

Do Not Fire the Linguist: Grammatical Profiles Help Language Models Detect Semantic Change

Mario Giulianelli*
ILLC, University of Amsterdam
m.giulianelli@uva.nl

Andrey Kutuzov*
University of Oslo
andreku@ifi.uio.no

Lidia Pivovarova
University of Helsinki
first.last@helsinki.fi

Abstract

Morphological and syntactic changes in word usage—as captured, e.g., by grammatical profiles—have been shown to be good predictors of a word’s meaning change. In this work, we explore whether large pre-trained contextualised language models, a common tool for lexical semantic change detection, are sensitive to such morphosyntactic changes. To this end, we first compare the performance of grammatical profiles against that of a multilingual neural language model (XLM-R) on 10 datasets, covering 7 languages, and then combine the two approaches in ensembles to assess their complementarity. Our results show that ensembling grammatical profiles with XLM-R improves semantic change detection performance for most datasets and languages. This indicates that language models do not fully cover the fine-grained morphological and syntactic signals that are explicitly represented in grammatical profiles.

An interesting exception are the test sets where the time spans under analysis are much longer than the time gap between them (for example, century-long spans with a one-year gap between them). Morphosyntactic change is slow so grammatical profiles do not detect in such cases. In contrast, language models, thanks to their access to lexical information, are able to detect fast topical changes.

1 Introduction

Human language is in continuous evolution. New word senses arise, and existing senses can change or disappear over time as a result of social and cultural dynamics or technological advances. NLP practitioners have become increasingly interested in this diachronic perspective of semantics. Some works focus on constructing, testing and improving psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic theories of meaning change (Xu and Kemp, 2015; Hamilton

et al., 2016; Goel et al., 2016; Noble et al., 2021); others are concerned with surveying how the meaning of words has evolved historically (Garg et al., 2018; Kozłowski et al., 2019) or how it is currently transforming in public discourse (Azarbondy et al., 2017; Del Tredici et al., 2019). Recently, we also see increased interest in more application-oriented work, with efforts to develop adaptive learning systems that can remain up-to-date with humans’ continuously evolving language use (*temporal generalization*; Lazaridou et al., 2021).

An increasingly popular way to determine whether and to what degree the meaning of words has changed over time is to use ‘contextualised’ (or ‘token-based’) word embeddings extracted from large pre-trained language models (Giulianelli et al., 2020; Montariol et al., 2021) as they encode rich, context-sensitive semantic information. However, it has also been shown recently that changes in the frequency distribution of morphological and syntactic features of words, as captured by *grammatical profiles*, can also be employed for lexical semantic change detection (Giulianelli et al., 2021), with competitive performance. These are, to some extent, two opposing approaches: while language models (LMs) are largely based on word co-occurrence statistics, grammatical profiles are de-lexicalised and rely on explicit linguistic information.

Although they are superficially unaware of morphology and syntax, LMs have been shown to capture approximations of grammatical information in their deep representations (Warstadt et al., 2020). Yet are these sufficient to detect meaning shifts that are accompanied by morphosyntactic changes in word usage? We hypothesise that this is not the case, and to test this hypothesis, we combine LM-based methods and grammatical profiles into ensemble models of lexical semantic change detection.¹ If adding grammatical profiles to LMs re-

*Equal contribution, the authors are listed alphabetically.

¹Throughout the paper, we refer to the systems that com-




Figure 1: Performance of an XLM-R based method (PRT) and an ensemble method (PRT-MORPHSYNT) on the ranking task; see Section 3 for method descriptions. The scores for the three Russian datasets are averaged as they exhibit similar trends.

sults in a boost in performance, then this means that LMs do not capture morphosyntactic change as accurately as explicit morphological tagging and syntactic parsing (or at the very least that it is difficult to extract this type of information from the models). If we do not observe any boost, this suggests that LMs already represent all the necessary grammatical information and explicit linguistic annotation is not required. We conduct our experiments with 10 datasets, covering 7 languages. For comparability, we use the same model for all the languages. We choose XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020), a multilingual Transformer-based masked language model which has already been successfully applied to the semantic change detection task (Arefyev and Zhikov, 2020; Arefyev et al., 2021). Although it covers the full linguistic diversity of our data, we additionally fine-tune XLM-R on monolingual diachronic corpora.

Our quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the resulting ensembles on the graded and binary semantic change detection tasks largely confirm our hypothesis. Ensembling XLM-R and grammatical profiles improves the results for 4 out of 6 languages in graded change detection (as well as for 1 of the 2 Norwegian datasets) and for 5 out of 6 languages in binary change detection. Figure 1 illustrates these improvements. The reasons why

bine LMs with grammatical profiles as ‘ensembles’. These are not statistical methods of *ensemble learning* but systems that combine the predictions of different models.

ensembles do not outperform the XLM-R baseline on some datasets are linked to the size of the gaps between the historical time periods represented in the diachronic corpora; we analyse and discuss these reasons in Section 4.3. Overall, we show that providing large language models with explicit morphosyntactic information helps them quantify semantic change.

2 Tasks and Data

The goal of lexical semantic change detection is to determine whether and to what extent a word’s meaning has changed over a certain period of time. The performance of automatic systems that address this problem is typically assessed in two tasks (Schlechtweg et al., 2020). **Task 1** is a binary classification task: given a diachronic corpus and a set of target words, a system must determine whether the words lost or gained any senses between two time periods. We refer to it as the *classification task* and use accuracy as an evaluation metric. **Task 2** is a ranking task: a system must rank the target words according to the degree of their semantic change. We refer to it as the *ranking task* and use the Spearman rank-correlation with the gold rankings as an evaluation metric.

We rely on a collection of diachronic corpora and annotated target word lists covering seven languages from three Indo-European language families. Target words are annotated with binary and graded scores of semantic change, corresponding respectively to Task 1 and 2 (Schlechtweg et al., 2018). English (EN), German (DE), Latin (LA), and Swedish (SW) data are available from the SemEval 2020 Unsupervised Lexical Semantic Change Detection shared task (Schlechtweg et al., 2020). For Italian (IT), we use the data released for the EvaLita competition (Basile et al., 2020). For Norwegian (NO), we use the NorDiaChange dataset recently released by Kutuzov et al. (2022), consisting of two subsets with different target word lists and time spans. Finally, for Russian (RU), we draw from the RuShiftEval shared task (Kutuzov and Pivovarova, 2021), consisting of three subsets with different time spans and a shared target word list. Table 1 summarises the most important properties of the datasets and indicates what types of annotations are available for each language. Note that the subset splitting in Norwegian and Russian is not introduced by us, but is provided by the corresponding dataset creators.

	EN	DE	IT	LA	NO-1	NO-2	RU-1	RU-2	RU-3	SW
Period 1	1810-1860	1800-1899	1945-1970	-200-0	1929-1965	1980-1990	1700-1916	1918-1990	1700-1916	1790-1830
Period 2	1960-2010	1946-1990	1990-2014	0-2000	1970-2013	2012-2019	1918-1990	1992-2016	1992-2016	1895-1903
Tokens (mln)	7+7	70+72	52+197	2+9	57+175	43+649	93+122	122+107	93+107	71+110
Targets	37	48	18	40	80	80	99	99	99	32
Ranking	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Classification	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓

Table 1: Statistics for our collection of diachronic corpora and of the corresponding semantic change annotations.

3 Methods

3.1 Grammatical Profiles

Grammatical profiling is a corpus linguistic technique which allows to distinguish subtle semantic differences by measuring the distance between distributions of grammatical parameters (Gries and Divjak, 2009; Janda and Ljashevskaya, 2011). It has been shown recently that diachronic changes in grammatical profiles can serve as a strong indication of semantic change (Giulianelli et al., 2021). For our experiments we adopt this method in its best performing configuration.

First, the diachronic corpus of interest is tagged and parsed using UDPipe (Straka and Straková, 2017). We then find all occurrences of a target word in the corpus and create a count vector for each detected morphological feature. For example, a morphological profile for an English verb could look as follows:

```
Tense : {Past 42, Pres 51}
VerbForm : {Part 68, Fin 25, Inf 9}
Mood : {Ind 25}
Voice : {Pass : 17}
```

In this way, count vectors are constructed for each target word in each time period of the corpus; these are a word’s grammatical profiles. The cosine distance between count vectors is computed separately for every morphological category, and the degree of semantic change between periods is measured as the maximum among the computed cosine distances. We refer to this type of grammatical profile as **MORPH**.

In addition to morphological features, a separate vector of syntactic features is created, which contains counts of dependency arc labels from a target word to its syntactic head. We refer to these grammatical profiles as **SYNT**. Semantic change is measured as the cosine distance between two syntactic vectors. Morphological and syntactic profiles can also be combined. We do this by concatenating syntactic features to the array of morphological features, and then using the maximum cosine dis-

tance as our third profile-based measure of semantic change, **MORPHSYNT**.

3.2 Static Embeddings

Static embeddings (e.g., Mikolov et al., 2013) are known to perform very well at detecting lexical semantic change (Schlechtweg et al., 2020). Therefore, although they are not directly relevant to our research question, we include them in our experiments as a point of comparison, following the common approach proposed by Hamilton et al. (2016). Further details can be found in Appendix B.

3.3 Contextualised Embeddings

Many have argued that static representations are not theoretically appropriate as a model of word meaning because they conflate all the usages of a word into a single context-independent embedding, and that contextualised representations should be used instead (e.g., Schütze, 1998; Erk and Padó, 2008; Pilehvar and Collier, 2016). This has motivated the development of semantic change detection algorithms that rely on context-dependent representations, where every usage of a word corresponds to a unique *token embedding* (Giulianelli et al., 2020; Martinc et al., 2020a). Language models produce very competitive results across languages (Kutuzov and Giulianelli, 2020), and they lead to more interpretable systems (Montariol et al., 2021).

We choose XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020) as our pre-trained language model, since it was shown to perform well in semantic change shared tasks (Schlechtweg et al., 2020; Kutuzov and Pivovarova, 2021) and because, being multilingual, it can be applied to all languages under analysis, making evaluation more consistent. First, we finetune XLM-R on the monolingual diachronic corpora of interest. Then, we deploy it to produce token embeddings for the target words in the diachronic corpus (in both time periods, T1 and T2). Further details on these two steps can be found in Appendix A. We compute graded semantic change scores based on the extracted XLM-R embeddings and we use the scores to compile an ordered list of target words

for the ranking task. Change scores are computed in four ways: 1) measuring the average pairwise cosine distance (**APD**) between embeddings collected in T1 and those in T2 (Giulianelli et al., 2020); 2) measuring the cosine distance between prototype embeddings (**PRT**)—i.e., the average contextualised word embeddings of T1 and T2 (Kuzov and Giulianelli, 2020); 3) clustering the embeddings and then calculating the Jensen-Shannon Divergence (**JSD**) between the putative sense distributions of T1 and T2 (Martinc et al., 2020b; Giulianelli et al., 2020); 4) by taking a simple average (**APD-PRT**) of the predictions made by PRT and APD. The mathematical definitions of the metrics are given in Appendix A.4.

3.4 Change Point Detection

To solve the classification task, we transform the continuous scores produced by our three metrics into binary semantic change predictions. Following Giulianelli et al. (2021), we rank target words according to their continuous scores and classify the top n words in the ranking as ‘changed’ (1) and the rest of the list as ‘stable’ (0). To determine the change point n , we apply an offline change point detection algorithm (Truong et al., 2020) with the default settings.²

3.5 Ensembling

To find out whether grammatical profiles can improve the performance of embedding-based detection methods, we test all possible combinations of grammatical profile types and embedding-based metrics. Grammatical profiles come in three variants: MORPH, SYNT, and MORPHSYNT. Our embedding-based measures include APD, PRT, APD-PRT, and JSD. We compute the geometric mean $\sqrt{c_g c_e}$ between the change score c_g obtained using grammatical profiles and the score c_e output by an embedding-based metric, and use the resulting value as the ensemble semantic change score (e.g., **PRT-MORPHSYNT**).

4 Results

We assess the performance of all methods presented in Section 3 on both semantic change detection tasks using our multilingual collection of semantic change datasets (see Section 2).

4.1 Ranking Task

For all methods, the Spearman rank-correlation between predicted scores and human annotations varies across languages and test sets; no method is a silver bullet for the ranking task (see Table 2). XLM-R obtains higher correlation scores in English, Swedish, Norwegian-1, and Russian (1, 2, and 3); whereas grammatical profiles outperform it in German, Latin, Swedish, and Norwegian-2. To better understand the strengths of all methods, we now first present the results of each of them individually; then we report the performance of ensembles, where each method is combined with every other to generate semantic change predictions.

Grammatical Profiles Whether morphological features, syntactic features, or a combination of both are the most effective depends on the dataset; this also varies across test sets of the same language, as can be seen in the first three rows of Table 2. The performance of the different features diverges mostly for English and Norwegian-1, where SYNT is the best approach, as well as for Norwegian-2 and Russian, where MORPH works best. Combining morphological and syntactic features helps creating better rankings for German, Latin, and Swedish.

Contextualised Embeddings The correlation scores of average pairwise distance (APD) and prototype distance (PRT) differ substantially for all datasets, with the exception of Norwegian-1 (see rows 4-7 of Table 2). APD outperforms PRT on English, Swedish, Norwegian, and Russian; PRT is better on German and Latin. Combining the two metrics in an ensemble (APD-PRT) marginally improves correlation scores for Norwegian-1 and Russian-1. Clustering contextualised embeddings (JSD) yields unstable results across datasets; it is the best contextualised method only for German.

Ensembles Whenever grammatical profiles produce better rankings than XLM-R, i.e., for German, Latin, Swedish, and Norwegian-2, combining the predictions of the two methods yields higher correlation scores than either method in isolation. The most effective contextualised method in combination with grammatical profiles is PRT, regardless of the profile type. The PRT-MORPHSYNT combination produces the overall best ranking for German and Latin, two languages with rich syntax and morphology. Which type of grammatical profile is the most complementary to XLM-R varies across

²<https://pypi.org/project/ruptures/>

datasets and it mostly corresponds to the profile type that obtains the best performance in isolation. Ensembles with JSD are outperformed by other methods, so we do not report them in Tables 2 and 3.

Static embeddings, despite their good performance in isolation, do not combine well with grammatical profiles: this type of ensemble improves correlation scores only for Latin (Table 4). As a final note, ensembles of grammatical profiles and XLM-R achieve the new best performance on the Latin ranking task of SemEval 2020 (PRT-MORPHSYNT), and establish a new SOTA for the recently released Norwegian-2 dataset (APD-MORPH).

4.2 Classification Task

Although our binary predictions for the classification task are dependent on the rankings discussed in the previous section, the overall trends of classification accuracy partly differ from the correlation trends of the ranking task. The classification results are shown in Table 3. Compared to the ranking task, ensemble methods more often produce a performance improvement with respect to grammatical profiles and contextualised embeddings used in isolation. They do so for English, German, Latin, and both Norwegian datasets. It is also more often the case that the best standalone profile and contextualised approach yield the best ensemble when combined. Another notable difference is that, when used in isolation, profiles outperform XLM-R; the opposite is true in the ranking task.

Following the structure of Section 4.1, we first present the results of each approach individually and then we report the performance of ensembles.

Grammatical Profiles At least one of the three profile types is substantially above chance performance for each language; as in the ranking task, different profile types fit different datasets. Nevertheless, SYNT is the best profile type for 4 out of 7 datasets: German, Swedish, Norwegian-1, and Italian. For the first two, it achieves the best overall scores (see Table 3). Combining morphology and syntax helps only in the case of Latin, where profiles obtain the best overall accuracy.

Contextualised Embeddings The accuracy of APD and PRT is relatively similar across test sets, with the exception of Italian, where APD has the best overall accuracy and PRT is slightly below

chance. Combining APD and PRT improves results for English, German, and Norwegian. The accuracy of clustering-based JSD is either close to or below chance level for all languages.

Ensembles Ensembles of grammatical profiles and contextualised embeddings are the best performing method for Norwegian. For German and Latin they are on par with pure profiles, and for English on par with pure XLM-R. The complementarity of different profile types and contextualised metrics varies across datasets yet it is overall stronger than that between profiles and static embeddings (combining the latter two improves performance only for Latin and for Norwegian-2, see Appendix B). A more fine-grained analysis of the classification results of the ensembles reveals that 1) ensemble predictions are virtually always correct when the two standalone predictions also are, 2) ensembling tends to have positive effects on precision with respect to both standalone methods, and 3) it tends to improve the precision of contextualised methods.

4.3 Why ensembles fail

Tables 2 and 3 show that grammatical profiles are consistently worse than XLM-R on all Russian datasets, Norwegian-1 and English. This naturally extends to their ensembles, so for all these datasets, contextualised embeddings in isolation are the best approach. The explanation may seem simple for English: its poor morphology does not provide enough signal for semantic change detection. Yet this does not hold for Russian (a synthetic language with rich morphology) and, arguably, for Norwegian. Moreover, ensembles with morphology-based grammatical profiles outperform pure XLM-R on Norwegian-2, but not on Norwegian-1. Thus, the explanation is likely not language-specific.

We believe that the different nature of the diachronic corpora can be a better explaining factor. SemEval-2020 datasets feature time periods separated by at least several decades, and the same is true for Norwegian-2 (more than 20 years gap). In contrast, the gaps are much shorter for Norwegian-1 (5 years gap), Russian-1 and Russian-2 (2 years gap). We observe that when two time periods with a very short gap between them are compared, the distributions of morphosyntactic features largely overlap, negatively affecting the performance of grammatical profiles. In these cases, LM-based methods can still detect semantic change as they

Method	EN	DE	LA	SW	NO-1	NO-2	RU-1	RU-2	RU-3	AVG
PROFILES										
MORPH	0.218	0.120	0.519	0.303	0.106	<i>0.409</i>	0.028	<i>0.241</i>	<i>0.293</i>	<i>0.248</i>
SYNT	<i>0.331</i>	0.146	0.265	0.184	<i>0.179</i>	0.006	<i>0.056</i>	0.111	0.279	0.173
MORPHSYNT	0.320	<i>0.298</i>	<i>0.525</i>	<i>0.334</i>	0.064	0.265	0.000	0.149	0.242	0.244
CONTEXTUALISED (XLM-R)										
APD	0.514	0.073	0.162	<i>0.310</i>	0.389	<i>0.387</i>	0.372	0.480	0.457	<i>0.349</i>
PRT	0.320	0.210	<i>0.394</i>	0.212	0.378	0.270	0.294	0.313	0.313	0.300
APD-PRT	0.457	0.202	0.370	0.220	0.394	0.325	0.376	0.374	0.384	0.345
Clustering/JSD	0.127	<i>0.287</i>	0.318	-0.108	0.160	-0.137	0.247	0.267	0.362	0.169
ENSEMBLES										
APD-MORPH	0.262	0.140	0.506	0.350	0.151	0.503	0.062	0.288	0.340	0.289
APD-SYNT	0.384	0.159	0.264	0.255	0.262	0.119	<i>0.093</i>	0.181	<i>0.354</i>	0.230
APD-MORPHSYNT	<i>0.390</i>	<i>0.290</i>	<i>0.513</i>	0.397	0.180	0.364	0.036	0.216	0.299	<i>0.298</i>
PRT-MORPH	0.278	0.204	0.528	0.305	0.236	<i>0.478</i>	0.112	<i>0.309</i>	0.336	0.309
PRT-SYNT	0.448	0.213	0.401	0.280	<i>0.351</i>	0.146	<i>0.186</i>	0.246	<i>0.351</i>	0.291
PRT-MORPHSYNT	<i>0.451</i>	0.354	0.572	<i>0.356</i>	0.273	0.360	0.117	0.269	0.326	<i>0.342</i>
APD-PRT-MORPH	0.277	0.188	0.518	0.338	0.189	<i>0.497</i>	0.092	<i>0.310</i>	0.340	0.305
APD-PRT-SYNT	0.405	0.189	0.376	0.295	<i>0.330</i>	0.121	<i>0.147</i>	0.235	<i>0.367</i>	0.274
APD-PRT-MORPHSYNT	<i>0.418</i>	<i>0.337</i>	<i>0.554</i>	<i>0.377</i>	0.236	0.359	0.092	0.255	0.328	<i>0.328</i>

Table 2: Spearman rank-correlation scores in the ranking task (‘Task 2’). **Bold** indicates the best method overall (for each language); *italic* indicates the best results for a group of methods.

Method	EN	DE	LA	SW	NO-1	NO-2	IT	AVG
PROFILES								
MORPH	<i>0.622</i>	0.479	0.625	0.581	0.486	<i>0.703</i>	0.500	0.571
SYNT	0.514	0.625	0.514	0.677	<i>0.622</i>	0.514	<i>0.611</i>	<i>0.582</i>
MORPHSYNT	0.541	0.521	0.675	0.581	0.486	0.432	0.444	0.526
CONTEXTUALISED (XLM-R)								
APD	0.568	0.500	0.500	<i>0.613</i>	0.486	<i>0.595</i>	0.667	<i>0.561</i>
PRT	0.595	0.500	<i>0.550</i>	0.548	0.541	0.541	0.444	0.531
APD-PRT	0.676	<i>0.542</i>	<i>0.550</i>	<i>0.613</i>	<i>0.568</i>	0.459	0.500	0.558
Clustering/JSD	0.459	0.521	0.500	0.516	0.541	0.486	0.389	0.487
ENSEMBLES								
APD-MORPH	<i>0.622</i>	0.500	0.575	<i>0.613</i>	0.541	0.730	0.500	0.583
APD-SYNT	0.568	0.479	0.550	0.581	<i>0.622</i>	0.622	<i>0.611</i>	<i>0.576</i>
APD-MORPHSYNT	<i>0.622</i>	0.625	<i>0.600</i>	<i>0.613</i>	0.514	0.703	<i>0.611</i>	0.613
PRT-MORPH	0.676	0.458	0.525	0.581	0.541	0.486	<i>0.500</i>	0.538
PRT-SYNT	0.541	<i>0.521</i>	<i>0.575</i>	<i>0.613</i>	0.703	<i>0.568</i>	<i>0.500</i>	<i>0.574</i>
PRT-MORPHSYNT	0.541	0.479	0.525	0.581	0.676	0.486	0.444	0.533
APD-PRT-MORPH	<i>0.649</i>	0.458	<i>0.650</i>	<i>0.581</i>	0.541	<i>0.676</i>	<i>0.611</i>	<i>0.595</i>
APD-PRT-SYNT	0.514	<i>0.542</i>	0.550	0.548	<i>0.676</i>	0.595	0.500	0.561
PRT-MORPHSYNT	0.541	0.479	0.525	<i>0.581</i>	<i>0.676</i>	0.486	0.444	0.533

Table 3: Binary accuracy scores in the classification task (‘Task 1’). **Bold** indicates the best method overall (for each language); *italic* indicates the best results for a group of methods.

have access to lexical information: changes at the referential and topical level can happen much faster (consider, e.g., the words ‘computer’ or ‘mouse’ in English). On the other hand, when the gap between time periods is more substantial, changes in morphological and syntactic behavior of words also emerge. In these cases grammatical profiles help detect semantic shifts which LMs overlook. It is possible that adding the length of the time gap as a feature in our ensemble systems can make them less sensitive to the nature of the datasets .

Exceptions to this pattern are Latin (no gap between the time periods, but great performance of grammatical profiles) and Russian-3 (80 years gap, but profiles still lag behind XLM-R). For Latin, its extremely rich morphology can compensate for the small gap between time periods. Moreover, the second time period spans two millennia, making the short gap less problematic. Rich morphology does not help surpass XLM-R for Russian-3, but profiles do work much better for this dataset than for Russian-1 and Russian-2, where the gaps are only two years long.

5 Analysis

In this section, we analyse the predictions of all methods beyond task performance. We quantitatively evaluate their complementarity (Section 5.1), and investigate whether and how predictions made with grammatical profiles improve the performance of embedding-based metrics (Section 5.2).

5.1 Correlations between methods

To investigate whether various methods use different types of linguistic information, we compute Spearman rank-correlations between the predictions of standalone methods. The correlations, averaged over all datasets, are presented in Figure 2 (we show averaged correlations since they are highly consistent across corpora). We include the correlations of static embeddings as well (SGNS-raw and SGNS-lemma). More details about their implementations and performance can be found in Appendix B.

The two methods with the highest correlation are SGNS-raw and SGNS-lemma. This is expected, as the two methods differ only in the lemmatisation of target words. Profile-based methods (MORPH and SYNT) do not correlate with each other. Slight significant correlations are only observed for Russian-2 (0.32) and Russian-3 (0.45). Interestingly, for




Figure 2: Averaged Spearman correlations between model predictions.

Russian, SYNT significantly correlates with static embeddings: the correlation with SGNS-raw is 0.48 for Russian-1, 0.52 for Russian-2 and 0.49 for Russian-3. Significant correlations between MORPH and static embeddings are observed for Latin (0.46) and Russian-3 (0.38).

Contextualised methods correlate weakly with grammatical profiles. Although we once again observe exceptional behaviour for the Russian datasets, the correlation between profiles and contextualized embeddings is on average weaker than between profiles and static embeddings, which might explain why combining contextualized embeddings with profiles yields notable performance improvements.

5.2 Qualitative analysis

In this section, we inspect the error patterns of our methods to find out when grammatical profiles help correct the predictions of embedding-based metrics. We frame this analysis in terms of *false positives* and *false negatives*. The definition of false positives and negatives is straightforward in the classification task. For the ranking task, we look at the signed distance between gold and predicted rankings of each word, considering a word as a false positive when the positive distance is in the highest 20% bin of the distance distribution (i.e., when the predicted rank is much higher than the true rank), and as a false negative if the negative distance is in the lowest 20% bin (i.e., when the predicted rank is much lower than the true rank). For each language, we focus on the best grammatical profile, the best contextualised method, and the best ensemble of these two.

In the English ranking task, we observe that four of APD’s five false positives are corrected by the ensemble: for example, the ranking of *tree* improves by 20 positions, that of *part* by 19, and that of *bag* by 17. As a result, *tree* and *bag* are only 1 position away from their respective gold ranks. For both words, the distribution of morphological features hardly vary between time period (e.g., 43.73% of the usages of *tree* are singular, 56.27% plural in the first time period; and in the second time period the percentages become 43.67% and 56.33%). Syntactic features vary only slightly; the most drastic change among these three words is the increase of direct object usages of *bag* from 33.16% to 41.40%, with all the other features remaining relatively stable—overall, a negligible change. Among APD’s five false negatives, four are corrected in the best ensemble (PRT-MORPHSYNT): the strongest ranking improvements concern *graft* and *plane*, whose rankings improve respectively by 18 and 15 positions. The syntactic profiles of these words vary substantially across time periods, with multiple syntactic categories increasing or decreasing their frequency of usage (e.g., usages of *plane* in subject and object position increase from 12.85% to 24.13% and from 13.25% to 19.67% respectively; while usages as a noun modifier decrease from 35.34% to 20.36%). The two targets that do not benefit from the ensemble are *gas* and *risk*: both are false negatives for the best grammatical profile (SYNT) and they remain for the ensemble.

In the Norwegian ranking task, the best ensemble (APD-MORPH) helps pure APD mostly by fixing extreme false positives and false negatives. As an example of a fixed false positive, APD ranked *test* (‘TEST’) very high, although in fact it did not experience any semantic change at all (change score of 0). APD-MORPH decreased the change score assigned to *test* from 0.216 down to 0.013, returning it to its proper place at the bottom of the ranking. On the other hand, *stryk* changed its dominant meaning sharply in the 21st century from ‘RIVER RAPIDS’ to ‘FAILURE’, but APD failed to capture it. APD-MORPH fixed this false negative by moving *stryk* significantly upwards in the ranking, only 8 position away from its gold rank.

In the Latin predicted rankings, it is somewhat likely for a word to be a false positive — e.g., *itero* (‘TO REPEAT’), *jus* (a ‘RIGHT’, the ‘LAW’) *ancilla* (‘HANDMAID’) — or a false negative — *virtus* (‘STRENGTH’; ‘COURAGE’; ‘MANLINESS’),

humanitas (‘HUMAN NATURE’; ‘KINDNESS’; ‘CIVILISATION’), *pontifex* (‘BISHOP’; but also, the ‘POPE’) — for both contextualised embeddings (PRT) and profiles (MORPHSYNT). As in the case of English, the ranking of these words does not improve with ensembling (PRT-MORPHSYNT). Overall, 7 out of 10 false negatives and 2 out of 7 false positives are corrected by the ensemble.

For German, too, ensembling (PRT-MORPHSYNT) is most effective for false negatives, 5 out of 8 are corrected. The words with the greatest improvements are *abdecken* (‘TO UNCOVER’; but also, in financial jargon, ‘TO COVER’, as in *Risiko abdecken*, *to cover a risk*), gaining 16 positions, and *Eintagsfliege* (‘MAYFLY’, the insect; but also, metaphorically, ‘FLEETING STAR’) gaining 17 positions and thereby obtaining the exact gold rank. Nevertheless, out of 8 false positives, 4 are corrected; with, e.g., *aufrechterhalten* (‘TO SUSTAIN’) losing 31 rankings and *Festspiel* (‘FESTIVAL’) losing 18. As we observed for English and Latin, some words are simply difficult to rank for both methods (here, JSD and PRT-MORPHSYNT): for example, the degree of semantic change of *Truppenteil* (‘TROOP UNIT’) and *Lyzeum* (‘LYCEUM’) is overestimated whereas the change of *packen* (‘TO PACK’; *to seize*) and *vorliegen* (‘TO BE AVAILABLE’; ‘TO BE EXISTENT’); is underestimated.

For Italian, we analyse the classification task. Among APD’s 4 false positives, 2 are corrected in the ensemble’s ranking (APD-SYNT), *processare* (‘PROCESS’; ‘TAKE TO TRIAL’) and *unico* (‘UNIQUE’); two nouns, *brama* (‘YEARNING’) and *cappuccio* (‘HOOD’), remain misclassified. APD’s false negatives are *pilotato* (‘DRIVEN’; but also, metaphorically, ‘PREMEDITATED’) and *rampante* (‘UNBRIDLED’; metaphorically, ‘EXUBERANT’); *pilotato* is correctly classified by the ensemble while *rampante* remains undetected by all methods. Overall, the contribution of SYNT is not always helpful: it also leads to one changing word being labelled as stable, and three stable words being classified as changing.

6 Conclusion

We showed that providing large pre-trained language models with explicit morphosyntactic information can in many cases help detect and quantify

lexical semantic change. Such ‘ensemble’ predictions are produced in a very straightforward way—i.e., by computing the geometric mean between semantic change scores predicted by grammatical profiles and by language models (via their contextualized embeddings). In the majority of the datasets under analysis (treating the three Russian datasets as one), the ensemble predictions outperformed single grammatical profiles or contextualised embeddings in the task of ranking words by the degree of their semantic change. The datasets where this was not true are characterized by specific properties: either languages with poor morphology or long time spans separated by narrow gaps.

We believe this means that although Transformer-based language models (like XLM-R, which we used here) are able to track morphological and syntactic properties to some extent (Warstadt et al., 2020), their encoding of grammatical features is only approximate and can therefore be improved by explicit linguistic preprocessing (morphological tagging and syntactic parsing). At any rate, we showed that this is true for the semantic change detection task, when a model has to take into account diachronic changes in morphosyntactic properties of words. The signal provided by these changes is complementary to the changes in typical lexical contexts more easily captured by distributional language models. Thus, it is still too early to fire the linguist, even if the ‘linguist’ is in fact an automated tagger.

As has already been said, an important limitation of grammatical profiles is their low performance when measuring semantic change across long time periods separated by very narrow gaps. This makes sense from a linguistic point of view: grammar changes slowly and gradually, sharp bursts are rare. In contrast, lexical contexts can change very quickly: for example, due to social and political events or technical progress, which is why language models excel with these datasets. The main practical take-away is therefore that diachronic grammatical profiles should be used in combination with language models especially when the gap between the compared time periods is large enough for significant grammatical changes to occur.

In the future, we plan to experiment with more sophisticated ensembling methods that go beyond simple averaging (including the usage of the information about gaps between time spans), and to perform a deeper analysis of ensemble predictions,

especially in relation to distinct word senses. Finally, we also plan to evaluate ensembles formed with monolingual language models, instead of the multilingual XLM-R, as they have the potential to better capture the idiosyncrasies of specific languages.

Acknowledgements

This work has been partly supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant 819455 (DREAM) and by Academy of Finland under grant numbers 333716 and 333717 (RiCEP). Our experiments were run on resources provided by UNINETT Sigma2 - the National Infrastructure for High Performance Computing and Data Storage in Norway.

References

- Nikolay Arefyev, Daniil Homskiy, Maksim Fedoseev, Adis Davletov, Vitaly Protasov, and Alexander Panchenko. 2021. Deepmistake: Which senses are hard to distinguish for a wordincontext model. *Computational linguistics and intellectual technologies: Papers from the annual conference Dialogue*.
- Nikolay Arefyev and Vasily Zhikov. 2020. **BOS at SemEval-2020 task 1: Word sense induction via lexical substitution for lexical semantic change detection**. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 171–179, Barcelona (online). International Committee for Computational Linguistics.
- Hosein Azarbondy, Mostafa Dehghani, Kaspar Beelen, Alexandra Arkut, Maarten Marx, and Jaap Kamps. 2017. Words are malleable: Computing semantic shifts in political and media discourse. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 1509–1518.
- Pierpaolo Basile, Annalina Caputo, Tommaso Caselli, Pierluigi Cassotti, and Rossella Varvara. 2020. DIACR-Ita @ EVALITA2020: Overview of the EVALITA2020 Diachronic Lexical Semantics (DIACR-Ita) Task. *Proceedings of the Seventh Evaluation Campaign of Natural Language Processing and Speech Tools for Italian. Final Workshop (EVALITA 2020) CEUR Workshop Proceedings (CEUR-WS.org)*.
- 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.
- Marco Del Tredici, Raquel Fernández, and Gemma Boleda. 2019. [Short-term meaning shift: A distributional exploration](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2069–2075, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Katrin Erk and Sebastian Padó. 2008. [A structured vector space model for word meaning in context](#). In *Proceedings of the 2008 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 897–906, Honolulu, Hawaii. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Brendan Frey and Delbert Dueck. 2007. Clustering by passing messages between data points. *Science*, 315(5814):972–976.
- Nikhil Garg, Londa Schiebinger, Dan Jurafsky, and James Zou. 2018. Word embeddings quantify 100 years of gender and ethnic stereotypes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(16):E3635–E3644.
- Mario Giulianelli, Marco Del Tredici, and Raquel Fernández. 2020. [Analysing lexical semantic change with contextualised word representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3960–3973, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mario Giulianelli, Andrey Kutuzov, and Lidia Pivovaro. 2021. [Grammatical profiling for semantic change detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 25th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 423–434, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rahul Goel, Sandeep Soni, Naman Goyal, John Parrizos, Hanna Wallach, Fernando Diaz, and Jacob Eisenstein. 2016. The social dynamics of language change in online networks. In *International Conference on Social Informatics*, pages 41–57. Springer.
- Stefan Th Gries and Dagmar Divjak. 2009. Behavioral profiles: a corpus-based approach to cognitive semantic analysis. *New directions in cognitive linguistics*, 57:75.
- William L. Hamilton, Jure Leskovec, and Dan Jurafsky. 2016. [Diachronic word embeddings reveal statistical laws of semantic change](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1489–1501, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Laura A Janda and Olga Lyashevskaya. 2011. Grammatical profiles and the interaction of the lexicon with aspect, tense, and mood in Russian. *Cognitive linguistics*, 22(4):719–763.
- Austin C Kozlowski, Matt Taddy, and James A Evans. 2019. The geometry of culture: Analyzing the meanings of class through word embeddings. *American Sociological Review*, 84(5):905–949.
- Andrey Kutuzov and Mario Giulianelli. 2020. [UiO-UvA at SemEval-2020 task 1: Contextualised embeddings for lexical semantic change detection](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 126–134, Barcelona (online). International Committee for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrey Kutuzov and Lidia Pivovaro. 2021. RuShiftEval: a shared task on semantic shift detection for Russian. *Computational linguistics and intellectual technologies: Papers from the annual conference Dialogue*.
- Andrey Kutuzov, Samia Touileb, Petter Mæhlum, Tita Ranveig Enstad, and Alexandra Wittemann. 2022. NorDiaChange: Diachronic semantic change dataset for Norwegian. In *Proceedings of the 13th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC)*. European Language Resources Association.
- Angeliki Lazaridou, Adhi Kuncoro, Elena Gribovskaya, Devang Agrawal, Adam Liska, Tayfun Terzi, Mai Gimenez, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Tomas Kocisky, Sebastian Ruder, et al. 2021. Mind the gap: Assessing temporal generalization in neural language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34.
- Jianhua Lin. 1991. Divergence measures based on the Shannon entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information theory*, 37(1):145–151.
- Matej Martinc, Petra Kralj Novak, and Senja Pollak. 2020a. [Leveraging contextual embeddings for detecting diachronic semantic shift](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 4811–4819, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Matej Martinc, Syrielle Montariol, Elaine Zosa, and Lidia Pivovaro. 2020b. Capturing evolution in word usage: Just add more clusters? In *Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2020*, pages 343–349.
- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 26.
- Syrielle Montariol, Matej Martinc, and Lidia Pivovaro. 2021. [Scalable and interpretable semantic change detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4642–4652, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Bill Noble, Asad Sayeed, Raquel Fernández, and Staffan Larsson. 2021. [Semantic shift in social networks](#). In *Proceedings of *SEM 2021: The Tenth Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, pages 26–37, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mohammad Taher Pilehvar and Nigel Collier. 2016. [De-conflated semantic representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1680–1690, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dominik Schlechtweg, Anna Hättö, Marco Del Tredici, and Sabine Schulte im Walde. 2019. [A wind of change: Detecting and evaluating lexical semantic change across times and domains](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 732–746, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dominik Schlechtweg, Barbara McGillivray, Simon Hengchen, Haim Dubossarsky, and Nina Tahmasebi. 2020. [SemEval-2020 task 1: Unsupervised lexical semantic change detection](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 1–23, Barcelona (online). International Committee for Computational Linguistics.
- Dominik Schlechtweg, Sabine Schulte im Walde, and Stefanie Eckmann. 2018. [Diachronic usage relatedness \(DUREL\): A framework for the annotation of lexical semantic change](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 169–174, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hinrich Schütze. 1998. [Automatic word sense discrimination](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 24(1):97–123.
- Milan Straka and Jana Straková. 2017. [Tokenizing, POS tagging, lemmatizing and parsing UD 2.0 with UDPipe](#). In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2017 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pages 88–99, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Charles Truong, Laurent Oudre, and Nicolas Vayatis. 2020. Selective review of offline change point detection methods. *Signal Processing*, 167:107299.
- Alex Warstadt, Alicia Parrish, Haokun Liu, Anhad Mohananey, Wei Peng, Sheng-Fu Wang, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2020. [BLiMP: The benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs for English](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:377–392.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. [Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yang Xu and Charles Kemp. 2015. A computational evaluation of two laws of semantic change. In *CogSci*.

Appendix

A Contextualised embeddings

Given two time periods t_1, t_2 , two corpora C_1, C_2 , and a set of target words, we use a neural language model to obtain *token embeddings* of each occurrence of the target words in C_1 and C_2 and use them to compute a continuous change score. This score indicates the degree of semantic change undergone by a word between t_1 and t_2 . As a language model, we choose XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020), pre-trained multilingual transformer, in the Huggingface implementation (Wolf et al., 2020).

A.1 Target Lemmas and Word Forms

The lists of target words that we rely on contain annotations for lemmas. However, only extracting embeddings for exact matches of the lemmas would result in discarding a large number of word usages, those where the target lemma takes another form (e.g., as a result of grammatical inflection). To take all of a lemma’s possible word forms into account, we parse the corpora using UDPipe (Straka and Strakova, 2017) and collect a set of word forms for each target word from the UDPipe output. Furthermore, because some word forms are not present in the vocabulary of XLM-R, we add them to the vocabulary before fine-tuning.³

A.2 Finetuning the Language Model

As a first step, to adapt the model to the characteristics of the diachronic corpora, we finetune it, separately, on each language-specific corpus. We limit the maximum sequence length of the transformer to 256 and train the model with a batch size of 16 for an amount of epochs dependent on the corpus size: 5 epochs for English and Latin, 3 for German and Swedish, 2 for Russian, Italian and Norwegian.

A.3 Extracting contextualised embeddings

Given a target word w and its sentential context $s = (v_1, \dots, v_i, \dots, v_m)$ with $w = v_i$, we extract the activations of the language model’s hidden layers for sentence position i . We then average over the layers (12 for XLM-R) and obtain a single vectorial

³Even after adding the word forms to the vocabulary, the Huggingface tokenizer still fails to recognise about a dozen of the target word forms and splits them into sub-tokens. For these exceptional cases, we extract the average contextualised embedding over the sub-tokens.

representation (for XLM-R, the vector dimensionality is 768). In our experiments, the maximum context length m is set to 256 and sentences are processed in batches of size 32. The N_w contextualised embeddings collected for w can be represented as the usage matrix $\mathbf{U}_w = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{N_w})$. The time-specific usage matrices $\mathbf{U}_w^1, \mathbf{U}_w^2$ for time periods t_1 and t_2 are used as input to a metric of semantic change.

A.4 Metrics of Semantic Change

As explained in Section 3.3, semantic change scores are computed using three metrics: 1) average pairwise distance or APD (Giulianelli et al., 2020), 2) prototype distance or PRT (Kutuzov and Giulianelli, 2020), and 3) Jensen-Shannon Divergence between embedding cluster distributions or JSD (Martinc et al., 2020b; Giulianelli et al., 2020):

APD Given two usage matrices $\mathbf{U}_w^{t_1}, \mathbf{U}_w^{t_2}$, the degree of change of w is calculated as the average cosine distance between any two embeddings from different time periods:

$$\text{APD}(\mathbf{U}_w^{t_1}, \mathbf{U}_w^{t_2}) = \frac{1}{N_w^{t_1} \cdot N_w^{t_2}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{U}_w^{t_1}, \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbf{U}_w^{t_2}} \cos(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \quad (1)$$

where $N_w^{t_1}$ and $N_w^{t_2}$ are the number of occurrences of w in time periods t_1 and t_2 .

PRT Here, the degree of change of w is measured as the cosine distance between the average token embeddings (‘prototypes’) of all occurrences of w in the two time periods:

$$\text{PRT}(\mathbf{U}_w^{t_1}, \mathbf{U}_w^{t_2}) = 1 - \cos\left(\frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{U}_w^{t_1}} \mathbf{x}_i}{N_w^{t_1}}, \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbf{U}_w^{t_2}} \mathbf{x}_j}{N_w^{t_2}}\right) \quad (2)$$

JSD To compute this measure, we form a single usage matrix $[\mathbf{U}_w^{t_1}; \mathbf{U}_w^{t_2}]$ with occurrences from two corpora. We standardise it and then clustered its entries using Affinity Propagation (Frey and Dueck, 2007), a clustering algorithm which automatically selects a number of clusters for each word.⁴ Finally, we define probability distributions $\mathbf{u}_w^{t_1}, \mathbf{u}_w^{t_2}$ based on the normalised counts of word embeddings in each cluster and compute a the Jensen-Shannon Divergence (Lin, 1991) between the distributions:

$$\text{JSD}(\mathbf{u}_w^{t_1}, \mathbf{u}_w^{t_2}) = \text{H}\left(\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}_w^{t_1} + \mathbf{u}_w^{t_2})\right) - \frac{1}{2}(\text{H}(\mathbf{u}_w^{t_1}) - \text{H}(\mathbf{u}_w^{t_2})) \quad (3)$$

⁴We use the scikit-learn implementation of Affinity Propagation with default hyperparameters.

B Static Embeddings

We follow the common approach proposed by Hamilton et al. (2016), SGNS+OP, to train skip-gram negative sampling embeddings (SGNS; Mikolov et al., 2013) from scratch for each time period of the diachronic corpus, and then to align the separate vector spaces using the Orthogonal Procrustes method (OP). Semantic change is measured as the cosine distance between the embeddings of a target word in the aligned spaces (for more details, see Schlechtweg et al., 2019).

We decided not to lemmatize our corpora for these experiments to preserve as much grammatical information as it is possible but we use two preprocessing strategies for target words. In the first strategy (**SGNS-raw**) we use a raw, unlemmatized, corpus and learn embeddings for target words only in their dictionary form. All other inflected forms of the target words are ignored. In the second strategy (**SGNS-lemma**), we lemmatize target word occurrences (but not other words) and thus use all target word forms to train their embeddings.

In the ranking task, SGNS+OP confirms itself as a very competitive approach, achieving the best correlation scores on German, Swedish, and Russian 3 (see Table 4). Our results show that lemmatizing target word forms, so that they all contribute to the same static embedding, brings substantial performance improvements as well as more stability across test sets.

Our classification results again confirm the strength of static embeddings, which outperform other approaches for German, Norwegian-1, and Italian (for English and Swedish, they perform on par with the profile-contextualised ensembles). Target word form lemmatization is important but less decisive than in the ranking task (see Table 5).

Method	EN	DE	LA	SW	NO-1	NO-2	RU-1	RU-2	RU-3
STATIC									
Raw text (SGNS-raw)	0.378	0.226	0.250	-0.036	0.320	0.181	0.101	0.148	0.255
Target words lemmatized (SGNS-lemma)	0.498	0.369	0.106	0.494	0.238	0.392	0.256	0.292	0.538
ENSEMBLES									
SGNS-raw-MORPH	0.253	0.105	0.436	0.204	0.116	0.368	0.020	0.222	0.275
SGNS-raw-SYNT	0.341	0.159	0.234	0.158	0.250	0.024	0.019	0.113	0.248
SGNS-raw-MORPHSYNT	0.354	0.258	0.454	0.297	0.142	0.218	0.013	0.148	0.229
SGNS-lemma-MORPH	0.255	0.157	0.409	0.386	0.106	0.440	0.057	0.259	0.332
SGNS-lemma-SYNT	0.364	0.173	0.224	0.242	0.212	0.156	0.071	0.129	0.315
SGNS-lemma-MORPHSYNT	0.367	0.269	0.415	0.461	0.128	0.341	0.023	0.163	0.286

Table 4: Spearman correlation scores in the ranking task (‘Task 2’) with type-based static embeddings (SGNS-OP). Bold values are cases when SGNS-OP outperforms all other methods (XLM-R and grammatical profiles).

Method	EN	DE	LA	SW	NO-1	NO-2	IT
Raw (SGNS-raw)	0.514	0.542	0.400	0.548	0.757	0.649	0.722
Target words lemmatized (SGNS-lemma)	0.676	0.646	0.375	0.742	0.676	0.676	0.778
ENSEMBLES							
SGNS-raw-MORPH	0.622	0.562	0.600	0.484	0.486	0.622	0.500
SGNS-raw-SYNT	0.541	0.583	0.550	0.581	0.649	0.486	0.500
SGNS-raw-MORPHSYNT	0.649	0.625	0.500	0.677	0.595	0.486	0.611
SGNS-lemma-MORPH	0.622	0.438	0.625	0.484	0.514	0.703	0.500
SGNS-lemma-SYNT	0.541	0.479	0.525	0.581	0.649	0.568	0.611
SGNS-lemma-MORPHSYNT	0.649	0.604	0.600	0.742	0.514	0.676	0.389

Table 5: Binary accuracy scores in the classification task (‘Task 1’) with type-based static embeddings (SGNS-OP). Bold values are cases when SGNS-OP outperforms all other methods (XLM-R and grammatical profiles).