIMP, the

¹ Some data on the discrepancies between *il* and *it*. While the English pronoun *it* can be found in subject and object positions, the French pronoun *il* can be found only in a subject position. When *it* is an anaphoric subject pronoun, it can have a clausal or nominal antecedent, while an anaphoric *il* can have only a nominal antecedent. The anaphoric subject pronoun *il* translates in English as *he* or *it* depending on the human nature of the nominal antecedent.

difficulties which have been encountered and the choices made to solve them. Finally, Section 4 presents an evaluation of ILIMP and discusses its positioning within a modular syntactic analysis.

2 Method

2.1 Lexicon-Grammar

As for most linguistic phenomena, the impersonal use of *il* depends on both lexical and syntactic conditions. For example, the adjective *violet* (*purple*) can never be the lexical head of an impersonal clause – see (1a); the adjective *probable* (*likely*) followed by a clausal complement anchors an impersonal clause – see (1b); and the adjective *difficile* (*difficult*) when followed by an infinitival complement introduced by the preposition *de* (resp. *à*) anchors an impersonal (resp. personal) clause – see (1c) and (1d).

- (1)a *Il est violet* (*It is purple*)
 b *Il est probable que Fred viendra* (*It is likely that Fred will come*)
 c *Il est difficile de résoudre ce problème* (*It is difficult to solve this problem*)
 d *Il est difficile à résoudre, ce problème* (*It is difficult to solve, this problem*)

Therefore, the French lexicon-grammar developed by Maurice Gross and his group (Gross 1994, Leclère 2003) is an appropriate linguistic resource for ILIMP since it describes, for each lexical head of a clause, its syntactic arguments and the possible alternations. From the lexicon-grammar, I have (manually) extracted all the items that can be the lexical head of an impersonal clause while recording their syntactic arguments. See below for a brief overview of the lexical heads that I have recorded.

First, one has to distinguish verbal phrases for which the subject can only be the impersonal pronoun *il*, from those whose surface subject is impersonal *il* because their deep subject is extraposed in a post-verbal position.

Among the former ones, I have compiled 45 meteorological verbal phrases (*Il neige* (*It snows*), *Il fait beau* (*It is a nice day*)), 21 verbs from Table 17 of (Gross 1975) (*Il faut que Fred vienne /du pain*) and 38 frozen expressions (*Il était une fois* (*once upon a time*), *quoi qu'il en soit* (*whatsoever*)).

Among the latter ones, one has to distinguish those with a *clausal* extraposed subject from those with a *nominal* extraposed subject.

Among the former ones, I have compiled 682 adjectives (*Il est probable que Fred viendra* (*it is likely that Fred will come*)), 88 expressions of the form *Prép X* (Danlos 1980) (*Il est de règle de faire un cadeau* (*It is standard practice to make a present*)), and around 250 verbs from (Gross 1975) (*Il est dit que Fred viendra* (*It is said that Fred will come*)).

Among the latter ones with a nominal extraposed subject, some are quite frequent verbs such as *rester* or *manquer*, while others are verbs in the passive form only used in a refined register (*Il est venu trois personnes* (*Three persons came*)).

2.2 Unitex

Unitex² is a tool which allows us to write linguistic patterns (regular expressions or automata) which are located in the input text, with a possible addition of information when an automaton is in fact a transducer. A raw text, when given as input to Unitex, is first pre-processed: it is segmented into sentences, some compound expressions are recognized as such, and each token is tagged with all the parts of speech and inflexion features recorded in its entry (if any) in the French full-form morphologic dictionary DELAF (Courtois 2004). There is no disambiguation at all; in other words, the pre-processing in Unitex does not amount to a tagging.

For ILIMP, the basic idea is to manually write patterns (transducers) such as the one presented in (2) in a simplified linear form. $\langle\text{être.V:3s}\rangle$ targets the third person singular inflected forms of the verb *être*; $\langle\text{Adj1.ms}\rangle$ targets the masculine singular adjectives that belong to the class Adj1, which groups together adjectives behaving as *difficult*; $\langle\text{V:K}\rangle$ targets any verb in the infinitive form. [IMP] is a tag which is added in the input text to the occurrences of *il* that appear in clauses which follow the pattern in (2). The occurrence of *il* in (1c) is thereby marked with tag [IMP].

- (2) *Il*[IMP] $\langle\text{être.V:3s}\rangle$ $\langle\text{Adj1.ms}\rangle$ *de*
 $\langle\text{V:K}\rangle$

² Unitex is a GPL open source system, which is similar to Intex (Silberstein 1994). Documentation and download of Unitex can be found at the following url: <http://ladl.univ-mlv.fr>.

Tag [ANA] is the default value: it marks the occurrences of *il* that have not been tagged with [IMP]. The occurrence of *il* in (1d) is thereby marked with tag [ANA]. Nevertheless, the matter is slightly more complex, since there is a third tag, [AMB], which is explained in Section 3.2. The output of ILIMP is therefore the input text in which each occurrence of *il* is marked with one of [IMP], [ANA] and [AMB].

After this presentation of the theoretical principles underlying ILIMP, let us examine its realization.

3 Realization

3.1 Left context of the lexical head

In (1c), the left context of the lexical head - the sequence of tokens on the left of *difficile* (*difficult*) - is reduced to *Il est* (*it is*). However, sentences such as (3a) or (3b), in which the left context of the lexical head is more complex, are frequently found in real texts. In (3a), the left context includes (from right to left) the adverb *très* (*very*) which modifies the adjective, the verb *paraître* (*seem*) in the infinitive form which is a “light verb” for adjectives, the pronoun *lui* (*to him*) and finally the modal verb *peut* (*may*) preceded by *il* (*it*). In (3b), it includes the light verb *s'avérer* conjugated in a compound tense (*s'est avéré*) and negated (*ne s'est pas avéré*).

(3a) Il peut lui paraître très difficile de résoudre ce problème (*It may seem very difficult to him to solve this problem*)

b Il ne s'est pas avéré difficile de résoudre ce problème (*It didn't turn out to be difficult to solve this problem*)

As a consequence, for each type of the lexical heads (adjectival, verbal) that anchors an impersonal clause, all the elements that may occur in the left-context have to be determined and integrated in patterns. This raises no real difficulty, though it is time consuming³. In contrast, we are faced with tough ambiguities when coming to the right context, as we are going to show it.

In the rest of the paper, patterns are presented with simplified left-contexts - as in (2) - for the sake of readability.

³ ILIMP can be re-used in a tool which aims at identifying the lexical head of a clause.

3.2 Right context of the lexical head

Syntactic ambiguities

There is a number of syntactic ambiguities in the right context since, as is well known, a sequence of parts of speech may receive several syntactic analyses. As an illustration, consider the pattern in (4a), in which the symbol Ω matches any non-empty sequence of tokens. This pattern corresponds to two syntactic analyses: (4b) in which *il* is impersonal and the infinitival phrase *de <V:K>* is subcategorized by *difficile*, and (4c) in which *il* is anaphoric and the infinitival phrase is part of an NP. These two analyses are illustrated in (4d) and (4e) respectively - these sentences differ only in the adverb *ici/juste*.

(4a) Il est difficile pour Ω de <V:K>

b Il[IMP] est difficile pour [Ω]_{NP} de <V:K>

c Il[ANA] est difficile pour [Ω de <V:K>]_{NP}

d Il est difficile pour [les étudiants qui viennent ici]_{NP} de résoudre ce problème (*It is difficult for the students who came here to solve this problem*)

e Il est difficile pour [les étudiants qui viennent juste de résoudre ce problème]_{NP} (*It is difficult for the students who have just solved this problem*)

To deal with syntactic ambiguities, one solution is to state explicitly that a pattern such as (4a) is ambiguous by means of the tag [AMB] which is to be interpreted as “ILIMP cannot determine whether *il* is anaphoric or impersonal”. However this tag may be of no help for later processing, especially if it is used too often. Another solution is to rely upon heuristics based on frequencies. For example, sentences which follow the pattern in (4a) are more frequently analyzed as (4b) than as (4c). Therefore *il* in (4a) can be tagged as [IMP] despite some rare errors. I have adopted this latter solution. The heuristics I use are either based on my linguistic knowledge and intuition and/or on quantitative studies on corpora.

Lexical ambiguities

In about ten cases, a lexical item may anchor both impersonal and personal clauses with the same subcategorization frame, e.g. the adjective

certain (*certain*) with a clausal complement as illustrated in sentence (5a). Since both readings of (5a) seem equally frequent, *il* in the pattern (5b) is tagged as [AMB].

(5a) Il est certain que Fred viendra (*He/it is certain that Fred will come*)

b Il[AMB] est certain que S⁴

Other difficulties

A last type of difficulties is found with impersonal clauses with an extraposed *nominal* subject. See the pair in (6a-b) in which the only difference is *du/de*, whereas (6a) is impersonal and (6b) personal. Along the same lines, see the pair in (6c-d) in which the only difference is *valise/priorité*, whereas (6c) is impersonal and (6d) personal.

(6a) Il manque du poivre (dans cette maison) (*There is pepper missing (in this house)*)

b Il manque de poivre (ce rôti de porc) (*It is lacking pepper (this roasting pork)*)

c Il reste la valise du chef (dans la voiture) (*There remains the boss' suitcase (in the car)*)

d Il reste la priorité du chef (le chômage) (*It remains the boss' priority (unemployment)*)

I have tried to set up heuristics to deal with these subtle differences. However, I did not attempt (perilous) enterprises such as using the feature [\pm abstract] for nouns.

In conclusion, ILIMP relies on a number of heuristics so as to avoid a too frequent use of [AMB]. These heuristics may lead to errors, which are going to be examined.

4 Evaluation

I have worked on the French newspaper *Le Monde*. More precisely, I have worked on a corpus of 3.782.613 tokens extracted from the corpus *Le Monde'94*. Unitex segments this corpus into 71.293 sentences. It contains 13.611 occurrences of token *il*, and 20.549 occurrences of third person subject pronouns, i.e. *il*, *elle*, *ils*, *elles* (*he*, *she*, *it*, *they*). So *il* is the most frequent third person subject pronoun, with a rate of 66%.

⁴ S is the symbol for the pattern aiming at representing a sentence. This pattern is made up of a non-empty sequence of tokens which includes a finite verb.

From this corpus, 8544 sentences which include at least one occurrence of *il* have been extracted, and they add up to around 10.000 occurrences of *il* (a complex sentence with embedded clauses may include several occurrences of *il*). These sentences have been given as input to ILIMP and the results - the tags [IMP], [ANA] and [AMB]- have been manually evaluated. The evaluators were asked to follow only their intuition.

The result of this evaluation is the following: the precision rate is 97,5%. We are going to examine the 2,5% errors, putting aside [AMB].

4.1 Errors from morphological ambiguities

Errors coming from morphological ambiguities are (of course) counted as the other errors coming from the realization of ILIMP (which are examined in the next sections). Recall (Section 2.2) that the pre-processing in Unitex does not include any disambiguation: it is not a tagger. To illustrate the consequences of this point, consider the pattern in (7a) in which <V6:W> targets verbs of Table 6 in the past participle, e.g. *choisi* (*chosen*), and S a sequence of tokens which includes a finite verb (see note 3). This pattern aims at targeting impersonal clauses such as (7b). Nevertheless, it also targets (7c), in which the pronoun *il* is thus wrongly tagged as [IMP]. This error comes from the fact that the dictionary DELAF rightly includes two entries for the word *mètres* - finite form of the verb *métrer* and plural form of the noun *mètre* - and Unitex does not make any distinction between these two entries. Therefore, the sequence *le béton pour soutenir une toiture de 170 mètres* is interpreted as including a finite verb, and hence follows pattern S.

(7a) Il[IMP] <avoir.V:3s> été <V6:W> (ADV) que S

b Il a été choisi que les séances se feraient le matin vers 9h (*It has been chosen that sessions would take place around 9 am*)

c Il a été choisi plutôt que le béton pour soutenir une toiture de 170 mètres (*It has been chosen rather than concrete to support a 170 meter roof*)

Any tagger should tag the word *mètres* in (7c) as a noun. Taking as input not a raw text pre-processed by Unitex but the output of a tagger

would avoid the error on *il* in (7c). However ILIMP would be dependent of the errors of a tagger. What is best? More generally, assuming that a syntactic parser relies upon a modular approach in which a set of modules - tagger, named entity recognition module, ILIMP, chunker, etc. – collaborates, the question of the order in which the modules should be chained arises.

Let us have this question open, and come back to the errors of ILIMP taking as input a raw text.

4.2 *il* wrongly tagged as [IMP] instead of [ANA]: 0,3%

Very few errors: 33. This is surprising when considering the frequent appeal to “brutal” heuristics. As an illustration, *il* in the pattern *Il y a* is systematically tagged as [IMP]. This heuristic gives two errors, as in (8a), but around 1500 right tags, as in (8b).

(8)a Il revient de Rimini. Il y a donné la réplique à Madeleine. (*He is back from Rimini. He gave there the cue to Madeleine.*)

b Il y a beaucoup de trafic à 8h (*There is a lot of traffic at 8 am*)

4.3 *il* wrongly tagged as [ANA] instead of [IMP]: 2%

More errors. This type of errors comes from the fact that [ANA] is the default value. These errors are thus directly imputable to gaps in the patterns making up ILIMP.

Among these gaps, there are first those coming from my laziness/tiredness/lack of time. For example, I have introduced quotation marks at some places in patterns but not everywhere. Hence, *il* is wrongly tagged as [ANA] in (9a) just because of the quotation marks. Similarly, I wrote some patterns for cases with subject inversion, but I did not take time to write all of them, hence the error in (9b).

(9)a Il[ANA] était “même souhaitable” que celui-ci soit issu ... (*It was “even desirable” that this one be from ...*)

b Est-il [ANA] inconcevable ... (*Is it inconceivable that ...*)

Secondly, there are lexical gaps. In particular, some adjectives which can be the head of impersonal clauses are missing: the list of 682

adjectives I have compiled needs to be completed.

Thirdly, there are syntactic gaps. In particular, I have considered any extraposed clausal subject as obligatory, whereas there exist cases where such a subject is not realized, for example, in phrases introduced by *comme* (*as*), (10). I have created a pattern to take into account such phrases but it does not handle all of them.

(10) *comme il a été annoncé* (*as it has been said*)

Finally, gaps are found for impersonal clauses with a *nominal* extraposed subject. In particular, I have written no pattern for verbs in the passive form used in a refined register, see section 2.1.

To conclude this section on the occurrences of *il* wrongly tagged as [ANA], I would like to add that though the first three types of errors can be avoided with a little effort, this is not the case for the last type.

4.4 Other errors: 0,2%

Some errors come from the fact that the word *il* is not used as a subject pronoun but as part of a named entity in a foreign language, see (11)⁵.

(10) Elle a publié cette revue appelée Il[ANA] Caffé (*She published this magazine called Il Caffé*)

4.5 Evaluation on other corpora

An evaluation of ILIMP has also been realized on French literary texts written in the XIXth century. It concerns 1858 occurrences of *il*. The precision rate falls compared to the journalistic genre: it goes from 97,5% to 96,8%. This fall comes, on the one hand, from impersonal expressions which are not used anymore, (11), on the other hand, from a high number of sentences with subject inversion, as in (9b) in Section 4.3. Recall that I have not handled subject inversion systematically.

(11) Mais peut-être était-il un peu matin pour organiser un concert (*But maybe was it a little bit morning to organize a concert*)

The percentage of impersonal *il* in literary texts increases compared to *Le Monde* corpus: it goes from 42% to 49,8%. In a more general way, I

⁵ This kind of error would be avoided if ILIMP took as input a text in which the named entities are recognized.

expect important differences on the percentage of *il* with an impersonal use according to the genre of corpora⁶, though I don't expect significant differences on the precision rate of ILIMP (especially if the three first types of errors described in Section 4.2 are corrected). This is because the list of lexical heads for impersonal clauses is closed and stable.

5 Conclusion and future work

The method used in ILIMP to locate the occurrences of *il* in an impersonal use, which gives good results, can be used for other languages and for other tasks. For English, ILIMP can be straightforwardly adapted to disambiguate the impersonal versus anaphoric use of *it* as a subject pronoun. It has already been said (Section 3.1) that a tool derived from ILIMP can be designed to identify the lexical head of a clause. Another tool can be designed to enhance a module in charge of the computation of syntactic functions, thanks to the notion of “deep extraposed subject”, which is relevant for impersonal clauses. Finally, the method I have proposed to disambiguate an ambiguous and very frequent word as *il* can be used for other ambiguous frequent functional words such as the (French) word *que* (which can be a complementizer, a relative pronoun, or an adverb in discontinuous restrictive or comparative expressions) (Jacques 2005).

The goal of ILIMP or related “little” tools is obviously modest and restricted when compared to the goal of a robust parser which would give for any sentence THE correct and complete analysis, with a precision rate closed to 98%. However, it has to be acknowledged that such an ideal parser does not exist, neither for French nor for English, despite many years of effort. So it could be a wise strategy to follow the saying which goes *Many a little makes a mickle*. If this strategy is followed, research effort is needed first to develop such “little” tools, second to determine how to order them in an efficient sequential processing chain.

⁶ *Le Monde* contains a number of long papers which describe in detail the life and work of famous individuals. These papers, when they describe the life of a man, link up numerous occurrences of anaphoric *il* (*he*) referring to the man concerned. One may expect that the percentage of impersonal *il* increases in newspaper handling only news or economy.

References

- COURTOIS B. (2004), Dictionnaires électroniques DELAF, *Syntax, Lexis and Lexicon-Grammar. Papers in honour of Maurice Gross*, *Linguisticae Investigationes Supplementa* 24, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 113–133.
- DANLOS L. (1980), *Représentation d'informations linguistiques: les constructions N être Prép X*. Thèse de troisième cycle, Paris: Université Paris 7.
- EVANS R. (2001), Applying Machine Learning toward an Automatic Classification of *it*, *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, Vol. 16-1 pp. 45-57.
- GROSS M. (1975), *Méthode en syntaxe*, Paris, Hermann.
- GROSS M. (1993), Les phrases figées en français, *L'information grammaticale* 59, Paris, pp. 36-41.
- GROSS M. (1994), Constructing Lexicon-Grammars, *Computational Approaches to the Lexicon*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 213-263.
- JACQUES M.P. (2005), *Que : la valse des étiquettes*, *Actes de TALN 05*, Dourdan.
- KENNEDY C., BOGURAEV B. (1996), Anaphora for Everyone; Pronominal Anaphora Resolution without a Parser, in *COLING'96*, Copenhagen.
- LAPIN S., LEASS H.J. (1994), An algorithm for pronominal anaphora resolution, *Computational Linguistics*, 20(4), pp. 535-561.
- LECLÈRE . C. (2003), The lexicon-grammar of French verbs: a syntactic database, In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Linguistic Informatics*, Kawaguchi Y. et alii (eds.), UBLI, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- NASR A. (2004), *Analyse syntaxique probabiliste pour grammaires de dépendances extraites automatiquement*, Habilitation à diriger des recherches, Université Paris 7
- SILBERSTEIN M. (1994), INTEX: a corpus processing system, in *COLING'94*, Kyoto, Japon, vol. 1, pp. 579-583.