

Weighted Finite-State Morphological Analysis of Finnish Compounding with HFST-LEXC

Krister Lindén

University of Helsinki
Helsinki, Finland

Krister.Linden@helsinki.fi

Tommi Pirinen

University of Helsinki
Helsinki, Finland

Tommi.Pirinen@helsinki.fi

Abstract

Finnish has a very productive compounding and a rich inflectional system, which causes ambiguity in the morphological segmentation of compounds made with finite state transducer methods. In order to disambiguate the compound segmentations, we compare three different strategies, which are all cast in the same probabilistic framework and compared for the first time. We present a method for implementing the probabilistic framework as part of the building process of LexC-style morpheme sub-lexicons creating weighted lexical transducers. To implement the structurally disambiguating morphological analyzer, we use the HFST-LEXC tool which is part of the open source *Helsinki Finite-State Technology*. Using our Finnish test corpus with 53 270 compounds, we demonstrate that it is possible to use non-compound token probabilities to disambiguate the compounding structure. Non-compound token probabilities are easy to obtain from raw data compared with obtaining the probabilities of prefixes of segmented and disambiguated compounds.

1 Introduction

In languages with productive multi-part compounding, such as Finnish, German and Swedish, approximately 9-10 % of the word tokens in a corpus are compounds (Hedlund, 2002) and approximately 2/3 of the dictionary entries are compounds, cf. a publicly available

Finnish dictionary (Research Institute for the Languages of Finland, 2007).

There have been various attempts at curbing the potential combinatorial explosion of segmentations that a prolific compounding mechanism produces. Karlsson (1992) showed that for Swedish the most significant factor in disambiguating compounds was the counting of the number of parts in the analysis, where the analysis with the fewest parts almost always was the best candidate. This has later been corroborated by others, e.g. (Sjöbergh and Kann, 2004). In particular, it was the main disambiguation criterion formulated by (Schiller, 2005) on German compounding. In addition, Schiller used frequency information for disambiguating between compounds with an equal number of parts. Schiller estimated her figures from compound part frequencies calculated from lists of segmented compounds, which requires a considerable amount of manual labor in order to create the training corpora consisting of attested compound words and their correct segmentations.

We suggest two modifications to the strategies of Karlsson and Schiller. First we suggest that the word segment probabilities can be estimated from non-compound word frequencies in the corpus. The motivation for our approach is that compounds are formed in order to distinguish between instances of frequently occurring phenomena and therefore compounds are more often formed for more frequently discussed phenomena. We assume that the frequency by which phenomena are discussed is reflected in the non-compound word form frequencies, i.e. high-frequency words should in general have more compounds. To further simplify the estimation process, we assume that

the frequencies of the word tokens directly affect the probability of the forms used in the compound formation, which can be motivated by an analogy of use.

In addition, we suggest that the special word border penalty suggested by Karlsson and maintained by Schiller is unnecessary when framing the problem in a probabilistic framework. This has also been suggested by others, see e.g. Marek (2006). However, this is the first time the disambiguation principles of Karlsson and of Schiller are compared with a probabilistic approach on the same corpus.

Previously, there has been no publicly available general framework for conveniently integrating both a full-fledged morphological description and for representing probabilities for general morphological compound and inflectional analysis. Karlsson (1992) applied a post-processing phase to count the parts, and Schiller (2005) used the proprietary weighted finite-state compiler of Xerox (Kempe et al., 2003), which compiles regular expressions. We therefore introduce the open source software tool HFST-LEXC¹, which is similar to the Xerox LexC tool (Beesley and Karttunen, 2003). In addition to the fact that HFST-LEXC compiles LexC-style lexicons, it also has a mechanism for adding weights to compound parts and morphological analyses.

The remainder of the article is structured as follows. In Sections 2 and 3, we introduce a version of Finnish morphology for compounding. In Section 4, we introduce the probabilistic formulation of the methods for weighting the lexical entries. In Section 5, we briefly introduce the test and training corpora. In Section 6, we present the results. Finally, in Sections 7, 8 and 9, we give some notes on the implementation, discuss the results and draw the conclusions.

2 Inflection and Compounding in Finnish

In Finnish morphology, the inflection of typical nouns produces several thousands of forms for the productive inflection. Finnish compounding theoretically allows nominal compounds of arbitrary length to be created from initial parts of certain noun forms. The final part may be inflected in all possible forms.

¹<http://kitwiki.csc.fi/twiki/bin/view/KitWiki/HfstLexC>

For example the compounds describing ancestors are compounded from zero or more of *isän* ‘father SINGULAR GENITIVE’ and *äidin* ‘mother SINGULAR GENITIVE’ and then one of any inflected forms of *isä* or *äiti*, creating forms such as *äidinisälle* ‘grandfather (maternal) SINGULAR ALLATIVE’ or *isänisänisänisä* ‘great great grandfather SINGULAR NOMINATIVE’. As for the potential ambiguity, Finnish also has the noun *nisä* ‘udder’, which creates ambiguity for any paternal grandfather, e.g. *isän#isän#isän#isä*, *isän#isä#nisän#isä*, *isä#nisä#nisä#nisä*, ...

However, much of the ambiguity in Finnish compounds is aggravated by the ambiguity of the inflected forms of the head words. For example *isän*, has several possible analyses, e.g. ISÄ+SG+GEN, ISÄ+SG+ACC and ISÄ+SG+INS.

Finnish compounding also includes forms of compounding where all parts of the word are inflected in the same form, but this is limited to a small fraction of adjective initial compounds and to the numbers if they are spelled out with letters. In addition, some inflected verb forms may appear as parts of compounds. These are much more rare than nominal compounds (Hakulinen et al., 2008) so they do not interfere with the regular compounding. We therefore did not consider them in this paper.

3 Morphological analysis of Finnish

Pirinen (2008) presented an open source implementation of a finite state morphological analyzer for Finnish. We use that implementation as a baseline for the compounding analysis as Pirinen’s analyzer has a fully productive compounding mechanism. Fully productive compounding means that it allows compounds of arbitrary length with any combination of nominative singulars, genitive singulars, or genitive plurals in the initial part and any inflected form of a noun as the final part.

The morphotactic combination of morphemes is achieved by combining sublexicons as defined in (Beesley and Karttunen, 2003). We use the open source software called HFST-LEXC with a similar interface as the Xerox LexC tool. The HFST-LEXC tool includes preliminary support for weights on the lexical entries.

For the purpose of this experiment, each lexical entry constitutes one full word form, i.e., we create a full form lexicon using the previously mentioned

analyzer (Pirinen, 2008). This creates a huge text file for the purely inflectional morphology of approximately 40 000 non-compound lexical entries for Finnish, which were stored in a single CompoundFinalNoun lexicon as shown in Figure 1. The figure demonstrates an unweighted lexicon and also shows how we model the compounding by dividing the word forms into two categories: compound non-final (i.e., nominative singular, genitive singular, and genitive plural) and compound final forms allowing us to give weights to each form or compound part as needed.

```

LEXICON Root
## CompoundNonFinalNoun ;
## CompoundFinalNoun ;

LEXICON Compound
#:0 CompoundNonFinalNoun "weight: 0" ;
#:0 CompoundFinalNoun "weight: 0" ;

LEXICON CompoundNonFinalNoun
isä Compound "weight: 0" ;
isän Compound "weight: 0" ;
äiti Compound "weight: 0" ;
äidin Compound "weight: 0" ;

LEXICON CompoundFinalNoun
isä:isä+sg+nom ## "weight: 0" ;
isän:isä+sg+gen ## "weight: 0" ;
isälle:isä+sg+all ## "weight: 0" ;

LEXICON ##
## # ;

```

Figure 1: Unweighted lexicon.

Compounding implemented with the unweighted sublexicons in Figure 1 is equivalent to the original baseline analyzer. The root sublexicon specifies that we can start directly with compound final noun forms, forming single part words, or start with compound initial forms, forming multi-word compounds. The compound initial lexicon is a listing of all nominative singulars, genitive singulars and genitive plurals, which is followed by a compound boundary marker in a separate sublexicon. After the compound boundary marker another word follows either from the compound initial sublexicon or from the compound final sublexicon. The compound final sublexicon, for the purposes of this experiment, contains a list of all possible forms of all words and their analyses.

4 Methodology

We define the weight of a token through its probability to occur in the corpus, i.e. we use the count, c , which is proportional to the frequency with which a token appears in a corpus divided by the corpus size, cs . The probability, $p(a)$, for a token, a , is defined by Equation 1.

$$p(a) = c(a)/cs \quad (1)$$

Tokens known to the lexicon but unseen in the corpus need to be assigned a small probability mass different from 0, so they get $c(x) = 1$, i.e. we define the count of a token as its corpus frequency plus 1 as in Equation 2.

$$c(a) = 1 + \text{frequency}(a) \quad (2)$$

If a token, e.g. *isän*, has several possible analyses, e.g. ISÄ+SG+GEN and ISÄ+SG+ACC, the total count for *isän* will be distributed among the analyses in a disambiguated training corpus. If the disambiguation result removes all readings ISÄ+SG+ACC from the disambiguated result, the count for this reading is still at least 1 according to Equation 2. We need the total probability mass of all the non-compound tokens in the lexicon to sum up to 1, so we define the corpus size as the number of all lexical token counts according to Equation 3.

$$cs = \sum_x c(x) \quad (3)$$

To use the probabilities as weights in the lexicon we implement them in the tropical semi-ring, which means that we use the negative log-probabilities as defined by Equation 4.

$$w(a) = -\log(p(a)) \quad (4)$$

For an illustration of how the weighting scheme is implemented in the lexicon, see Figure 2.

According to Karlsson (1992) and Schiller (2005), we may need to ensure that the weight of the compound segmentation ab of a word always is greater than the weight of a non-compound analysis c of the same word, so for compounds we use Equation 5, where a is the first part of the compound and x is the remaining part, which may be split into additional parts applying the equation recursively.

$$w(ax) = w(a) + M + w(x) \quad (5)$$

```

LEXICON Root
## CompoundNonFinalNoun ;
## CompoundFinalNoun ;

LEXICON Compound
0:# CompoundNonFinalNoun "weight: 0" ;
0:# CompoundFinalNoun "weight: 0" ;

LEXICON CompoundNonFinalNoun
isä Compound "weight: -log(c(isä)/cs)" ;
isän Compound "weight: -log(c(isän)/cs)" ;
äiti Compound "weight: -log(c(äiti)/cs)" ;
äidin Compound "weight: -log(c(äidin)/cs)" ;

LEXICON CompoundFinalNoun
isä:isä+sg+nom ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+nom)/cs)" ;
isän:isä+sg+gen ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+gen)/cs)" ;
isälle:isä+sg+all ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+all)/cs)" ;
isin:isä+pl+ins ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+all)/cs)" ;

LEXICON ##
## # ;

```

Figure 2: Structure weighting scheme using token penalties.

In particular, it is true that $w(ab) > w(c)$ if M is defined as in Equation 6.

$$M = -\log(1/(cs + 1)) \quad (6)$$

For an illustration of how a structure weighting scheme with compound penalties is implemented in the lexicon, see Figure 3.

```

LEXICON Root
## CompoundNonFinalNoun ;
## CompoundFinalNoun ;

LEXICON Compound
0:# CompoundNonFinalNoun "weight: -log(1/(cs+1))" ;
0:# CompoundFinalNoun "weight: -log(1/(cs+1))" ;

LEXICON CompoundNonFinalNoun
isä Compound "weight: -log(c(isä)/cs)" ;
isän Compound "weight: -log(c(isän)/cs)" ;
äiti Compound "weight: -log(c(äiti)/cs)" ;
äidin Compound "weight: -log(c(äidin)/cs)" ;

LEXICON CompoundFinalNoun
isä:isä+sg+nom ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+nom)/cs)" ;
isän:isä+sg+gen ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+gen)/cs)" ;
isälle:isä+sg+all ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+all)/cs)" ;
isin:isä+pl+ins ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+all)/cs)" ;

LEXICON ##
## # ;

```

Figure 3: Structure weighting scheme using token and compound border penalties.

In order to compare with the original principle suggested by Karlsson (1992), we create a third lexicon for which structural weights are placed on the compound borders only, so for compounds we use Equation 7.

$$w(ax) = M + w(x) \quad (7)$$

For an illustration of how a weighting scheme

with the compound penalty suggested by Karlsson is implemented in the lexicon, see Figure 4.

```

LEXICON Root
## CompoundNonFinalNoun ;
## CompoundFinalNoun ;

LEXICON Compound
0:# CompoundNonFinalNoun "weight: -log(1/(cs+1))" ;
0:# CompoundFinalNoun "weight: -log(1/(cs+1))" ;

LEXICON CompoundNonFinalNoun
isä Compound "weight: 0" ;
isän Compound "weight: 0" ;
äiti Compound "weight: 0" ;
äidin Compound "weight: 0" ;

LEXICON CompoundFinalNoun
isä:isä+sg+nom ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+nom)/cs)" ;
isän:isä+sg+gen ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+gen)/cs)" ;
isälle:isä+sg+all ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+all)/cs)" ;
isin:isä+pl+ins ## "weight:-log(c(isä+sg+all)/cs)" ;

LEXICON ##
## # ;

```

Figure 4: Structure weighting scheme using compound border penalties.

5 Training and Test Data

For training and testing purposes, we use a compilation of three years, 1995-1997, of daily issues of Helsingin Sanomat, which is the most wide-spread Finnish newspaper. The data actually spanned 2.5 years with 1995 and 1996 of equal size and 1997 only half of this. This collection contained approximately 2.4 million different words, i.e. types. We disambiguated the corpus using Machine² which provided

²Machine is available from Connexor Ltd., www.connexor.com

one reading in context for each word based on syntactic parsing.

To create the test material from the corpus, we selected all word forms with more than 20 characters for which our baseline analyzer (Pirinen, 2008) gave a compound analysis, i.e. 53 270 types. The compounds were evenly distributed among the three years of data. Of these, we selected the types which had a structural ambiguity and found 4 721 such words, i.e. approximately 8.9 % of all the compound words analyzed by our baseline analyzer. Of the remaining more than 20-character compounds 63.7 % contained no ambiguities or only inflectional ambiguities. At most, the combination of structural and inflectional ambiguities amounted to 30 readings in three different words which after all is a fairly moderate number. On the average, the structural and inflectional ambiguity amounts to 2.79 readings per word. Examples of structurally ambiguous words are *aktivointimahdollisuuksien* with the ambiguity *aktivointi#mahdollisuus* 'of the opportunities to activate' vs. *akti#vointi#mahdollisuus* 'of the opportunities to act health' and *hiihtoharjoittelupaikassa* with the ambiguity *hiihto#harjoittelu#paikka* 'in the ski training location' vs. *hiihto#harjoittelu#pai#kassa* 'ski training pie cashier'.

The characteristics of all the compounds in the corpus is presented in Table 1.

# of Characters			# of Segments		
Min.	Max.	Avg.	Min.	Max.	Avg.
2	44	15.34	2	6	2.19

Table 1: Evaluation of compounds, segments and readings.

Examples of six-part compounds are:

- *elo#kuva#teatteri#tuki#työ#ryhmä*
'movie theater support workgroup'
- *jatko#koulutus#yhteis#työ#toimi#kunta*
'higher education cooperation committee'
- *lähi#alue#yhteis#työ#määrä#raha*
'regional cooperation reserve'

The longest compound found in the corpus is *liikenne#turvallisuus#asiain#neuvottelu#kunnassa* 'in the road safety issue negotiating committee'

6 Tests and Results

We estimated the probabilities for the non-compound words in the 1995 part of the corpus. We then repeated the experiment and estimated the probabilities on the non-compound words of the 1996 part of the corpus. Since we do not use the compounds for training we can test on the compounds of all three years.

We evaluated the weighting schemes described in Section 4, i.e. the probabilistic method without compound boundary weighting, the probabilistic method combined with compound weighting and the traditional pure compound weighting. The precision and recall is presented in Table 2. Since we only took the first of the best results, the precision is equal to recall.

In both tests, we found the exact same result, i.e. there were two words out of 4721 structurally ambiguous words that failed when we used the compound weighting only. These were *puunostopolitiikkaansa* which had the structural ambiguities *puun#osto#politiikkaansa* 'timber purchasing policy' vs *puu#nosto#politiikkaansa* 'timber lifting policy' and *vuorotteluvapaalaisille* with the structural ambiguity *vuorottelu#vapaa#laisille* 'for persons on exchange sabbatical' vs. *vuorottelu#vapa#alaisille*³ 'for exchange rod subjugates'.

We found no word that could be said to have a structural misinterpretation due to the estimated probabilities, but we found some words that were interpreted differently by the statistics from the two years, e.g. *laihдутuskuurilaisilla* with the ambiguity *laihдутus#kuurilaisilla* 'diet # program participants' vs. *laihдутuskuuri#laisilla* 'diet program # participants' and e.g. *avaruuslentotukikohta* with the ambiguity *avaruus#lentotukikohta* 'space # flight base' vs. *avaruuslento#tukikohta* 'space flight # base'.

Parameters	Prec. & Rec.
Only compound penalty	99.96 %
Compound penalty and prefix weights	100.00 %
No compound penalty but prefix weights	100.00 %

Table 2: Precision equals recall for the test results when we use only the first result.

³Strictly speaking this particular error is possible only because we did not enforce the Finnish orthography rule that the same vowel on both sides of the compound border requires a hyphen in-between.

We started with 53 270 compounds. With the probabilistic approach, we were hard pressed to find even some structural misinterpretations. With the word boundary penalty, we found two structural errors in the compound disambiguation.

7 Implementation Note

In HFST-LEXC, we use OpenFST (Allauzen et al., 2007) as the underlying finite-state software library for handling weighted finite-state transducers. The estimated probabilities are encoded as weights in the tropical semi-ring, see (Mohri, 1997). To extract the n-best results, we use a single-source n-best paths algorithm, see (Mohri and Riley, 2002).

8 Discussion and Further Research

Previous results for structural compound disambiguation for German using word probabilities and compound penalties (Schiller, 2005) or using only word probabilities (Marek, 2006) also achieved results with precision and recall in the region of 97-99 %. In German the ambiguities of long compounds may produce even 120 readings, but on the average the ambiguity in compounds is between 2-3 readings (Schiller, 2005), which is on par with the ambiguity of 2.8 readings found for long Finnish compounds. As pointed out initially (Hedlund, 2002), the amount of compounds occurring in Finnish, Swedish and German texts is also on a comparable level.

For some words the compound form has a linking element or a glue element. In Swedish, as pointed out by Karlsson (1992), the linking element is sometimes a structure indicator, e.g. the “-s-” in “[peppar#kak]s#burk” (ginger-bread jar) indicates a bracketing which is different if the “-s-” is missing as in “peppar#[kak#burk]” (pepper # cookie jar). However, in German the linking elements most often coincide with inflected forms (Fuhrhop, 1996), in which case they are called paradigmatic linking elements. The only exceptional or non-paradigmatic linking element in German is “-s-” for words ending in “-ung, -heit, -keit” and “-ion”, in which case it is also mandatory, so the fact that it does not appear as an inflected form of non-compounds in a corpus is a non-issue from a probabilistic point of view. In this case, it is sufficient to estimate the frequency of the form without an “-s-”. Finnish only has one systematic non-paradigmatic linking element,

i.e. the linking element for nouns and adjectives ending in “-nen” which is “-s-” in compounds, e.g. “yhteinen” (common) becomes “yhteis-” in compounds. In addition, a handful of words have exceptional forms, e.g. “suuri” (big) may also be “suur-” when used as a compound prefix. All other linking elements are paradigmatic, i.e. the compound prefixes coincide with inflected forms.

As the astute reader may have noticed, Equation 5 gives us a non-tight distribution for the complete set of words generated by the lexicon, although the distribution we estimate is tight for non-compounds. The consequence of this is that we cannot claim that the weights we derive for compounds correspond to the true probabilities of the productively formed compounds. What they do reflect, however, is whether the parts are more likely than surprise to form a productive compound from the parts observed in a corpus or whether the word is more likely to be an attested non-compound. E.g. the Swedish word “bollfot” (ball foot) is more likely to be formed by productive compounding from the parts “boll” (ball) and “fot” (foot) than to be observed as a single token, whereas the Swedish word “fotboll” (football) is more likely to be one token in the corpus than a productive compound. In English, this phenomenon is reflected in the orthography with some delay by tending to write very frequent or lexicalized compounds without intervening spaces.

If a disambiguated corpus is not available for calculating the word analysis probabilities, it is possible to use only the string token probabilities to disambiguate the compound structure without saying anything about the most likely morphological reading.

In Finnish, using only the structural penalties may also be an acceptable replacement. However, we need to note that a similar strategy in German, i.e. using only compound penalties on all compound prefixes, did not seem to perform as well (Schiller, 2005). This may be due to the fact that German contains a high number of very short one-syllable words which interfere with the compounding, whereas Finnish is more restricted in the number of short words.

Scandinavian languages are similar to German in that they have a number of short one-syllable nouns. Several different approaches for Swedish compound disambiguation are demonstrated in

(Sjöbergh and Kann, 2004). They show results of 86 % accuracy of compound segmenting when using compound component frequencies estimated from compounds and 90 % when using the number of compound components. However, they do not try a fully probabilistic approach and they do not try to estimate probabilities or any other weights for prefixes from non-compound words. So it is a question for further research whether a purely probabilistic approach could fare as well for Swedish and other Scandinavian languages as it seems to work for Finnish and German.

9 Conclusions

For Finnish, weighting compound complexity gives excellent results around 99.9 % almost regardless of the approach. However, from a theoretical point of view, we can still verify the two hypotheses we postulated initially. Most importantly, there seems to be no need to extract the counts from lists of disambiguated compounds, i.e., it is quite feasible to use general word occurrence probabilities for structurally disambiguating compounds. In addition, we can also corroborate the observation that when using word probabilities, it is possible to forego a specific structural penalty and rely only on the word probabilities. From a practical point of view, we introduced the open source tool, HFST-LEXC, and demonstrated how it can be successfully used to encode various compound weighting schemes.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Finnish Academy and the Finnish Ministry of Education. We are also grateful to the HFST-Helsinki Finite State Technology research team and to the anonymous reviewers for various improvements of the manuscript.

References

Cyril Allauzen, Michael Riley, Johan Schalkwyk, Wojciech Skut, and Mehryar Mohri. 2007. OpenFst: A general and efficient weighted finite-state transducer library. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Implementation and Application of Automata, (CIAA 2007)*, volume 4783 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 11–23. Springer. <http://www.openfst.org>.

Kenneth R. Beesley and Lauri Karttunen. 2003. *Finite State Morphology*. CSLI Publications. <http://www.fsmbook.com>.

Nanna Fuhrhop, 1996. *Deutsch - typologisch*, chapter Fugenelemente. de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.

Auli Hakulinen, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, and Irja Alho. 2008. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. referred on 31.12.2008, available from <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk>.

Turid Hedlund. 2002. Compounds in dictionary-based cross-language information retrieval. *Information Research*, 7(2). <http://InformationR.net/ir/7-2/paper128.html>.

Fred Karlsson. 1992. Swetwol: A comprehensive morphological analyzer for swedish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 15(2):1–45.

André Kempe, Christof Baeijs, Tamás Gaál, Franck Guingne, and Florent Nicart. 2003. Wfsc - a new weighted finite state compiler. In *Proceedings of CIAA'03*, volume 2759 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 108–120. Springer.

Torsten Marek. 2006. Analysis of german compounds using weighted finite state transducers. Technical report, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.

Mehryar Mohri and Michael Riley. 2002. An efficient algorithm for the n-best-strings problem. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Spoken Language Processing 2002 (ICSLP '02)*.

Mehryar Mohri. 1997. Finite-state transducers in language and speech processing. *Computational Linguistics*, 23(2).

Tommi Pirinen. 2008. Suomen kielen äärellistilainen automaattinen morfologinen analyysi avoimen lähdekoodin keinoin. Master's thesis, Helsingin yliopisto.

Research Institute for the Languages of Finland. 2007. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen nykysuomen sanalista. <http://kaino.kotus.fi/sanat/nykysuomi/>.

Anne Schiller. 2005. German compound analysis with wfsc. In *FSMNLP*, pages 239–246.

Jonas Sjöbergh and Viggo Kann. 2004. Finding the correct interpretation of Swedish compounds a statistical approach. In *Proceedings of LREC-2004*, pages 899–902, Lisbon, Portugal. http://dr-hato.se/research/sjobergh_kann_04.ps.