Behind the Labels: Criteria for Defining Analytical Categories in FrameNet Brasil

Tiago Timponi Torrent (FrameNet Brasil / UFJF)
Michael Ellsworth (FrameNet / ICSI / UC Berkeley)
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Introduction

FrameNet Brasil (FN-Br) has been developing, since 2007, the Brazilian Portuguese branch of the FrameNet initiative (FILLMORE ET AL., 2003a; 2003b), started in 1997 by Charles J. Fillmore at the International Computer Sciences Institute, in Berkeley. Following the main purposes of the original project, under development for English, FN-Br is creating a lexical resource for Brazilian Portuguese, based on the principles of Frame Semantics (FILLMORE, 1982; 1985) and supported by corpus evidence.

Aside from FN-Br (SALOMÃO, 2009), other non-English framenets are being developed for Chinese (YOU & LIU, 2005), German (BOAS, 2002; ERK ET AL., 2003a), Japanese (OHARA ET AL., 2004), Spanish (SUBIRATS & PETRUCK, 2003) and Swedish (BORIN ET AL., 2010), to name the most advanced initiatives. All of them rely on the same database structure proposed broadly for FrameNet (see BAKER ET AL., 2003 for details): (i) a set of Frames composed by a definition and a set of Frame Elements; (ii) a set of Lexical Units – the pairing of a lemma to a meaning defined in terms of a frame –; and (iii) a set of Annotated Sentences that provide evidence for how the Lexical Units are used in the target language in regards to both to their semantic and syntactic valences. In spite of those cases in which a given frame is related to some culturally specific construct (see BERTOLDI, 2011 for a comparative analysis of juridical frames in Brazilian Portuguese and in English), or perspectivized differently by the lexical material in a specific language (see OHARA, this volume) framenets tend to use the same set of frames defined by the original project. Obviously, the same does not hold for the lexical units, since these are specific for each language. As for the categories used for annotating the sentences, although the semantic valences are defined in terms of the Frame Elements, which are dependent to the frame, the syntactic valences are composed of phrase types and grammatical functions, which may vary crosslinguistically.

Although FrameNet-like annotation is designed to require as little theoretical background as possible, because it deals with categories with long tradition in Linguistics, such as grammatical functions and phrase types, and also because it has to make decisions on whether to annotate or not a given constituent in a sentence, one can ask why we work with the set of labels we do and not with another set, or even why we annotate raised subjects and controlling expressions but not anaphoric antecedents.
In this paper, we discuss the definition of these analytical categories for FN-Br, based on those defined for English by the Berkeley FrameNet project. To achieve this goal, this paper begins with a brief presentation of FrameNet’s basic concepts, such as Frame, Frame Elements, Lexical Units and Annotation Sets in section 1. In section 2, we present the FrameNet Brasil initiative and its relation to FrameNet. In section 3, we discuss the theoretical background supporting the creation of analytical categories for FrameNet-like lexicographic annotation. In section 4, we present the grammatical functions and phrase types used in FN-Br annotations, contrasting them with those used for English. The last section presents the conclusive remarks.

1. FrameNet basics

FrameNet is a computational lexicography initiative, which relies on the theoretical bases of Frame Semantics (FILLMORE, 1982; 1985) and develops syntactic-semantic analyses of lexical items – and, since 2008, of constructions as well (FILLMORE, LEE-GOLDMAN & ROMIEUX, 2012) – supported by corpus evidence (FILLMORE ET AL., 2003a). The main analytical categories used by FrameNet are the Frame – together with the Frame Elements – and the Lexical Unit.

According to Fillmore’s definition in the seminal Frame Semantics paper, a frame can be regarded as any system of concepts related in such a way that to understand any one of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits; when one of the things in such a structure is introduced into a text, or into a conversation, all of the others are automatically made available. (FILLMORE, 1982, p.111)

In FrameNet, frames are defined in a way that maintains the basis of Fillmore’s definition: they are composed of a textual definition characterizing the broad scene, and of the definitions of the participants and props in the frame, the Frame Elements (FEs). Figure 1 shows the Possession frame as it is presented at the FrameNet website.

Some of the FEs are labeled as Core, meaning that they are absolutely necessary for the instantiation of the frame. Non-core FEs are those that may occur when the frame is evoked, usually indicating the circumstances surrounding the instantiation of the frame (see RUPPENHOFER ET AL., 2010 for a complete account of FE types).

In turn, Lexical Units (LUs) are the pairing of a lemma to a frame. In FrameNet, they receive a definition that is either written by the analyst or retrieved from the Concise Oxford Dictionary. LUs are also classified by part of speech. FrameNet annotates for verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs and prepositions (RUPPENHOFER ET AL., 2010), as well as for multiword expressions such as take (one’s) life or a pain in the neck, which are classified by part of speech according to their heads.

In the context of Fillmore’s (1982) definition, LUs are the linguistic material responsible for introducing a given frame in a text or in a conversation. To analyze how LUs evoke frames and also how FEs are instantiated in real texts, FrameNet annotates sentences in which the target LUs occur, extracting them from large corpora. Sentences are also annotated for their syntactic properties and stored in the database as annotation sets. The sentences that exemplify the frame definition and the FE definitions in Figure 1 show how the FE labels are applied.
After the annotation sets are analyzed and each part of the relevant example sentences is labeled, the FrameNet Desktop software summarizes the semantic and syntactic valences of the target LUs. Such a summary is presented in the Lexical Entry report, shown in Figure 2, below the information about which frame is paired with the lemma have.v in this LU and its definition. The first of the two tables shows the FEs in the Possession frame that were instantiated in sentences containing the target LU, the number of instances annotated for each one, as well as their syntactic realizations in terms of the phrase types in which they occur and of the grammatical functions they play in the sentence. The second table presents the syntactic patterns in which each sequence of FEs observed occur. The numbers in brackets indicate how many instances of each syntactic pattern were observed in the data analyzed.

In section 3, we will discuss the theoretical background supporting FrameNet annotation, and, thus, come back to some of the key concepts presented above.
Lexical Entry

**have.v**

Frame: Possession

Definition:
COD: posess, own, or hold

Frame Elements and Their Syntactic Realizations

The Frame Elements for this word sense are (with realizations):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame Element</th>
<th>Number Annotated</th>
<th>Realization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depressive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AVP,Dep (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PP[in],Dep (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PP[in],Obj (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VPing,Dep (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PP[for],Dep (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PP[in],Dep (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VP,Dep (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>NP,Ext (140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP,Obj (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CNL-- (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DNI-- (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INL-- (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>DNI-- (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP,Obj (156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP,Dep (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stfn,Dep (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sing,Obj (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AVP,Dep (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valence Patterns:

These frame elements occur in the following syntactic patterns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Annotated</th>
<th>Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 TOTAL</td>
<td>Depressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>AVP,Dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>PP[in],Dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>PP[in],Obj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>VPing,Dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 TOTAL</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>PP[for],Dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 TOTAL</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>PP[for],Dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TOTAL</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>PP[in],Dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>VPto,Dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 TOTAL</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>NP,Ext</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Lexical Entry Report for have.v (http://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu)
2. FrameNet Brasil

Since its foundation in the late 90’s, FrameNet has been expanded to other languages, giving rise to several different research initiatives in the Computational Lexicography field. Some of those initiatives, although relying on Frame Semantics and corpus evidence for the construction of their lexicons, have developed their own methodology – and, hence, their own software apparatus – for lexicographic annotation (see, for instance, ERK ET AL., 2003b, on the SALSA annotation tool). Others have chosen to adapt the original FrameNet software, methodology and annotation labels to their target languages. This was the direction followed by Spanish FrameNet, Japanese FrameNet, and FrameNet Brasil as well.

Given such a scenario, in this section, we will present the FN-Br database, discussing how frames and the elements in them are created. We will also present the annotation modes used in both FrameNet and FrameNet Brasil, and, demonstrate how the multilayer annotation is performed in the Brazilian version of the FrameNet Desktop annotation software.

2.1. The FrameNet Brasil Databases

FN-Br currently works with two different databases: a general vocabulary database (GVDB) and a domain specific database (DSDB). The GVDB is being constructed based on Berkeley FrameNet’s data release 1.5, which was made available to FN-Br together with the distribution of the FrameNet Desktop software. Frames in this data release, as well as the Frame Elements in them were either directly translated from English into Brazilian Portuguese, or adapted to the later, in those cases in which there are differences regarding perspective, cultural specificity or FE coreness (see, in this respect VAZ, 2012 on the Communication, Communication_manner and Communication_means frames). To ensure the interconnection between FN-Br’s GVDB and FrameNet’s database, the Brazilian staff maintains the same frame and FE IDs in the translated version. The IDs are the numbers representing each frame and FE in the database tables. By doing so, it will be possible, in the near future, to include FN-Br’s GVDB in the FrameSQL tool (SATO, 2008), a search engine capable of comparing frames and their instantiations across languages.

Figure 3 shows the Posse frame as seen in FN-Br’s GVDB. This frame was translated into Brazilian Portuguese from FrameNet’s Possession frame, depicted in Figure 1. Since possession is a crosscultural concept, no adaptations were necessary. Besides maintaining the same IDs for the frame and for the FEs, FN-Br also keeps the FE names in English so as to ensure the readability of the frame by non-Portuguese speakers.
The GVDB also contains the constructions created for the Brazilian Portuguese Construction (LAGE, 2013), which, for the sake of economy, will not be presented in this paper.

The DSDB, in turn, is being developed within the Copa 2014 FrameNet Brasil project (SALOMÃO ET AL., 2011), which is creating, in cooperation with the Semantec Group at UNISINOS, a multilingual frame-based electronic resource covering the vocabulary of soccer and tourism for Brazilian Portuguese, Spanish, and English. This resource will be used by tourists, journalists and the staff involved in the 2014 FIFA World Cup, to be held in Brazil.
As a domain-specific resource, Copa 2014 requires the creation of frames that are more specific than those in the FrameNet database, which covers the general vocabulary. Hence, frames in the Copa 2014 DSDB are being created via a bottom-up approach (see GAMONAL, 2013 for a detailed description of such a process), this is to say that frames were modeled from the sentences extracted from corpora covering the target domains of the dictionary. The result of such an approach is the creation of more detailed frames. If one takes the domain of tourism, for example, while the GVDB has only the Turismo (Touring) frame, the DSDB already has 17 frames, as shown in Figure 4.

Since the domains covered by the resource don’t seem to vary significantly across cultures (GAMONAL, 2013), Copa 2014 is adopting the same set of frames for the three languages. The translation equivalents for these frames and lexical units, as well as example sentences, are all stored in one single database.

2.2. Multilayer Lexicographic Annotation

Annotation procedures adopted by FN-Br follow the guidelines provided by FrameNet’s Book (RUPPENHOFER ET AL., 2010) and are performed with the aid of the FrameNet Brasil Desktop, an adaptation of FrameNet’s annotation and report generation tool. The FN-Br Desktop allows the creation of frames, FEs and LUs, as well as the creation of subcorpora bound to each LU, which contains the sentences for annotation.

After sentences are imported into the Desktop, they can be annotated for their semantic and syntactic valences. This annotation is performed in a set of layers, which include:

- at least one for the Frame Elements;
- one for Grammatical Functions (GFs);
- one for Phrase Types (PTs);
- one for Other information that is relevant to the annotation but is not covered by the previous layers (information on relative pronouns and their antecedents, for example, is annotated in this layer);
- one for specific properties of the part of speech being analyzed (this layer being named after the part of speech it refers to);
- one for storing extra information on the Sentence, such as whether it is metaphorical or not, for example.

Figure 5 shows an annotation screen in the FN-Br Desktop. In this case, a sentence with the LU ter ‘have’, evoking the Posse / Possession frame is annotated for the first four layers, which are the most used in FN-Br’s lexicographic annotation.

The sentence depicted in Figure 5 could be translated into English as “I mean, the person who doesn’t have any money is under a lot of stress”. The target LU being annotated is ter ‘have’, which appears inflected in its third person singular present form. This LU evokes, in this sentence, the Posse / Possession frame, whose core FEs are the Posse / Possession and the Possuidor / Possessor. In the first layer – FE –, both the relative pronoun que ‘that’ and its antecedent, the NP o indivíduo ‘the person’, are marked with the FE Possuidor / Possessor. In turn, the NP dinheiro ‘money’ is marked as the Posse / Possession. In the GF layer, o indivíduo and que are marked as an External Argument, while dinheiro is a Direct Object. As for the PT layer, all of the three constituents are marked as Noun Phrases. Finally, in the Other layer, we see that the labels Antecedent and Relative were applied.
The sentence depicted in Figure 5 could be translated into English as “I mean, the person who doesn’t have any money is under stress”. The target LU being annotated is ter ‘have’, which appears inflected in its third person singular present form. This LU evokes, in this sentence, the Posse / Possession frame, whose core FEs are the Posse / Possession and the Possuidor / Possessor. In the first layer – FE –, both the relative pronoun que ‘that’ and its antecedent, the NP o indivíduo ‘the person’, are marked with the FE Possuidor / Possessor. In turn, the NP dinheiro ‘money’ is marked as the Posse / Possession. In the GF layer, o indivíduo and que are marked as an External Argument, while dinheiro is a Direct Object. As for the PT layer, all of the three constituents are marked as Noun Phrases. Finally, in the Other layer, we see that the labels Antecedent and Relative were applied.

This example annotation may raise a list of questions, such as:
- Why the rest of the sentence is not annotated?
- Why do the Antecedent and the Relative receive the exact same labels for the first three layers?
- Why is it important to annotate both semantic and syntactic information in FrameNet?

Those questions will be answered as we discuss the theory behind FN’s annotation labels in section 3.

3. Behind the Labels: Theoretical Background Supporting FN’s Annotation Labels

FrameNet has been designed with the goal of requiring a minimum of theoretical overhead from its users. However, FrameNet views the primary function of annotation as exemplifying how lexical semantics interfaces with syntax; our annotation should help human users and automated machine learning algorithms to map from a phrase to meaning and from a meaning to a phrase. No annotated example can act as a template for building new phrases unless the example has been annotated with categories that generalize beyond the example, and, moreover, with categories that clearly indicate what phenomena they generalize over. Such a description comes perilously close to theory, no matter how carefully phrased.
Nevertheless, we view our policy of “atheoretical” description as keeping us focused concretely on precise matters of how our annotation should be interpreted and generalized by ideal users.

Maintaining clarity about how to annotate in such a way as to support generalization from our examples has required a host of decisions both in our annotation policy and in how data is presented to users. The most basic of these decisions is to separately indicate the contribution of each target. Whether more than one LU is annotated in a sentence or not, each LU is annotated as a completely separate set of layers so that the annotation can be interpreted and generalized to other sentences in which the two LUs did not co-occur. Annotations in which the target LU and its frame explain virtually everything occurring in a sentence are grouped with those in which the target LU and frame explain only a tiny portion of a sentence, to be compared and contrasted for how they map between meaning and form. This simplification is what makes the FrameNet enterprise possible at all. The complications arise from specifying at a gross level how an example is to be generalized, mostly falling under (i) the need to specify how the annotation interacts with syntax (see 3.1) and (ii) the need to indicate both the semantic tendencies of FE fillers and the target-specific syntactic relations of FE fillers.

Inclusion of both semantic and syntactic information about fillers is vital, as it is necessary for human learners, lexical semanticists, and for automatic semantic role labeling. Given the goal of mapping between semantic and syntactic information, the utility of syntactic annotation is obvious. In many cases, syntactic relations unambiguously indicate frame elements, so that in an English sentence representing the Ingestion frame like plant eats man, we know that the man is the Ingestible, despite the fact that one might have thought that plant is semantically a much better fit, simply because the syntactic role of Object cannot map to any other role. In other cases, however, the syntactic analysis is semantically ambiguous and the semantic classes of fillers are the only factor that allows role assignment. In sentences like I tricked $50 out of her, (Manipulate_into_doing) the direct object is analyzed as the Goods, and the prepositional phrase headed by out of is analyzed as the Victim, whereas in I tricked her out of $50, the exact opposite assignments are made. Despite the syntactic ambiguity, the assignments remain obvious because money is clearly the kind of thing that is prototypically interpretable as Goods and is not interpretable as Victim, while a person clearly is interpretable as Victim.

Beyond cases where the semantic information of fillers is vital even for the most basic interpretation of a sentence that uses an LU, it is clear that there is a great deal of semantic information in annotation examples that is potentially useful, but not indicated in our structured data. For example, the Ingestion frame includes LUs pertaining both to eating and to drinking and to various kinds of eating and drinking. For second language learners wondering what a verb like devour means, they can learn a lot from looking at the annotation of devour, and finding example Ingestibles like the bodies of dead animals, huge meals, only unbaptised children, and all that is mortal of the body to learn that devour does not describe a desirable or normal kind of eating, but rather a terrible and inhuman kind.

Because inclusion of both syntactic and semantic information is so vital, our annotation policy emphasizes finding syntactically simple examples and finding semantically informative examples, two constraints that often conflict. The desire to include semantically informative examples is one of the primary motivations for having policies to handle sentences that involve syntactic complications like relative clauses, fronting, passivization, middles, etc. Our annotation aims to indicate only how to map semantics based on the target LU onto phrases headed by the target LU, so all of these constructions, for this part of the project, are merely distractions. The primary goal in our annotation policy is to include as
many informative examples as possible while simultaneously indicating which aspects of the annotation should be considered part of the LU-specific syntax-semantics mapping (the Valence, see 3.2), and which aspects are not to be generalized beyond the current example.

### 3.1. Locality

As mentioned above, because we are focused on the mapping between syntax and semantics, FrameNet annotates only those parts of a sentence that are syntactically connected to a target LU. The narrowest type of syntactic connection is a **local** syntactic relation: sub-phrases that are part of the phrase headed by the target, as in the direct object in (1). For these phrases, the annotated examples give maximal information on how to build a phrase headed by the target LU, including what type of syntactic sub-phrase can fill an FE, what order it occurs in with respect to other sub-phrases and the target, and how it can interact with other constructions. In principle, these are distinct from other phrases that are connectable to the target LU, for example a verb target LU’s subject (in FrameNet called Ext), which is consistently identifiable with a particular role just as local arguments are, even though it is not part of the verb phrase headed by the verb target, may be some considerable distance away from the target due to control relations, and may in fact appear with unusual phrase type due to control relations, as demonstrated in (2). This also includes arguments whose position is entirely due to a construction other than the target LU, as in the questioned direct object in (3). FrameNet policy is to annotate these and, in fact, any phrase in any position that could naturally signal the same semantic relation to the target, regardless of what material occurs in the phrase; this policy is intended to be broad enough to cover every kind of indirect syntactic relation, from the connection of the subject to a verb phrase, to control relations, to heavy NP shift, to gapping, without enumerating all such connecting constructions in advance, a task that is virtually impossible within a language and absolutely impossible in a cross-linguistic setting, as is made all too clear by edge-cases like (4), in which it is perfectly obvious that the possessor of a noun modified by the adjective *favorite* must be supplied as the subject of the infinitive *prepare*, and thus be annotated as filling the *Cook* frame element; it would not be possible to know all such idiosyncratic constructions in advance.

1. She was trying to **put the cap** back on.
2. *Their* attempt to stop the oil by **putting** the cap back on was a simple failure.
3. *Whom* do you think he tried to **contact**?
4. *His* favorite soup to **prepare** was French onion.

All of the phrases that are syntactically connected to the target are available for annotation. It is important to note that relations that are mediated by anaphoric pronouns and inference, as in (5), we do not annotate. The pronoun *they* refers back to the actions *his attempts at stalling*, and the pronoun itself forms the subject and means action of the purpose infinitive construction which, further, supplies the subject to the verb *anger*; by inference, the agent of the means action of *anger* is the agent of *anger*, so it seems attractive to annotate *his* as the Agent of *anger*.

5. *His* attempts at stalling she opposed, whether they were just to **anger** her or not.

The pattern in (5) is different from those in (1-4) in that, depending as it does on inference and anaphora, it is robust to complete syntactic rearrangement, i.e., the *they* could have referred to actions that were mentioned over the course of paragraphs, each with different subjects mentioned or even themselves only resolvable by inference, and the conclusion that the Agent(s) of whatever events are covered by *they* are those who intend to
cause anger. In a nutshell, the pattern in (5) is not about mappings between syntax and semantics, but rather it is about combining the low-level syntax and semantics mappings with semantics to semantics operations that are not restricted by syntax. If we included such examples in our data, we would be implying a syntax-semantics connection that is not there.

For those syntactically connected elements of the sentence, to the extent possible, they are annotated just as if they were local; this policy is based on our goal of representing the syntactic specifications associated specifically with the Target, rather than the syntactic facts that are due to other complications occurring in the sentence. Thus whom in (3) is annotated with the grammatical function Object, just as in (1). This policy lets us generalize beyond the peculiar appearance of arguments in examples like (3), since their configuration is predictable from the combination of the process of question formation with simple sentences like (6).

(6) She tried to contact him.

Labeling with the grammatical function Object is a shorthand for a set of possible realizations and alternations in English. Regardless of where an Object actually appears in an annotated example, it indicates, among other things, that an argument may appear locally immediately after the Target (curing a wound), as part of a hyphenated -ing compound (wound-curing), or non-locally due to interaction with other constructions, and, when the Target is passivized, may appear as the External argument.

Because we do not distinguish between local arguments and non-local ones, FrameNet’s policy is easily misinterpreted, and has led to problems especially in the case where a target occurs inside a relative clause, as seen in Figure 5 and in (7-8):

(7) The woman (that) she had wanted to contact had (apparently) passed away.
(8) The woman (that) she had wanted to talk to had …

In (7) and (8), we can see that woman is a simple, useful example of the semantic restrictions of an Addressee. However, in (7) the woman and the relative-clause marker that do not form a constituent, and, worse, the semantically uninformative that is the clause-internal argument that should be annotated as the argument of contact. The problems only proliferate when we look at examples involving prepositions: in (8), the argument of talk appears in three pieces, [the woman], [that], and [to], of which the last is the piece that shows the syntactic requirement for an Addressee to appear as a prepositional phrase with the preposition to, and the first is the one that gives useful semantic information.

Since we want to represent both types of information but do not want to mislead learners (either humans or computers) about the syntactic and semantic information, we have an elaborated annotation in this case that indicates how the relative clause is put together. In keeping with representing only the Target’s contribution to the syntax, we note that all the separate pieces would occur as a single constituent in a sentence without a relative clause, so we must label all the pieces of the frame element with the phrase type and grammatical function of the single constituent that would occur without the relative clause – NP/Obj for (7), PP/Dep for (8). We then also explicitly mark the relativizing word (that in both sentences) with the label Rel and mark the entire modified NP with the label Ant. From this annotation, learners can see that the Ant should be understood as providing useful semantic information, while the other piece or pieces of the FE reveal any useful syntactic information, such as the preposition to in (8).

3.2. Valence Patterns
The result of labeling FEs of a Target only with the syntactic relations and syntactic structures called for by the Target specifically is that the annotation represents patterns of mapping from FEs to syntax and vice-versa. However, as seen in examples like (9-10), we cannot assign a mapping from a particular semantic role (Recipient) consistently to the same syntactic role – Obj in (9), PP(to) in (10). Similarly, we cannot consistently map from a syntactic role (Obj) to a semantic role – Recipient in (9), Theme in (10). We can, however, note that the syntactic sequence give + NP/Obj + NP/Dep is associated with the first NP being the Recipient and the second NP being the Theme, as can be seen from the uninterpretability of (11).

(9) She gave me a book.
(10) He gave a book to me.
(11) * She gave a book me.

The conclusion is that, in many cases, we need to note the entire pattern of mappings of all of the semantic and syntactic elements. These sets of FEs + GFs + PTs we call valences. Valences represent the unique patterns of mapping between the totality of syntactic elements (phrase types, grammatical functions, relative order) and the list of frame elements. Because we wish to remain as atheoretical as possible, however, these valences are not equivalent to the minimal lexical valences of Construction Grammar (for minimal lexical entries and valences, see KAY & FILLMORE, 1999, p. 14, e.g.). Despite generalizing over clear, cross-cutting, language-wide phenomena such as relative clause formation, our valences do not generalize over alternations that are potentially lexically idiosyncratic, including passive sentences or any other complex valence alternation that interacts closely with the Target’s semantics. For instance, in (12), note that we record Pat as the subject, since rumor can only appear in the passive, while the conative at her face in (13) is labeled Patient/PP(at)/Dep. This approach allows annotators to annotate without resolving deep mysteries such as the conative construction before proceeding and does not impose any (potentially incomprehensible) analysis on either human learners or automated machine learning applications.

(12) Pat is rumored to have a secret.
(13) The cat scratched at her face.

4. Annotation Labels in FrameNet Brasil

In spite of the fact that FN-Br follows all the annotation policies discussed in section 3, given the differences between English and Brazilian Portuguese syntax and morphology, it was necessary to re-evaluate and, in many cases, propose changes to set of GF and PT labels used for annotation. This section presents the sets of labels used in FN-Br for assigning GFs and PTs to the linguistic material instantiating the FEs, and also provides discussion of why the sets of labels were defined the way they are presented here.

4.1. Grammatical Functions

As has already been stated in 3.1, FrameNet, and FN-Br as well, annotates syntactic information related to the target LU. Hence, the set of GF labels to be used in annotation is directly related to the part-of-speech of the LU being annotated. Berkeley FrameNet uses the set of grammatical functions presented in Chart 1 (RUPPENHOFER ET AL., 2010, p.64-71).

External Arguments (Ext) are used in FrameNet not only for subjects, but also for expressions controlling subjects, and dependents of a noun governing an infinitival verb.
Arguments of a preposition that are outside of the PP are also marked as Ext under similar circumstances. In turn, any kind of object subcategorized by a verb or preposition receives the Obj label (see 3.1 for detailed discussion on the kinds of structures FN annotates as Obj). The Dep label is applied to all other kinds of complements, such as finite or infinitival clauses, adverbs, prepositional phrases and so on. It may be considered the default GF label in FrameNet. Head can refer both to nouns modified by pre-nominal target adjectives and to an event or relation modified by a target adverb or prepositional phrase. The Gen label is applied to the possessive determiners of a target noun, while Quant refers to pre-nominal definite or indefinite quantifiers. Finally, Appos marks post-target appositional nouns or NPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF Labels</th>
<th>Part-of-speech of the target LU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External argument (Ext)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (Obj)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent (Dep)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head noun/verb (Head)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive determiner (Gen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantificational det. (Quant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appositive (Appos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1: Summary of GFs used in Berkeley FrameNet

For FrameNet Brasil, one new GF was created, while one was renamed so as to become more intuitive. In the following paragraphs, we present all GFs used in FN-Br, providing examples.

The External argument (Ext) label in FN-Br is equivalent to the Ext label used in the original project. As can be seen in (14-20), when the target LU is a verb, the Ext label is applied to, respectively, subjects of finite target verbs (14), raised subjects (15), expressions controlling subjects of infinitival verbs (16-18), and arguments of a noun governing an infinitival verb (19-20).¹

1. For the sake of clarity, we chose to fabricate examples for the GF labels. Examples are similar to each other on purpose, so that it can be easier for the non-Portuguese-speaking reader to compare the different instantiations of grammatical functions.

---

PPG LINGUÍSTICA/UFJF – JUIZ DE FORA – ISSN: 1982-2243
(19) Eu admiro a disposição [de Maria]\textsuperscript{2} para ajudar os amigos.
I admire.PRES.1SG the willingness of Maria to help.INF the friends.

*I admire Maria’s willingness to help her friends.*

(20) Eu admiro a [sua]\textsuperscript{2} disposição de ajudar os amigos.
I admire.PRES.1SG the your willingness of to help.INF the friends.

*I admire your willingness to help your friends.*

Examples (14-20) almost parallel those listed by Ruppenhofer et al. (2010, p.65). This is due to the fact that both Brazilian Portuguese and English allow almost the same kinds of external argument configurations. One key difference, however, relies on the fact that, while English does not allow null subjects, at least not in its Standard norm, in Brazilian Portuguese, as in other romance languages, they are very common. Spanish FrameNet has a specific kind of label for null subjects: the External Constructional Null Instatiation – ECNI (SUBIRATS, 2009, p.140), however, such a label is not applied in the GF layer, but it marks FEs that are not overtly expressed. Anyhow, FN-Br decided to label null subjects as constructionally motivated null instantiations (CNI) together with other CNIs such as Imperatives and Instructional Infinitives\textsuperscript{3}.

Following the annotation policies devised for English, FN-Br also applies the Ext label when annotating noun, adjective and prepositional targets. Ext labels are applied to FEs evoked by noun targets in support constructions, such as (21). In the case of adjectival targets, FEs that receive the Ext label either are the subjects of a copula (22) or the objects in a verbal-nominal predicate (23). As for prepositional target externals, they comprise those elements that are related to the preposition in spite of being outside of the Prepositional Phrase (24). Again, the use of the Ext label in FN-Br is similar to the one proposed for English (RUPPENHOFER ET AL., 2010, p. 66-71).

(21) [Maria]\textsuperscript{Ext} deu um soco no Antônio.
Maria give.PAST.3SG a punch in the Antônio

*Maria punched Antônio.*

(22) [Maria]\textsuperscript{Ext} é alta.
Maria be.PRES.3SG tall

*Maria is tall.*

(23) Antônio acha [Maria]\textsuperscript{Ext} bonita.
Antônio find.PRES.3SG Maria beautiful

*Antônio thinks Maria is beautiful.*

(24) Antônio viu [o livro]\textsuperscript{Ext} sobre a mesa.
Antônio see.PAST.3SG the book on the table

\textsuperscript{2} This constituent is bracketed [de Maria] on the same principle that has us bracket, in English, “said [to her] to go”. The bracketing in such cases follows a general principle of local of mediation of control in a way that we cannot fully explore here, but we may separately note that this increases the comparability of (19) to (20), in the second of which the possession marking is inherently expressed by sua ‘your’.

\textsuperscript{3} It could be argued, however, that those cases should be annotated as Definite Null Instantiations (DNI), since null subjects in Brazilian Portuguese can be regarded as a mechanism of textual cohesion based on anaphora. Nevertheless, a constructional annotation would allow us to explain the DNI as due to a Subjectless Finite VP construction and would additionally allow us to explain the different subject specification in the Imperative construction entirely with the same mechanisms. Most importantly, using CNI will avoid an implicit claim that such DNIs are in any way lexically specific.
Antônio saw the book on the table.

Differently from what holds for the External, the Object label is not applied similarly for English and for Brazilian Portuguese. The Object label used for English is restricted to NP and wh-extracted objects, all other kinds of internal arguments being Dependents. According to Ruppenhofer et al. (2010, p. 65), the Obj label is only assigned to those NPs that are not headed by a preposition and that can serve as a subject in a passive construction. For Brazilian Portuguese, some changes were necessary so as to more adequately capture the syntactic properties of internal arguments of verb targets. First, two labels were created: the Direct Object (DObj) and the Indirect Object (IObj). The DObj label is used for all cases in which the Obj label is applied for English (25-27), plus those cases of either finite or infinitival clausal objects (28-29).

(25) Maria comprou [frutasDObj].
    Maria bought fruit

(26) [O queDObj] Maria comprou?
    What Maria bought
What did Maria buy?

(27) Maria viu [nosDObj] comprar frutas.
    Maria saw us buying fruit.

(28) Maria sabe [comprar frutasDObj].
    Maria knows how to buy fruit.

(29) Maria sabe [que você adora frutasDObj]
    Maria knows you love fruit.

The reasons for including clausal complements among the pieces of language labeled as DObj are three: (i) they can go through wh-extraction in the same way as NPs can, (ii) they can serve as subjects of passive sentences, and (iii) differently from what holds for English, both NP objects and clausal objects may be separated from the verbs subcategorizing them by intervening linguistic material. For instance, while, in English, a sentence like (30) would sound at least weird, if not ungrammatical, its translation into Brazilian Portuguese in (31) would cause no alarm to speakers.

(30) * Ronaldo passed slowly the ball.
(31) Ronaldo passou lentamente a bola.

The other difference between FrameNet and FrameNet Brasil in regards to the use of the Obj label is related to preposition targets. Annotations carried out for English may present the use of Obj for NPs headed by a preposition. Unlike in English, the NPs depending from a prepositional head in Brazilian Portuguese do not share significant properties with the NPs depending from a verbal head (passivizability, cohesion with head); therefore, FN-Br has chosen to use the default label Dep for complements of prepositions.

Indirect Objects, in turn, cannot be used as subjects of passive sentences, since Brazilian Portuguese only allows direct transitive verbs in passive constructions. According to Castilho (2010), Brazilian Portuguese has two kinds of prepositional complements following verbs, indirect objects and obliques, the differences between those two being the following:
- indirect objects can be replaced by dative pronouns (me, te, lhe), while obliques cannot;
- indirect objects are headed exclusively by prepositions a and para, while obliques can occur with other prepositions;
- indirect objects are usually the second object of a verb, while obliques tend to be the only internal argument of a verb.

The IObj label in FN-Br is applied exclusively to indirect objects, such as the ones exemplified in (32-34), while oblique complements are merged into the Dependent category.

(32) Maria **deu** um livro [pra mim]IObj
Maria gave a book to me.

(33) Maria [meIObj] **deu** um livro
Maria gave me a book.

(34) Maria **deu** um livro [pra mim]IObj ler.
Maria gave a book for me to read it.

The Dependent label, hence, is applied to all other verbal arguments not covered by the Ext, DObj and IObj labels, including obliques (35). It is also used for phrases traditionally classified as verbal adjuncts (36-38). In regards to the other kinds of targets (nouns, adjectives and prepositions), Dep is the label ascribed to the right complements of such targets (39-41).

(35) Maria **gosta** [de frutas]Dep
Maria likes fruit

(36) Maria **saiu** [de casa]Dep
Maria left the house.

(37) Maria **comprou** frutas [ontem]Dep
Maria bought fruit yesterday.

(38) Maria **veio** [aqui]Dep
Maria came here.

(39) Maria **tem** medo [do escuro]Dep
Maria is afraid of dark places.

(40) Maria **é** responsável [pelas compras]Dep
Maria is in charge of purchases.

(41) Maria **saiu** para [comprar] frutasDep
Maria left to buy fruit.

The Head label, translated into Portuguese as Núcleo, is primarily used for identifying head nouns modified by qualitative adjective targets (42). Relational adjectives (e.g. algebraic) are not usually annotated in FrameNet, for they are not usually the frame-evoking element in a noun-adjective expression (RUPPENHOFER ET AL., p.68).
Maria comprou frutas frescas.

Maria bought fresh fruit.

Gen and Quant labels were also imported to FN-Br’s annotation, the only difference being the fact that we renamed Gen as PossDet (from Possessive Determiner) so as to make the label more intuitive for annotators. The linguistic chunks they identify, however, are quite similar to those they mark in English. PossDet is applied to either pre-nominal or post-nominal possessive determiners (43-44), although post-nominal possessive determiners are pretty rare in Brazilian Portuguese, while Quant is applied to either definite or indefinite quantifying expressions accompanying a noun (45-46).

(42) Maria comprou [frutasHead] frescas.
Maria buy.PAST.1SG fruit fresh
Maria bought fresh fruit.

As for the Appositive label (Appos), although it seems quite intuitive, one can be tempted to annotate it in regards to verbal targets, in sentences like (47). However, since FrameNet annotation is concerned with describing the valence of target LUs, respecting the constituency of the terms instantiating the FEs, Appos is only used when annotating noun targets, as in (48).

(43) [MinhasPossDet] compras
my purchases
My purchases were delivered.

(44) Vejo a felicidade nos olhos [seuPossDet].
I see happiness in your eyes.

(45) Maria comprou [trêsQuant] litros de leite.
Maria bought three liters of milk.

(46) Maria gastou [muitosQuant] milhares de dólares.
Maria spent many thousands of dollars.

(47) *Maria, [minha professora de francêsAppos], viajou.
Maria, my French teacher, has traveled.

(48) O professor [FillmoreAppos] iniciou a FrameNet.
Professor Fillmore initiated FrameNet.

As for the Appositive label (Appos), although it seems quite intuitive, one can be tempted to annotate it in regards to verbal targets, in sentences like (47). However, since FrameNet annotation is concerned with describing the valence of target LUs, respecting the constituency of the terms instantiating the FEs, Appos is only used when annotating noun targets, as in (48).

The reason why (47) is a bad annotation while (48) is a good one is the fact that viajou ‘travel’ evokes the Travel frame, in which a Traveler moves from a Source location to a Goal through a Path, and both “Maria” and “minha professora de francês” identify the same FE Traveler. Hence, instead of labeling “Maria” as Traveler/Ext/NP and “minha professora de francês” as Traveler/Appos/NP, we choose to label the whole chunk “Maria, minha professora de francês” as Traveler/Ext/NP. Such a choice is reinforced by the fact that, in relation to verb targets, Appositives always inherit the grammatical function of their antecedents. In (48), on the other hand, we find a completely different scenario. Here, the LU professor evokes the People_by_vocation frame, in which a Person, marked by the Appos “Fillmore”, is viewed in terms of his vocation, being a professor.

The GF labels Dep and Head, when used for adverbial targets, identify linguistic chunks whose syntactic properties are somehow different from those presented by the chunks
these labels identify when annotating for other part-of-speech targets: Head is used to mark the events or relations modified by the adverbs – this use being extended to preposition targets, when the preposition being annotated for heads a PP with adverbial value –, while Dep is applied to any linguistic material modifying the adverb (usually another adverb). See (49) for examples.

\[(49) \quad [\text{Maria explicou} \quad \text{tudo}_{\text{Head}}] \quad [\text{bem}_{\text{Dep}}] \quad \text{lentamente}.\]

\[\text{Maria explained everything well slowly}\]

Given the examples annotated in this section, we can summarize the GF labels used in FN-Br as presented in Chart 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF Labels</th>
<th>Part-of-speech of the target LU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External argument (Ext)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Object (DObj)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Object (IObj)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent (Dep)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head noun/verb (Head)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive det. (PossDet)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantificational det. (Quant)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appositive (Appos)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2: Summary of GFs used in FrameNet Brasil

Aside from ascribing GF labels to the linguistic material instantiating FEs, FN-Br annotation also captures the morphological properties of such a material in terms of Phrase Types. In 4.2. we present the set of PT labels developed for FN-Br.

### 4.2. Phrase Types

Unlike GFs, Phrase Types (PTs) tend to cause less controversy in FrameNet-like annotations, since the labels and the linguistic material they identify are not different from those found in other analytical perspectives; in this section we present the criteria used for creating the set of PT labels FN-Br uses.

Because the primary goal of PT labels in FrameNet is to categorize the selectional properties of a valence-slot, the PT labels are designed to refer to patterns of external or distributional syntax. These interact with internal syntax in interesting ways. In Chart 2, we show the phrase types which are relevant for Brazilian Portuguese, arranged by several cross-cutting features of internal syntax: the morphology of the syntactic head of the phrase (noun, infinitive verb), the presence or absence of complements (head only vs. the rest), the presence or absence of a marker (e.g. a particular preposition that serves merely to identify its NP complement as a particular argument of a verb), and by the presence or absence of an external argument (distinguishing, in general, phrases from sentences). In addition, the cross-cutting categories combine with indirect question constructions and relativizing constructions, which, despite the fact that both may appear as finite sentences or infinitival verb phrase, are for convenience listed as if they had a different head morphology than other categories. In particular cases, the marker is sufficiently unusual in how it interacts with the grammar that a specific phrase type is devoted to such marked phrases (e.g. se is a marked finite sentence, possessive is a marked NP). Although the morphology of Brazilian Portuguese is not the same...
as English, just as in English, these features are those that are selected for particular phrases in valence slots.

Despite variable internal syntax, there are several phrases that can be given the same label because of identical external syntax. Just as in English, there are no valences that differentially select the phrases composed of an Ext with an AP, from the phrases composed of an Ext with a gerund or a participle, nor are these differently selected depending on whether they have an overt marker – thus the label $S_{abs}$ for all of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Morphology</th>
<th>External (+) Marker (-)</th>
<th>External (+) Marker (+)</th>
<th>External (-) Marker (-)</th>
<th>External (-) Marker (+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective (Adj)</td>
<td>Absolutive Sentence ($S_{abs}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjective Phrase (AdjP)</td>
<td>Prepositional Adjective Phrase (PPAdj)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb (Adv)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Adverbal Phrase (AdvP)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitival Verb (V$_{inf}$)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Prepositional Infinitive Sentence ($PS_{inf}$)</td>
<td>Verb Phrase (VP$_{inf}$)</td>
<td>Prepositional Verb Phrase (PPV$_{inf}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund (V$_{ger}$)</td>
<td>Absolutive Sentence ($S_{abs}$)</td>
<td>Gerund Phrase (VP$_{ger}$)</td>
<td>Prepositional Gerund Phrase (PP$_{ger}$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle (V$_{part}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participle Phrase (VP$_{part}$)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite Verb (V$_{fin}$)</td>
<td>Finite Complement Sentence ($S_{fin}$)</td>
<td>Finite Adverbal Sentence (Sub)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive Verb (V$_{subj}$)</td>
<td>Subjunctive Complement Sentence ($S_{subj}$)</td>
<td>Subjunctive Adverbal Sentence (Sub)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative (Interrog)</td>
<td>Interrogative Sentence ($S_{interrog}$)</td>
<td>Interrogative Prepositional Phrase (PP$_{interrog}$)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Interrogative Prepositional Phrase (PP$_{interrog}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative (Rel)</td>
<td>Finite Relative Clause ($S_{finRel}$)</td>
<td>Prepositional Infinitival Relative (PlnRel)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Prepositional Infinitival Relative (PlnRel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number (Num)</td>
<td>Number (Num)</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase (PP)</td>
<td>Number (Num)</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase (PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation (Quot)</td>
<td>Quotation (Quot)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive (Poss)</td>
<td>Possessive Noun Phrase (PossNP)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 3: Phrase Types used for annotation in FN-Br.

The first column in Chart 3, besides identifying the morphology of the head in each PT label used in FN-Br, also presents a list of labels, since head-only constituents may occur in the annotation, especially when annotating non-lexical constructions, but also in cases such as in (50).
Overall, we may note that the alterations to the GF and PT labels of FrameNet as used for English have been modest. However, the flexibility of the FrameNet method and software have made it relatively straightforward to add the GF and PT labels for Brazilian Portuguese while retaining the same clear framework.

Conclusion

In this paper, we aimed to discuss the criteria used for developing the GF and PT sets of labels used in FN-Br annotation. After presenting some FrameNet and FrameNet Brasil basics, we defined the concepts of locality and valence in FrameNet, both of which are key for understanding the motivation behind our decisions on whether to annotate or not a given piece of language. Our policies on locality and valence are further motivated in terms of what information is of use to language learners, computational systems, and linguists.

Having defined the ground upon which FrameNet and FN-Br annotation is founded, we presented the sets of GF and PT labels used for Brazilian Portuguese, exemplifying the contexts in which each label in the first set is used. We also carried out specific discussions on the kind of linguistic material covered by some labels, such as DObj, IObj, Dep and Appos, for instance. Far from representing meaningless theoretical labels, each of these categories is concretely grounded in what linguistic alternations are implied by their use, how such phrases are put together, and in what embedding contexts these phrases should be expected to occur.

We believe the discussions presented in this paper may contribute to the understanding of the analytical decisions behind the annotations in the FN-Br databases, thus enabling all users of our data to interpret them properly and further enabling them to proceed to powerful and insightful analyses of their own, firmly planted on the foundation of more than a decade of detailed annotation practice.
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