

# Multiple References with Meaningful Variations Improve Literary Machine Translation

Si Wu

Northeastern University  
siwu@ccs.neu.edu

John Wieting

Google DeepMind  
jwieting@google.com

David A. Smith

Northeastern University  
dasmith@ccs.neu.edu

## Abstract

While a source sentence can be translated in many ways, most machine translation (MT) models are trained with only a single reference. Previous work has shown that using synthetic paraphrases can improve MT. This paper investigates best practices for employing multiple references by analyzing the semantic similarity among different English translations of world literature in the Par3 dataset (Thai et al., 2022). We classify the semantic similarity between paraphrases into three groups: low, medium, and high, and fine-tune two different LLMs (mT5-large and LLaMA-2-7B) for downstream MT tasks. Across different models, holding the total training instances constant, single-reference but more source texts only marginally outperforms multiple-reference with half of the source texts. Moreover, using paraphrases of medium and high semantic similarity outperforms an unfiltered dataset (+BLEU 0.3-0.5, +COMET 0.2-0.9, +chrF++ 0.25-0.32). Our code is publicly available on GitHub.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

A sentence can be translated into another language in many ways. The differences among translations can be trivial—replacement of a synonym, punctuation, possessive *'s* vs. *of*—or they can be meaningful and reveal different aspects of the source language text. (See examples in Figure 1, Table 5, and Appendix B.)

Literary translators have to consider multiple aspects of a source language when translating: meaning, form, rhyme, style, corresponding culture that the language is embedded in, etc. (Lefevere, 1992). Some emphasize lexical and syntactic imitation (formal equivalence), while others sacrifice form for comprehensibility (dynamic/functional equivalence) (Nida, 1964). Read together, different translations’ emphases and interpretations provide a

<sup>1</sup>[https://github.com/swsiwu/multi\\_ref\\_literary\\_MT](https://github.com/swsiwu/multi_ref_literary_MT)

Classical 長安士方棟，頗有才名，而佻脫不持儀節。每陌上見游女，輒輕薄尾綴之。

trans 1: In the capital, Chang’an, there lived a scholar named Fang Dong with a reputation for being quite talented, although his behavior was inappropriately frivolous and discourteous. Every time he caught sight of a woman wandering the streets, he’d follow behind her, without regard to manners.

trans 2: In the city of Chang’an there lived a man by the name of Fang Dong, known as a gentleman of considerable accomplishments, while at the same time having a reputation as an unprincipled libertine. If ever a pretty woman caught his eye on the street, he would trail her and do his utmost to seduce her.

Figure 1: An example of meaningful variations between different English translations of a Classical Chinese source text. Highlighted texts are segments where the variations are meaningful. The example source text and its English translations are from the Par3 dataset (Thai et al., 2022).

more comprehensive impression of the source text and a deeper understanding of the source language.

Previous work has shown that using synthetic paraphrases can improve MT performance (Madnani et al., 2008; Zheng et al., 2018; Khayrallah et al., 2020), but they do not explore different semantic similarity of paraphrases and their impact on MT performance.

To systematically investigate this, we use the Par3 dataset, which has paragraph-level, complex English paraphrases from literature translated by expert translators (Thai et al., 2022). While there are highly similar paraphrases in Par3, many variations between paraphrases in Par3 are more than replacement, insertion, deletion, and re-ordering of words. These naturally existing paraphrases are more complex than what’s generated by traditional paraphrasers that are rule-based (McKeown, 1983) and SMT-based (Wubben et al., 2010; Bannard and Callison-Burch, 2005; Madnani et al., 2007). While LLMs have improved synthetic paraphrase’s quality and complexity, they are still at

risk of mistakes, especially for outputs longer than one sentence (Jayawardena and Yapa, 2024a,b; Su et al., 2022; Horvitz et al., 2024; Mishra et al., 2024). Moreover, non-expert translations are prone to translationese, where the translation is overly literal and awkward (NLLB Team et al., 2022).

In this paper, we investigate two questions: when holding the amount of fine-tuning data constant, is using multiple references better than just one target reference? What kind of paraphrase should be incorporated to achieve the best performance?

To answer these questions, we create datasets that vary in the number of source texts, the number of references per source text (single vs multiple references), and for multiple-reference datasets, vary in the level of semantic similarity among the references. We use PARAGRAM-SP (Wieting et al., 2022), an efficient and effective model for measuring semantic similarity. We divide paraphrases into three groups based on their semantic similarity: low, medium, and high, where medium has the most interesting and meaningful variations among the references for a source text. We then fine-tune two LLMs, mT5-large and LLaMA-2-7B, using aforementioned datasets on MT tasks, and compare their performances with baseline and commercial models: No Language Left Behind (NLLB Team et al., 2022) and Google Translate.

Our findings in the literary domain are:

- Holding the total training instances constant, single-reference but more source texts only marginally outperforms multiple-reference. (Section 6.1)
- Using source texts with medium and high semantic similarity among references can outperform an unfiltered dataset even if the unfiltered dataset has more training instances. (Section 6.2)
- On the other hand, training with medium and low semantic similarity among references will perform worse than an unfiltered dataset. (Section 6.2)

The remainder of our paper is organized as follows: we describe our method for measuring semantic similarity in Section 3, then we describe how we construct different datasets based on their semantic similarity and number of source and reference texts in Section 4. We provide details on the models we use for fine-tuning as well as the

baseline MT models in Section 5, where we also provide information about the MT metrics we use and relevant training details. Finally, we discuss our experimental results in Section 6.

## 2 Related work

Paraphrases have been used to augment training data and improve MT performance. Madnani et al. (2008) explore how much improvement one can get by increasing the number of synthetic references when tuning an SMT system. The paraphrases they use are automatically generated using phrase table pivoting. Similarly, Callison-Burch et al. (2006) also use pivot-based method to generate paraphrases to improve SMT performance. However, neither of these works examines the linguistic variations between the reference translations of a source text, which is reasonable since the references are synthetic and much less complex.

Khayrallah et al. (2020) use simulated paraphrases to improve MT performance on low-resource languages. They focus on the general effect of augmenting training data using synthetic paraphrases when training data is scarce. Our work further studies the semantic similarity of paraphrases on MT. It is worth noting that the languages present in our dataset are not low-resource languages, and instead of training a language model from scratch, we fine-tune two different types of LLMs: mT5 (an encoder-decoder model) and LLaMA-2-7B (an autoregressive LLM).

Zheng et al. (2018) propose a method to compress existing human references into a lattice and then generate synthetic references for training to boost MT and text generation performance. They also explore different ways of utilizing multiple references during training with a bidirectional language model. Instead of exploring methods of creating synthetic references, our work uses all available expert references for each source text.

Many studies have operationalized paraphrase taxonomy with different levels of granularity (Bhagat and Hovy, 2013; Wahle et al., 2023; Wegmann et al., 2024). Most are trained on human-annotated paraphrase datasets with explicit definitions and follow different agreement protocols among human annotators. Wegmann et al. (2024) operationalize context-dependent paraphrases with plausible variations in dialog, and they demonstrate their hands-on training approach for annotators. With this annotated dataset, they use in-context learning

to train a classifier to detect paraphrases in dialog. In our paper, instead of using human annotations, we use PARAGRAM-SP, a semantic textual similarity scorer, to classify the type of paraphrase, as we are interested in a computational, low-cost, yet effective approach.

Others explore different factors that can impact translation quality: [Khayrallah and Koehn \(2018\)](#) explore how different kinds of noise in training data impact MT performance when using an NMT model. [Maillard et al. \(2023\)](#) show that the addition of high-quality data can significantly improve MT performance on low-resource languages, even when the quantity of high-quality training data is small. Consequently, they emphasize the value of collecting high-quality data from native speakers for training MT models.

### 3 Measuring semantic similarity

We want to investigate what level of semantic similarity among the references (of a source text) is best for training MT systems by first measuring and classifying it.

Given a source text, we use a semantic textual similarity scoring model, PARAGRAM-SP ([Wieting et al., 2022](#)), to measure the semantic similarity between its English translations. PARAGRAM-SP score ranges from -1 to 1, where a lower score indicates low semantic similarity, and a higher score indicates high semantic similarity. A model similar to this one from ([Wieting et al., 2019b](#)) was successfully used as a reward function in minimum risk training ([Shen et al., 2016](#)) to improve machine translation quality ([Wieting et al., 2019a](#)).

In the literary translation dataset Par3 ([Thai et al., 2022](#)), each source text has at least two different English translations. PARAGRAM-SP can only score the semantic textual similarity for two texts, so in the case where there are more than two translations, we take the average pairwise PARAGRAM-SP score as the source text’s  $sim\_p$  score. Mathematically:

$$sim\_p(M) = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{(a,b) \in C} \text{PARAGRAM-SP}(a, b)$$

where  $M$  is the set of human translations given a source text  $s$ , and  $C$  is all possible combinations of a set of pairs in  $M$ . PARAGRAM-SP ( $a, b$ ) is the PARAGRAM-SP score given a pair of English translations  $a$  and  $b$ .

To identify the range for meaningful variations, we rank the source texts by their  $sim\_p$  scores from




Figure 2: The distribution of  $sim\_p$  for the Par3 corpus’s source texts. Paraphrases with high scores are more similar semantically and syntactically. Upon manual inspection, we observe that the paraphrases in between the two blue vertical lines are the ones with meaningful variations: different enough to be interesting, but similar enough to still be a paraphrase.

low to high with their target references attached. Upon manual inspection, we define the range for meaningful variations to be  $[0.45, 0.85]$ , and we call this set of paraphrases the *Medium* dataset. Subsequently, the lower range  $[-1, 0.45]$  is the *Low* dataset, and  $[0.85, 1]$  is the *High* dataset.

We provide a detailed description of each  $sim\_p$  range in Table 1, and the distribution of  $sim\_p$  in the entire unfiltered dataset is in Figure 2.

### 4 Datasets

We classify reference translations based on their semantic similarity with the method described in Section 3, then we create different datasets composed of various  $sim\_p$  for experiments.

To systematically study the impact of the number of source texts, the number of references, and the type of paraphrase included, we create different training datasets such that each varies one potentially influential factor.

We use #SOURCE to denote the number of unique source texts, and #INSTANCE to denote the total number of training instances, e.g. 3 source texts each of which has 3 reference translations, then #SOURCE = 3, and #INSTANCE = 9. #SOURCE and #INSTANCE for each dataset are in Table 2. Here we describe some representative datasets:

**Medium All** #SOURCE = 49,650: This dataset uses multiple references for each source text. It contains all the paraphrases with  $sim\_p \in [0.45, 0.85]$ , of which we define to have the most meaningful variations (§3).

sim_p	Description	Dataset
1.0	Completely identical.	Medium+High Unfiltered
[0.9 – 1.0)	Almost identical, except for minor punctuation differences, e.g. single vs double quotation marks, or word replacement (by a synonym or a phrase).	Medium+High Unfiltered
[0.85 – 0.9)	Differences happen more often, but they are still variations that are not meaningful. Compared to the 0.9-1.0 similarity, the difference can be clausal instead of just one or two words. However, the overall amount of information is about the same.	Medium+High Unfiltered
[0.45 – 0.85)	Very meaningful variations. The paraphrases are more likely to be visually dissimilar. Sometimes, the amount of information can differ much more: some translators are more verbose, others are more succinct.	Medium Medium+High Medium+Low Unfiltered
[-1 – 0.45)	Noisy paraphrases that have an overall information mismatch. Paraphrases can be misaligned or erroneous.	Medium+Low Unfiltered

Table 1: Different levels of semantic similarity score (sim\_p) and their characteristics. See Section 3 for how we compute sim\_p given a source text and its reference translations. The dataset column indicates the datasets that include paraphrases from the corresponding sim\_p range.

**Medium** #SOURCE = 20,897: This dataset uses multiple references for each source text and has the same amount of training instances (#INSTANCE) as Single Ref #SOURCE = 49,650, but its #SOURCE is smaller. This dataset is created to find out the extent of the efficiency of training with Medium datasets. Similarly, we create Medium with #INSTANCE = 57,987 and 76,938 to compare with the corresponding single-reference datasets.

**Unfiltered** #SOURCE = 49,650: This dataset uses multiple references for each source text, and it contains the same amount of source texts as Medium All, but its source texts are randomly selected regardless of their corresponding target texts’ sim\_p.

**Single Ref** #SOURCE = 49,650: This dataset has the same amount of source texts as Medium All, but each source text is only trained with one reference.

**Medium+Low 10%:** This dataset uses multiple references for each source text, and it includes the entire Medium All dataset. Additionally, we randomly select 10% of the source texts from the lower sim\_p range ([0, 0.45]).

**Medium+Low All:** Similar to Medium+Low 10%, but it includes all the source texts with sim\_p in the lower range ([0, 0.45]).

**Medium+High 10%:** Similar to Medium+Low 10%, except the additional 10% source texts are from high sim\_p range ([0.85, 1]). The Medium+High datasets are to examine the impact of including less meaningful variations (high semantic similarity) when fine-tuning an MT model.

The source paragraphs and human references are from Par3 (Thai et al., 2022).<sup>2</sup> The source languages include Portuguese, Swedish, Italian, Czech, Japanese, Classical Chinese, Norwegian, German, Russian, and French. All references are only in English; In other words, the language pairs in this dataset are all to-English language pairs. We provide details about the composition of Medium all compared to Unfiltered All in Appendix 4.

We use paragraphs as units for source and target and only select source paragraphs whose human translations are all under the 128-word limit. Voigt and Jurafsky (2012) have shown that when applying MT to literary translation, using above sentence-level translation can improve literary cohesion. Moreover, a paragraph provides enough length for interesting variations but also increases the complexity of the task.

To ensure train/val/test has the same language split, we split data into train and val/test in 0.8/0.2 ratio for each language by the number of source paragraphs instead of the source-target pairs. Train and val/test also don’t share the same books. Val and test datasets are created by first randomizing at the source paragraph level. The test dataset is used in all experiments, and it has multiple human references per source text for evaluation. It is composed of medium semantic similarity only.

## 5 Experiments

We are interested in the effect of varying the number of source text, the number of references, and

<sup>2</sup>Par3 dataset can be downloaded from <https://github.com/katherinethai/par3>



the semantic similarity of reference translations on MT tasks in the literary domain. Using datasets described in Section 4, we fine-tune two different general-purpose LLMs for translation: mT5-large and LLaMA-2-7B.

To calibrate our interpretation of the performance of these models, we compare them to out-of-the-box translation results from No Language Left Behind (NLLB) and Google Translate (§5.1). We employ three different translation evaluation metrics (§5.2). In the remainder of this section, we describe our training protocols (§5.3).

### 5.1 Models

**mT5-large** (Xue et al., 2021): an encoder-decoder model that covers 101 languages (Xue et al., 2021) including all the languages in Par3. It is not specifically trained on translation tasks but could be fine-tuned for a variety of downstream tasks including multilingual translation. It has about 1.2 billion parameters. We choose to fine-tune mT5-large for our translation tasks.<sup>3</sup>

**LLaMA-2-7B** (Touvron et al., 2023): an English-centric LLM with limited multilingual capabilities. Studies have shown that LLaMA-2 can translate high-resource non-English language with some fine-tuning due to the presence of the corresponding language in the training dataset. LLaMA-2 is also able to adapt to a new low-resource language with some fine-tuning. All the languages in this paper are in the LLaMA-2 training data for  $\geq 0.05\%$ , except that the Chinese in Par3 is classical Chinese, which shares mostly the same characters as modern Chinese but has different grammar. It would be interesting to observe the translation performance after fine-tuning on our datasets given that non-English data is only a minuscule part of LLaMA-2 training data.

**No Language Left Behind (NLLB)**: An open-source MT system that can translate any language pairs between 202 languages, including low-resource languages, such as Asturian, Luganda, Urdu (NLLB Team et al., 2022). All the NLLB models are able to translate out-of-the-box, unlike mT5 which requires fine-tuning for MT downstream tasks. To compare to a fine-tuned mT5-large (1.2B), we choose the NLLB-200-Distilled model

<sup>3</sup><https://huggingface.co/google/mt5-large>

with 1.3B parameters.<sup>4</sup> We choose NLLB as a baseline model to compare to.

**Google Translate**: A closed-sourced commercial system. As far as we know, it is trained on data from the public web with a transformer encoder and an RNN decoder.<sup>5</sup> Google Translate’s output is provided in the Par3 dataset.

### 5.2 Evaluation metrics

**BLEU** (Papineni et al., 2002): An n-gram-based MT evaluation metric. Notice that we are using multiple human references for each source input.

**COMET<sub>22</sub><sup>DA</sup>** (Rei et al., 2020): An MT evaluation metric that is based on sentence embeddings. We use wmt22-comet-da by Unbabel (Rei et al., 2022).<sup>6</sup> It was trained on a transformer-based multilingual masked language model, XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020). Since COMET<sub>22</sub><sup>DA</sup> only accepts one reference per source text for evaluation, for each source text, we take the average of their COMET<sub>22</sub><sup>DA</sup> scores regarding different references translations.

**chrF++** (Popović, 2017): An MT evaluation metric that is based on character and word-level n-gram recall and precision. We include this metric as Zouhar et al. (2024) find that COMET can struggle in domains outside WMT, e.g. literary domain.

### 5.3 Training details

Given many LLMs already have strong language abilities and only require fine-tuning for MT downstream tasks, we consider fine-tuning as a more efficient approach than training from scratch, especially since our dataset is English-centric (all reference translations are in English) and these LLMs usually perform better when translating from non-English language into English.

For fine-tuning, each training instance is a source text and one of its human translations, and the training and validation datasets are randomized, e.g. (source text A, target human translation  $A_1$ ), (source text B, target human translation  $B_3$ ), (source text C, target human translation  $C_1$ ), etc.

We fine-tuned mT5-large with Hugging Face libraries. Our optimal hyperparameters for fine-tuning are  $lr = 0.00025$ , global batch size = 128,

<sup>4</sup><https://huggingface.co/facebook/nllb-200-distilled-1.3B>

<sup>5</sup><https://research.google/blog/recent-advances-in-google-translate/>

<sup>6</sup><https://huggingface.co/Unbabel/wmt22-comet-da>

	#SOURCE	#INSTANCE	BLEU		COMET <sub>22</sub> <sup>DA</sup>		chrF++	
NLLB-1.3B			27.3		0.689		41.62	
Google Translate			35.8		0.726		48.02	
			mT5	LLaMA-2	mT5	LLaMA-2	mT5	LLaMA-2
medium	20,897	49,650	29.8	30.0	71.3	72.8	43.20	44.06
single ref	49,650	49,650	29.9	30.1	71.5	70.3	43.44	42.08
unfiltered	49,650	116,689	31.3	30.8	71.8	72.7	44.17	44.52
medium all	49,650	118,003	31.5	30.3	71.9	71.6	43.81	43.76
medium	24,398	57,987	29.8	30.2	71.3	72.4	43.36	43.79
single ref	57,987	57,987	30.4	30.2	71.5	72.1	43.81	42.86
medium	32,357	76,938	30.6	28.2	71.6	70.2	43.73	41.12
single ref all	76,938	76,938	31.3	29.4	71.8	71.3	44.33	42.81
unfiltered	57,987	136,356	31.7	30.4	71.9	72.2	44.63	44.13
medium + low (10%)	57,987	137,811	31.1	29.4	71.7	71.6	44.16	41.29
medium + low (all)	59,072	140,407	31.1	30.1	71.7	71.7	44.11	43.64
unfiltered all	76,938	180,927	31.9 <sup>†</sup>	30.8 <sup>‡</sup>	71.9 <sup>†</sup>	72.1 <sup>‡</sup>	44.67 <sup>†</sup>	44.11 <sup>‡</sup>
medium + high (10%)	57,987	136,870	32.0	29.2	72.0	70.3	44.77	42.39
medium + high (20%)	66,324	155,809	32.2 <sup>†</sup>	30.8 <sup>‡</sup>	72.1 <sup>†</sup>	72.6 <sup>‡</sup>	<b>44.92<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>44.43<sup>‡</sup></b>
medium + high (all)	67,516	158,523	<b>32.4<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>31.1<sup>‡</sup></b>	<b>72.1<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>73.0<sup>‡</sup></b>	44.84 <sup>†</sup>	44.31 <sup>‡</sup>

Table 2: Different datasets’ performance across different models. #SOURCE is the number of source texts, and #INSTANCE is the number of total training instances. For each MT metric, † denotes statistical significance for experiments using mT5, and ‡ denotes statistical significance for experiments using LLaMA-2-7B. We tested the statistical significance (p-value < 0.05) using the paired bootstrap resampling method (Koehn, 2004).

and batch size = 16. Training took 16 to 48 hours on 4 GPUs depending on the size of the dataset.

For LLaMA-2-7B, we used LoRA-tuning (Hu et al., 2022) with Meta’s LLaMA-recipe.<sup>7,8</sup> We structured each training instance as "source\_text ###> target text" following the fine-tuning method from Zhang et al. (2023). We used a batch size of 16. Depending on the dataset size, training took 8 to 24 hours.

For both models, we use BLEU on the validation set for early stopping. We notice that unlike mT5, the LLaMA-2 fine-tuning hyperparameters impact the performance significantly ( $\pm 5$  BLEU score). We also discover that when the training data increases significantly, increasing global batch size seems to improve the performance. In this paper, we report the best performance we obtained with three different global batch sizes for LLaMA-2-7B.

## 6 Results and Discussion

Using the datasets, models, and MT metrics described in previous sections, we analyze the effectiveness of the number and semantic similarity of reference translations.

### 6.1 Single reference vs multiple references

Simply adding additional references to a single-reference training set will, unsurprisingly, improve

<sup>7</sup><https://llama.meta.com/llama-downloads/>

<sup>8</sup><https://github.com/meta-llama/llama-recipes>

performance, just as will happen with increases in same-quality training data (Madhani et al., 2007, 2008). The more interesting question, however, is when the number of training instances are the same, does it make a difference whether we increase the amount of source text and pair each with one translation, or we have less source text but each source text is paired with multiple translations?

This is not, to our knowledge, an idea that has been previously explored. In Table 2, when n\_instance is the same, Single Ref on average only marginally outperforms Medium across different models and metrics: ranging 0.0-0.7 in BLEU, (-)2.5-(+)1.1 in COMET, and (-)1.98-(+)1.69 in chrF++. It is surprising considering Medium has less than half of Single Ref’s n\_source.

This suggests that when one has limited source and target texts, augmenting the number of references per source text can improve performance similarly to increasing the number of source text single target text pairs. However, it is unknown to what extent this observation will still hold when the references are synthetically generated with paraphraser instead of high-quality human references in the literary domain.

### 6.2 Unfiltered All vs. Medium+High All

Although Unfiltered All has more training instances, its MT performance across different models and metrics is worse than Medium+High All and Medium+High 20% (Table 2).




Figure 3: Performance difference between different languages under different MT metrics when fine-tuning with mT5-large (1st row) and LLaMA-2-7B (2nd row). Darker dots are from Medium+High All, and lighter dots are from Unfiltered All. The bar chart show the amount of source-target-text pairs in Unfiltered All dataset.

We perform the paired bootstrap resampling to test the statistical significance of our finding (Koehn, 2004) and find that Med+High All outperforms Unfiltered All across different MT metrics and LLMs ( $p$ -value  $< 0.05$ ). Specifically, Medium+High All outperforms Unfiltered All by 0.3-0.5 BLEU, 0.2-0.9 COMET, and 0.17-0.2 chrF++ (Medium+High 20% by 0.25-0.32 chrF++). This implies that when fine-tuning an MT model with multiple references, it is beneficial to compute the `sim_p` and filter out the ones with low semantic similarity to achieve the optimal MT performance.

Furthermore, we observe that Medium+Low 10% and All perform worse than Unfiltered All across different models and metrics (Table 2). Too much divergence among references of a source text may create confusion and hinder the performance.

### 6.3 Performance difference between models

We mentioned in Section 5.3 that LLaMA-2-7B is sensitive to the batch size when fine-tuning, and overall the fine-tuning result is less stable than mT5. In Table 2, we notice that BLEU, COMET, and chrF++ scores all seem less stable under LLaMA-

2-7B, e.g. for Medium, increasing #INSTANCE resulted in a decrease in these metrics when #INSTANCE went from 57,987 to 76,938.

LLaMA-2’s MT ability is still not well understood: Xu et al. (2024) observe that for LLaMA-2-7B, increasing training data, under COMET, the MT performance declines, while under BLEU, it improves. From their observation, they suggested that for LLaMA-2-7B, increasing parallel data might dilute its pre-existing knowledge.

Although it is unknown what caused such unstable performance for LLaMA-2-7B, overall our observation in Section 6.2 still applies: using Medium+High is better than the unfiltered dataset, despite unfiltered dataset has larger #INSTANCE.

### 6.4 Performance difference between languages

All source languages in our datasets are also in the mT5-large and LLaMA-2-7B training data. However, as described in Section 5.1, non-English languages are only of an extremely small percentage of the total training data.

We compare the gain between Unfiltered All

	BLEU		COMET <sub>22</sub> <sup>DA</sup>		chrF++	
	mT5	LLaMA-2-7B	mT5	LLaMA-2-7B	mT5	LLaMA-2-7B
medium + 1.0	31.7 <sup>†</sup>	28.9 <sup>‡</sup>	<b>72.0<sup>†</sup></b>	71.3 <sup>‡</sup>	<b>44.59<sup>†</sup></b>	42.46 <sup>‡</sup>
medium + 0.9-1.0	31.7 <sup>†</sup>	27.8 <sup>‡</sup>	71.9 <sup>†</sup>	70.3 <sup>‡</sup>	44.55 <sup>†</sup>	40.75 <sup>‡</sup>
medium + 0.85-0.9	31.7 <sup>†</sup>	<b>31.0<sup>‡</sup></b>	71.9 <sup>†</sup>	<b>72.9<sup>‡</sup></b>	44.52 <sup>†</sup>	<b>44.70<sup>‡</sup></b>

Table 3: Ablation study on fine-tuning with the highly similar paraphrases (§6.5). 1.0 is pure repetition, 0.9-1.0 is the paraphrases with trivial differences, and 0.85-0.9 is non-trivial but non-meaningful paraphrases. All experiments have the same amount of source texts, #SOURCE = 57,987. For each MT metric, † denotes statistical significance for experiments using mT5, and ‡ denotes statistical significance for experiments using LLaMA-2-7B. We tested the statistical significance (p-value < 0.05) using the paired bootstrap resampling method (Koehn, 2004).

and Medium+High All among different languages under different metrics in Figure 3, and we also compare this gain with respect to the amount of fine-tuning data in Unfiltered All.

While among different metrics, Medium+High All outperforms Unfiltered All (Table 2), under the same model, each language’s metric gain is different. Surprisingly, for both mT5-large and LLaMA-2-7B, more fine-tuning data for a language (e.g. French and Russian have more fine-tuning data) does not result in proportionally more gain.

The gain for languages with less fine-tuning data also seems inconsistent between mT5-large and LLaMA-2-7B in both the amount and direction, e.g. Classical Chinese mostly has negative gain for mT5-large while much bigger positive gain using LLaMA-2-7B. However, overall, between metrics, the direction of gain for a language under the same model, is consistent.

### 6.5 Ablation study on the highly similar paraphrases

The Medium+High datasets (Medium+High 10%, 20% and ALL) are only different by the *quantity* of high semantic similarity paraphrases (Table 2 and Section 6.2.), in this ablation study, we further examine the characteristics of these high semantic similarity paraphrases and their impact on MT performance. We classify these high semantic similarity paraphrases into 3 categories:

- $\text{sim\_p} = 1.0$ : completely identical paraphrases (absolute repetition)
- $\text{sim\_p} \in [0.9 - 1.0)$ : little variation, mostly lexical: 1 or 2 word replacements, deletion, addition, reordering, and punctuation change.
- $\text{sim\_p} \in [0.85 - 0.9)$ : slightly less trivial variations than the above. More syntactic variations, but still not meaningful.

For each category above, we combine Medium All and 10% additional paraphrases from that category and create a new dataset. These new datasets have the same number of source texts, #SOURCE = 57,987), with the exception that the first category ( $\text{sim\_p} = 1.0$ ) does not have enough data. To counter that, since the paraphrases in the first category are pure repetition, we create more training instances by randomly selecting source texts from the other two categories and repeating one of its reference translations.

Across different metrics, mT5 fine-tuned on Medium+1.0 provides the best performance, while LLaMA-2-7B performs best with Medium+0.85-0.9 (Table 3). We tested the statistical significance (p-value < 0.05) of the results in Table 3 using the paired bootstrap resampling method (Koehn, 2004).

Given the conflicting results from the two LLMs in this ablation study, it is inconclusive what the best kind of high semantic similarity is for achieving the best MT performance. We recommend simply including all medium and high semantic similarity paraphrases (Medium+High All) as suggested in Section 6.2.

## 7 Conclusion

Unlike more utilitarian domains of translation, literary works encourages multiple translators to try their hand at improving on their predecessors. To make the most of this valuable resource for training MT systems, we explore the optimal way to employ multiple references when fine-tuning LLMs for machine translation.

We find using source texts with medium and high semantic similarity among their references outperform an unfiltered dataset and provide the best performance.

Additionally, we observe that when holding the total number of training instances constant, single-reference (having more source texts with one target



text each) is slightly better than multiple-reference (less source text with multiple target texts each). Future research could test these findings in other MT domains.

## 8 Limitations

1. We chose to fine-tune LLMs as a more efficient approach, given that these LLMs already have strong language ability and only require fine-tuning for downstream tasks. It is unclear if our claims still hold when one trains an LLM from scratch. Informed by the finding by [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#), we did not use few-shot and zero-shot methods with LLaMA-2 because LoRA-tuning provides the best MT performance, and we considered LoRA-tuning to be the most appropriate to compare with fine-tuning the mT5-large model. Future research can study the performance difference among these approaches.
2. Fine-tuning mT5-large and LLaMA-2-7B usually requires multiple GPUs. Specifically, we trained mT5-large with 4 A100 GPUs since the model is very large and requires at least 30GB RAM. This could make it difficult for other researchers to replicate our experiments.

## 9 Potential Risks

MT systems are prone to gender-biased translation errors ([Stanovsky et al., 2019](#)), which could happen at test time in this work. Our dataset is also very English-centric since Par3 dataset only contains English paraphrases as target texts. English as a high-resource language is more likely to have multiple translations of the same book than low-resource languages, so working on English only will further widen the performance gap between high and low-resource languages; however, we hope our findings on the characteristics of paraphrases can be used in future research to improve MT on low-resource languages.

## References

- Colin Bannard and Chris Callison-Burch. 2005. [Paraphrasing with bilingual parallel corpora](#). In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL'05)*, pages 597–604, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rahul Bhagat and Eduard Hovy. 2013. [Squibs: What is a paraphrase?](#) *Computational Linguistics*, 39(3):463–472.
- Chris Callison-Burch, Philipp Koehn, and Miles Osborne. 2006. [Improved statistical machine translation](#)

- using paraphrases. In *Proceedings of the Human Language Technology Conference of the NAACL, Main Conference*, pages 17–24, New York City, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- J.C. Catford. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. [Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zachary Horvitz, Ajay Patel, Chris Callison-Burch, Zhou Yu, and Kathleen McKeown. 2024. [Paraguide: Guided diffusion paraphrasers for plug-and-play textual style transfer](#).
- Edward J Hu, yelong shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Lasal Jayawardena and Prasan Yapa. 2024a. [Parafusion: A large-scale llm-driven english paraphrase dataset infused with high-quality lexical and syntactic diversity](#). In *Artificial Intelligence and Big Data*, AIBD. Academy & Industry Research Collaboration Center.
- Lasal Jayawardena and Prasan Yapa. 2024b. [Parameter efficient diverse paraphrase generation using sequence-level knowledge distillation](#). In *2024 5th International Conference on Advancements in Computational Sciences (ICACS)*. IEEE.
- Huda Khayrallah and Philipp Koehn. 2018. [On the impact of various types of noise on neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Neural Machine Translation and Generation*, pages 74–83, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Huda Khayrallah, Brian Thompson, Matt Post, and Philipp Koehn. 2020. [Simulated multiple reference training improves low-resource machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 82–89, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Philipp Koehn. 2004. [Statistical significance tests for machine translation evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 388–395, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- André Lefevre. 1992. *Translating literature : practice and theory in a comparative literature context*. New York :Modern Language Association of America.
- Nitin Madnani, Necip Fazil Ayan, Philip Resnik, and Bonnie Dorr. 2007. [Using paraphrases for parameter tuning in statistical machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, pages 120–127, Prague, Czech Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nitin Madnani, Philip Resnik, Bonnie J. Dorr, and Richard Schwartz. 2008. [Are multiple reference translations necessary? investigating the value of paraphrased reference translations in parameter optimization](#). In *Proceedings of the 8th Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas: Research Papers*, pages 143–152, Waikiki, USA. Association for Machine Translation in the Americas.
- Jean Maillard, Cynthia Gao, Elahe Kalbassi, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Vedanuj Goswami, Philipp Koehn, Angela Fan, and Francisco Guzman. 2023. [Small data, big impact: Leveraging minimal data for effective machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2740–2756, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kathleen R. McKeown. 1983. [Paraphrasing questions using given and new information](#). *American Journal of Computational Linguistics*, 9(1):1–10.
- Abhika Mishra, Akari Asai, Vidhisha Balachandran, Yizhong Wang, Graham Neubig, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2024. [Fine-grained hallucination detection and editing for language models](#).
- E.A. Nida. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating (Second edition)*. Brill.
- NLLB Team, Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Hefernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, Anna Sun, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loic Barraut, Gabriel Mejia Gonzalez, Prangthip Hansanti, John Hoffman, Semarley Jarrett, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Dirk Rowe, Shannon Spruit, Chau Tran, Pierre Andrews, Necip Fazil Ayan, Shruti Bhosale, Sergey Edunov, Angela Fan, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Francisco Guzmán, Philipp Koehn, Alexandre Mourachko, Christophe Ropers, Safiyyah Saleem, Holger Schwenk, and Jeff Wang. 2022. [No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation](#).
- 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.
- Maja Popović. 2017. [chrF++: words helping character n-grams](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Confer-*

- ence on Machine Translation*, pages 612–618, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ricardo Rei, José G. C. de Souza, Duarte Alves, Chrysoula Zerva, Ana C Farinha, Taisiya Glushkova, Alon Lavie, Luisa Coheur, and André F. T. Martins. 2022. [COMET-22: Unbabel-IST 2022 submission for the metrics shared task](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Machine Translation (WMT)*, pages 578–585, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid). 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.
- Shiqi Shen, Yong Cheng, Zhongjun He, Wei He, Hua Wu, Maosong Sun, and Yang Liu. 2016. [Minimum risk training for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1683–1692, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gabriel Stanovsky, Noah A. Smith, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. [Evaluating gender bias in machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1679–1684, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dan Su, Xiaoguang Li, Jindi Zhang, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, and Pascale Fung. 2022. [Read before generate! faithful long form question answering with machine reading](#).
- Katherine Thai, Marzena Karpinska, Kalpesh Krishna, Bill Ray, Moira Inghilleri, John Wieting, and Mohit Iyyer. 2022. [Exploring document-level literary machine translation with parallel paragraphs from world literature](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9882–9902, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruiti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#).
- Rob Voigt and Dan Jurafsky. 2012. [Towards a literary machine translation: The role of referential cohesion](#). In *Proceedings of the NAACL-HLT 2012 Workshop on Computational Linguistics for Literature*, pages 18–25, Montréal, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jan Philip Wahle, Bela Gipp, and Terry Ruas. 2023. [Paraphrase types for generation and detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12148–12164, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anna Wegmann, Tijs van den Broek, and Dong Nguyen. 2024. [What’s mine becomes yours: Defining, annotating and detecting context-dependent paraphrases in news interview dialogs](#).
- John Wieting, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, Kevin Gimpel, and Graham Neubig. 2019a. [Beyond BLEU: Training neural machine translation with semantic similarity](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4344–4355, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Wieting, Kevin Gimpel, Graham Neubig, and Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick. 2019b. [Simple and effective paraphrastic similarity from parallel translations](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4602–4608, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Wieting, Kevin Gimpel, Graham Neubig, and Taylor Berg-kirkpatrick. 2022. [Paraphrastic representations at scale](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 379–388, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sander Wubben, Antal van den Bosch, and Emiel Krahmer. 2010. [Paraphrase generation as monolingual translation: Data and evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 6th International Natural Language Generation Conference*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haoran Xu, Young Jin Kim, Amr Sharaf, and Hany Hassan Awadalla. 2024. [A paradigm shift in machine translation: Boosting translation performance of large language models](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2021. [mT5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 483–498, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Xuan Zhang, Navid Rajabi, Kevin Duh, and Philipp Koehn. 2023. [Machine translation with large language models: Prompting, few-shot learning, and fine-tuning with QLoRA](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 468–481, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Renjie Zheng, Mingbo Ma, and Liang Huang. 2018. [Multi-reference training with pseudo-references for neural translation and text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3188–3197, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Vilém Zouhar, Shuoyang Ding, Anna Currey, Tatyana Badeka, Jenyuan Wang, and Brian Thompson. 2024. [Fine-tuned machine translation metrics struggle in unseen domains](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 488–500, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

## A Medium All dataset statistics

Lang	book	#src	total	%used
Portuguese	4	1021	3261	0.313
Swedish	3	1249	2591	0.482
Italian	2	1325	1912	0.693
Czech	4	1759	2886	0.609
Japanese	9	1779	2483	0.716
Chinese	7	2199	3671	0.599
Norwegian	2	3011	4756	0.633
German	16	6136	8905	0.689
Russian	27	20003	34030	0.588
French	32	32353	51052	0.634

Table 4: Composition of the Medium All dataset. "#src" is the total number of unique source paragraphs selected, while column "total" is the all unfiltered number of paragraphs. "%used" is "#src" divided by "total".

## B Example of an untranslatable word

Catford (1965) explained the definition of an untranslatable word with an example from French literature *La Chatte* (The Cat) by Colette:

Fr: "Le soleil allume un crépitement d'oiseaux dans les jardin"

En 1: "The sun kindles a crackling of birds in the garden"

En 2: "the sun... As it rose, already burning hot, it awoke a twittering of sparrows in the gardens"

In the French sentence, the word *crépitement* is translated as *crackling* in English by the first translator, but it does not capture the association of *crépitement* (crackling) with *pépiement* (twittering) due to shared lexical component in French. The second English translation, though lengthier, captures both the direct meaning and the associated concept of the word "crépitement". To be aware of this artful play of words, one needs to have in-depth knowledge of the French language.

## C Example source texts and target texts from Par3 dataset



source language	source text	human references
French	Le grand chien noir, qui était allé flairer la bière, revint en rechignant.	<b>ref_1</b> The big black dog, who had gone over to sniff at the bier, came back reluctantly. <b>ref_2</b> The big black dog, who had gone to sniff at had gone to sniff at the coffin, came back sulkily.
Czech	Kadet Biegler viděl, že je rozmluva s ním skončena, zasalutoval a celý červený v obličejí prošel vagónem, až se ocitl na samém konci v příčné chodbě.	<b>ref_1</b> Cadet Biegler, seeing that the conversation was at an end, saluted and, very red in the face, passed through the carriage to the corridor at the very end. <b>ref_2</b> Cadet Biegler saw that the conversation with him was over, so he saluted and all red in the face walked through the car until he found himself at the very end, in the crosswise passageway.
Swedish	Ty det var just nu det borde ha skett. Den som vill handla måste kunna gripa tillfället. Ingen vet om det kommer igen. Jag duger inte!	<b>ref_1</b> For now is when it should have happened. Someone who wants to act must be able to seize the moment. Who knows if it will return? I'm not up to it! <b>ref_2</b> For it was just now it should have happened. He who wants to act must seize his chance. No one knows whether it will ever come back. I'm not up to it!

Table 5: Examples of source texts and human references from the Medium All dataset where there are meaningful variations between human references for each source text.