

# Multilingual Embeddings Jointly Induced from Contexts and Concepts: Simple, Strong and Scalable

Philipp Dufter, Mengjie Zhao, Hinrich Schütze

Center for Information and Language Processing (CIS), LMU Munich, Germany

philipp@cis.lmu.de, mengjie.zhao@cis.lmu.de

## Abstract

Word embeddings induced from *local context* are prevalent in NLP. A simple and effective context-based multilingual embedding learner is Levy et al. (2017)’s S-ID (sentence ID) method. Another line of work induces high-performing multilingual embeddings from *concepts* (Dufter et al., 2018). In this paper, we propose Co+Co, a simple and scalable method that combines context-based and concept-based learning. From a sentence-aligned corpus, concepts are extracted via sampling; words are then associated with their concept ID and sentence ID in embedding learning. This is the first work that successfully combines context-based and concept-based embedding learning. We show that Co+Co performs well for two different application scenarios: the Parallel Bible Corpus (1000+ languages, low-resource) and EuroParl (12 languages, high-resource). Among methods applicable to both corpora, Co+Co performs best in our evaluation setup of six tasks.

## 1 Introduction

Multilingual embeddings are useful because they provide word representations of source and target language in the same space in machine translation and because they are a basis for transfer learning. In contrast to prior multilingual work (Zeman and Resnik, 2008; McDonald et al., 2011; Tsvetkov et al., 2014), automatically learned embeddings potentially perform as well but are more efficient and easier to use (Klementiev et al., 2012; Hermann and Blunsom, 2014b; Guo et al., 2016). Thus, multilingual word embedding learning is important for natural language processing (NLP).

The quality of multilingual embeddings is driven by the underlying feature set more than the type of algorithm used for training the embeddings (Upadhyay et al., 2016; Ruder et al., 2019). Most

embedding learners build on using *context information* as feature. Dufter et al. (2018) showed that using *concept information* is effective for multilingual embedding learning, as well. We propose Co+Co, a method that combines the concept identification method *Anymalign* (Lardilleux and Lepage, 2009) and the multilingual embedding learning method sentence ID (*S-ID*) (Levy et al., 2017) into an embedding learning method that is based on both concept and context.

Our aim is to create a method for learning non-contextualized embeddings that yield strong results while being scalable and widely applicable. Thus we work on two parallel corpora: a low-resource, massively multilingual corpus, the Parallel Bible Corpus (*PBC*), and on a high-resource, mildly multilingual corpus, *EuroParl*. Out of 15 embedding learning methods we identify S-ID, the concept based method N(t) by Dufter et al. (2018) and Co+Co as the only ones that yield high-quality word spaces across corpora. Co+Co exhibits the best and most stable performance.

Our contributions are: **i)** We show that Co+Co, i.e., using concepts and contexts jointly, yields higher quality embeddings than either by itself. **ii)** We demonstrate that Co+Co performs well across very different datasets and scales across a high number of languages. **iii)** We find that lower embedding dimensionality is better for word translation in PBC. In addition, we find that QVEC evaluation (Tsvetkov et al., 2015) is highly dependent on dimensionality.

## 2 Methods

Our proposed method consists of three steps: 1) Inducing concepts using *Anymalign* (Lardilleux and Lepage, 2009). 2) Generating an artificial corpus using sentence and concept IDs. 3) Training word2vec on the artificial corpus.

## 2.1 Concept Induction

Lardilleux and Lepage (2009) propose Anymalign, an algorithm originally intended for obtaining word alignments. Consider a parallel corpus  $V$  across multiple languages. The central idea is that words that occur strictly in the same sentences, can be considered translations. In addition to words, word ngrams can be considered. We call words or word ngrams that occur exclusively in the same sentences *perfectly aligned*. By this strict definition, the number of perfect alignments is low. Coverage can be increased by sampling subcorpora. As the number of sentences is smaller in each sample and there is a high number of sampled subcorpora, perfect alignments occur more often.

Figure 1 shows Lardilleux and Lepage (2009)’s Anymalign algorithm on a high level.

There are three relevant hyperparameters in Anymalign: the minimum number of languages a perfect alignment should cover ( $MinLg.$ ) and the maximum ngram length ( $MaxNgr.$ ). The size of a subsample is adjusted automatically to maximize the probability that each sentence is sampled at least once. This probability depends on the number of samples drawn and thus on the runtime ( $T$ ) of the algorithm. Thus,  $T$  is another hyperparameter. For details see (Lardilleux and Lepage, 2009).

We argue that with small  $MaxNgr.$  one can interpret perfect alignments as concepts, i.e., a set of semantically similar words. For example the English trigram “mount of olives” and the French trigram “montagne des oliviers” are a perfect alignment describing the same concept. Thus we define a *concept* as a set of perfectly aligned words and use Anymalign as concept induction algorithm. Note that most members of a concept are not perfect alignments in  $V$  (only in a subsample  $V'$ ) and that a word can be part of multiple concepts. See Section 5 for comments on concept quality.

## 2.2 Corpus Creation

We use sentence IDs from the parallel corpus and concepts to create corpora. Figure 2 shows samples of the generated corpora to be processed by the embedding learner.

**S-ID.** We adopt Levy and Goldberg (2014)’s framework; it formalizes the basic information that is passed to the embedding learner as a set of pairs. In the monolingual case, each pair consists of two words that occur in the same context. A successful approach to multilingual embedding

---

### Algorithm 1 Anymalign (Lardilleux and Lepage, 2009)

---

```

1: procedure GETCONCEPTS( $V$ ,  $MinLg.$ ,  $MaxNgr.$ ,  $T$ )
2:    $C = \emptyset$ 
3:   while  $runtime \leq T$  do
4:      $V' = \text{get-subsample}(V)$ 
5:      $A = \text{get-concepts}(V')$ 
6:      $A = \text{filter-concepts}(A, MinLg., MaxNgr.)$ 
7:      $C = C \cup A$ 
8:   end while
9: end procedure

```

---

Figure 1:  $V$  is a parallel corpus. *get-subsample* creates a sentence-aligned parallel subcorpus by sampling lines from  $V$ . *get-concepts* returns the set of perfect alignments (concepts). *filter-concepts* filters the set of concepts to enforce  $MinLg.$  and  $MaxNgr.$

	[...]	[...]
48001018	enge:fifteen	C:911 kqc0:Jerusalem
48001018	enge: ,	C:911 por5:Jerusalem
48001018	enge:years	C:911 eng7:Jerusalem
48001018	deu0:fünfzehn	C:911 haw0:Jerusalem
48001018	deu0:Jahre	C:911 ilb0:Jerusalem
48001018	deu0: ,	C:911 fra1:Jerusalem
	[...]	[...]
	[...]	[...]
45016016	Salute one another with an holy kiss . The churches of Christ salute you .	
48001018	Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter , and abode with him fifteen days .	
	[...]	

Figure 2: Samples of S-ID (top-left) and C-ID (top-right) corpora that are input to word2vec. Words are prefixed by a 3 character ISO 639-3 language identifier followed by an alphanumeric character to distinguish editions in the same language (e.g., enge = English King James Version (James-Ed.)). C:911 is a concept identifier. Bottom: James-Ed. text sample.

learning for parallel corpora is to use pairs of a word and a sentence ID (Levy et al., 2017). The sentence ID acts as crosslingual signal. We call this method *S-ID*.<sup>1</sup>

**C-ID.** We propose to adjust S-ID by replacing sentence IDs with concept IDs. That is, a line consists of a concept ID and a concept member word.

**Co+Co.** We combine S-IDs and C-IDs by creating two corpora with the respective method and then concatenating their corpora before learning embeddings. Intuitively, both methods use complementary information: S-ID uses local context information and C-ID leverages globally aggregated information. Therefore, we expect a higher performance by combining those.

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that we use the name S-ID for the sentence identifier, for the corpus creation method that is based on these identifiers, for the embedding learning method based on such corpora and for the embeddings produced by the method. The same applies to other method names. Which sense is meant should be clear from context.

### 2.3 Embedding Learning

To obtain embeddings we use *word2vec skip-gram*<sup>2</sup> (Mikolov et al., 2013a) on the generated corpora. We use default hyperparameters, and investigate three more closely: number of iterations (*NIter.*), minimum frequency of a word (*Min-Count.*) and embedding dimensionality (*Dim.*). Throughout the paper we  $\ell^2$ -normalize vectors.

## 3 Application to Parallel Bible Corpus

### 3.1 Data

We work on *PBC*, the Parallel Bible Corpus (Mayer and Cysouw, 2014), a verse-aligned corpus of 1000+ translations of the New Testament. For the sake of comparability we use the same 1664 Bible editions across 1259 languages (distinct ISO 639-3 codes) and the same 6458 training verses as in (Dufter et al., 2018).<sup>3</sup> We follow their terminology and refer to “translations” as “editions”. *PBC* is a good model for resource-poverty; e.g., the training set of the English King James Version (*James-Ed.*) contains fewer than 150,000 tokens in 6458 verses. *James-Ed.* spans a vocabulary of 6162 words and all 32 English editions together cover 23,772 words. We use the tokenization provided in the data, which is erroneous for some hard-to-tokenize languages (e.g., Khmer, Japanese), and do not apply further preprocessing.

### 3.2 Evaluation

Dufter et al. (2018) introduce roundtrip translation (*RTT*) as multilingual embedding evaluation when no gold standard is available. A query word  $q$  in language  $L_1$  is translated to its nearest neighbor (by cosine similarity)  $v$  in an intermediate language  $L_2$  and then backtranslated to its closest neighbor  $q'$  in the query language  $L_1$ . *RTT* is successful if  $q = q'$ . For the roundtrips we consider  $k_I$  nearest neighbors in  $L_2$  and, for each of these intermediate neighbor,  $k_T$  predictions in  $L_1$ .

Predictions are compared to a ground truth set  $G_q$ . There is a strict ( $\{q\}$ ) and a relaxed ( $\{words\}$  with the same lemma and part-of-speech as  $q$ ) ground truth. Thus multiple roundtrips of  $q$  can be considered correct (e.g., inflections of a query). We average binary results (per query) over editions and report mean ( $\mu$ ) and median (*Md.*) over queries. Inspired by the precision@k evaluation

for word translation we vary  $(k_I, k_T)$  as follows: “S1” (1, 1), “R1” (1, 1), “S4” (2, 2), and “S16” (2, 8), where S (R) stand for using the strict (relaxed) ground truth.

If  $q$  is not in the embedding space, we consider the roundtrip as failed. The number of queries contained in the embedding space is denoted by  $N$  (“coverage”). We use the same queries as in (Dufter et al., 2018), which are based on (Swadesh, 1946)’s 100 universal words. In addition, we introduce a development set: an earlier list by Swadesh with 215 words.<sup>4</sup> 151 queries remain in the development set after excluding queries from the test set. Due to this large number we do not compute the relaxed measure on the development set as this requires manual effort on the ground truth. We work on the level of Bible editions, i.e., two editions in the same language are considered different “languages”. We use *James-Ed.* as the query edition if *James-Ed.* contains  $q$ . Else we randomly choose another English edition.

As extrinsic task we perform sentiment analysis following (Dufter et al., 2018). We use their ground truth and data split into training and test set. There are two classifications: whether a verse contains positive (*Pos.*) or negative (*Neg.*) sentiment. Given the multilingual space, for each task a linear support vector machine (*SVM*) is trained on the English World Edition (*World-Ed.*) (following (Dufter et al., 2018)) and subsequently tested on all other editions. We train *SVMs* in 5-fold cross-validation on the training set to optimize the hyperparameter  $C$ . We report average  $F_1$  across editions.

### 3.3 Baselines

We compute diverse baselines to pinpoint reasons for performance changes as much as possible.

**Monolingual Embedding Space.** In the baseline *MONO* we train 1664 monolingual spaces using *word2vec* and interpret them as if they were a shared multilingual embedding space. This serves as consistency check for our evaluation methods.

**Context Based Embedding Space.** We use *S-ID* to obtain a multilingual space.

**Transformation Based Embedding Space.** The baseline *LINEAR* follows (Duong et al., 2017). We pick one edition as the “embedding space defining edition”, in our case the English Catholic Bible (*Cath-Ed.*). We did not choose

<sup>2</sup>We use [code.google.com/archive/p/word2vec](http://code.google.com/archive/p/word2vec)

<sup>3</sup>Information downloaded from [cistern.cis.lmu.de/comult](http://cistern.cis.lmu.de/comult)

<sup>4</sup>[concepticon.clld.org/contributions/Swadesh-1950-215](http://concepticon.clld.org/contributions/Swadesh-1950-215)

James-Ed. or World-Ed. to avoid that one single edition has multiple special roles. We then create 1664 bilingual embedding spaces using S-ID; in each case the two editions covered are Cath-Ed. and one of the other 1664 languages. We then use (Mikolov et al., 2013b)’s linear transformation method to map all embedding spaces to the Cath-Ed. embedding space. More specifically, let  $X' \in \mathbb{R}^{n_X \times d}$ ,  $Y' \in \mathbb{R}^{n_Y \times d}$  be two embedding spaces, with  $n_X, n_Y$  number of words, and  $d$  be the embedding dimension. We then select  $n_T$  transformation words that are contained in both embedding spaces. This yields:  $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_T \times d}$ . The transformation matrix  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is then given by  $\arg \min_W \|XW - Y\|_F$  where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  is the Frobenius norm. The closed form solution is given by  $W^* = X^+Y$  where  $X^+$  is the Moore-Penrose Pseudoinverse (Penrose, 1956). In our case,  $X$  is a bilingual and  $Y$  is a monolingual embedding space, both containing the vocabulary of Cath-Ed.

**Bilingual Embedding Spaces.** *BILING* uses the same bilingual embedding spaces as *LINEAR*, but we do not transform the bilingual spaces into a common space. This baseline shows the effect of multilingual vs. bilingual embedding spaces. As we do not have a multilingual space we need to modify our evaluation methods slightly: we perform RTT in each bilingual embedding space separately. For sentiment analysis, we train one SVM per embedding space on English, which is then tested on the other edition.

**Unsupervised Embedding Learning.** We apply the recent unsupervised embedding learning method by Lample et al. (2018) (*MUSE*).<sup>5</sup> Given unaligned corpora in two languages, MUSE learns two separate embedding spaces that are subsequently unified by a linear transformation. This transformation is learned using a discriminator neural network that tries to identify the original language of a vector. Again, we learn monolingual embedding spaces by running word2vec on PBC directly. Subsequently, we transform all spaces into the word space of Cath-Ed. using MUSE. Chen and Cardie (2018) extended MUSE multilingually. We include their method *MAT+MPSR* as baseline. *MAT+MPSR* is memory and computation intensive. Allocating three days of computation on a standard GPU (GTX 1080 Ti), we were only able to apply this baseline on a subset of 52 editions.

<sup>5</sup>We use <https://github.com/facebookresearch/MUSE>

		NIter.	MinCount.	Dim.	S1		S4		S16		N
					$\mu$	Md	$\mu$	Md	$\mu$	Md	
1	S-ID	<b>100</b>	5	200	29	21	43	46	56	78	103
2	S-ID	5			14	11	25	22	41	45	103
3	S-ID	10			25	16	38	34	51	60	103
4	S-ID	25			27	20	41	43	53	69	103
5	S-ID	50			27	16	40	40	53	67	103
6	S-ID	150			29	21	43	47	56	79	103
7	S-ID	<b>2</b>			<b>35</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>90</b>	130
8	S-ID	10			24	5	36	17	48	63	85
9	S-ID		<b>100</b>		30	24	45	48	58	83	103
10	S-ID		300		28	19	42	41	54	69	103

  

		MinI.g.	MaxNgr.	T	S1		S4		S16		N
					$\mu$	Md	$\mu$	Md	$\mu$	Md	
1	C-ID	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	10	<b>30</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>46</b>	60	71	120
2	C-ID	50			26	21	39	42	56	<b>79</b>	104
3	C-ID	150			22	14	34	28	47	56	94
4	C-ID	500			15	0	25	0	33	0	59
5	C-ID	1			17	0	27	0	38	0	73
6	C-ID	5			28	20	40	35	55	58	122
7	C-ID		5		24	20	36	34	48	52	114
8	C-ID		<b>15</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>61</b>	76	121

Table 1: Hyperparameter selection for word2vec (top) and Anymalign (bottom) on RTT. Initial parameters in first row; empty cell: initial parameter from the first row. For example: to compare the effect of different dimensionality in word2vec compare lines 1, 9 and 10 in the top table (best dimension is 100). Bold: best result per column or selected hyperparameter value.

**Non-Embedding Baseline.** To show that embedding spaces provide some advantages over using the concepts as is, we introduce *C-SIMPLE*, a non-embedding baseline that follows the idea of RTT. Given a query word  $q$  and an intermediate edition, we consider all words that share a concept ID with  $q$  as possible intermediate words. We then choose randomly (probability weights according to number of concepts shared with  $q$ ) intermediate words. For back translation we apply the same procedure.

### 3.4 Hyperparameter Selection

We select hyperparameters based on the roundtrip translation task.

**Word2vec.** We tune word2vec parameters based on the method S-ID. Since a grid search for optimal values for the parameters NIter., MinCount. and Dim. would take too long, we search greedily instead: we choose an initial parameter setting, vary one parameter at a time and select the value with the best performance. More iterations yield better performance. NIter. = 100 is a good efficiency-performance trade-off. For MinCount. (minimum frequency of a word) the best performance is found using 2. This is mainly due to



		Roundtrip								Sentiment		
		S1		R1		S4		S16		N	Pos.	Neg.
		$\mu$	Md	$\mu$	Md	$\mu$	Md	$\mu$	Md			
1	C-SIMPLE	35	33	35	34	49	54	56	56	67		
2	MONO	21	18	21	18	39	36	67	68	69	4	74
3	S-ID	48	47	53	59	65	72	83	93	69	71	88
4	C-ID	43	42	46	43	58	60	58	60	79	91	86
5	Co+Co	<u>51</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>96</u>	69	79	<b>89</b>
6	LINEAR	30	28	31	30	43	46	62	71	69	76	83
7	MUSE	16	13	16	13	33	28	65	64	69	13	73
8	MAT+MPSR	11	10	11	10	20	17	44	42	66	37	72
9	BILING	41	32	42	35	53	55	67	82	69	80	87
10	N(t)*	<b>54</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>100</b>	69	<b>82</b>	<b>89</b>
11	SAMPLE*	33	23	43	42	54	59	82	96	65	<b>82</b>	<b>89</b>

Table 2: Evaluation results. \*: results by (Dufter et al., 2018). Sentiment analysis not defined for C-Simple. Bold: best result per column, Underlined: second best.

increased coverage. Surprisingly, smaller embedding dimensions work better to some degree. A highly multilingual embedding space is expected to suffer more from ambiguity and that is an argument for higher dimensionality; cf. Li and Jurafsky (2015). But this effect seems to be counteracted by the low-resource properties of PBC for which the increased number of parameters of higher dimensionalities cannot be estimated reliably. We choose embedding size 100.

**Anymalign.** We tune the hyperparameters for Anymalign by evaluation embedding spaces created with C-ID. We use the above word2vec settings except for MinCount. As argued before, each word in a concept carries a strong multilingual signal, which is why we do not apply any frequency filtering for C-ID. Thus we set MinCount. to 1 whenever we learn concept based embeddings. For Co+Co we apply the different frequency thresholds on the two parts (S-ID and C-ID parts) of the corpus.

We find the best performance when setting the minimum number of editions (MinLg.) to 100. As expected coverage worsens when increasing MinLg. MaxNgr. is the maximum ngram length. We see the best performance when setting MaxNgr. to 3. This is intuitive for languages like Swedish since compounds can be found. T is the time in hours, i.e., for how long to sample (which steers the size and number of sampled sub-corpora). As expected higher T yields better performance. Given only a slight difference between 10 and 15 we set T to 15 for slightly higher coverage.

### 3.5 Results

Table 2 presents results on the test set.

**Embeddings vs. Concepts.** C-Simple works reasonably well but is outperformed by most em-

bedding spaces. This indicates that learning embeddings augments the concept information.

**Evaluation Difficulty.** MONO is the weakest baseline and is a good indicator that the RTT task is challenging, e.g., S1=21 and R1=18. It admits the weakness of RTT by yielding a non-zero performance despite most of the intermediate neighbours being not related to the query at all. Still it proves that RTT is a good indicator for the quality of multilingual word spaces, as truly multilingual word spaces significantly outperform MONO (especially for the median). The same is true for sentiment analysis where Pos. is more challenging than Neg. Thus Pos. is a better indicator of performance differences.

**Transformation Based Spaces.** LINEAR performs similar to C-Simple (but outperforms it for S16). This supports the hypothesis that PBC offers too little data for training mono-/bilingual embeddings. As expected BILING works better than LINEAR. Keep in mind that this is not a universal embedding space and has fewer constraints than other embedding spaces. Thus it is not directly comparable.

**Unsupervised Embedding Learning.** MUSE performs even worse than MONO. MAT+MPSR performs poorly, as well. This is a strong indication that PBC offers too little data for learning high-quality monolingual embeddings. In addition, we hypothesize that the word spaces themselves offer too few data points (i.e., vocabulary size) for neural network based mapping approaches. We plan to investigate this in the future. As discussed MAT+MPSR results are for a subset of 52 editions.

**Context vs. Concept Based.** N(t) by Dufter et al. (2018) shows consistently the best performance. Later we will see that this method works well here (massively multilingual PBC setting), but worse on EuroParl. SAMPLE by Dufter et al. (2018) is based on sampling like C-ID. However, it induces concepts only on a small set of pivot languages, not on all 1664 editions. This does not only work worse (C-ID beats SAMPLE except for S16), but it also requires word alignment information and is thus computationally more expensive. As has been observed frequently, S-ID is highly effective. S-ID ranks third consistently. Representing a word as its binary vector of verse occurrence provides a clear signal to the embedding learner. Concept-based methods can

be considered complementary to this feature set because they can exploit aggregated information across languages as well as across verses. C-ID alone has slightly lower performance than S-ID.

**Combining Concept and Context.** Co+Co, the combination, outperforms both C-ID and S-ID and seems to unite the “best of both worlds”. It yields consistently the best performance with 3% to 6% relative performance increase (for  $\mu$ ) compared to S-ID alone and even more compared to C-ID. Overall Co+Co always ranks second. Thus combining context and concept is effective indeed, but not sufficient to outperform the strong method N(t) which is tailored for massively multilingual corpora. In experiments we found that adding C-ID to N(t) harmed the performance of N(t) severely, so these two methods seem to be incompatible. In short: N(t) is the best method on this corpus, Co+Co second-best and S-ID is third.

#### 4 Application to a High-Resource Corpus

PBC is a low-resource, highly multilingual scenario. We now provide experimental evidence that Co+Co is broadly applicable and works in a high-resource, mildly multilingual scenario. We test the three best performing methods (based on PBC S1  $\mu$ ): S-ID, Co+Co, N(t).

##### 4.1 Data

We choose a dataset by Ammar et al. (2016), a parallel corpus covering 12 languages<sup>6</sup> from the proceedings of the European Parliament, Wikipedia titles and news commentary. We refer to this corpus as *EuroParl*. We do not apply any preprocessing. The dataset is lowercased.

##### 4.2 Evaluation

Ammar et al. (2016) provide an extensive evaluation framework covering two extrinsic and four intrinsic tasks. The tasks are document classification, dependency parsing (those models were not available to us, so we omit this evaluation), word translation, word similarity, QVEC (Tsvetkov et al., 2015) and QVEC-cca (Ammar et al., 2016). For all tasks, there is a development and test set available. For more details on data and tasks see (Ammar et al., 2016). Due to obvious weaknesses of QVEC (measure not rotation invariant, for details see (Ammar et al., 2016) and

<sup>6</sup>Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, English, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Spanish, Swedish

Co+Co			S-ID			N(t)			
MinLg.	MinCount	Word Trans.	MinCount	Word Trans.	NPIv.	Word Trans.			
6	5	18.85	52.37						
3		18.38	52.09	5	18.48	52.37	4	17.08	59.33
9		20.15	52.37	2	<b>19.22</b>	65.65	2	15.88	50.05
12		19.87	52.37	10	15.97	43.92	6	16.90	62.95
2		<b>21.17</b>	67.41						
10		17.92	50.51						

Table 3: Hyperparameter selection on EuroParl. Initial parameter in first row; empty cell: initial parameter from first row. Bold: best result per column or selected hyperparameter values. Subscript numbers indicate coverage.

	Dim.	Word Trans.	Word Sim.	QVEC	QVEC-cca	Doc. Class.
S-ID	10	0.19	23.61	12.10	19.75	53.30
S-ID	25	4.92	42.08	<b>15.74</b>	19.24	74.33
S-ID	50	13.93	54.29	14.85	19.67	83.91
S-ID	100	15.97	53.86	11.73	25.51	86.88
S-ID	300	16.81	<b>56.29</b>	9.29	34.58	90.31
S-ID	500	<b>16.90</b>	55.51	9.01	<b>38.64</b>	<b>90.88</b>
Coverage		43.92	57.58	70.91	70.91	38.89

Table 4: Results of S-ID on the dev set for varying dimensionality. There is clear correlations with the embedding dimension. Note that results are slightly different to Table 3 due to MinCount. 10 used in this table.

Table 4) we omit QVEC in our final evaluation. In their word translation task Ammar et al. (2016) reduce the word space to contain only words from the evaluation test set. We are interested in an (unrestricted) word translation task, where all words in the word space are possible answers, which is why we reimplemented this task and report results (precision@1) only for the unrestricted word translation task. Obviously this task is more challenging and thus the performance numbers we report are significantly lower than the numbers reported by Ammar et al. (2016).

To ensure comparability with previous approaches, we follow Ammar et al. (2016) in evaluating only on words that are contained in the embedding space and simultaneously reporting the coverage (e.g., how many queries of the task are contained in the embedding space). Only for word translation we follow the same reasoning as for PBC and compute accuracy across all queries (i.e., queries not in the word space count as errors).

##### 4.3 Hyperparameter Selection

We optimize corpus specific hyperparameters (e.g., MinLg.) on the development set of the word translation task. Co+Co: we vary the minimum number of languages that need to be covered by

	Word Trans.	Word Sim.	QVEC-cca	Doc. Class.
multiCluster*	11.79 62.30	57.45 73.89	43.34 82.01	92.11 48.16
multiCCA*	11.79 77.16	69.99 77.94	41.52 87.03	92.18 62.81
multiSkip*	11.70 54.41	60.24 67.55	36.34 75.69	90.46 45.73
Invariance*	12.26 41.41	59.13 62.50	46.21 74.78	91.10 31.35
S-ID	19.13 64.53	48.62 75.39	24.58 80.33	86.66 56.45
Co+Co	<b>20.24</b> 65.92	<b>52.75</b> 75.39	24.39 82.76	<b>87.33</b> 57.52
N(t)	15.32 59.42	48.01 71.27	<b>25.92</b> 79.07	84.97 53.17

Table 5: Results on the test set. \*: methods by (Ammar et al., 2016). We downloaded their embedding spaces and performed the evaluation using their code. We can mostly reproduce their results (up to rounding errors), but word similarity numbers are slightly different. Best result across S-ID, Co+Co, N(t) is bold; best result across all methods is italic.

the concept identification and MinCount. for the S-ID part of Co+Co. N(t) requires pivot languages. Following Dufter et al. (2018) we choose as pivot languages those with the lowest type-token ratio (these are Greek, Danish, Spanish, French, Italian, English) and vary the number of pivot languages ( $NPiv$ ) between 2, 4 and 6.

Table 3 gives an overview of our hyperparameter selection. For Co+Co, we choose MinLg. 9 and MinCount. 2. For S-ID, we find the best performance with MinCount. 2. For N(t), the best result is obtained when using 4 pivot languages.

Further, we show the effect of varying embedding dimensions in Table 4. For most tasks 300 to 500 dimensions are optimal. This confirms the findings by Yin and Shen (2018). For QVEC, extremely low dimensionality is beneficial. Note that QVEC is not rotation invariant: we hypothesize that the probability of an axis being highly correlated with linguistic features in a high-dimensional space is very small compared to a low-dimensional space. QVEC-cca on the other hand benefits greatly from higher dimensions and even choosing 100 dimensions, which is a popular and reasonable choice, seriously harms the performance compared to 300 dimensions: the higher the dimensionality the more likely, CCA will find an arbitrary dimension which is highly correlated with linguistic features. When comparing our results to (Ammar et al., 2016) we need to be aware of this effect, as they used an embedding dimension of 512 vs. 100 used in this work.

#### 4.4 Results

Table 5 provides results on the test set. It immediately becomes clear that different word spaces have different strengths and weaknesses.

		Mean	Median	Stddev.	Min	Max
Bible	#editions	250	194	160	101	1530
	#tokens	259	198	172	102	2163
EuroParl	#editions	8	7	1	7	13
	#tokens	11	10	4	8	38
	#Concepts	Cov.	Cov. (relev.)	Cov. (rare)	Cov. (freq.)	
Bible	119,026	0.43	0.56	0.19	0.85	
EuroParl	6,208,134	0.24	0.66	0.14	0.61	

Table 6: Top: Descriptive statistics of concept size. Bottom: Coverage of concepts. We report the percentage of vocabulary in English (James-Ed. for PBC) that is covered by the concepts. For “relev.” we consider only words above the MinCount. threshold. To examine frequent and rare words we report the coverage on the bottom/top decile based on word frequency.

Among S-ID, Co+Co and N(t), Co+Co performs best, followed by S-ID and N(t) in 3 out of 4 tasks. Only for QVEC-cca the order is different. However, the differences between methods are small in this task. Co+Co outperforms N(t) in “doc. class.”, the only extrinsic task. Compared to S-ID, Co+Co yields consistent improvements (except for QVEC-cca). Co+Co provides higher coverage throughout all tasks.

The methods by (Ammar et al., 2016) perform well for “doc. class.”, word similarity and QVEC-cca (the latter mostly because of increased dimensionality) and much worse for word translation. There are strong indications that neither of the four methods are applicable to highly multilingual corpora like PBC. “Invariance” considers the full cooccurrence matrix across all languages, a matrix in the size of terabytes. In addition, word alignment matrices would need to be stored. Both multiCluster and multiCCA rely on bilingual dictionaries, which are not feasible to process in the case of PBC. multiSkip requires adding  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  terms in the objective function, which does not scale either.

In short: Among the methods that are applicable to both PBC and EuroParl, Co+Co performs best, followed by S-ID and N(t).

## 5 Concept Quality

Table 6 reports the size of a typical concept and concept coverage with respect to the vocabulary (English). The largest concept contains 2163 tokens across 1530 editions describing the 2-gram “Simon Peter”. Frequent words tend to be better covered. However, almost 20% of really rare words (i.e., hapax legomena) are contained in concepts. In Figure 3 we show five randomly sampled concepts from EuroParl.

hun:történelem fin:historian gre:ιστορία  
spa:historia fra:histoire ita:storia eng:history

swe:heavenly swe:word spa:heavenly spa:word fra:heavenly  
fra:word deu:heavenly deu:word ita:heavenly ita:word eng:heavenly

swe:kan fin:tarkistuksen spa:enmienda fra:amendement  
ita:emendamento eng:amendment

dan:erhvervet gre:οικολογική fra:filière  
deu:industriezweig ita:coinvolge eng:ecological

swe:vodka fin:vodka gre:βότκα spa:vodka  
deu:wodka ita:vodka eng:vodka

Figure 3: Five randomly sampled concepts from EuroParl. Quality is generally high. The second example is a video game consisting of two words.

## 6 Related Work

We cluster prior work for **multilingual embedding learning** for parallel corpora into three groups. Our focus is on methods which are applicable to both PBC and EuroParl. **1)** follows the basic idea of projecting monolingual spaces into a unified multilingual space using (linear) transformations. We use (Mikolov et al., 2013b) together with (Duong et al., 2017) in our baseline LINEAR. Zou et al. (2013), Xiao and Guo (2014) and Faruqui and Dyer (2014) use similar approaches (e.g., by computing the transformation using CCA). It has been shown that computing the transformation using discriminator neural networks works well, even in a completely unsupervised setting. See, e.g., (Vulić and Moens, 2012; Lample et al., 2018; Chen and Cardie, 2018; Artetxe et al., 2018). We used (Lample et al., 2018) as the baseline MUSE. **2)** is true multilingual embedding learning: it integrates multilingual information in the objective of embedding learning. Klementiev et al. (2012) and Gouws et al. (2015) add a word alignment based term. Luong et al. (2015) introduce BiSkip as a bilingual extension of word2vec. For  $n$  editions, including  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  bilingual terms does not scale. Thus this line of work is not applicable to PBC. A slightly different objective function expresses that representation of aligned sentences should be similar. Approaches based on neural networks are (Hermann and Blunsom, 2014a) (BiCVM), (Sarath Chandar et al., 2014) (autoencoders) and (Soyer et al., 2014). Again, we argue that neural network based approaches do not work for the low-resource setting of PBC. **3)** creates multilingual corpora and uses monolingual embedding learners. A successful approach is (Levy et al., 2017)’s sentence ID (S-ID). Vulić and Moens (2015) create pseudocorpora by merging words from multiple languages into a single corpus. Dufter et al.

	PBC		EuroParl				Mean Rank	Mean Perf.
	RTT	Sent.	Doc. Class.	Word Sim.	QVEC -cca	Word Trans.		
S-ID	3	3	2	2	2	2	2.33	53.91
N(t)	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	3	3	<b>1</b>	3	2.00	55.87
Co+Co	2	2	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	3	<b>1</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>56.31</b>

Table 7: Performance overview: we show the rank among N(t), S-ID and Co+Co across all tasks. For RTT and Sent. the overall performance is the mean over all task versions (S1, R1, S4, S16 and Pos., Neg.).

(2018) found this method to perform poorly on PBC. Søgaard et al. (2015) learn a space by factorizing an interlingual matrix based on Wikipedia concepts. word2vec is roughly equivalent to matrix factorization (Levy and Goldberg, 2014), so this work fits this group.

With the raise of pretrained language models, methods to obtain **multilingual contextual representations** have been proposed (Conneau and Lample, 2019). We focus on creating static word embeddings which are computationally much more efficient at the cost of lower performance.

Much research has been dedicated to identifying **multilingual concepts**. BabelNet (Navigli and Ponzetto, 2012) leverages existing resources (mostly manual annotations), including Wikipedia, using information extraction methods. BabelNet could be used to learn concept based embeddings, but it covers only 284 languages and thus cannot be applied to all PBC languages. Other work induces concepts within a dictionary graph (Ammar et al., 2016; Dufter et al., 2018), with alignment algorithms (Östling, 2014), or by means of sampling (Lardilleux and Lepage, 2009). We used sampling based concept induction in this work, as it scales easily for 1000+ languages.

## 7 Summary

We proposed Co+Co, to the best of our knowledge the first method that learns embeddings *jointly from concept and context information*. We showed that Co+Co performs well across two very different corpora and a wide range of tasks. Among the three high-performing methods applicable to both PBC and EuroParl Co+Co performs best (see Table 7). Two other advantages of Co+Co are that it is a simple method (compared to more complex methods like MUSE) and scalable to 1000s of languages. In summary, Co+Co is a simple, strong and scalable method that is well suited for a wide range of application scenarios.

We gratefully **acknowledge** funding for this



work by the European Research Council (ERC #740516) and by Zentrum Digitalisierung.Bayern (ZD.B), the digital technology initiative of the State of Bavaria.

## References

- Waleed Ammar, George Mulcaire, Yulia Tsvetkov, Guillaume Lample, Chris Dyer, and Noah A Smith. 2016. Massively multilingual word embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.01925*.
- Mikel Artetxe, Gorka Labaka, and Eneko Agirre. 2018. A robust self-learning method for fully unsupervised cross-lingual mappings of word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 789–798.
- Xilun Chen and Claire Cardie. 2018. Unsupervised multilingual word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Alexis Conneau and Guillaume Lample. 2019. Cross-lingual language model pretraining. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 7057–7067.
- Philipp Dufter, Mengjie Zhao, Martin Schmitt, Alexander Fraser, and Hinrich Schütze. 2018. Embedding learning through multilingual concept induction. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Long Duong, Hiroshi Kanayama, Tengfei Ma, Steven Bird, and Trevor Cohn. 2017. Multilingual training of crosslingual word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Manaal Faruqui and Chris Dyer. 2014. Improving vector space word representations using multilingual correlation. In *Proceedings of the 14th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Stephan Gouws, Yoshua Bengio, and Greg Corrado. 2015. Bilbowa: fast bilingual distributed representations without word alignments. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Jiang Guo, Wanxiang Che, David Yarowsky, Haifeng Wang, and Ting Liu. 2016. A representation learning framework for multi-source transfer parsing. In *Proceedings of the 30th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Karl Moritz Hermann and Phil Blunsom. 2014a. Multilingual distributed representations without word alignment. In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Karl Moritz Hermann and Phil Blunsom. 2014b. Multilingual models for compositional distributed semantics. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Alexandre Klementiev, Ivan Titov, and Binod Bhattarai. 2012. Inducing crosslingual distributed representations of words. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*.
- Guillaume Lample, Alexis Conneau, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Ludovic Denoyer, and Hervé Jégou. 2018. Word translation without parallel data. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Adrien Lardilleux and Yves Lepage. 2009. Sampling-based multilingual alignment. In *Proceedings of 7th Conference on Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing*.
- Omer Levy and Yoav Goldberg. 2014. Neural word embedding as implicit matrix factorization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2014*.
- Omer Levy, Anders Søgaard, and Yoav Goldberg. 2017. A strong baseline for learning cross-lingual word embeddings from sentence alignments. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Jiwei Li and Dan Jurafsky. 2015. Do multi-sense embeddings improve natural language understanding? In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Thang Luong, Hieu Pham, and Christopher D Manning. 2015. Bilingual word representations with monolingual quality in mind. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Vector Space Modeling for Natural Language Processing*.
- Thomas Mayer and Michael Cysouw. 2014. Creating a massively parallel bible corpus. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*.
- Ryan T. McDonald, Slav Petrov, and Keith B. Hall. 2011. Multi-source transfer of delexicalized dependency parsers. In *Proceedings of the 2011 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013a. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Tomas Mikolov, Quoc V Le, and Ilya Sutskever. 2013b. Exploiting similarities among languages for machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.4168*.

- Roberto Navigli and Simone Paolo Ponzetto. 2012. BabelNet: The automatic construction, evaluation and application of a wide-coverage multilingual semantic network. *Artificial Intelligence*.
- Robert Östling. 2014. Bayesian word alignment for massively parallel texts. In *Proceedings of the 14th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Roger Penrose. 1956. On best approximate solutions of linear matrix equations. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*.
- Sebastian Ruder, Ivan Vulić, and Anders Søgaard. 2019. A survey of cross-lingual word embedding models. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 65:569–631.
- AP Sarath Chandar, Stanislas Lauly, Hugo Larochelle, Mitesh M. Khapra, Balaraman Ravindran, Vikas C. Raykar, and Amrita Saha. 2014. An autoencoder approach to learning bilingual word representations. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Anders Søgaard, Željko Agić, Héctor Martínez Alonso, Barbara Plank, Bernd Bohnet, and Anders Johannsen. 2015. Inverted indexing for cross-lingual nlp. In *The 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference of the Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing*.
- Hubert Soyer, Pontus Stenetorp, and Akiko Aizawa. 2014. Leveraging monolingual data for crosslingual compositional word representations. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Morris Swadesh. 1946. South Greenlandic (Eskimo). In Cornelius Osgood, editor, *Linguistic Structures of Native America*. Viking Fund Inc. (Johnson Reprint Corp.), New York.
- Yulia Tsvetkov, Leonid Boytsov, Anatole Gershman, Eric Nyberg, and Chris Dyer. 2014. Metaphor detection with cross-lingual model transfer. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Yulia Tsvetkov, Manaal Faruqui, Wang Ling, Guillaume Lample, and Chris Dyer. 2015. Evaluation of word vector representations by subspace alignment. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Shyam Upadhyay, Manaal Faruqui, Chris Dyer, and Dan Roth. 2016. Cross-lingual models of word embeddings: An empirical comparison. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Ivan Vulić and Marie-Francine Moens. 2012. Detecting highly confident word translations from comparable corpora without any prior knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 13th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Ivan Vulić and Marie-Francine Moens. 2015. Bilingual word embeddings from non-parallel document-aligned data applied to bilingual lexicon induction. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*.
- Min Xiao and Yuhong Guo. 2014. Distributed word representation learning for cross-lingual dependency parsing. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*.
- Zi Yin and Yuanyuan Shen. 2018. On the dimensionality of word embedding. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Daniel Zeman and Philip Resnik. 2008. Cross-language parser adaptation between related languages. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*.
- Will Y Zou, Richard Socher, Daniel Cer, and Christopher D Manning. 2013. Bilingual word embeddings for phrase-based machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.