interlingual representation. It may well be that a great deal of the semantic work specific to a language must be done at generation time, possibly even after a round of lexical selection. In this model, a reasoning tool examines a partially or fully lexicalized target representation, and makes a judgment about its felicity (semantic, pragmatic, discourse-wise), choosing alternates in some cases and lexicalization of variables in others. This delegation of powerful reasoning to the generation component seems to violate our current sensibilities about the role of the interlingua, but the interlingua model of MT remains language independent, and in fact becomes more so by expressing only what is truly universal and not by trying to be all things to all languages.
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Topic addressed: What information is captured by an adequate interlingual representation system?

Any examination of real corpora, especially in non-scientific domains, will reveal that metonymic expressions are pervasive in real language use. Although various definitions of metonymy may draw the distinction between metonymic and non-metonymic expressions differently, typically certain core metonymic expressions (such as "Moscow announced ...") which are pervasive in text will always be defined as metonymy.

Regardless of the strategy adopted for handling metonymy in the analysis phase of processing, the representation of metonymic expressions in the interlingua will be faced with one central decision: how to represent the metonymy, literally or as rendered in the source text? The position that I will argue for is that despite the processing overhead, it is beneficial to resolve the metonymy in analysis and to represent the replaced entity in the interlingua explicitly.

Reasons for resolving metonymy and explicitly representing the replaced entity include:

1. In some cases it is necessary to resolve the metonymy before generation in MT because some different languages have different
inventories of metonymy, and word-for-word translation of some metonymies will result in anomalous translations. By representing the resolved metonymy, the generator can choose to either render the content literally or to produce an appropriate metonymy in the target language (assuming an appropriately generator is available...)

2. The replaced referent can provide context for use during word-sense disambiguation, whether by domain inference techniques, selectional restrictions (which would have been violated by the metonym), or other techniques.

3. One may need to make the replaced entity available as a referent. Metonymies such as the infamous "ham sandwich" example allow anaphora to the replaced referent: "The ham sandwich wants a cup of coffee. He also needs a new fork". The metonymy may in fact result in a full-fledged use of the referent, entering the entity into the "given" register; examples such as "I drive a Volvo, but the engine is shot" illustrate that the replaced entity (the car or truck) is available as if it had been used explicitly.
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The fact that two different translators can appropriately translate the Spanish expressions "[d]el tercer piso" and "el segundo piso" in:

... los 300 metros cuadrados del tercer piso estaban disponibles pero fueron aquilados ..., sslo queda el segundo piso ....

as, on the one hand, "the third floor" and "the second floor" respectively and, on the other, "the fourth floor" and "the third floor" respectively, demonstrates (1) that the representation of the semantics of the expressions uttered is insufficient for providing an appropriate translation and (2) that the representation of the translator's beliefs about the beliefs of the participants in the translation process (the SL speaker/author, the SL addressee and the TL addressee) which are needed for assigning an interpretation to the utterance are, in fact, necessary. That the seemingly contradictory translations provided above are both potentially appropriate is due to the fact that there are at least two floor naming conventions that are