

When Does Translation Require Context? A Data-driven, Multilingual Exploration

Kayo Yin^{1*} Patrick Fernandes^{1,2,3*} André F. T. Martins^{2,3,4} Graham Neubig¹

¹Language Technologies Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA

²Instituto Superior Técnico & LUMILIS (Lisbon ELLIS Unit), Lisbon, Portugal

³Instituto de Telecomunicações, Lisbon, Portugal

⁴Unbabel, Lisbon, Portugal

{kayoy, pfernand, gneubig}@cs.cmu.edu andre.t.martins@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

Abstract

Although proper handling of discourse phenomena significantly contributes to the quality of machine translation (MT), common translation quality metrics do not adequately capture them. Recent works in context-aware MT attempt to target a small set of these phenomena during evaluation. In this paper, we propose a new metric, P-CXMI, which allows us to identify translations that require context systematically and confirm the difficulty of previously studied phenomena as well as uncover new ones that have not been addressed in previous work. We then develop the **Multilingual Discourse-Aware** (MuDA) benchmark, a series of taggers for these phenomena in 14 different language pairs, which we use to evaluate context-aware MT. We find that state-of-the-art context-aware MT models find marginal improvements over context-agnostic models on our benchmark, which suggests current models do not handle these ambiguities effectively. We release code and data to invite the MT research community to increase efforts on context-aware translation on discourse phenomena and languages that are currently overlooked.¹

1 Introduction

In machine translation (MT), information from previous utterances has been found crucial to adequately translate a number of discourse phenomena including anaphoric pronouns, lexical cohesion, and discourse markers (Guillou et al., 2018; Läubli et al., 2018; Toral et al., 2018). However, while generating proper translations of these phenomena is important, they represent only a small portion of the words in natural language data. Because of this, common metrics such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) do not provide a clear picture of whether they are appropriately captured or not.

* Equal contribution

¹<https://github.com/neulab/contextual-mt>

Dataset	Lang.	Phenomena
Müller et al. (2018)	EN → DE	Pronouns
Bawden et al. (2018)	EN → FR	Pronouns, Coherence Lexical Consistency
Voita et al. (2018) Voita et al. (2019b)	EN → RU	Pronouns Deixis, Ellipsis Lexical Consistency
Jwalapuram et al. (2020)	DE → EN ZH → EN EN → RU	Pronouns, Coherence Lexical Consistency Discourse
Our Work	14 Pairs (§5)	Pronouns, Ellipsis Formality Lexical Consistency Verb Forms

Table 1: Some representative works on contextual machine translation that perform evaluation on discourse phenomena, contrasted to our work. For a more complete review see Maruf et al. (2021)

Recent work on neural machine translation (NMT) models that attempt to incorporate extrasentential context (Tiedemann and Scherrer, 2017; Miculicich et al., 2018; Maruf and Haffari, 2018, *inter alia*) often perform targeted evaluation of certain discourse phenomena, mostly focusing on lexical cohesion (Voita et al., 2019b,a) and pronoun translation (Müller et al., 2018; Bawden et al., 2018; Lopes et al., 2020). However, only a limited set of discourse phenomena for a few language pairs have been studied (see summary in Table 1). The difficulty of broadening these studies stems from the reliance of previous work on introspection and domain knowledge to identify the relevant discourse phenomena, which then requires engineering language-specific methods to create test suites or manually designing data for evaluation.

In this paper, we fill this gap by proposing a *data-driven, semi-automatic methodology for identifying salient phenomena* that require context for translation, and we apply this method to create a *multilingual benchmark testing these discourse phenomena*. This is done through several steps. First, we develop P-CXMI (§2) as a metric to identify when context is helpful in MT, or more broadly text generation in general. Then, we perform a

systematic analysis of words with high P-CXMI to find categories of translations where context is useful (§3). This allows us to identify novel discourse phenomena that to our knowledge have not been addressed previously (e.g. consistency of formality and verb forms), without requiring language-specific domain knowledge. Finally, we design a series of methods to automatically tag words belonging to the identified classes of ambiguities (§4) and we evaluate existing translation models for different categories of ambiguous translations (§5).

We perform our study on a parallel corpus spanning 14 language pairs, over which we compare translation ambiguity and model performance. Somewhat surprisingly, we find that the context-aware methods, while improving on translation evaluation metrics, only perform slightly better in our benchmark, hinting that improvements on these metrics might be due to factors other than context usage (Kim et al., 2019). We also find that DeepL, a commercial document-level translation system, does better in our benchmark than its sentence-level ablation and Google Translate. We hope that the released benchmark and code, as well as our findings, will spur targeted evaluation of discourse phenomena in MT to cover more languages and a wider variety of phenomena in the future.

2 Measuring Context Usage

2.1 Cross-Mutual Information

While document-level MT models can be compared using standard automatic performance metrics such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), these metrics do not provide a clear picture of whether models are performing better due to improvements in the handling of context or due to other improvements in training or modelling (Kim et al., 2019). Another common evaluation paradigm is *contrastive evaluation*, which evaluates contextual models on their ability to distinguish between correct and incorrect translations of very specific discourse phenomena, such as anaphora resolution (Müller et al., 2018) and lexical cohesion (Bawden et al., 2018). However, such evaluation provides only a limited measure of context usage with respect to a fixed number of ambiguous translations defined by the creators of the dataset, and hence cannot capture other unanticipated ways in which the model might be using context. We are therefore interested in devising a metric that is able to capture *all* context usage by a model, beyond a predefined set.

Conditional Cross-Mutual Information (CXMI) (Fernandes et al., 2021) is a phenomena-agnostic metric for measuring the influence of context on model predictions. CXMI is defined as

$$\text{CXMI}(C \rightarrow Y|X) = H_{q_{MT_A}}(Y|X) - H_{q_{MT_C}}(Y|X, C),$$

where X and Y are a source and target sentence, respectively, C is the context, $H_{q_{MT_A}}$ is the entropy of a *context-agnostic* MT model, and $H_{q_{MT_C}}$ refers to a *context-aware* MT model. This quantity can be estimated over a held-out set with N sentence pairs and the respective context as:

$$\text{CXMI}(C \rightarrow Y|X) \approx -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \frac{q_{MT_A}(y^{(i)}|x^{(i)})}{q_{MT_C}(y^{(i)}|x^{(i)}, C^{(i)})}$$

Importantly, the authors find that training a *single* model q_{MT} as both the context-agnostic and context-aware model ensures that non-zero CXMI values are due to context and not other factors (see the original paper for a more detailed explanation).

2.2 Context Usage Per Sentence and Word

CXMI measures the context usage by a model by comparing the log-likelihood ratio of samples across *the whole corpus*. However, for our purposes, we are interested in measuring how much the context is helpful for single sentences or even just particular words in a sentence.

Pointwise Mutual Information (P-MI) (Church and Hanks, 1990) is a measure of the association between two random variables for *specific* outcomes of them. Mutual information can be seen as the expected value of P-MI over all possible outcomes of the variables. Taking inspiration from this, we define the **Pointwise Cross-Mutual Information** (P-CXMI) for a given triplet of source, target and context (x, y, C) as

$$\text{P-CXMI}(y, x, C) = -\log \frac{q_{MT_A}(y|x)}{q_{MT_C}(y|x, C)}$$

Intuitively, P-CXMI measures how much more (or less) likely a target sentence y is when it is given context C , compared to not being given that context. Note that this is estimated *according to the models* q_{MT_A} and q_{MT_C} since, just like CXMI, this measure depends on their learned distributions.

We can also apply P-CXMI at *word-level* (as opposed to sentence-level) to measure how much

<i>Avelile's mother had HIV virus. Avelile had the virus, she was born with the virus.</i> 阿维尔利的母亲是携有艾滋病病毒。阿维尔利也有艾滋病病毒。她一生下来就有。	Lexical Cohesion
<i>Your daughter? Your niece?</i> Votre fille ? Votre nièce ?	Formality (T-V)
<i>Roger. I got'em. Two-Six, this is Two-Six , we're mobile.</i> 了解 捕捉した。 2-6 こちら移動中だ。	Formality (Honorifics)
<i>Our tools today don't look like shovels and picks. They look like the stuff we walk around with.</i> As ferramentas de hoje não se parecem com pás e picaretas. Elas se parecem com as coisas que usamos.	Pronouns
<i>Louis XIV had a lot of people working for him. They made his silly outfits, like this.</i> Luis XIV tenía un montón de gente trabajando para él. Ellos hacían sus trajes tontos, como éste.	Verb Form
<i>They're the ones who know what society is going to be like in another generation. I don't.</i> Ancak onlar başka bir nesilde toplumun nasıl olacağını biliyorlar. Ben bilmiyorum.	Ellipsis

Table 2: Examples of high P-CXMI tokens and corresponding linguistic phenomena. Contextual sentences are *italicized*. The high P-CXMI target token is highlighted in pink, source and contextual target tokens related to the high P-CXMI token are highlighted in blue and green respectively.

more likely a particular word in a sentence is when it is given the context, by leveraging the autoregressive property of the neural decoder. Given the triplet (x, y, C) and the word index i , we can measure the P-CXMI for that particular word as:

$$\text{P-CXMI}(i, y, x, C) = -\log \frac{q_{MT_A}(y_i | y_{t < i}, x)}{q_{MT_C}(y_i | y_{t < i}, x, C)}$$

Note that nothing constrains the form of C or even x and P-CXMI can, in principle, be applied to any conditional language modelling problem.

Using this metric, we now ask: what kind of words tend to see their likelihood increase when given the context? Such words should have a high P-CXMI, which we examine in the following §3.

3 Which Translation Phenomena Benefit from Context?

To identify salient translation phenomena that require context, we perform a *thematic analysis* (Braun and Clarke, 2006), examining words with high P-CXMI across different language pairs and manually identifying patterns and categorizing them into phenomena where context is useful for translation. To do so, we systematically examined (1) the mean P-CXMI per POS tag, (2) the vocabulary items with the highest P-CXMI, and (3) the individual tokens with the highest P-CXMI. We follow the experimental setup in Fernandes et al. (2021). See also D for more details on the training.

3.1 Data

To compare linguistic phenomena that arise during document-level translation across various language pairs, we need a dataset that is document-level, rich in context-dependent discourse phenomena,

and parallel in multiple languages. We, therefore, perform our study on transcripts of TED talks and their translations (Qi et al., 2018). We choose to study translation between English and Arabic, German, Spanish, French, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Dutch, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Turkish and Mandarin Chinese. These 14 target languages are chosen for their high availability of TED talks and of linguistic tools, as well as for the diversity of language types represented in our comparative study (Table 7 in Appendix A). In total, our dataset contains 113,711 parallel training sentences from 1,368 talks, 2,678 development sentences from 41 talks, and 3,385 testing sentences from 43 talks.

3.2 Analysis Procedure

We adopt a top-down approach and start our analysis by studying POS tags with high mean P-CXMI. In Appendix B, we report the mean P-CXMI for selected POS tags on our test data for translation from English to the 14 target languages. Some types of ambiguity, such as dual form pronouns (§3.3), can be linked to a single POS tag and be identified at this step, whereas others require finer inspection.

Next, we inspect the vocabulary items with high mean P-CXMI. At this step, we can detect phenomena that are reflected by certain lexical items that consistently benefit from context for translation.

Finally, we examine individual tokens that obtain the highest P-CXMI. In doing so, we identify patterns that do not depend on lexical features, but rather on syntactic constructions for example. In Table 2, we provide selected examples of tokens that have high P-CXMI and the discourse

phenomenon we have identified from them.

3.3 Identified Phenomena

Through our thematic analysis of P-CXMI, we identified various types of translation ambiguity. Unlike previous work, our methodology requires no prior knowledge of the language pair to find relevant discourse phenomena and easily scales to various languages.

Firstly, we find relatively high P-CXMI for proper nouns (PRON) for the majority of languages. As in the first row of Table 2, proper nouns and named entities may have multiple possible translations (another translation for “Avelile” is “艾薇儿”), but the same entity should be referred to by the same word in a translated document for **lexical cohesion** (Carpuat, 2009).

We find high P-CXMI for second-person pronouns (PRON.2) in languages in which they encode politeness distinction (Appendix A, “Pronouns Politeness”), such as German, Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, and Chinese. While English uses the same second-person pronouns for everyone, these languages perform T-V distinction where this pronoun depends on the level of formality and relationship between the speaker and addressee. We also find high P-CXMI for verbs in Japanese and Korean. These two languages use honorifics and speech levels for politeness distinction, where prefixes and suffixes of certain words and the verb lemma depend on the interlocutors’ relationship and on the **formality** of the discourse. Moreover, Japanese has relatively high P-CXMI on auxiliary verbs (AUX) and particles (PART) which also often control the formality and tone of the sentence, and further confirms the significance of this phenomenon.

In English, only the 3rd person singular pronoun may contain gender distinction and it assigns gender based solely on semantic rules (Appendix A, “Gendered Pronouns”, “Gender Assignment”). We find that several languages have high P-CXMI on pronouns (PRON), and these languages use gendered pronouns for pronouns other than the 3rd person singular or assign gender using formal rules (German, French, Hebrew, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, and Chinese). When translating a gender-neutral English pronoun to a gendered target pronoun, context is therefore needed to resolve anaphora and determine the gender. We also find that Arabic obtains high P-CXMI on dual form pro-

nouns (0.139 on PRON.3.Dual words), whereas duality not explicitly expressed in English **pronouns** which leads to ambiguity.

We also find high P-CXMI for certain **verb forms**, such as the future form in Italian and imperfect form in Spanish, French, Italian, and Romanian. While English verbs may have five forms (e.g. *write, writes, wrote, written, writing*), other languages often have a more fine-grained system of verb forms. For example, English has only a single form for the past tense, while the French past tense consists of five verb forms. Verbs must be translated using the verb form that reflects the tone, mood and cohesion of the document.

Finally, among the individual tokens with the highest P-CXMI, we find that many are due to **ellipsis** in the English sentence that does not occur on the target side. For example, in the last row of Table 2, the English text does not repeat the verb *know* in the second sentence as it can be understood from the previous sentence. However, in Turkish, there is no natural way to translate the verb-phrase ellipsis and must infer that “don’t” refers to “don’t *know*”, and translate the verb accordingly.

4 Cross-phenomenon MT Evaluation

After identifying a set of linguistic phenomena where context is useful to resolve ambiguity during translation, we develop a series of methods to automatically tag tokens belonging to these classes of ambiguous translations and propose the **Multilingual Discourse-Aware** (MuDA) benchmark for context-aware MT models.

4.1 MT Evaluation Framework

Given a pair of parallel source and target documents (X, Y) , our MuDA tagger assigns a set of discourse phenomena tags $\{t_i^1, \dots, t_i^n\}$ to each target token $y_i \in Y$. Then, using the `compare-mt` toolkit (Neubig et al., 2019), we compute the mean word f-measure of system outputs compared to the reference for each tag. This allows us to identify which discourse phenomena models can translate more or less accurately.

4.2 Automatic Tagging of Discourse Phenomena

In this section, we describe how we devise automatic taggers for each discourse phenomenon identified through our thematic analysis.

Lexical Cohesion To tag words that require lexical cohesion, we first extract word alignments from a parallel corpus $D = \{(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_{|D|}, Y_{|D|})\}$, where (X_m, Y_m) denote the source and target document pair. We use the AWESOME aligner (Dou and Neubig, 2021) to obtain:

$$A_m = \{\langle x_i, y_j \rangle \mid x_i \leftrightarrow y_j, x_i \in X_m, y_j \in Y_m\},$$

where each x_i and y_j are the lemmatized content source and target words and \leftrightarrow denotes a bidirectional word alignment. Then, for each target word y_j that is aligned to source word x_i , if the alignment pair $\langle x_i, y_j \rangle$ occurred at least 3 times already in the current document, we tag y_j for lexical cohesion.

Formality For languages that use distinct pronouns for different levels of formality (T-V distinction), we tag the target pronouns containing formality distinction in their various forms. Some languages such as Spanish and Italian often drop the subject pronoun, and T-V distinction is instead reflected in the verb form. For these languages, we use spaCy (Honnibal and Montani, 2017) and Stanza (Qi et al., 2020) to find POS tags (for other phenomena that use POS tags, we do the same), which we use to detect verbs with a second-person subject in the source text, and conjugated in the second (T) or third (V) person in the target text. For languages such as Japanese and Korean with a more complex honorifics system, we construct a word list of common honorifics-related words to tag. For details of formality-related pronouns and honorifics-related words, see Appendix C.

Pronoun Choice To find pronouns in English that have multiple translations in the target language, we manually construct a list $P_\ell = \{\langle p_s, \mathbf{p}_t \rangle\}$ for each language (provided in Appendix C), where each p_s is an English pronoun and \mathbf{p}_t the list of possible translations of p_s in the language ℓ . Then, for each aligned token pair $\langle x_i, y_j \rangle$, if x_i, y_j are both pronouns with $\langle x_i, \mathbf{p}_t | y_j \in \mathbf{p}_t \rangle \in P_\ell$, we tag y_j as an ambiguous pronoun.

Verb Form For each target language, we define a list $V_\ell = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ of verb forms (also in Appendix C) where $v_i \in V_\ell$ if there exists a verb form in English u_j and an alternate verb form $v_k \neq v_i$ in the target language such that an English verb with form u_j may be translated to a target verb with form v_i or v_k depending on the context. Then, for




Figure 1: Number of MuDA tags on TED test data.

each target token y_j , if y_j is a verb and its verb form is in V_ℓ , we tag y_j as an ambiguous verb.

Ellipsis To detect translation ambiguity due to ellipsis, we look for instances where the ellipsis occurs on the source side, but not on the target side, which means that the ellipsis must be resolved during translation. Existing ellipsis detection models only operate monolingually, and are often limited to just one type of ellipsis such as verb-phrase ellipsis or noun-phrase ellipsis. We, instead, are interested in capturing ellipsis in general. To detect when ellipsis occurs in the source but not in the target, we first train an English ellipsis detection model. To do so, we extract an ellipsis dataset from the English data in the Penn Treebank (Marcus et al., 1993) and train a BERT text classification model (Devlin et al., 2019), which achieves 0.77 precision and 0.73 recall (see Appendix C for training details). Then, for each sentence pair where the source sentence is predicted to contain an ellipsis, we tag the word y_j in the target sentence Y_m if: (1) y_j is a verb, noun, proper noun or pronoun; (2) y_j has occurred in the previous target sentences of the same document; (3) y_j is not aligned to any source words, that is, $\nexists x_i \in X_m$ s.t. $\langle x_i, y_j \rangle \in A_m$.

4.3 Evaluation of Automatic Tags

We apply the MuDA tagger to the reference translations of our data from TED talks. In Appendix B, we report the mean P-CXMI for each language and MuDA tag. Overall, we find higher P-CXMI on tokens with a tag compared to those without, which suggests that our tags are indeed able to capture high P-CXMI words. The tags that obtain the highest P-CXMI depends on the target language, hinting that different language pairs contain different translation ambiguities.

In Figure 1, we can see that the frequency of

	lexical	formality	pronouns	verb form	ellipsis
de	1.00	0.74	0.70	–	0.54
es	1.00	0.92	1.00	1.00	0.53
fr	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.92	0.43
ja	1.00	0.98	1.00	–	0.41
ko	1.00	0.93	–	–	0.26
pt	0.99	0.88	1.00	–	0.31
ru	1.00	1.00	–	0.96	0.50
tr	1.00	1.00	–	1.00	0.57
zh	1.00	1.00	–	–	0.78

Table 3: Precision of MuDA tags on 50 utterances.

tags can significantly vary across languages. Overall, ellipses are infrequent, as only 4.5% of the English sentences have been marked for ellipsis which gives an upper bound for the number of ellipsis tags. We do remark that languages from a different family than English have a relatively higher number of ellipsis tags. Korean and especially Japanese have more formality tags than those with T-V distinction, which is aligned with our intuition that register is more often important when translating to languages with honorific systems.

Manual Evaluation To verify the correctness of our automatic tagger, authors of the paper who are native speakers of French and Japanese manually verified the MuDA tags on 50 randomly selected utterances as well as all words tagged with *ellipsis* in our corpus. In Table 3, we report the tags’ precision.

For both languages, *ellipsis* is the least precise. False positives often come from when a single source word is translated into two or more words, but our automatic aligner does not align all target words to the corresponding source word. Another common mistake is when the reference is not a word-by-word translation of the source expression, so many target words are not aligned to any source words even if there was no ellipsis. We believe that the *ellipsis* tagger is still useful in selecting difficult examples that require context for translation, and despite the low precision, we find a significantly high P-CXMI for *ellipsis* words for many target languages (Appendix B).

5 A Cross-lingual, Cross-Model Exploration of Context-aware MT

Next, we use our MuDA benchmark to perform an initial exploration of context usage across 14 languages pairs and 4 models, including those we trained ourselves and commercial systems.

5.1 Trained Models

In all of our experiments, we base ourselves on the Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017). For all the language pairs, we train a base model (*transformer-small*) and incorporate the target side context by concatenating it to the current target sentence (Tiedemann and Scherrer, 2017).

To evaluate potentially stronger models, we additionally train a large model (*transformer-large*) that was pretrained on a large corpora, for German, French, Japanese and Chinese. Further training details can be found in Appendix D.

5.2 Commercial Models

To assess if commercially available machine translation engines are able to leverage context and therefore do well in the MuDA Benchmark, we consider two engines:² (1) the *Google Cloud Translation* v2 API. In early experiments, we assessed that this model only does sentence-level translation, but included it due to its widespread usage and recognition; (2) the *DeepL* v2 API. This model advertises its usage of context as part of their translations and our experiments confirm this. Early experimentation with other providers (Amazon and Azure) indicated that these are not context-aware so we refrained from evaluating them.

To obtain the translations for each provider, we feed the whole document into an API request. To resegment the translation, we include special marker tokens in the source document that are preserved during translation and split the translation on those tokens. For DeepL, we also evaluate a *sentence-level* version, where we feed each sentence in a document separately, to compare with its document-level counterpart.

5.3 Results and Discussion

Table 4 shows the results for our base models, trained either without context (*no-context*) or with context, and for the latter with either *predicted* context (*context*) or *reference* context (*context-gold*) during decoding. Results are reported with respect to standard MT metrics such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and COMET (Rei et al., 2020), as well as the MuDA benchmark.

First, we find that although BLEU scores are highest for *context-gold* models for most language pairs, COMET is more often higher for the *no-context* models. Moreover, in terms of

²translate.google.com, deepl.com

		ar	de	es	fr	he	it	ja	ko	nl	pt	ro	ru	tr	zh
BLEU	no-context	15.69	31.02	38.16	27.09	25.29	34.91	4.64	8.15	35.23	39.83	27.60	19.70	17.12	17.24
	context	14.93	31.06	38.51	26.62	25.96	35.02	3.18	8.62	35.03	39.89	27.09	19.66	17.15	15.59
	context-gold	17.15	31.08	38.57	26.93	26.36	35.25	5.63	8.87	35.11	40.08	29.84	19.98	17.40	16.92
COMET	no-context	0.113	0.152	0.422	-0.057	0.300	0.312	-0.876	-0.148	0.310	0.526	0.426	0.029	0.232	-0.100
	context	0.055	0.130	0.424	-0.047	0.273	0.319	-0.914	-0.069	0.314	0.525	0.398	-0.001	0.211	-0.192
	context-gold	0.092	0.129	0.424	-0.049	0.276	0.323	-0.810	-0.049	0.317	0.523	0.396	-0.001	0.213	-0.150
all	no-context	0.512	0.650	0.694	0.630	0.627	0.635	0.287	0.370	0.678	0.688	0.592	0.529	0.462	0.402
	context	0.501	0.650	0.695	0.640	0.630	0.637	0.209	0.379	0.678	0.688	0.589	0.528	0.464	0.364
	context-gold	0.524	0.650	0.695	0.641	0.631	0.639	0.295	0.385	0.679	0.690	0.616	0.531	0.464	0.409
ellipsis	no-context	0.340	0.372	0.286	0.226	0.387	0.355	0.033	0.159	0.314	0.436	0.172	0.250	0.171	0.146
	context	0.318	0.278	0.303	0.209	0.392	0.339	0.026	<u>0.195</u>	0.273	0.421	<u>0.239</u>	0.145	0.132	0.090
	context-gold	0.364	0.235	<u>0.333</u>	0.202	0.400	0.323	0.031	<u>0.192</u>	0.273	<u>0.464</u>	<u>0.250</u>	0.104	0.130	0.148
formality	no-context	-	0.631	0.290	0.748	-	0.328	0.405	0.138	0.665	0.619	0.433	0.451	0.165	0.689
	context	-	0.623	<u>0.325</u>	0.745	-	<u>0.362</u>	0.369	0.135	0.669	0.607	0.428	0.476	<u>0.204</u>	0.693
	context-gold	-	0.649	<u>0.317</u>	0.740	-	0.347	0.401	0.141	0.677	0.612	0.422	0.471	<u>0.271</u>	0.697
lexical	no-context	0.633	0.742	0.815	0.816	0.713	0.750	0.591	0.515	0.822	0.852	0.689	0.610	0.672	0.612
	context	0.621	0.733	0.813	0.812	0.717	0.764	0.595	0.539	0.820	0.855	0.669	0.586	0.636	0.552
	context-gold	0.657	0.736	0.819	0.816	0.726	0.769	0.607	<u>0.577</u>	0.821	0.857	0.704	0.591	0.645	0.568
pronouns	no-context	0.570	0.574	0.575	0.718	-	0.512	0.363	-	-	0.461	0.402	-	-	-
	context	0.569	0.570	0.560	0.733	-	<u>0.548</u>	0.362	-	-	0.440	0.359	-	-	-
	context-gold	0.588	0.579	0.565	0.738	-	0.536	0.345	-	-	0.466	0.351	-	-	-
verb tense	no-context	-	-	0.266	0.389	0.258	0.291	-	-	0.479	-	0.289	0.213	0.128	-
	context	-	-	0.261	0.397	0.254	0.312	-	-	0.472	-	0.305	0.212	0.079	-
	context-gold	-	-	0.261	0.398	0.263	0.307	-	-	0.478	-	<u>0.337</u>	0.227	0.090	-

Table 4: BLEU, COMET, and Word f-measure per tag for our base context-aware models. Best BLEU and COMET are **bolded** whereas word f-measure higher than no-context by > 0.025 are underlined.

		de	fr	ja	zh
BLEU	no-context	37.70	50.23	16.39	23.07
	context	38.23	50.47	12.87	23.32
	context-gold	38.77	51.64	17.44	23.80
COMET	no-context	0.483	0.628	0.135	0.249
	context	0.486	0.632	-0.004	0.271
	context-gold	0.493	0.645	0.153	0.287
all	no-context	0.697	0.733	0.474	0.447
	context	0.699	0.734	0.427	0.456
	context-gold	0.704	0.741	0.475	0.463
ellipsis	no-context	0.421	0.447	0.227	0.195
	context	<u>0.485</u>	0.415	0.085	0.191
	context-gold	<u>0.457</u>	0.380	0.152	0.209
formality	no-context	0.632	0.797	0.506	0.724
	context	0.654	0.792	0.495	0.736
	context-gold	<u>0.698</u>	0.811	0.527	0.719
lexical	no-context	0.774	0.865	0.682	0.648
	context	0.776	0.862	0.677	0.626
	context-gold	0.795	0.872	<u>0.730</u>	0.644
pronouns	no-context	0.623	0.755	0.485	-
	context	0.613	0.760	0.481	-
	context-gold	0.645	0.778	0.492	-
verb tense	no-context	-	0.518	-	-
	context	-	0.517	-	-
	context-gold	-	0.530	-	-

Table 5: Word f-measure per tag for our large models. Best BLEU and COMET are **bolded** whereas word f-measure higher than no-context by > 0.025 are underlined.

mean word f-measure overall words, we do not find significant differences between the three systems. It is therefore difficult to see which system

performs the best using only corpus-level metrics. For words that do require context for translation tagged with MuDA, our context-aware models obtain only marginally higher word f-measure than context-agnostic models, which suggests that these models are not sensitive enough to context or unable to use the relevant information from context to translate ambiguous words well.

For the pretrained large models (Table 5), context-aware models obtain slightly higher scores on corpus-level metrics. We do find that improvements are more pronounced for certain tags such as *ellipsis*, *lexical cohesion* and *formality*.

Among commercial engines (Table 6), DeepL seems to outperform Google on most metrics and language pairs. Also, the sentence-level ablation of DeepL performs worse than its document-level system for most MuDA tags, which further suggests DeepL is able to handle context to some extent.

Overall, current context-aware MT systems are unable to obtain considerable improvements over their context-agnostic counterparts on challenging MuDA data.

6 Related Work

Because examples requiring context to translate accurately is sparse in document-level datasets, standard MT metrics such as BLEU or COMET are

		ar	de	es	fr	he	it	ja	ko	nl	pt	ro	ru	tr	zh
BLEU	Google	19.45	36.52	41.29	35.09	29.37	35.60	11.76	11.22	38.51	45.99	26.61	19.61	21.30	24.22
	DeepL (sent)	x	38.49	40.43	43.48	x	37.07	13.85	x	40.92	39.41	32.67	25.98	x	28.10
	DeepL (doc)	x	39.21	42.75	45.09	x	40.54	13.86	x	41.11	40.64	33.24	29.08	x	28.93
COMET	Google	0.464	0.448	0.722	0.567	0.554	0.371	0.208	0.405	0.594	0.775	0.682	0.491	0.663	0.299
	DeepL (sent)	x	0.498	0.734	0.628	x	0.658	0.138	x	0.589	0.734	0.778	0.510	x	0.352
	DeepL (doc)	x	0.474	0.747	0.653	x	0.671	0.206	x	0.602	0.602	0.790	0.529	x	0.362
all	Google	0.563	0.690	0.748	0.720	0.652	0.676	0.412	0.422	0.683	0.667	0.573	0.491	0.531	0.445
	DeepL (sent)	x	0.705	0.737	0.732	x	0.676	0.454	x	0.706	0.652	0.638	0.602	x	0.528
	DeepL (doc)	x	0.706	0.742	0.740	x	0.681	0.451	x	0.711	0.668	0.642	0.611	x	0.542
ellipsis	Google	0.376	0.462	0.414	0.453	0.481	0.377	0.209	0.254	0.381	0.549	0.314	0.333	0.271	0.193
	DeepL (sent)	x	0.462	0.444	0.482	x	0.467	0.299	x	0.439	0.407	0.360	0.312	x	0.265
	DeepL (doc)	x	0.462	<u>0.500</u>	<u>0.537</u>	x	0.483	0.291	x	0.381	0.407	0.372	0.279	x	0.261
formality	Google	x	0.579	0.266	0.727	x	0.279	0.483	0.099	0.624	0.633	0.449	0.488	0.326	0.290
	DeepL (sent)	x	0.665	0.281	0.655	x	0.332	0.419	x	0.622	0.584	0.521	0.522	x	0.722
	DeepL (doc)	x	0.660	0.272	<u>0.765</u>	x	0.350	<u>0.455</u>	x	0.631	0.580	0.520	<u>0.549</u>	x	0.729
lexical	Google	0.663	0.767	0.856	0.852	0.711	0.789	0.568	0.597	0.820	0.856	0.686	0.592	0.662	0.698
	DeepL (sent)	x	0.770	0.822	0.851	x	0.777	0.628	x	0.807	0.842	0.713	0.619	x	0.679
	DeepL (doc)	x	0.782	0.839	0.865	x	0.779	0.629	x	0.801	0.846	0.721	0.637	x	0.673
pronouns	Google	0.640	0.622	0.618	0.741	-	0.509	0.467	-	-	0.503	0.436	-	-	-
	DeepL (sent)	x	0.620	0.554	0.707	x	0.509	0.500	x	-	0.470	0.473	-	x	-
	DeepL (doc)	x	<u>0.660</u>	0.571	0.750	x	0.517	<u>0.555</u>	x	-	<u>0.497</u>	<u>0.502</u>	-	x	-
verb tense	Google	-	-	0.399	0.524	0.265	0.410	-	-	0.515	-	0.345	0.312	0.204	-
	DeepL (sent)	x	-	0.415	0.548	x	0.455	-	x	0.547	-	0.409	0.328	x	-
	DeepL (doc)	x	-	0.432	0.549	x	0.460	-	x	0.568	-	0.409	0.346	x	-

Table 6: Scores for commercial models. Best BLEU and COMET are **bolded**, DeepL (doc) where word f-measure is higher than DeepL (sent) by >0.025 are underlined. Languages not supported are ‘x’ed.

not sensitive enough to gains in context-aware MT. Thus, several works resort to measuring the performance of context-aware models targeted to discourse phenomena that require context.

Some works have attempted to do an automatic evaluation of discourse without relying on a contrastive dataset. The first example of discourse phenomena evaluations was done by [Hardmeier et al. \(2010\)](#), which evaluated the automatically precision and recall of pronoun translation in statistical MT systems. [Jwalapuram et al. \(2019\)](#) proposed evaluating models on pronoun translation based on a pairwise comparison between translations that were generated with and without context, and later [Jwalapuram et al. \(2020\)](#) extended this work to include more languages and phenomena in their automatic evaluation/test set creation. While these works rely on prior domain knowledge and intuitions to identify context-aware phenomena, we instead take a systematic, data-driven approach and find additional phenomena in doing so.

Most works have focused on evaluating performance in discourse phenomena through the use of *contrastive datasets* instead. [Müller et al. \(2018\)](#) automatically create a dataset for anaphoric pronoun resolution to evaluate MT models in EN \rightarrow DE. [Bawden et al. \(2018\)](#) manually creates a

dataset for both pronoun resolution and lexical choice in EN \rightarrow FR. [Voita et al. \(2018, 2019b\)](#) creates a dataset for anaphora resolution, deixis, ellipsis and lexical cohesion in EN \rightarrow RU. However, [Yin et al. \(2021\)](#) suggest that the task of *translating* and *disambiguating* between two contrastive choices are inherently different, which motivates our approach in measuring direct translation performance through evaluation of word f-measure.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

In this work, we investigate the types of ambiguous translations where MT models benefit from context using our proposed P-CXMI metric. Our data-driven thematic analysis helps us identify context-sensitive discourse phenomena that has not been addressed in prior works on context-aware MT, such as *ellipsis*, *formality* and *verb forms*, for 14 language pairs. The advantages of our approach is that it is systematic, and does not require domain knowledge in language to identify these phenomena, so we believe that our methodology can be easily extended to other language pairs. P-CXMI can also be used to identify types of context-dependent words for tasks outside MT. Based on our findings, we then construct the MuDA benchmark that tags words in a given parallel corpus and evaluate

models on 5 context-dependent discourse phenomena. We find that *ellipsis* is the most challenging to tag with high precision and leave improvements to model cross-lingual ellipsis for future work.

Our evaluation of models on MuDA reveals that both context-aware and commercial translation systems do not considerably improve on many of the discourse-aware translations compared to models that do not use context, and we encourage the development of models that address these ambiguities.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Uri Alon, Ipek Baris, George Bejinariu, Hiba Belkadi, Chloé Billiotte, Giovanni Campagna, Remi Castera, Volkan Cirik, Taisiya Glushkova, Junxian He, Mert Inan, Alina Karakanta, Benno Krojer, Emma Landry, Chanyoung Park, Maria Ryskina, Odette Scharenborg, Melanie Sclar, Jenny Seok, Emma Schippers, Bogdan Vasilescu for advice on various languages and help with manual annotations.

We would also like to thank all the members of DeepSPIN and NeuLab who provided feedback on earlier versions of this work. This work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC StG DeepSPIN 758969), by the P2020 programs MAIA and Unbabel4EU (LISBOA-01-0247-FEDER-045909 and LISBOA-01-0247-FEDER-042671), and by the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia through contracts SFRH/BD/150706/2020 and UIDB/50008/2020.

References

- Rachel Bawden, Rico Sennrich, Alexandra Birch, and Barry Haddow. 2018. [Evaluating discourse phenomena in neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1304–1313, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ann Bies, Mark Ferguson, Karen Katz, Robert MacIntyre, Victoria Tredinnick, Grace Kim, Mary Ann Marcinkiewicz, and Britta Schasberger. 1995. Bracketing guidelines for treebank ii style penn treebank project. *University of Pennsylvania*, 97:100.
- Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2):77–101.
- Marine Carpuat. 2009. [One translation per discourse](#). In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Semantic Evaluations: Recent Achievements and Future Directions (SEW-2009)*, pages 19–27, Boulder, Colorado. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kenneth Ward Church and Patrick Hanks. 1990. [Word association norms, mutual information, and lexicography](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 16(1):22–29.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zi-Yi Dou and Graham Neubig. 2021. [Word alignment by fine-tuning embeddings on parallel corpora](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2112–2128, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Miquel Esplà, Mikel Forcada, Gema Ramírez-Sánchez, and Hieu Hoang. 2019. [ParaCrawl: Web-scale parallel corpora for the languages of the EU](#). In *Proceedings of Machine Translation Summit XVII Volume 2: Translator, Project and User Tracks*, pages 118–119, Dublin, Ireland. European Association for Machine Translation.
- Patrick Fernandes, Kayo Yin, Graham Neubig, and André F. T. Martins. 2021. [Measuring and increasing context usage in context-aware machine translation](#). In *Joint Conference of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (ACL-IJCNLP)*, Virtual.
- Liane Guillou, Christian Hardmeier, Ekaterina Lapshinova-Koltunski, and Sharid Loáiciga. 2018. [A pronoun test suite evaluation of the English-German MT systems at WMT 2018](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Shared Task Papers*, pages 570–577, Belgium, Brussels. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Christian Hardmeier, Marcello Fondazione, and Bruno Kessler. 2010. Modelling pronominal anaphora in statistical machine translation.
- Matthew Honnibal and Ines Montani. 2017. spaCy 2: Natural language understanding with Bloom embeddings, convolutional neural networks and incremental parsing. To appear.
- Prathyusha Jwalapuram, Shafiq Joty, Irina Temnikova, and Preslav Nakov. 2019. [Evaluating pronominal anaphora in machine translation: An evaluation measure and a test suite](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2964–2975, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Prathyusha Jwalapuram, Barbara Rychalska, Shafiq R. Joty, and Dominika Basaj. 2020. [Can your context-aware MT system pass the dip benchmark tests? : Evaluation benchmarks for discourse phenomena in machine translation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2004.14607.

- Yunsu Kim, Duc Thanh Tran, and Hermann Ney. 2019. [When and why is document-level context useful in neural machine translation?](#) In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Discourse in Machine Translation (DiscoMT 2019)*, pages 24–34, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Samuel Läubli, Rico Sennrich, and Martin Volk. 2018. [Has machine translation achieved human parity? a case for document-level evaluation.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4791–4796, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- António Lopes, M. Amin Farajian, Rachel Bawden, Michael Zhang, and André F. T. Martins. 2020. [Document-level neural MT: A systematic comparison.](#) In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, pages 225–234, Lisboa, Portugal. European Association for Machine Translation.
- Mitchell P. Marcus, Beatrice Santorini, and Mary Ann Marcinkiewicz. 1993. [Building a large annotated corpus of English: The Penn Treebank.](#) *Computational Linguistics*, 19(2):313–330.
- Sameen Maruf and Gholamreza Haffari. 2018. [Document context neural machine translation with memory networks.](#) In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1275–1284, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sameen Maruf, Fahimeh Saleh, and Gholamreza Haffari. 2021. [A survey on document-level neural machine translation: Methods and evaluation.](#) *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 54(2).
- Lesly Miculicich, Dhananjay Ram, Nikolaos Pappas, and James Henderson. 2018. [Document-level neural machine translation with hierarchical attention networks.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2947–2954, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Makoto Morishita, Jun Suzuki, and Masaaki Nagata. 2020. [JParaCrawl: A large scale web-based English-Japanese parallel corpus.](#) In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 3603–3609, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Mathias Müller, Annette Rios, Elena Voita, and Rico Sennrich. 2018. [A large-scale test set for the evaluation of context-aware pronoun translation in neural machine translation.](#) In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*, pages 61–72, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Graham Neubig, Zi-Yi Dou, Junjie Hu, Paul Michel, Danish Pruthi, and Xinyi Wang. 2019. [compare-mt: A tool for holistic comparison of language generation systems.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Demonstrations)*, pages 35–41, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Myle Ott, Sergey Edunov, Alexei Baevski, Angela Fan, Sam Gross, Nathan Ng, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. 2019. [fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Demonstrations)*, pages 48–53, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation.](#) In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peng Qi, Yuhao Zhang, Yuhui Zhang, Jason Bolton, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. [Stanza: A python natural language processing toolkit for many human languages.](#) In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 101–108, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ye Qi, Devendra Sachan, Matthieu Felix, Sarguna Padmanabhan, and Graham Neubig. 2018. [When and why are pre-trained word embeddings useful for neural machine translation?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 529–535, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ricardo Rei, Craig Stewart, Ana C Farinha, and Alon Lavie. 2020. [COMET: A neural framework for MT evaluation.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2685–2702, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jörg Tiedemann and Yves Scherrer. 2017. [Neural machine translation with extended context.](#) In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Discourse in Machine Translation*, pages 82–92, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Antonio Toral, Sheila Castilho, Ke Hu, and Andy Way. 2018. [Attaining the unattainable? reassessing claims of human parity in neural machine translation.](#) In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*, pages 113–123, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need.](#) In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 5998–6008.

- Elena Voita, Rico Sennrich, and Ivan Titov. 2019a. [Context-aware monolingual repair for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 877–886, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Elena Voita, Rico Sennrich, and Ivan Titov. 2019b. [When a good translation is wrong in context: Context-aware machine translation improves on deixis, ellipsis, and lexical cohesion](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1198–1212, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Elena Voita, Pavel Serdyukov, Rico Sennrich, and Ivan Titov. 2018. [Context-aware neural machine translation learns anaphora resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1264–1274, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. [Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kayo Yin, Patrick Fernandes, Danish Pruthi, Aditi Chaudhary, André F. T. Martins, and Graham Neubig. 2021. [Do context-aware translation models pay the right attention?](#) In *Joint Conference of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (ACL-IJCNLP)*, Virtual.

A Language Properties

Table 7 summarizes the properties of the languages analyzed in this work.

B P-CXMI Results

Table 8 presents the average P-CXMI value per POS tag and per MuDA tag.

C Tagger Details

C.1 Formality Words

Table 9 gives the list of words related to formality for each target language.

C.2 Ambiguous Pronouns

Table 10 provides English pronouns and the list of possible target pronouns.

C.3 Ambiguous Verbs

Table 11 lists verb forms that may require disambiguation during translation.

C.4 Ellipsis Classifier

We train a BERT text classification model (Devlin et al., 2019) on data from the Penn Treebank, where we labeled each sentence containing the tag ‘*?’ as containing ellipsis (Bies et al., 1995). We obtain 248,596 sentences total, with 2,863 tagged as ellipsis. Then, our model using HuggingFace Transformers (Wolf et al., 2020). To address the imbalance in labels, we up-weight the loss for samples tagged as ellipsis by a factor of 100.

D Training details

The *transformer-small* model has hidden size of 512, feedforward size of 1024, 6 layers and 8 attention heads. The *transformer-large* model has hidden size of 1024, feedforward size of 4096, 6 layers, 16 attention heads.

As in Vaswani et al. (2017), we train using the Adam optimizer with $\beta_1 = 0.9$ and $\beta_2 = 0.98$ and use an inverse square root learning rate scheduler, with an initial value of 10^{-4} for `large` model and 5×10^{-4} for the `base` and `multi` models, with a linear warm-up in the first 4000 steps.

For the pretrained models we used Paracrawl (Esplà et al., 2019) for German and French, JParacrawl (Morishita et al., 2020) for Japanese and the Back-translated News from WMT2021 for Chinese.

Due to the sheer number of experiments, we use a single seed per experiment.

We base our experiments on the framework *Fairseq* (Ott et al., 2019).

Language	Family	Word Order	Pronouns Politeness	Gendered Pronouns	Gender Assignment
Arabic	Afro-Asiatic	VSO	None	1 and/or 2 and 3	Semantic-Formal
English	Indo-European	SVO	None	3.Sing	Semantic
German	Indo-European	SOV/SVO	Binary	3.Sing	Semantic-Formal
Spanish	Indo-European	SVO	Binary	1 and/or 2 and 3	Semantic-Formal
French	Indo-European	SVO	Binary	3.Sing	Semantic-Formal
Hebrew	Afro-Asiatic	SVO	None	1 and/or 2 and 3	Semantic-Formal
Italian	Indo-European	SVO	Binary	3.Sing	Semantic-Formal
Japanese	Japonic	SOV	Avoided	3	None
Korean	Koreanic	SOV	Avoided	3.Sing	None
Dutch	Indo-European	SOV/SVO	Binary	3.Sing	Semantic-Formal
Portuguese	Indo-European	SVO	Binary	3.Sing	Semantic-Formal
Romanian	Indo-European	SVO	Multiple	3.Sing	Semantic-Formal
Russian	Indo-European	SVO	Binary	3.Sing	Semantic-Formal
Turkish	Turkic	SOV	Binary	None	None
Mandarin	Sino-Tibetan	SVO	Binary	3.Sing	None

Table 7: Properties of the languages in our study.

	ar	de	es	fr	he	it	ja	ko	nl	pt	ro	ru	tr	zh
CXMI	0.073	0.008	0.011	0.011	0.021	0.015	0.067	0.035	0.005	0.009	0.051	0.015	0.016	0.081
P-CXMI	0.075	0.005	0.011	0.021	0.023	0.016	0.059	0.038	0.002	0.013	0.049	0.015	0.014	0.057
ADJ	0.039	-0.008	0.015	0.01	0.006	0.015	0.046	0.008	-0.011	0.002	0.035	0.003	-0.006	0.023
ADP	0.03	-0.006	-0.0	-0.015	0.012	0.001	0.036	0.046	-0.004	-0.007	0.008	0.005	-0.012	0.024
ADV	0.093	0.003	0.03	0.045	0.024	0.02	0.042	0.025	0.001	0.007	0.058	0.012	0.016	0.041
AUX	0.04	0.016	0.02	-0.035	0.039	0.027	0.033	0.054	0.004	0.005	0.063	0.042	0.103	0.035
CCONJ	0.057	0.001	0.024	0.001	0.018	0.092	0.004	0.047	0.002	0.006	0.252	0.031	0.013	0.02
DET	0.023	-0.001	0.008	0.005	0.006	0.01	0.06	0.015	0.006	0.005	0.055	0.004	-0.003	0.045
INTJ	0.28		-0.001	0.101	-0.183	0.033	0.09	0.063	0.004	-0.013	0.102	-0.014	-0.005	
NOUN	0.039	0.003	0.006	0.05	0.015	0.008	0.072	0.037	0.004	0.016	0.069	0.002	-0.001	0.041
NUM	0.03	0.018	0.021	0.073	0.021	-0.01	0.005	-0.05	0.015	0.007	0.052	0.0	0.008	0.015
PART	0.062	0.009	0.001	0.021			0.033				0.016	0.016		-0.005
PRON	0.029	0.016	0.003	0.011	0.052	0.015	0.012	0.062	0.0	0.044	0.027	0.031	0.0	0.064
PRON.1	0.019	0.021	0.01	0.029	0.034	0.025			-0.002	0.071	0.041	0.04	0.007	0.062
PRON.1.Plur	0.015	-0.002	0.025	0.01	0.106	0.0				0.079	0.015	0.042	0.047	0.067
PRON.1.Sing	0.039	0.037	0.001	0.047	-0.019	0.049				0.068	0.062	0.038	-0.02	
PRON.2	0.036	0.39	0.016	0.041	0.144	0.033			-0.008	0.318	0.018	0.109	-0.032	0.074
PRON.2.Plur	0.05	-1.203	-0.062	0.017	0.095	0.014					0.022	0.051	-0.033	
PRON.2.Sing	0.02	0.412	0.061	0.406	0.226	0.089				0.318	0.007	0.662	-0.027	
PRON.3	0.031	0.024	-0.004	-0.0	0.053	0.009			0.003	0.058	0.024	0.047	0.002	0.097
PRON.3.Dual	0.139													
PRON.3.Plur	0.044	0.023	0.001	-0.015	0.065	0.075				0.091	0.048	0.031	0.019	0.1
PRON.3.Sing	0.026	0.024	0.008	0.008	0.056	0.006				0.037	0.034	0.059	-0.002	
PRON.Plur		-0.008	0.021	0.183		0.028				0.008		0.027		
PRON.Sing		-0.001	0.002	0.042	-0.054	-0.0				0.019		-0.001		
PROP	-0.001	-0.011	0.022	0.003	0.013	0.005	0.054	0.013	-0.006	0.003	0.114	-0.009	0.015	0.028
PUNCT	0.155	0.003	0.007	0.026	0.031	0.011	0.267	0.02	0.001	0.009	0.008	0.011	0.016	0.172
SCONJ	0.238	0.003	0.003	0.011	0.023	0.022	0.051	0.011	0.009	0.002	0.047	0.003		
SYM	-0.174	0.062	0.042	0.393		0.045	0.114	0.042	-0.712	-0.001		-0.047		0.153
VERB	0.055	0.013	0.028	0.012	0.029	0.022	0.042	0.093	0.013	0.028	0.092	0.046	0.05	0.049
VERB.Fut			-0.007	-0.069	0.009	0.061				0.044		0.012	0.034	
VERB.Imp			0.102	0.024		0.044				0.118	0.18			
VERB.Past		0.075	0.032	0.019	0.053	0.041			0.064	0.046	0.029	0.115	0.047	
VERB.Pres		0.017	0.029	0.014		0.022			0.002	0.024	0.083	0.022	0.051	
X	0.085	-0.188		0.443		0.114		0.024	-0.004	0.144	-0.51	-0.149		0.095
ellipsis	-0.096	-0.001	-0.06	0.064	0.055	-0.035	0.136	0.101	-0.041	-0.132	0.072	0.033	-0.004	0.104
formality		0.046	0.056	0.035		0.061	0.05	0.25	-0.008	0.021	0.055	0.109	0.025	0.072
lexical	0.037	0.005	0.015	0.261	0.007	0.021	0.118	0.044	0.0	0.009	0.05	0.062	0.012	0.081
no tag	0.076	0.004	0.01	0.014	0.024	0.015	0.059	0.03	0.001	0.012	0.048	0.009	0.014	0.056
pronouns	0.055	0.031	0.017	0.02		-0.025	-0.062			0.094	0.073			
verb form			0.075	0.02	0.009	0.051			0.064		0.13	0.115	0.024	
with tag	0.034	0.021	0.029	0.1	0.008	0.029	0.06	0.196	0.015	0.024	0.076	0.099	0.011	0.079

Table 8: CXMI for all POS tags and our ambiguity tags.

de	du sie
es	tú, tu, tus, ti, contigo, tuyo, te, tuya usted, vosotros, vuestro, vuestra, vuestras, os
fr	tu, ton,ta, tes, toi, te, tien, tiens, tienne, tiennes vous, votre, vos
it	tu, tuo, tua, tuoi lei, suo, sua, suoi
ja	だ, だっ, じゃ, だろう, だ, だけど, だっ ごさい, ます, いらっしゃれ, いらっしゃい, ご覧, 伺い, 伺っ, 存知, です, まし
ko	제가, 저희, 나 덕에, 성함, 분, 생신, 식사, 연세, 병환, 약주, 자제분, 뵙다, 저
nl	jij, jouw, jou, jullie, je u, men, uw
pt	tu, tua, teu, teus, tuas, te você, sua, seu, seus, suas, lhe
ro	tu, el, ea, voi, ei, ele, tău, ta, tale, tine dumneavoastră, dumneata, mata,matale,dânsul, dânsa dumnealui,dumneaei, dumnealor
ru	ты, тебя, тебе, тобой, твой, твоя, твои,тебе вы, вас, вам, вами, ваш, ваши
tr	sen, senin siz, sizin
zh	你 您

Table 9: Words related to formality for each target language.

ar	you it they, them	انت، أنت، أنتِ، انتي، أنتم، أنتن، انتو، أنتما، أنتما هو، هي هم، هن، هما
de	it	er, sie, es
es	it they, them this that these those	él, ella ellos, ellas ésta, éste, esto esa, ese estos, estas aquellos, aquellas, ésos, ésas
fr	it they, them we this that these, those	il, elle, lui ils, elles nous, on celle, ceci celle, celui celles, ceux
it	it them this that these those	esso, essa ellos, ellas questa, questo quella, quello queste, questi quella, quelli
ja	I	私、僕、俺
pt	it them they this, that these, those	ele, ela, o, a eles, elas, os, as eles, elas este, esta, esse, essa estes, estas, esses, essas
ro	it they, them	el, ea ei, ele

Table 10: Ambiguous pronouns w.r.t. English for each target language.

es	Imperfect, Pluperfect, Future
fr	Imperfect, Past, Pluperfect
he	Imperfect, Future, Pluperfect
it	Imperfect, Pluperfect, Future
nl	Past
pt	Pluperfect
ro	Imperfect, Past, Future
ru	Past
tr	Pluperfect

Table 11: Ambiguous verb forms w.r.t. English for each target language.