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#### Abstract

SIGTYP's Shared Task on Word Embedding Evaluation for Ancient and Historical Languages was proposed in two variants, constrained or unconstrained. Whereas the constrained variant disallowed any other data to train embeddings or models than the data provided, the unconstrained variant did not have these limits. We participated in the five tasks of the unconstrained variant and came out first. The tasks were the prediction of part-of-speech, lemmas and morphological features and filling masked words and masked characters on 16 historical languages. We decided to use a dependency parser and train the data using an underlying pretrained transformer model to predict part-of-speech tags, lemmas, and morphological features. For predicting masked words, we used multilingual distilBERT (with rather bad results). In order to predict masked characters, our language model is extremely small: it is a model of 5 -gram frequencies, obtained by reading the available training data.


## 1 Introduction

Since word embeddings and the transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017) found their way into natural language processing (NLP), results for all NLP tasks improved to unseen levels. Multilingual pretrained language models like multilingual BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) and XLM-RoBERTa (Conneau et al., 2020) include word embeddings for up to 100 languages. However, historical languages are most unlikely to be covered by these models. Since corpora of historical languages are limited in size and will most likely not grow anymore (unless an archaeological miracle unearths corpora yet unheard of) it will be difficult to include these languages to existing or new language models. In the SIGTYP Shared Task on Word Embedding Evaluation for Ancient and Historical Languages 2024 (ST 2024) ${ }^{1}$, it is proposed to present word

[^0]embeddings/models for 16 historical languages (cf. Table 1) for which part of speech (POS) (task 1), lemmas (task 2), morphological features (task 3) must be predicted. A fourth task asks to unmask masked words (task 4a) or characters (including spaces and punctuation, task 4b). Both masked words and masked characters can appear in an adjacent position. $10 \%$ of words and $5 \%$ of characters are masked. The shared task comes in two variants, constrained and unconstrained. In the first variant, only the data provided by the organizers can be used to train models, the unconstrained task allows any additional data to be used for training and inference.

The data used for the Shared Task (Dereza et al., 2024) has been compiled from various sources. Old, Middle, and Early Modern Irish is taken from Bauer et al. (2017), Doyle (2018), Ó Corráin et al. (1997), Acadamh Ríoga na hÉireann (2017); the Old Hungarian corpus origins from Simon (2014) and HAS Research Institute for Linguistics (2018), all other corpora have been published in version 2.12 of the Universal Dependencies project (UD) (Zeman et al., 2023) ${ }^{2}$.

Both the training and the test data for the tasks 1, 2, and 3 is in CoNLL-U ${ }^{3}$ format, i.e. the documents are segmented into tokenised sentences. The values for POS and the morphological features in tasks 1 and 3 are the UPOS and UFeats sets of the UD project. However not all languages use all possible features, e.g., the Old French data does not use the features Number or Person.

The Evaluation of the shared task is carried out by the CodaLab platform (Pavao et al., 2023) and uses the metrics shown in Table 2. In case of multiple metrics per task an unweighted average of the metrics was used.

We participated in all five tasks of the uncon-

[^1]| Language | Code | Script | Dating | corpus size in tokens |  |  | corpus size in sentences |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Train | Valid | Test | Train | Valid | Test |
| Ancient Greek | grc | Greek | VIII c. BCE - 110 CE | 334,043 | 41,905 | 41,046 | 24,800 | 3,100 | 3,101 |
| Ancient Hebrew ${ }^{\dagger}$ | hbo | Hebrew | X c. CE | 40,244 | 4,862 | 4,801 | 1,263 | 158 | 158 |
| Classical Chinese ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | lzh | Hanzi | $47-220 \mathrm{CE}$ | 346,778 | 43,067 | 43,323 | 68,991 | 8,624 | 8,624 |
| Coptic ${ }^{\dagger}$ | cop | Coptic | I - II c. CE | 57,493 | 7,282 | 7,558 | 1,730 | 216 | 217 |
| Gothic | got | Latin | V - VIII c. CE | 44,044 | 5,724 | 5,568 | 4,320 | 540 | 541 |
| Medieval Icelandic | isl | Latin | 1150-1680 CE | 473,478 | 59,002 | 58,242 | 21,820 | 2,728 | 2,728 |
| Classical and Late | lat | Latin | I c. BCE - IV c. CE | 188,149 | 23,279 | 23,344 | 16,769 | 2,096 | 2,097 |
| Latin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medieval Latin | latm | Latin | 774 - early XIV c. CE | 599,255 | 75,079 | 74,351 | 30,176 | 3,772 | 3,773 |
| Old Church Slavonic | chu | Cyrillic | X - XI c. CE | 159,368 | 19,779 | 19,696 | 18,102 | 2,263 | 2,263 |
| Old East Slavic | orv | Cyrillic | 1025-1700 CE | 250,833 | 31,078 | 32,318 | 24,788 | 3,098 | 3,099 |
| Old French | fro | Latin | 1180 CE | 38,460 | 4,764 | 4,870 | 3,113 | 389 | 390 |
| Vedic Sanskrit | san | Latin (transcr.) | 1500-600 BCE | 21,786 | 2,729 | 2,602 | 3,197 | 400 | 400 |
| Old Hungarian* | ohu | Latin | 1440-1521 CE | 129,454 | 16,138 | 16,116 | 21,346 | 2,668 | 2,669 |
| Old Irish | sga | Latin | 600-900 CE | 88,774 | 11,093 | 11,048 | 8,748 | 1,093 | 1,094 |
| Middle Irish | mga | Latin | 900-1200 CE | 251,684 | 31,748 | 31,292 | 14,308 | 1,789 | 1,789 |
| Early Modern Irish | ghc | Latin | 1200-1700 CE | 673,449 | 115,163 | 79,600 | 24,440 | 3,055 | 3,056 |

Table 1: Data $\left({ }^{\dagger}\right.$ Afro-Asiatic language family, ${ }^{\ddagger}$ Sino-Tibetan, ${ }^{*}$ Finno-Ugric; all other languages are from the Indo-European language family)

| Task |  | Metrics |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | POS-tagging | Accuracy @ 1, F1 |
| 2 | Morph/ annotation <br> of Acc. @1 per tag | Macro-average |
| 3 | Lemmatisation | Acc. @ 1, Acc. @3 |
| 4a | Filling masked words | Acc. @ 1, Acc.@ @ |
| 4b | Filling masked chars. | Acc.@ 1, Acc.@3 |

Table 2: Evaluation metrics
strained variant of the shared task, even though our approach for filling mask characters does not use any other data than the data provided by the organizers. Apart from task 4 (filling masked words) we got the best results of all participants.

## 2 Related Work

Even though this shared task is not about dependency parsing, POS tagging and lemmatisation are often present in dependency parsing. The shared task in dependency parsing 2018 (Zeman et al., 2018) processed three historical languages, Ancient Greek, Latin, and Old Church Slavonic, for which annotated data was present in the Universal Dependencies project at the time. In many of the approaches word embeddings were used (calculated on corpora of these languages using word 2 vec (Mikolov et al., 2013), GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014), or fastText (Grave et al., 2018), the latter already provides word embeddings for Latin. The best results of the participants of the 2018 shared tasks for historical languages are above $98 \%$ for

Latin, above $97 \%$ for Ancient Greek, and above $96 \%$ for Old church Slavonic for POS tagging. Lemmatisation for these languages also performs similarly well as modern languages. Sprugnoli et al. (2021) also studied the creation and evaluation word embeddings on Latin for the analysis of language change. More recently, several large language models for Classical Greek and Latin have been provided by (Riemenschneider and Frank, 2023) who evaluated this models on POS-tagging and lemmatisation (as this shared task), and dependency parsing. Brigada Villa and Giarda (2023) exploited models trained on Modern English to parse Old English, similar to our approach.

Evidently, word embeddings can be used for other tasks as well. E.g., Hamilton et al. (2016) use word embeddings of earlier version of English (but not going beyond the 1800s) to detect semantic shifts in English.

## 3 Approaches

### 3.1 Tasks 1 - 3: Inference of POS, Lemmas, and morphological features

Tasks 1, 2 and three consists of predicting the POS, the lemma, and morphological features of 13 historical languages (Table 1, exluding Old, Midlle and Early Modern Irish).

In order to infer POS, lemmas, and morphological features we used our syntactic dependency parser UDParse ${ }^{4}$. This parser is an evolution of UDpipe (Straka, 2018), which won the CoNLL

[^2]2018 Shared Task on dependency parsing (Zeman et al., 2018). UDpipe is a graph parser using pretrained word embeddings and embeddings of POS and characters to take the context into account. Word embeddings are loaded before the training, POS and characters embeddings are calculated from the training data. In contrast to UDPipe, UDParse uses word embeddings created by a pretrained transformer instead of contextless word embeddings produced by fastText ${ }^{5}$. This configuration proved to be very successful (Heinecke, 2020; Akermi et al., 2020), so we tried training models for the 13 languages for which the dependency syntax training data was available using different pretrained transformer models: bert-base-multilingual-uncased (Devlin et al., 2019), XLMRoBERTa, GPT2 (Radford et al., 2019) and language specific models like slavicBERT (Arkhipov et al., 2019) for Old Church Slavonic and Old East Slavic or heBERT ${ }^{6}$ for Ancient Hebrew. For the training we used 60 epochs with an initial learning rate of $10^{-3}$, which decreased to $10^{-4}$ after 40 epochs $^{7}$, batch size was 32 . We then chose for each language and each of task (1: POS, 2: lemmas, 3: morphological features) the best underlying pretrained transformer model (cf. Table 3). In nearly all cases XLM-RoBERTa produced the best results on the validation dataset (even though the difference, notably to multilingual BERT, was very small). For some languages we used different transformer models for tasks 1 to 3 to obtain the best results (on validation data).

Note that the test-data provided by the organizers was already tokenized. This simplifies enormously the tasks of assigning a POS, a lemma, or morphological features, especially for (historical) languages, which do not always come with standardized orthographies.

Even though the challenging fact was that most of these languages are not covered by any of the underlying pretrained language models, the results (Table 5, columns 2, 3, and 4) for POS, lemmas, and features, are well above $90 \%$ (except the lemmas for Old Hungarian and Old East Slavic). Partly this can be explained by the fact that the modern descendants of these languages are covered by XLMRoBERTa etc., and at least some of the words of the

[^3]| Language <br> code | POS | Lemma | Morphological <br> features |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| chu | XLMR | XLMR | XLMR |
| cop | XLMR | GPT2 | XLMR |
| fro | XLMR | mBERT | XLMR |
| got | XLMR | mBERT | mBERT |
| grc | XLMR | XLMR | XLMR |
| hbo | heBERT | XLMR | heBERT |
| isl | XLMR | XLMR | XLMR |
| lat | XLMR | XLMR | XLMR |
| latm | XLMR | XLMR | XLMR |
| lzh | mBERT | mBERT | mBERT |
| ohu | XLMR | XLMR | mBERT |
| orv | XLMR | XLMR | XLMR |
| san | mBERT | mBERT | XLMR |

Table 3: Best underlying pretrained transformer models per language and task 1, 2, and 3. For language codes please refer to Table 1.
historical languages still exist in the contemporary languages. Thus, the modern languages might have helped their ancestors. For comparison, UDParse on modern languages, covered by XLM-RoBERTa or mBERT has results ${ }^{8}$ only slightly above the results obtained on historical language (Table 4).

| Code | UPOS | Lemma |  | Code | UPOS | Lemma |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| fr | 97.93 | 98.41 |  | fro | 96.01 | 95.11 |
| he | 97.81 | 97.60 |  | hbo | 97.84 | 98.15 |
| hu | 97.07 | 95.51 |  | ohu | 96.71 | 86.91 |
| ru | 99.35 | 98.90 |  | orv | 94.99 | 89.23 |

Table 4: UDParse results for some modern languages (left) compared to historical languages (right, results copied from Table 5)

However, this does not explain the worse than average results for Old Hungarian and Old East Slavic whose descendants are also covered by XLM-RoBERTa. Old East Slavic contains some characters absent in its modern successors (Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian). Similarly, the Old Hungarian corpus contains diacritics and characters not used in Modern Hungarian. This could have played a role. For the above average results for Coptic (not covered by XLM-RoBERTa and written in an alphabet totally absent in the vocabulary of XLM-RoBERTa), UDParse seems to exploit the word and character vectors produced during training to perform well in the lemmatisation.

[^4]| Code | UPOS | Lemma | Morph. <br> feat. | Word <br> fill | Char <br> fill | Avg. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| chu | 97.00 | 92.70 | 96.49 | 2.80 | 66.77 | 71.15 |
| cop | 97.33 | 98.28 | 98.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 58.90 |
| fro | 96.01 | 95.11 | 98.33 | 3.28 | 62.77 | 71.10 |
| got | 96.47 | 95.41 | 96.23 | 2.67 | 74.59 | 73.07 |
| grc | 96.49 | 93.39 | 97.78 | 3.07 | 68.46 | 71.84 |
| hbo | 97.84 | 98.15 | 97.05 | 5.39 | 36.85 | 67.05 |
| isl | 96.88 | 97.23 | 95.92 | 3.42 | 66.45 | 71.98 |
| lat | 96.83 | 96.99 | 96.66 | 3.51 | 67.91 | 72.38 |
| latm | 98.79 | 98.69 | 98.83 | 4.73 | 72.93 | 74.79 |
| lzh | 93.76 | 99.91 | 96.24 | 6.10 | 0.00 | 59.20 |
| ohu | 96.71 | 86.91 | 96.62 | 6.31 | 66.52 | 70.61 |
| orv | 94.99 | 89.23 | 95.16 | 5.03 | 61.34 | 69.15 |
| san | 90.02 | 91.48 | 92.60 | 3.86 | 70.10 | 69.61 |
| ghc | - | - | - | 3.29 | 58.09 | 30.69 |
| mga | - | - | - | 4.03 | 53.38 | 28.71 |
| sga | - | - | - | 2.79 | 58.38 | 30.59 |

Table 5: Results (Word filling failed for Coptic (cop) and character filling missing for Coptic and Classical Chinese (lzh). For Old Irish (sga) Middle Irish (mga), and Early Modern Irish (hgc), only data for the word and character filling tasks was available)

All results for tasks 1, 2, and 3 are well above the baseline provide by the shared task's organisers (Table 6) with the exception of the lemmatisation of Old Hungarian (ohu).

| Code | UPOS | Lemma | Morph. feat |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| chu | 3.64 | 3.09 | 11.42 |
| cop | 2.35 | 2.54 | 51.47 |
| fro | 4.44 | 3.18 | 70.06 |
| got | 2.74 | 3.46 | 77.28 |
| grc | 6.16 | 2.33 | 72.68 |
| hbo | 3.77 | 2.86 | 54.26 |
| isl | 2.88 | 3.45 | 60.09 |
| lat | 4.44 | 4.90 | 78.49 |
| latm | 1.56 | 1.65 | 67.89 |
| lzh | 2.85 | 1.10 | 52.66 |
| ohu | 3.12 | -2.53 | 73.42 |
| orv | 4.66 | 4.79 | 69.60 |
| san | 0.65 | 7.24 | 84.26 |

Table 6: Difference with respect to the baseline

### 3.2 Task 4a: Filling masked words

The task of filling one or several single words in a sentence was the most challenging task for historical languages. Consequently, our results are extremely low (Table 5, column 5). This is probably more due to the chosen approaches than to the fact that the pretrained transformers have been trained little or not at all on these languages. We tried two classical approaches, an encoder (distilbert-
base-multilingual-cased, Sanh et al. (2019)) and an encoder/decoder (facebook/mbart-large-50, Tang et al. (2020)). In the first case we used Huggingface's AutoModelForMaskedLM, the AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) optimiser with a learning rate of $5 * 10^{-5}$, a batch size of 8 and early stopping, which stopped the training after 4 to 6 epochs depending on the language. For the training process, we did not use the masks provided in the training corpus, but masked words randomly with a probability of $15 \%$. In the second case (with mBART) we used Huggingface's MBartForConditionalGeneration (other hyperparameters were identical).

The difference between distilBERT and mBART was marginal, possibly linked to a problem not identified before the shared task's deadline. We submitted the results of the first approach. However since this approach only predicts a single token (in the sense of distilBERT's vocabulary) for each masked word instead of a word (in most cases two or more tokens) our prediction was wrong for all masked words which are represented by more than one distilBERT token. In other words, masked words which are not in distilBERT's vocabulary, could not be predicted with this approach. The second approach, based on MBartForConditionalGeneration, did indeed return most times a word (or more) for a masked word, but we had cases where only a space was obtained.

### 3.3 Task 4b: Filling masked characters

For this subtask we chose a very old idea: a simple $n$-gram count and applying the most frequent n -gram which matches the masked character and its context. We trained our model by counting all n -grams in the unmasked part of the training corpus. We then looked for every masked character in test sentences and tried to find the frequency of all $n$-grams which include the masked character (we experimented with 3grams and 5-grams, the latter proved to work much better): for instance, forthe following string "Ne ${ }^{5}$ voloi? ${ }_{\square}$ aler $_{5}$ nule part." 9 which includes a masked character, we take the frequencies of all the 5 character windows around the masked characters, including spaces (" "") from the training

[^5]corpus. "?" is the masked character. The letter in inverted colors is the candidate letter:

1. "oloi?" $\rightarrow$

- "oloie" which has frequency of 6 in the training corpus,
- "oloil" (frequency of 3),
- "oloir" (8),
- "oloit" $(15$, at this stage, this 5 -gram is the best match. It is therefore kept while the other 5-grams are discarded)

2. "loi? ${ }^{\prime}$ " $\rightarrow$

- "loie " (2),
- "loil_" (2),
- "loir $"$ "(6),
- "lois " (1),
- "loit ${ }_{-}$" (22, new best match so far)

3. "oi? ${ }_{5} \mathrm{a} " \rightarrow$

- "oia aa" (1),
- "oie_a" (17),
- "oif a" (1),
- "oil_a" (3),
- "oir a" (3),
- "ois a" (14),
- "oit a " (57, retained),
- "oi $z_{4} a "$ (8)

4. "i? ${ }^{\text {al }}$ " $\rightarrow$

- "it_al" (3); discarded since with "oit_a" above we have found a more frequent match already

5. "? ${ }^{\text {ale" }} \rightarrow$

- "ـ_ale" (3),
- "a ale" (1),
- "e _ale" (3),
- "i ale" (2),
- "1_ale" (1),
- "n_ale" (2),
- "r ale" (6),
- "s ale" (2),
- "t_ale" (17),
- "Z_ale" (1),
- "«」ale" (1); all discarded

In this example "oit a " is the most frequent replacement for one the 5-grams which contain the masked character ("oi?,a"). So, we can replace the masked character by " $t$ " to obtain "Ne ${ }_{\square}$ voloit ${ }_{\square}$ aler $r_{\sqcup}$ nule part.". Note that at least in this example for each of the five 5-ngrams the best match is the one where the masked character is the same (" $t$ "), but this was not always the case.

The results of this approach can be found in Table 5, column 6. For time reason we could not implement the needed post processing for Classical Chinese (lzh) to rebuild the Hanzi characters from the decomposed characters in the train/validation and test data. Apparently we did not submit the Coptic data to the evaluation server, but a run after the deadline resulted in an accuracy of $62.26 \%$. Interestingly, the score for Ancient Hebrew (hbo) is only half as good as for the other languages. Since the number of different characters of Ancient Hebrew is rather low (cf. Table 7), the reason of this bad result must be found elsewhere. Surprisingly the evaluation of the validation corpus, resulted in around $60 \%$ accuracy.

| lang. <br> code | characters |  | lang. <br> code | characters |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| san | 37 |  | ghc | 92 |
| cop | 41 |  | lat | 116 |
| got | 50 |  | isl | 118 |
| fro | 64 |  | ohu | 120 |
| hbo | 67 | chu | 124 |  |
| latm | 77 |  | orv | 156 |
| mga | 77 |  | grc | 176 |
| sga | 78 |  | lzh | 318 |

Table 7: Number of different characters in the fill masked characters test data. Many languages contain accentuated characters, digits, Classical Latin (lat) contains citations in Greek which account for the unexpected high number of different characters.

We think a more word-context-aware approach could have improved the results, even a simple word based bi- or trigram. For instance in the Old French validation corpus is the following masked character "se je ai dite [_]ne response". Our approach finds for the 5-gram " ${ }^{\text {? }}$ ne ${ }_{5}$ " the 5 -gram " ${ }^{-}$ne" (the most frequent) instead of the correct " une,". Due to the approaching deadline, we did not have the time to implement and test this.

## 4 Conclusion

We successfully used rather old and wellestablished techniques to provide a solution to the five tasks of this year's SIGTYP shared task. Putting aside the failed results for filling-maskedwords task, we got very good results for POS tagging, lemmatization, and morphological feature assignment, which are as good as for modern languages and well above the baseline. We are not aware of any state-of-the-art values for filling masked characters, however, even though our results are first placed in the shared task, they are probably perfectible. For modern languages, word embedding or transformer-based methods, e.g. such as CharacterBERT, (El Boukkouri et al., 2020) will probably yield much better results.
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