
**Language resource management —
Lexical markup framework (LMF) —**

**Part 1:
Core model**

*Gestion des ressources linguistiques — Cadre de balisage lexical
(LMF) —
Partie 1: Modèle de base*

*ITeH Standards
(<https://standards.iteh.ai>)
Document Preview*

[ISO/PRF 24613-1](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/5aa02d04-5dab-4356-816c-06107b0ef4c8/iso-prf-24613-1)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/5aa02d04-5dab-4356-816c-06107b0ef4c8/iso-prf-24613-1>

PROOF / ÉPREUVE



iTeh Standards
(<https://standards.iteh.ai>)
Document Preview

[ISO/PRF 24613-1](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/5aa02d04-5dab-4356-816c-06107b0ef4c8/iso-prf-24613-1)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/5aa02d04-5dab-4356-816c-06107b0ef4c8/iso-prf-24613-1>



COPYRIGHT PROTECTED DOCUMENT

© ISO 2023

All rights reserved. Unless otherwise specified, or required in the context of its implementation, no part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized otherwise in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, or posting on the internet or an intranet, without prior written permission. Permission can be requested from either ISO at the address below or ISO's member body in the country of the requester.

ISO copyright office
CP 401 • Ch. de Blandonnet 8
CH-1214 Vernier, Geneva
Phone: +41 22 749 01 11
Email: copyright@iso.org
Website: www.iso.org

Published in Switzerland

Contents

Page

Foreword	iv
Introduction	vi
1 Scope	1
2 Normative references	1
3 Terms and definitions	1
4 Key standards used by LMF	3
4.1 Unicode.....	3
4.2 Language coding.....	3
4.3 Script coding.....	3
4.4 Unified modelling language.....	3
5 The LMF model	4
5.1 General.....	4
5.2 Class inheritance and data category selection procedures.....	4
5.2.1 Class inheritance.....	4
5.2.2 LMF attributes.....	4
5.2.3 Data category selection (DCS).....	4
5.2.4 User-defined data categories.....	4
5.3 LMF core package.....	4
5.3.1 General.....	4
5.3.2 LexicalResource class.....	5
5.3.3 GlobalInformation class.....	5
5.3.4 Lexicon class.....	6
5.3.5 LexiconInformation class.....	6
5.3.6 LexicalEntry class.....	6
5.3.7 Form class.....	6
5.3.8 OrthographicRepresentation class.....	6
5.3.9 GrammaticalInformation class.....	6
5.3.10 Sense class.....	7
5.3.11 Definition class.....	7
5.4 Cross reference (CrossREF) model.....	7
5.4.1 General.....	7
5.4.2 CrossREF classes.....	7
5.4.3 CrossREFConstraint class.....	7
5.5 Methods for data category selection and subclass creation.....	7
5.5.1 General.....	7
5.5.2 Generalization.....	8
5.5.3 Object instantiation.....	8
5.5.4 Design choices.....	8
5.5.5 Data categories for orthographic representation.....	9
5.5.6 Principles for model simplification.....	9
5.6 LMF extension use.....	9
5.6.1 General.....	9
5.6.2 Lexicon comparison.....	10
Annex A (informative) Data category examples	11
Bibliography	14

Foreword

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) is a worldwide federation of national standards bodies (ISO member bodies). The work of preparing International Standards is normally carried out through ISO technical committees. Each member body interested in a subject for which a technical committee has been established has the right to be represented on that committee. International organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO, also take part in the work. ISO collaborates closely with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) on all matters of electrotechnical standardization.

The procedures used to develop this document and those intended for its further maintenance are described in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1. In particular, the different approval criteria needed for the different types of ISO document should be noted. This document was drafted in accordance with the editorial rules of the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 (see www.iso.org/directives).

ISO draws attention to the possibility that the implementation of this document may involve the use of (a) patent(s). ISO takes no position concerning the evidence, validity or applicability of any claimed patent rights in respect thereof. As of the date of publication of this document, ISO had not received notice of (a) patent(s) which may be required to implement this document. However, implementers are cautioned that this may not represent the latest information, which may be obtained from the patent database available at www.iso.org/patents. ISO shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

Any trade name used in this document is information given for the convenience of users and does not constitute an endorsement.

For an explanation of the voluntary nature of standards, the meaning of ISO specific terms and expressions related to conformity assessment, as well as information about ISO's adherence to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles in the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), see www.iso.org/iso/foreword.html.

This document was prepared by Technical Committee ISO/TC 37, *Language and terminology*, Subcommittee SC 4, *Language resource management*.

This second edition cancels and replaces the first edition (ISO 24613-1:2019), which has been technically revised.

The main changes are as follows:

- several changes have been made to [Figure 1](#) “LMF core package”, as follows:
 - the OrthographicRepresentation class associations with the Form and Definition classes previously had a cardinality of 1 to 1, which did not correctly represent the intent of the UML model; the revision of the cardinality to 1 to 0..* in each case now provides a correct model;
 - the type: intern/extern attribute-value pair is no longer included in the CrossREF class since it described linking processes relevant for implementations, not associations relevant for a metamodel;
 - the full names relationship values in the CrossREF class, “synonym/composition” replace the abbreviations, “syn/compo”;
 - the class names in [Figure 1](#) are now harmonized with the LMF style;
- relevant information has been moved from the tables in ISO 24613-2:2020 to [Table A.1](#), meaning that the latter now contains more complete examples of values and attributes allocated to classes first introduced in this document.

A list of all parts in the ISO 24613 series can be found on the ISO website.

Any feedback or questions on this document should be directed to the user's national standards body. A complete listing of these bodies can be found at www.iso.org/members.html.

iTeh Standards
(<https://standards.itih.ai>)
Document Preview

[ISO/PRF 24613-1](https://standards.itih.ai/catalog/standards/sist/5aa02d04-5dab-4356-816c-06107b0ef4c8/iso-prf-24613-1)

<https://standards.itih.ai/catalog/standards/sist/5aa02d04-5dab-4356-816c-06107b0ef4c8/iso-prf-24613-1>

Introduction

Optimizing the production, maintenance and extension of electronic lexical resources is one of the crucial aspects impacting human language technologies (HLTs) in general and natural language processing (NLP) in particular, as well as human-oriented translation technologies. A second crucial aspect involves optimizing the process leading to their integration in applications. Lexical markup framework (LMF) is an abstract metamodel that provides a common, standardized framework for the construction of computational lexicons. LMF ensures the encoding of linguistic information in a way that enables reusability in different applications and for different tasks. LMF provides a common, shared representation of lexical instances, including morphological, syntactic and semantic aspects.

The goals of LMF are:

- to provide a common model for the creation and use of electronic lexical resources ranging from small to large in scale;
- to manage the exchange of data between and among these resources; and
- to facilitate the merging of large numbers of different individual electronic resources to form extensive global electronic resources.

The ultimate goal of LMF is to create a modular structure that will facilitate true content interoperability across all aspects of electronic lexical resources.

LMF supports existing lexical resource models such as Genelex,^[5] the EAGLES International Standard for Language Engineering (ISLE),^[6] Multilingual ISLE Lexical Entry (MILE) models,^[12] Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) guidelines,^[10] Ontolex^[9] and the Language Base Exchange (LBX) serialization together with the US Government Wordscape On-Line Dictionary system^[7].

LMF uses unified modelling language (UML) modelling processes.^[11] The LMF core package describes the basic hierarchy of information of a lexical entry, including information on the word form. The core package is supplemented by various resources that are part of the definition of LMF. These resources include:

- specific data categories used by the variety of resource types associated with LMF (both those data categories relevant to the metamodel itself, and those associated with the extensions to the core package in additional LMF parts. See [Annex A](#) for data category examples);
- the constraints governing the relationship of these data categories to the metamodel and to its extensions;
- standard procedures for expressing these categories and thus for anchoring them on the structural skeleton of LMF and relating them to the respective extension models;
- the vocabularies used by LMF that describe how to extend LMF through linkage to a variety of specific resources (extensions) and methods for analysing and designing such linked systems.

LMF parts are expressed in a framework that describes the reuse of the LMF core components (such as structures, data categories and vocabularies) in conjunction with the additional components required for a specific resource.

The ISO 24613 series is designed to coordinate closely with ISO 16642.

Language resource management — Lexical markup framework (LMF) —

Part 1: Core model

1 Scope

This document establishes the core model of the lexical markup framework (LMF), a metamodel for representing data in monolingual and multilingual lexical resources used with computer applications.

LMF provides mechanisms that allow the development and integration of a variety of electronic lexical resource types.

2 Normative references

The following documents are referred to in the text in such a way that some or all of their content constitutes requirements of this document. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

ISO 639, *Code for individual languages and language groups*

ISO 15924, *Information and documentation — Codes for the representation of names of scripts*

3 Terms and definitions

For the purposes of this document, the following terms and definitions apply.

ISO and IEC maintain terminology databases for use in standardization at the following addresses:

- ISO Online browsing platform: available at <https://www.iso.org/obp>
- IEC Electropedia: available at <https://www.electropedia.org/>

3.1

data category

DC

class of data items that are closely related from a formal or semantic point of view

EXAMPLE /part of speech/, /subject field/, /definition/.

Note 1 to entry: A data category can be viewed as a generalization of the notion of a field in a database.

Note 2 to entry: In running text, such as this document, data category names are enclosed in forward slashes (e.g. /part of speech/).

[SOURCE: ISO 30042:2019, 3.8, modified – admitted term “DC” added]

3.2

word form

instantiation of a lexeme in a syntactic context

3.3
grammatical feature

property associated with a *word form* (3.2) to describe one of its grammatical attributes

EXAMPLE grammaticalGender.

3.4
lemma
lemmatized form
canonical form

word form (3.2) chosen to represent a *lexeme* (3.5)

Note 1 to entry: In many European languages, the lemma is usually the singular for a noun if there is a variation in number, the masculine form if there is a variation in gender and the infinitive for all verbs. In some languages, certain nouns are defective in the singular form, in which case the plural is chosen. In Arabic, for a verb, the lemma is sometimes considered as being the third person singular with the accomplished aspect. In other approaches it is considered as being the root.

3.5
lexeme

abstract unit generally associated with a set of *word forms* (3.2) sharing common properties, such as morphologic, morpho-syntactic, semantic, or phonetic properties

3.6
lexical resource
lexical database

database consisting of one or several *lexicons* (3.7)

3.7
lexicon

resource comprising lexical entries for one or several languages

Note 1 to entry: A special language lexicon or a lexicon prepared for a specific natural language processing application can comprise a specific subset of a language.

3.8
multiword expression
MWE

lexeme (3.5) made up of a sequence of two or more lexemes that has properties that are not necessarily predictable from the properties of the individual lexemes or their normal mode of combination

EXAMPLE “To kick the bucket”, an idiomatic expression which means to die rather than to hit a bucket with one’s foot. An idiomatic expression is a subtype of MWE whose properties are not predictable from the properties of the individual lexemes.

Note 1 to entry: An MWE can be a compound, a fragment of a sentence or a sentence. The group of lexemes making up an MWE can be continuous or discontinuous. It is not always possible to mark an MWE with a *part of speech* (3.11).

3.9
natural language processing
NLP

computer science field covering knowledge and techniques involved in the processing and analysis of linguistic data by a computer

3.10 orthography

systematic way of spelling or writing *lexemes* (3.5) that conforms to a conventionalized use

Note 1 to entry: Usually, the notion of orthography covers standardized spellings of alphabetic languages, such as standard UK or US English, or reformed German spelling, as well as hieroglyphic or syllabic writing systems. For the purpose of this document, variations such as transliterations of languages in non-native *scripts* (3.12), stenographic renderings or representations in the International Phonetic Alphabet are also subsumed under the notion of orthography.

3.11 part of speech

lexical category

word class

category assigned to a *lexeme* (3.5) based on its grammatical properties

EXAMPLE Typical parts of speech for European languages include noun, verb, adjective, adverb, preposition, etc.

3.12 script

set of graphic characters used for the written form of one or more languages

EXAMPLE Hiragana, Katakana, Latin, Cyrillic.

Note 1 to entry: The description of scripts ranges from a high-level classification such as hieroglyphic or syllabic writing systems versus alphabets to a more precise classification like Roman versus Cyrillic. Scripts are defined by a list of values taken from ISO 15924.

[SOURCE: ISO/IEC 10646:2020, 3.48, modified — Example and Note 1 to entry have been added.]

4 Key standards used by LMF

4.1 Unicode

[ISO/PRF 24613-1](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/5aa02d04-5dab-4356-816c-06107b0ef4c8/iso-prf-24613-1)

LMF is Unicode-compliant and presumes that all data are used according to the Unicode character encodings specified in ISO/IEC 10646.

4.2 Language coding

Language identifiers used in LMF-compliant resources shall conform to criteria specified in ISO 639. Some issues involving the combination of language and country codes have been addressed in external standards supported by the technology community. The current edition of IETF Best Common Practices (BCP) 47^[8] should be consulted.

4.3 Script coding

When the script code is not part of the language identifier, script identifiers shall conform to criteria specified in ISO 15924.

4.4 Unified modelling language

LMF complies with the specifications and modelling principles of UML as defined by the Object Management Group (OMG).^[9] LMF uses a subset of UML that is relevant for linguistic description (see ISO/IEC 19505-1 and ISO/IEC 19505-2).

5 The LMF model

5.1 General

LMF models are represented by UML classes, associations among the classes and a set of data categories that function as UML attribute-value pairs. The data categories are used to adorn the UML diagrams that provide a high-level view of the model. LMF specifications in the form of textual descriptions describe the semantics of the modelling elements and provide more complete information about classes, relationships and extensions that can be included in UML diagrams.

In this process, lexicon developers shall use the classes that are specified in the LMF core package (see [5.3](#)), and classes that are defined in other LMF parts or classes derived from any of these referenced classes using documented LMF processes for class inheritance. Developers shall define a data category selection (DCS) as specified for LMF DCS procedures (see [5.2.3](#) and [5.2.4](#)).

5.2 Class inheritance and data category selection procedures

5.2.1 Class inheritance

LMF specifies constraints on which classes allow subclasses.

5.2.2 LMF attributes

UML models such as LMF are populated or further described by UML attributes, which provide information about specific properties or characteristics associated with the model. All LMF attributes are complex data categories. For a given class, all attributes are different. Each value of an attribute is either a simple data category or a Unicode string. Each attribute has only one value.

5.2.3 Data category selection (DCS)

In the broadest sense, a DCS can comprise all the data categories used by a given domain in the field of language resources. A DCS can also list and describe the set of data categories that can be used in a given LMF lexicon. The DCS also describes constraints on how the data categories are mapped to specific classes.

5.2.4 User-defined data categories

Lexicon creators can define a set of new data categories to cover data category concepts that are needed and that are not available.

5.3 LMF core package

5.3.1 General

The LMF core package is a metamodel that provides a flexible basis for building LMF models and extensions, see [Figure 1](#).

NOTE Each word in a class name begins with a capital letter with no intervening spaces or punctuation. This practice is not required by UML, but generally conforms with most UML documentation.