

OCR of historical printings with an application to building diachronic corpora: A case study using the RIDGES herbal corpus

Uwe Springmann
LMU Munich & Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
uwe.springmann@hu-berlin.de

Anke Lüdeling
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
anke.luedeling@rz.hu-berlin.de

Abstract

This article describes the results of a case study to apply Optical Character Recognition (OCR) to scanned images of books printed between 1487 and 1870 by training the OCR engine OCRopus (Breuel et al. 2013) on the RIDGES herbal text corpus (Odebrecht et al. submitted). The resulting machine-readable text has character accuracies (percentage of correctly recognized characters) from 94% to more than 99% for even the earliest printed books, which were thought to be inaccessible by OCR methods until recently. Training specific OCR models was possible because the necessary “ground truth” has been available as error-corrected diplomatic transcriptions. The OCR results have been evaluated for accuracy against the ground truth of unseen test sets. Furthermore, mixed OCR models trained on a subset of books have been tested for their predictive power on page images of other books in the corpus, mostly yielding character accuracies well above 90%. It therefore seems possible to construct generalized models covering a range of fonts that can be applied to a wide variety of historical printings. A moderate postcorrection effort of some pages will then enable the training of individual models with even better accuracies. Using this method, diachronic corpora including early printings can be constructed much faster and cheaper than by manual transcription. The OCR methods reported here open up the possibility of transforming our printed textual cultural heritage into electronic text by largely automatic means, which is a prerequisite for the mass conversion of scanned books.

1 Introduction

This paper describes an OCR training procedure for converting images of historical printings with character accuracies from 94% to over 99%. The possibility to convert historical printings to electronic text with the same relative ease as more recent printings from the 20th century onward would be highly welcome to all researchers who have to deal with source materials from these periods. By historical printings we here summarily mean all printings ranging from the beginning of modern printing in 1450 to the 19th century, when current OCR engines begin to deliver acceptable results with character accuracies in the high 90% range.¹

Optical Character Recognition (OCR) for modern printed texts using the Latin alphabet works very well and is often considered a solved task. During the OCR process, an image of a printed page is segmented into characters which are then compared to a set of features describing prototypical characters learned previously from a set of frequently used fonts. The similarity of learned and recognized fonts, the clear separation of uniformly black characters and white spotless background, and modern standardized spelling of the printed words all contribute to excellent recognition results.

This is, however, not true for early printings because of non-standard typography, highly variable spelling preventing automatic lexical correction, and physical degradation due to aging and usage (see Figure 1 for two typical examples of pages from the RIDGES² corpus, a diachronic corpus of herbal texts in German). Historical typography alone poses a severe limit for the effectiveness of OCR: All available OCR engines have been extensively trained on modern fonts, but since historical fonts are different and the engines cannot be trained very well by end users they are of only limited value for the OCR of historical printings. Even for relatively late (i.e. 19th century) texts, OCR results (especially for the multitude of highly variable ‘broken’ blackletter typefaces) from commercial OCR engines are often less than satisfactory (Piotrowski 2012; Strange et al. 2014). The more regular Antiqua typefaces (Roman glyph shapes) of historical printings often lead to character accuracies of only around 85% when they are OCRed with ABBYY Finereader³, a leading commercial product (Reddy and Crane 2006; Springmann et al. 2014). Incunabula as the earliest texts printed from 1450 to 1500 have been deemed to be completely unsuitable for OCR methods (Rydberg-Cox 2009)⁴.

The constraint that OCR engines only give good results on a fixed set of pre-trained fonts

¹DFG Practical Guidelines on Digitisation [02/13], p. 29; http://www.dfg.de/formulare/12_151/

²http://korpling.german.hu-berlin.de/ridges/index_en.html. The corpus is freely available under the CC-BY license. It can be downloaded in several formats as well as queried through the ANNIS search tool (Krause and Zeldes 2016). The corpus is still growing. Here we focus only on the first step in corpus compilation. More on meta-data, annotation, and analysis in Odebrecht et al. (submitted).

³<http://https://www.abby.com/finereader/>

⁴<http://digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/3/1/000027/000027.html#p7>




Figure 1: Two example pages (left: Libavius 1603; right: Curioser Botanicus, 1675) illustrating barriers to OCR: text mixed with images, historical fonts, bleed-through from back page (left), bad contrast (right).

can be lifted by the fully trainable open-source OCR engines Tesseract⁵ and OCRopus.⁶ There are two ways of training, namely training on synthetic data (images generated from existing electronic text and available computer fonts), or training on real data (scans and their transcriptions). The first method obviates the need to generate ‘ground truth’ data by diplomatic transcriptions which are needed to establish the link from glyph shapes to characters during the training process, and one also does not need to preprocess real images. As the complete training process can be automated, this training method is the preferred one whenever it is applicable. However, the multitude of historical fonts is not matched by existing computer fonts, and the irregularities of word spacing in real printings lead to inferior recognition results compared to training on real data (Springmann et al. 2014). OCR training for historical printings therefore has to rely on the training process using real data, which means that diplomatic transcriptions of printed images become a key resource. However, diplomatically transcribed historical corpora which could serve as training data for historical fonts are not yet available in sufficient quantity. One problem is variability: Earlier typographies are more variable than modern ones because typecutting had not yet become a profession of its own, and early printers had to cut their own fonts leading to a large variety of historical fonts. It is therefore problematic to learn the associations between printed glyphs and characters from one printing and apply them to the next printing.

The problem for applying OCR methods to historical printings is thus twofold: First one has to produce some ground truth in the form of a diplomatic transcription of some pages of a single book in order to train an individual model for this book, which usually requires linguistic knowledge. Second, even if this model works well for this book it has been trained on, it does not normally produce good OCR results for other books, even if their fonts look similar to the human eye. We need to overcome this *typography barrier* in order to use OCR methods effectively in the building of a diachronic electronic text corpus.

In the following we will describe our experiments addressing both problems: First we describe our procedure for training individual models with the open-source OCR engine OCRopus (Breuel et al. 2013) yielding excellent results with accuracies from 94% to over 99% for even the oldest printed texts using readily available scans from library digitization programs and the transcriptions from the RIDGES corpus. Then we explore the viability of training generalized models by splitting our training pool into two parts, training a mixed model on one part and applying it to the images of the other part.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: The current state of the art in historical OCR is related in Section 2. As we will illustrate and evaluate our method on the RIDGES corpus we will briefly describe it in the following section. Section 4 details our procedure for training individual models for a subset of 20 books printed in broken (black-

⁵<https://github.com/tesseract-ocr/tesseract>

⁶<https://github.com/tmbdev/ocropy>

letter) typefaces, which were used extensively in German printing until well into the 20th century. In Section 5 we present the training results and discuss the need for building generalized models. Section 6 reports on our experiments to construct mixed models and their performance on unseen books. In Section 7 we discuss the significance of our results for the building of historical corpora and Section 8 concludes with a summary.

2 Related work

Work on historical OCR by other groups has mostly focused on Tesseract which is trainable on artificial images generated from computer fonts. Training on real data, however, has proved to be difficult, and lead to efforts to reconstruct the original font from cut-out glyphs. This has been done by both the Digital Libraries Team of the Poznań Supercomputing and Networking Center (Dudczak, Nowak, and Parkoła 2014) with their cutouts application⁷ (proprietary) and EMOP’s Franken+ tool⁸ (open-source). The latter group has reported⁹ on reaching about 86% accuracy on the ECCO document collection¹⁰ and 68% on the EEBO collection.¹¹ Their OCR results suffer badly from scans of binarized microfilm images containing a lot of noise.

The Kallimachos project¹² at Würzburg University did have success with Franken+ to reach accuracies over 90% for an incunable printing (Kirchner et al. 2016), but this method again relies on creating diplomatic transcriptions from scratch for each individual font. Ul-Hasan, Bukhari, and Dengel (2016) proposed a method to circumvent ground truth production by first training Tesseract on a historically reconstructed font. They then applied the resulting model to the complete book and used the recognized text as pseudo-ground truth to train OCRopus. The newly recognized text was again used as pseudo-ground truth for another round of OCRopus training, and after a few iterations they also achieved accuracies above 95%, but their method shifts the effort to the manual (re)construction of the printing font.

A completely different approach was taken with the new Ocular OCR engine by Berg-Kirkpatrick, Durrett, and Klein (2013), Berg-Kirkpatrick and Klein (2014) which is able to convert printed to electronic text in a completely unsupervised manner (i.e., no ground truth is needed) employing a language, typesetting, inking, and noise model. This may be a viable alternative for training individual models with low manual effort, but it seems to be very resource-intensive and slow (transcribing 30 lines of text in 2.4 min according

⁷<https://confluence.man.poznan.pl/community/display/WLT/Cutouts+application>

⁸<http://emop.tamu.edu/outcomes/Franken-Plus>

⁹<http://emop.tamu.edu/final-report>

¹⁰Eighteenth Century Collections Online, <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/ecco/>

¹¹Early English Books Online, <http://www.textcreationpartnership.org/tcp-eebo/>

¹²<http://kallimachos.de>

to Berg-Kirkpatrick and Klein 2014). Its results are better than (untrained) Tesseract and ABBYY, but it remains to be shown that they consistently reach accuracies higher than 90%.

In summary, while there are other approaches to train individual OCR models for the recognition of historical documents, none have so far reported results as good as OCRopus when trained on real data (consistently over 94% accuracy), nor has it been shown that one could construct generalized models applicable to a variety of books with reasonable results (above 90% accuracy).

3 Diachronic Corpora and RIDGES

Our method is evaluated using a *diachronic* corpus because diachronic corpora are a good case for the training and application of our OCR models. Many historical corpora are basically synchronic, covering a given linguistic period.¹³ In addition to these synchronic corpora, there is a small number of diachronic corpora built *specifically* to do research on change phenomena. Over and above the variation that comes through different dialects, traditions, text types, etc. which is present in any corpus, there is the variation that is caused by linguistic and extralinguistic change. The construction of diachronic corpora is subject to all the problems and decisions faced in the construction of synchronic historical corpora, such as corpus design decisions in a situation where many text types or dialects are simply not available, issues of choosing the ‘original’ (e.g. manuscript/print or edition), questions of tokenization, normalization, or annotation, etc. (see Rissanen 1989, Lüdeling, Poschenrieder, and Faulstich (2004), Rissanen (2008), Archer et al. (2015), Gippert and Gehrke (2015) among many others). Linguistic changes that make the construction of diachronic corpora more difficult are, among many others, changes in spelling, changes in word formation, or changes in syntax such as changes in word order.

Extralinguistic changes that might prove problematic include the change of medium (manuscript, print), but also changes within a medium such as different scripts, changing conventions with respect to layout, abbreviations, inclusion of information and images, the development of technical equipment (i.e. the printing press) or paper quality (Eisenstein 1979; Weel 2011) as well as the development of science with its methods and conventions, the foundation of universities and the addition of new fields (W. P. Klein 1999).

Most existing high-quality historical (synchronic and diachronic) corpora are transcribed, collated, and corrected manually, sometimes by (offshore) double-keying methods. If

¹³Basically, even the so-called ‘synchronic’ corpora for older language stages are often diachronic, covering a long period in time; examples are the reference corpora in the DeutschDiachronDigital project, such as the Referenzkorpus Altdeutsch (<http://www.deutschdiachrondigital.de/home/>) or the Old and Middle English Corpora listed at <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~stuart/english/med/corp.htm>

OCRed text is available for historical prints at all, the quality is typically too low for linguistic studies (Strange et al. 2014; Piotrowski 2012).

Manual transcription is time-consuming and expensive and it requires well-trained transcribers. It would therefore be very useful for diachronic studies to have high quality OCR.¹⁴ The RIDGES corpus which we use in this article to test our methods is being constructed for research on the development of the scientific register in German (similar corpora are available for English, see e.g. the corpora constructed by the Varieng group in Helsinki¹⁵). It contains herbal texts from between the earliest printing to about 1900. Herbal texts are chosen because they are available throughout the history of German (see e.g. Riecke 2004; Gloning 2007) and are among the earliest ‘scientific’ texts that are available in the vernacular languages in Europe. These texts are often compilations or loose translations or transmissions from Latin herbal compendia (transmitting authoritative texts from famous physicians such as Dioscorides, Galen, Avicenna, or Paracelsus) and can be viewed as predecessors of scientific as well as popular texts about plants and illnesses (Habermann 2003; W. P. Klein 2011).

The current version of RIDGES (5.0) contains excerpts (about 30 pages each) from 33 different books roughly spaced between 1487 and 1914. The originals are very different from each other in appearance. The earliest texts are mostly collections of ‘herbal monographs’, that is descriptions of a given herb with respect to its properties according to the theory of humoral pathology and its medical indications and ways of preparation for treatment. Starting in the 16th century, we increasingly find botanical facts. Later texts show greater variety: some are clearly botanical or medical, others are more in the realm of popular science. Because RIDGES is used for register studies (Biber and Conrad 2009), it is necessary to analyse and annotate many different properties (lexical, morphological, syntactic, structural, etc.) of each text. The corpus is therefore stored in a multilayer architecture; annotation layers can be added at any time (Krause and Zeldes 2016). The texts are transcribed diplomatically, normalized on several layers, and annotated deeply (some of the texts contain as many as 53 annotation layers).

For our present purpose the most important layer is the diplomatic transcription which serves as training material (ground truth) for the OCR engine (see below), and we want to briefly explain the decisions we took to acquire the diplomatic layer. For all the texts in RIDGES, scans are available from libraries (mostly from Bavarian State Library¹⁶) or from

¹⁴While our focus here is on linguistic research questions it is obvious and has been argued many times (see e.g., the DFG Practical Guidelines on Digitisation [02/13], p. 29; http://www.dfg.de/formulare/12_151/) that the better the OCR quality, the more useful the resulting text is for any kind of research. The re-usability of corpora has been an issue in many recent endeavours (cf. Lüdeling and Zeldes (2008), Geyken and Gloning (2015), among many others) but cannot be discussed here.

¹⁵<http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/about/index.html>

¹⁶http://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/index.html?c=digitale_sammlungen&l=en

other sources such as Google Books.¹⁷ Early texts are transcribed manually by students and collated and corrected by other students and researchers; for later texts it is sometimes faster to correct existing OCR results available from library digitization programs or Google Books. The transcription is highly diplomatic - differences between letter forms (like f and s) are preserved as well as abbreviation signs (e.g. *vñ* for modern German *und*, *modoꝝ* for *modorum* with Latin abbreviation *z*), or other special characters. Words broken up at a line break are also broken up in the transcription. Layout information (line breaks, page breaks, etc.) and information about typefaces (Antiqua, broken fonts) and rendering (colours, spaced type, etc.) are provided in the annotation.

4 Training the OCR engine on historical printings

Our training procedure is based on OCRopus with its new recognition algorithm based on recurrent neural nets (RNNs) with long short-term memory (LSTM; Hochreiter and Schmidhuber 1997). LSTM overcomes the problem of earlier neural networks to forget previously learned information and has proven to be very successful in pattern recognition tasks such as handwriting recognition (Graves et al. 2009). Models trained with lots of computer fonts led to excellent recognition results for 19th and 20th century printings of Antiqua and Fraktur (blackletter) typefaces with accuracies above 98.5% (Breuel et al. 2013). As mentioned in the introduction, for earlier printings it is necessary to train on real data. Images of printed lines have to be matched with their corresponding transcriptions (see Figure 2). Unicode code points for unusual historical characters are available due to the efforts of the Medieval Unicode Font Initiative.¹⁸

During training, the OCR engine accesses these images-transcription pairs randomly and learns to associate the inputs (vertical stripes of pixel values) to outputs (characters). Because the line image gets divided into many vertical slices each one pixel wide, there is no need to segment the line further into single glyphs as is usually done by OCR engines. Instead, the engine learns to associate several slices corresponding to single glyphs (including ligatures, digraphs etc. which are not easily segmented from neighboring glyphs) to characters or even character groups automatically (see Figure 3). The cumbersome reconstruction of fonts by cutting out images of the complete glyph repertoire necessary for the training of Tesseract is thus completely avoided.

More detailed explanations of the inner workings of neural net training are given in Breuel et al. (2013), and a detailed tutorial on how to train models from the user perspective is available in Springmann (2015). Special recommendations for training models for incunable printings are given in Springmann and Fink (2016).¹⁹ Springmann, Fink, and Schulz

¹⁷<https://books.google.de/>

¹⁸<http://folk.uib.no/hnooh/mufi/>

¹⁹<http://www.cis.lmu.de/ocrworkshop>

Beyfuß

Beyfuß

Das Erst Capitel

Das Erst Capitel

Ariuofa Ampolata Brita

Ariuofa Ampolata Brita

nica Campanaria Metri

nica Campanaria Metri

caria minor latie Melenoff Zans

caria minor latie + Melenoff Zans

tes Thagetes Leptafelos ¶ Die

tes Thagetes Leptafelos ¶ Die

Figure 2: Pairs of line images and their associated transcriptions needed for training




Figure 3: The training process in action: The neural network is presented with a printed text line together with its transcription (uppermost panel). The pixel coordinates at the x axis correspond to the vertical slices mentioned in the text. Groups of sequential slices corresponding to a glyph are learned automatically and labelled with the corresponding character from the transcription. The two black panels show the network response to the feeding of the line: the vertical axis represents the type case of the printer and enumerates single characters (about 200), while the horizontal axis again is the pixel width of the line. At each horizontal position, the number of the output character is highlighted. The next panel shows the confidence by which the network recognized the glyphs on a scale from 0 to 1. Blue rectangles correspond to characters, green rectangles to inter-word spaces. The last panel gives the prediction error over training history (over 23,000 lines have been seen at this point).

(2016) show that a training set of only 85 randomly selected lines with their transcription often results in a model that is almost as good in its performance as more extensive training sets. In this study we used all the material (i.e. the ca. 30 transcribed pages) for training that was available.

Every 1,000 learning steps (one step consists in seeing one image-transcription pair) an OCR model is saved to disk, and after having seen each pair about 30 times the training process is stopped. The series of models is then evaluated on a test set which has been set aside from the training pool (about 10% of the available lines) and never seen in training. The model with the least error on this test when comparing OCR result and ground truth is then selected as the best one representing the training effort for this book. An example of the resulting OCR text together with the corresponding page image is shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Resulting OCR text from application of a trained model to a previously unseen page (1487 printing, errors marked in red).

5 OCR results from individually trained models

For the training of individual models we have selected the following 20 books²⁰ printed in broken typefaces typical of German historical printings. The printing dates cover a period of almost four centuries, from the incunable printing of *Garten der Gesunthait* in 1487 to *Deutsche Pflanzennamen* from 1870 (cf. Table 1).

Table 1: Books used for training OCR models.

Year	(Short) Title	Author	Label
1487	Garten der Gesunthait	Johannes von Cuba	1487-G

²⁰Sources are given at http://korpling.german.hu-berlin.de/ridges/download_v5.0_en.html.

Year	(Short) Title	Author	Label
1532	Artzney Buchlein der Kreutter	Johannes Tallat	1532-A
1532	Contrafayt Kreüterbuch	Otto Brunfels	1532-C
1543	New Kreüterbuch	Hieronimus Bock	1543-N
1557	Wie sich meniglich	Adam von Bodenstein	1557-W
1588	Paradeißgärtlein	Konrad Rosbach	1588-P
1603	Alchymistische Practic	Andreas Libavius	1603-A
1609	Hortulus Sanitatis	Castore Durante	1609-H
1609	Kräutterbuch	Bartholomäus Carrichter	1609-K
1639	Pflantz-Gart	Daniel Rhagor	1639-P
1652	Wund-Artzney	Guilelmus Fabricius Hildanus	1652-W
1673	Thesaurus Sanitatis	Adrian Nasser	1673-T
1675	Curioser Botanicus	Anonymous	1675-C
1687	Der Schweizerische Botanicus	Timotheus von Roll	1687-D
1722	Flora Saturnizans	Johann Friedrich Henckel	1722-F
1735	Mysterium Sigillorvm	Israel Hiebner	1735-M
1764	Einleitung zu der Kräuterkenntniß	Georg Christian Oeder	1764-E
1774	Unterricht von der allgemeinen Kräuter- und Wurzelrocknung	Johann Georg Eisen	1774-U
1828	Die Eigenschaften aller Heilpflanzen	Anonymous	1828-D
1870	Deutsche Pflanzennamen	Hermann Grassmann	1870-D

The resulting character accuracies for models trained on each book have been measured on unseen test pages and are shown in Figure 5. To get an idea of the variance of the measurement values we also indicated upper and lower limits of a 95% confidence interval calculated from the assumption that OCR recognition can be treated as a Bernoulli experiment with the measured accuracy as the probability for correct recognition. These results have been achieved just by recognizing glyph shapes, without employing any language model, lexicon or postcorrection. This shows that OCR quality does not deteriorate with earlier printing dates but instead depends on the quality of the printings in its currently preserved state and the scans. Lower accuracies point to intrinsic problems on book pages such as manual annotation, speckles, or low resolution (about 150 dpi), especially when downloaded from Google Books. Often a higher resolution of the same book was available from the Bavarian State Library (BSB).²¹

²¹E.g., a retraining on the BSB scan of the same exemplar of Bodenstein's 1557 book increased the

Given good printings in well preserved states, 300 dpi color or grey-scale scans, and an accurate preprocessing of page images into single text lines (see the discussion in Section 7), it is possible to reach character accuracies above 98% in all periods of modern printing. The fact that commercial OCR applications yield increasingly bad results the older the printing just reflects that fact that earlier printings are increasingly different from the fonts the OCR engine has been trained on.




Figure 5: Character accuracies with 95% confidence intervals for models trained on the individual books given in Table 1.

While the above results are very promising, they could only be reached by training an individual model on each book. Using RIDGES, we are in the favorable situation that the necessary ground truth needed for training is available. In general, however, no such transcriptions will be available and this may still prevent the application of OCR to large volumes of scans of historical books in an automatic manner. It is therefore of interest to see whether any existing model generalizes well to unseen books. To test how the individual models perform on the other books of our selection, we applied each model to each book. The resulting accuracies from this experiment are shown in Figure 6. The rows represent the books, whereas columns designate the models.

As expected, the best result for each book is provided by its own model. This is mostly true for the models as well, but in one case (1675-C) the trained model performs better on other books (1764-E and 1774-U, although not as well as these books' models) with a similar font than on its own book. The bad performance of 1675-C is due to the greyscale images lacking in contrast (see Figure 1). More interesting is the question whether individual models give satisfactory results on any other books. Again 1675-C is an exception with accuracies over 90% for books printed between 1609 and 1828. If accuracies above 90% accuracy from 95% to 99%.

are acceptable, models trained on printings from the 17th century seem to be somewhat applicable to printings from the 17th and 18th century, whereas for later and especially earlier printings single models do not generalize well. In the next section, we will therefore explore whether mixed models trained on several books will better generalize to unseen books and offer a way to overcome the typography barrier.

	1487-G	1532-A	1532-C	1543-N	1557-W	1588-P	1603-A	1609-H	1609-K	1639-P	1652-W	1673-T	1675-C	1687-D	1722-F	1735-M	1764-E	1774-U	1828-D	1870-D
1487-G	96.5	77.0	74.7	75.4	79.3	72.4	74.1	68.1	72.6	73.8	71.0	70.4	77.5	64.6	72.6	71.3	66.6	72.2	64.2	54.7
1532-A	84.3	99.1	85.4	85.7	90.5	84.8	90.5	87.2	89.4	83.5	87.2	81.9	90.6	79.7	74.1	84.2	67.9	75.8	70.3	59.2
1532-C	80.0	74.9	98.5	84.5	84.4	72.9	80.9	74.5	67.7	77.8	63.8	67.0	80.7	60.1	67.5	66.3	63.6	67.6	56.2	46.4
1543-N	89.9	88.6	91.0	98.6	91.6	85.2	86.9	85.0	86.1	85.5	80.5	81.5	88.9	74.9	80.0	84.3	73.8	75.7	71.1	60.8
1557-W	90.0	84.8	87.6	84.0	99.2	82.1	83.6	79.8	76.7	84.1	83.4	70.2	89.7	69.1	73.4	78.9	66.9	79.5	76.4	63.8
1588-P	69.2	71.2	66.9	66.8	72.2	96.7	86.6	86.2	85.1	88.4	90.3	84.8	88.6	82.1	76.4	79.1	72.3	74.9	70.0	62.3
1603-A	78.4	81.9	79.7	78.5	78.5	89.0	97.1	95.7	91.4	90.0	83.8	87.9	87.5	84.6	85.7	84.6	76.3	76.6	64.3	63.1
1609-H	67.7	72.8	72.4	69.3	68.8	86.4	93.6	96.9	87.8	84.3	80.0	81.5	82.9	78.2	76.5	76.9	65.3	66.9	59.6	58.9
1609-K	83.1	83.4	81.6	82.6	83.3	93.9	97.0	96.2	98.7	92.7	92.1	90.9	93.3	91.5	84.7	88.2	80.3	82.5	76.7	68.0
1639-P	79.7	80.1	77.7	79.3	82.0	91.8	92.6	91.7	91.0	97.3	94.5	89.3	93.6	86.7	86.2	86.9	81.1	86.5	75.8	70.1
1652-W	71.5	77.1	71.4	61.4	76.7	91.6	89.0	85.8	85.8	92.4	97.6	87.8	92.0	86.8	82.7	84.8	78.8	83.0	72.8	66.1
1673-T	73.0	79.1	70.3	69.0	77.3	88.8	91.8	88.7	90.6	90.3	91.1	99.0	93.5	90.6	87.8	88.2	86.3	83.9	78.3	70.3
1675-C	72.0	72.6	73.3	76.3	75.8	88.5	82.7	85.3	84.9	91.7	89.1	82.4	94.6	80.8	78.7	80.9	76.8	79.4	73.0	66.2
1687-D	74.2	76.7	63.7	64.0	68.1	82.2	89.3	87.0	88.7	87.6	89.5	90.3	94.2	96.3	86.6	84.7	84.5	83.7	77.5	69.2
1722-F	75.8	71.5	70.5	72.2	73.2	81.4	88.5	84.7	84.7	89.3	83.5	87.3	92.2	84.7	97.8	91.6	87.5	86.9	77.0	73.0
1735-M	79.0	80.1	77.8	81.0	82.5	85.1	90.8	86.1	87.6	91.6	87.3	90.1	92.0	86.8	94.7	98.1	90.8	91.5	86.9	85.1
1764-E	82.7	78.2	73.8	70.3	78.2	91.3	88.8	85.7	88.4	93.6	92.5	95.0	97.2	91.1	95.6	95.3	99.6	96.2	93.0	88.4
1774-U	81.6	80.6	79.9	76.3	84.6	92.7	92.6	90.5	90.3	95.8	95.5	93.0	96.5	91.2	94.4	95.5	96.4	99.3	94.3	87.2
1828-D	75.2	77.0	77.3	67.3	78.6	86.1	84.8	82.3	84.7	89.7	89.2	87.6	93.5	83.1	88.0	90.7	93.9	92.4	99.3	93.5
1870-D	71.3	71.6	69.2	65.6	69.9	81.3	80.4	80.1	79.8	84.9	82.3	84.5	87.4	81.3	86.1	84.2	86.6	84.5	88.2	98.4

Figure 6: Cross evaluation of each model (column) to each book (row). Accuracies are color coded in the ranges greater than 95% (green), between 90 and 95% (yellow) and below 90% (grey).

6 Construction of mixed models

We trained two mixed models on a breakdown of our corpus into two parts by choosing every other book as part 1 and the rest as part 2. Each part covers about 400 years of printing history so that we can test whether a mixed model trained from a sample of books over a wide range of printing dates generalizes well to other unseen books dating from the same range, or to a more restricted period.

The result of applying each mixed model to both the books it has been trained on and on the books from the other subset is shown in Figure 7. The accuracies of individual models (first column) are also shown for comparison. As may be expected, mixed models (second column) give a lower accuracy on their constituent books compared to individual models, because with many different glyphs representing a character there is a greater potential for confusion. The most interesting values are those represented by the third column, which show accuracies from a mixed model trained on the other part of the corpus. Again, the

values are mostly lower than both individual models and the mixed model trained on these books. But except for the two earliest printings and in stark contrast to Figure 6, both mixed models now consistently reach over 90% accuracy on books which did not contribute to the training pool. In a few cases (1639-P, 1687-D, 1774-U) the mixed models show comparable performance with the individual models or are even surpassing the individual model (1675-C). In these cases the fonts for these books are similar enough to other books in both parts of the corpus that the training on other books actually helps in recognition. The big exception is the incunable printing of 1487 which is unlike any other book.

The training of mixed models does therefore seem to be a way to overcome the typography barrier and can provide models which generalize well over a wide range of books. The resulting OCR text can at least be taken as a first approximation and better models can be trained from an error corrected version of it. The same conclusion has been reached in a study on twelve Latin books printed from 1471 to 1686 in Antiqua fonts in Springmann, Fink, and Schulz (2016), where also a method is given to construct better individual models with minimal manual effort starting from a mixed model.




Figure 7: Accuracies compared: individual models (blue), a mixed model trained on Part 1 (orange) and a mixed model trained on Part 2 (yellow).

7 Discussion

For the practical purpose of historical corpus construction, it is very encouraging to see that we can train OCR models that work very well for even the oldest printings. However, this success comes at the price of necessary training for each new font. The peculiarities of early typesetting requires that we train on real data and we must therefore manually prepare the ground truth for a couple of pages. The resulting trained model will be applicable to all works printed with the same font, which for early printings means the same font of the same typographer's office which may have been used for a whole series of works. The possibility to train mixed models covering a range of historical fonts and periods is a big

step forward to convert historical printings to electronic text without needing to train an individual model. In the absence of ground truth, one can start with the output of a mixed model and only correct it if needed, so that manual transcription is reduced to a minimum (Springmann, Fink, and Schulz 2016).

We want to stress that the usefulness of OCR results for research purposes not just depends on recognition quality, but also on some related areas such as preprocessing (page segmentation, binarization etc.) and postprocessing (error correction, normalization, annotation) which we will discuss in turn.

Because text recognition happens on single printed lines, we need to segment printed pages into those lines. This is not a trivial task, as many historical printings abound with decorative initials, floral decorations, marginal annotations (printed and manual), and image drawings (see Figure 1). Anything that goes wrong at this preprocessing stage will lead to bad recognition results later. Because the preprocessing routines of the OCR engines are often not able to solve this difficult task in a satisfactory manner there is a need for specific tools which could at least assist a human to semi-automatically segment the page images. Some work in this direction has been done (e.g. Ramel, Sidère, and Rayar 2013), but currently there is no actively developed open-source tool available which could be integrated into an open OCR workflow. For best results and in the absence of such a tool, there is therefore quite a lot of manual segmentation work necessary. Note that this preprocessing step is also needed for generating training material in the form of line images which are to be matched by corresponding transcriptions.

On the postprocessing side, we first have to deal with the accuracy of the OCR result. Whether the uncorrected OCR output is sufficient for research or not depends on the specific research interests of a scholar. 95% character accuracy may be enough for searching within a work or a corpus, especially if the search is spelling tolerant and if the results are simultaneously highlighted in the scan. Getting a high percentage of possible hits (high recall) is more important than getting a low number of false hits (high precision), because false hits can easily be discarded by looking at the scan. Any true hit will provide the researcher with a piece of evidence he is looking for. For other interests a higher accuracy might be needed and error correction will be necessary. The efficiency of correction will be greatly helped by a tool that presents whole series of statistically induced errors which the user can inspect, select and correct in a single step. The more common errors can then be corrected with little effort, boosting accuracy and leaving only rare errors for which one still would need to go over the complete text if needed. Such a postcorrection method enabling batch correction of common errors has been developed at the Center for Information and Language Processing of LMU under the name of PoCoTo (Vobl et al. 2014) and is available under an open-source licence.²² Furthermore, the tool is able to distinguish between historical spellings and real OCR errors and offers only the latter category for cor-

²²<https://github.com/cisocrgroup/PoCoTo>

rection. It can import OCR results from ABBYY Finereader (XML), Tesseract (hOCR), and OCRopus (hOCR) and export the corrected text as pure text, XML, hOCR, or TEI.

But even if we had 100% correct transcriptions from corrected OCR recognition, we would still be hampered by the fact that the resulting text is spelled historically and often strongly deviates from its modern spelling, if the historical word exists in a modern form at all. Sometimes the same word even appears in multiple variant forms in the same text. Searching then becomes problematic as searches are usually done by entering search terms in modern spelling. One needs to make sure that all tokens with their various historical spellings are found. For this reason the RIDGES corpus contains a special annotation layer with a normalized token for each historical token. Normalized layers (which in multi-layer architectures can be provided in addition to the diplomatic layers) allow searches across different spellings (stemming from different authors and times) and can be used as input for automatic tools. Odebrecht et al. (submitted) illustrate this using several test cases. Weiß and Schnelle (2016) sketch how the normalized layer of RIDGES can be used for automatic parsing. The current paper only considers the automatic production of diplomatic text, but for a completely automatic corpus construction one would also need methods for automatic normalization of historical texts. Work in this direction has been done by Pilz et al. (2008), Baron, Rayson, and Archer (2009), Bollmann, Petran, and Dipper (2011) and Jurish (2013).

To summarize, the current main obstacles for the automatic building of historical corpora are the problems of automatic segmentation of page images into text and non-text zones, the recognition of historical fonts, and the postprocessing problems of error correction and the normalization of historical spellings. The better we solve the recognition problem by means of trained historical OCR and mixed models, the more prominent the preprocessing (segmentation) and postprocessing (error correction, normalization) problems will become.

8 Summary and Conclusion

We have shown that the new trainable OCR method based upon LSTM RNNs can provide high character accuracy (from 95% to over 99%) for images of early printings regardless of their age, provided good scans are available. An OCR model trained on the diplomatic transcription of some pages can be used for the recognition of the rest of the book and leads to electronic text whose quality may already be sufficient for many research questions. The availability of generalized models trained on a mixture of fonts would further ease the use of OCR on historical documents, as the output of these mixed models can be taken as a first approximation to a true representation of the text and may be corrected (and better models trained on it) if needed. The models trained on RIDGES have been used to recognize whole books and thus led to an expanded, if somewhat inaccurate, electronic

corpus. Both this corpus (named RIDGES-OCR) and the above mentioned mixed models are available under CC-BY.²³ As more and more diplomatically transcribed texts (either manually transcribed or recognised by OCR methods) become available, their usability as a corpus for research purposes will depend on automatic means to normalize historical spelling (even in the presence of OCR errors) so that searches using modern spelling can find all instances of the search terms in the corpus.²⁴

References

- Archer, Dawn, Merja Kytö, Alistair Baron, and Paul Rayson. 2015. "Guidelines for Normalising Early Modern English Corpora: Decisions and Justifications." *ICAME Journal* 39: 5–24. doi:10.1515/icame-2015-0001.
- Baron, Alistair, Paul Rayson, and Dawn Archer. 2009. "Automatic Standardization of Spelling for Historical Text Mining." University of Maryland.
- Berg-Kirkpatrick, Taylor, and Dan Klein. 2014. "Improved Typesetting Models for Historical OCR." In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 118–23. Baltimore, Maryland: Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P14-2020>.
- Berg-Kirkpatrick, Taylor, Greg Durrett, and Dan Klein. 2013. "Unsupervised Transcription of Historical Documents." In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 207–17. Sofia, Bulgaria: Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P13-1021>.
- Biber, Douglas, and Susan Conrad. 2009. *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bollmann, Marcel, Florian Petran, and Stefanie Dipper. 2011. "Applying Rule-Based Normalization to Different Types of Historical Texts – an Evaluation." In *Human language technology challenges for computer science and linguistics*, 166–77. Springer.

²³https://www.linguistik.hu-berlin.de/en/institut-en/professuren-en/korpuslinguistik/research/ridges-projekt/ocr?set_language=en

²⁴It would be very beneficial if a consortium of libraries would set up a central repository for trained models that would otherwise end up on the hard disks of individual users and not be available for others who would unnecessarily need to train the same model again. Even better, the complete training procedure could be made available via a web interface which allows to transcribe some pages as ground truth, train a model (possibly through several refinement steps as explained above) and at the end provide the user with the recognized text in some marked-up format as well as adding the model and ground truth to the repository. That way both the individual user and the community at large would benefit from an ever-increasing amount of ground truth, corresponding image data and trained models.

- Breuel, Thomas M, Adnan Ul-Hasan, Mayce Ali Al-Azawi, and Faisal Shafait. 2013. "High-Performance OCR for Printed English and Fraktur Using LSTM Networks." In *2th International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR), 2013*, 683–87. IEEE.
- Dudczak, Adam, Aleksandra Nowak, and Tomasz Parkoła. 2014. "Creation of Custom Recognition Profiles for Historical Documents." In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Digital Access to Textual Cultural Heritage*, 143–46. ACM.
- Eisenstein, Elisabeth. 1979. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change and the Structure of Communications Revolutions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Geyken, Alexander, and Thomas Gloning. 2015. "A Living Text Archive of 15th to 19th Century German. Corpus Strategies, Technologies, Organization." In *Historical Corpora*, edited by Jost Gippert and Ralf Gehrke, 165–79. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Gippert, Jost, and Ralf Gehrke, eds. 2015. *Historical Corpora. Challenges and Perspectives*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Gloning, Thomas. 2007. "Deutsche Kräuterbücher des 12. bis 18. Jahrhunderts. Textorganisation, Wortgebrauch, funktionale Syntax." In *Gesund und krank im Mittelalter. Marburger Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der Medizin*, edited by Andreas Meyer and Jürgen Schulz-Grobert, 9–88. Leipzig: Eudora-Verlag.
- Graves, Alex, Marcus Liwicki, Santiago Fernández, Roman Bertolami, Horst Bunke, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2009. "A Novel Connectionist System for Unconstrained Handwriting Recognition." *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 31 (5). IEEE: 855–68.
- Habermann, Mechthild. 2003. "Der Sprachenwechsel und seine Folgen: Zur Wissensvermittlung in lateinischen und deutschen Kräuterbüchern des 16. Jahrhunderts." *Sprachwissenschaft* 28 (3). Winter: 325–54.
- Hochreiter, Sepp, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. "Long Short-Term Memory." *Neural computation* 9 (8). MIT Press: 1735–80.
- Jurish, Bryan. 2013. "Canonicalizing the Deutsches Textarchiv." In *Proceedings of Perspektiven einer corpusbasierten historischen Linguistik und Philologie (Berlin, 12th - 13th December 2011)*, edited by Ingelore Hafemann. Vol. 4. Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae. Berlin, Germany: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. http://edoc.bbaw.de/frontdoor.php?source_opus=2443.
- Kirchner, Felix, Marco Dittrich, Philipp Beckenbauer, and Maximilian Nöth. 2016. "OCR bei Inkunabeln – Offizinspezifischer Ansatz der UB Würzburg." *ABI Technik, to Appear*.
- Klein, Wolf Peter. 1999. *Die Geschichte der meteorologischen Kommunikation in Deutschland*.

Eine historische Fallstudie zur Entwicklung von Wissenschaftssprachen. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Olms.

———. 2011. “Die deutsche Sprache in der Gelehrsamkeit der frühen Neuzeit. Von der lingua barbarica zur HauptSprache.” In *Diskurse der Gelehrtenkultur in der Frühen Neuzeit. Ein Handbuch*, edited by Herbert Jaumann, 465–516. de Gruyter.

Krause, Thomas, and Amir Zeldes. 2016. “ANNIS3: A New Architecture for Generic Corpus Query and Visualization.” *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 31 (1). Oxford University Press: 118–39.

Lüdeling, Anke, and Amir Zeldes. 2008. “Three Views on Corpora: Corpus Linguistics, Literary Computing, and Computational Linguistics.” *Jahrbuch für Computerphilologie* 9: 149–78.

Lüdeling, Anke, Thorwald Poschenrieder, and Lukas Faulstich. 2004. “DeutschDiachronDigital - Ein diachrones Korpus des Deutschen.” *Jahrbuch für Computerphilologie* 6: 119–36.

Odebrecht, Carolin, Malte Belz, Vivian Voigt, Amir Zeldes, and Anke Lüdeling. submitted. “RIDGES Herbology - Designing a Diachronic Multi-Layer Corpus.”

Pilz, Thomas, Andrea Ernst-Gerlach, Sebastian Kempken, Paul Rayson, and Dawn Archer. 2008. “The Identification of Spelling Variants in English and German Historical Texts: Manual or Automatic?” *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 23 (1). ALLC: 65–72.

Piotrowski, Michael. 2012. *Natural Language Processing for Historical Texts.* Morgan & Claypool Publishers.

Ramel, Jean-Yves, Nicolas Sidère, and Frédéric Rayar. 2013. “Interactive Layout Analysis, Content Extraction, and Transcription of Historical Printed Books Using Pattern Redundancy Analysis.” *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 28 (2). ALLC: 301–14.

Reddy, Sravana, and Gregory Crane. 2006. “A Document Recognition System for Early Modern Latin.” In *Chicago Colloquium on Digital Humanities and Computer Science: What Do You Do with a Million Books, Chicago, IL.* Vol. 23.

Riecke, Jörg. 2004. *Die Frühgeschichte der mittelalterlichen medizinischen Fachsprache im Deutschen.* Vol. 2 Bände, Band 1: Untersuchungen, Band 2: Wörterbuch. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Rissanen, Matti. 1989. “Three Problems Connected with the Use of Diachronic Corpora.” *ICAME* 13: 16–19.

———. 2008. “Corpus Linguistics and Historical Linguistics.” In *Corpus Linguistics. an International Handbook*, edited by Anke Lüdeling and Merja Kytö, 1:53–68. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Rydberg-Cox, Jeffrey A. 2009. "Digitizing Latin Incunabula: Challenges, Methods, and Possibilities." *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 3 (1).
- Springmann, Uwe. 2015. "Ocrocis: A high accuracy OCR method to convert early printings into digital text – a tutorial." <http://cistern.cis.lmu.de/ocrocis/tutorial.pdf>.
- Springmann, Uwe, and Florian Fink. 2016. "CIS OCR Workshop v1.0: OCR and post-correction of early printings for digital humanities." doi:10.5281/zenodo.46571.
- Springmann, Uwe, Florian Fink, and Klaus U Schulz. 2016. "Automatic quality evaluation and (semi-) automatic improvement of mixed models for OCR on historical documents." <http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.05157>.
- Springmann, Uwe, Dietmar Najock, Hermann Morgenroth, Helmut Schmid, Annette Gotscharek, and Florian Fink. 2014. "OCR of historical printings of Latin texts: problems, prospects, progress." In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Digital Access to Textual Cultural Heritage*, 57–61. DATeCH '14. New York, NY, USA: ACM. doi:10.1145/2595188.2595197.
- Strange, Carolyn, Daniel McNamara, Josh Wodak, and Ian Wood. 2014. "Mining for the Meanings of a Murder: The Impact of OCR Quality on the Use of Digitized Historical Newspapers." *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 8 (1). <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/8/1/000168/000168.html>.
- Ul-Hasan, Adnan, Syed Saqib Bukhari, and Andreas Dengel. 2016. "OCRoRACT: A Sequence Learning OCR System Trained on Isolated Characters." In *DAS2016*, to Appear.
- Vobl, Thorsten, Annette Gotscharek, Uli Reffle, Christoph Ringlstetter, and Klaus U. Schulz. 2014. "PoCoTo - an open source system for efficient interactive postcorrection of OCRed historical texts." In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Digital Access to Textual Cultural Heritage*, 57–61. DATeCH '14. New York, NY, USA: ACM. doi:10.1145/2595188.2595197.
- Weel, Adriaan van der. 2011. *Changing Our Textual Minds. Towards a Digital Order of Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Weiß, Zarah, and Gohar Schnelle. 2016. "Sentence Annotation Guidelines for Early New High German." Universität Tübingen; Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (submitted).