

# The Persian Dependency Treebank Made Universal

Mohammad Sadegh Rasooli<sup>1\*</sup>, Pegah Safari<sup>2\*</sup>, Amirsaeid Moloodi<sup>3\*</sup>, Alireza Nourian<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Computer Science and Engineering, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran

<sup>4</sup> Sobhe, Tehran, Iran

<sup>1</sup>rasooli@seas.upenn.edu, <sup>2</sup>p\_safari@sbu.ac.ir,

<sup>3</sup>amirsaeid.moloodi@shirazu.ac.ir, <sup>4</sup>nourian@sobhe.ir

## Abstract

We describe an automatic method for converting the Persian Dependency Treebank (Rasooli et al., 2013) to Universal Dependencies. This treebank contains 29107 sentences. Our experiments along with manual linguistic analysis show that our data is more compatible with Universal Dependencies than the Uppsala Persian Universal Dependency Treebank (Seraji et al., 2016), and is larger in size and more diverse in vocabulary. Our treebank brings in a labeled attachment F-score of 85.2 in supervised parsing. Our delexicalized Persian-to-English parser transfer experiments show that a parsing model trained on our data is  $\approx 2\%$  absolutely more accurate than that of Seraji et al. (2016) in terms of labeled attachment score.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been a great deal of interest in developing universal dependency treebanks (McDonald et al., 2013; Rosa et al., 2014; Nivre et al., 2020). The main goal of the Universal Dependencies project (Nivre et al., 2020) is to develop a consistent linguistic annotation scheme in different levels from tokenization to syntactic dependency relations. As a result, the majority of annotation discrepancies disappear, and the resulting dataset facilitates several cross-lingual natural language processing tasks including part-of-speech transfer (Täckström et al., 2013), syntactic transfer (Naseem et al., 2010; McDonald et al., 2011; Ammar et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2019), and probing (Tenney et al., 2019; Hewitt and Manning, 2019). Starting with 10 treebanks in 2015, there are

\*Rasooli and Safari equally contributed in the conversion and experimentation process. Rasooli and Moloodi equally contributed in the linguistic design of conversion rules and manual investigation of conversions.

<sup>1</sup>The treebank is publicly available in [https://github.com/UniversalDependencies/UD\\_Persian-PerDT/tree/dev](https://github.com/UniversalDependencies/UD_Persian-PerDT/tree/dev).




Figure 1: An example of our automatic conversion. The universal labels are shown at the bottom of words.

163 treebanks in version 2.6 (May 2020) including the Uppsala Persian Treebank (Seraji et al., 2016).

Persian (aka Farsi) is a pro-drop morphologically rich language with a high degree of free word order and a unique light verb construction (Karimi-Doostan, 2011). Despite its importance, it still suffers from lack of sufficient annotated data. The Uppsala Universal treebank (Seraji et al., 2016) is currently the only publicly available universal treebank for Persian. It is a valuable resource based on news genre, and has been used as a testbed in previous work (Zeman et al., 2018; Chi et al., 2020). Among other non-universal treebanks, the Persian dependency treebank (PerDT) (Rasooli et al., 2013) is significantly larger than (Seraji et al., 2016) (29K vs. 6K sentences), and its sentences are sampled from contemporary Persian texts in different genres (as opposed to only news genre).

In this paper, we propose an automatic method for converting PerDT (Rasooli et al., 2013) to Universal Dependencies (An example of such conversion is shown in Figure 1). After a thorough analysis of dependency relations in the treebank, we design different mapping rules to generate trees with universal relations. This process involves a series of steps including unifying tokenization, part-of-

speech tags, named-entity recognition, and finally mapping dependencies. The mapping for many relations are not necessarily one-to-one, and we have to deal with peculiar cases that are specific to certain structures in modern Persian. Therefore, our approach is neither a blind one-to-one mapping, nor an expensive and time-consuming manual process. We empirically show that our annotations are more compatible with the Universal guidelines via learning a delexicalized transfer model with more than 2% absolute difference in labeled attachment score. The summary of our contributions is as following:

- We propose an automatic annotation conversion process with manual care of special cases. We develop a new Persian Universal Treebank with 29107 sentences. This is in contrast to the treebank of Seraji et al. (2016) that contains 5997 sentences.
- We develop a modified and corrected version of PerDT with the Universal tokenization scheme. Moreover, the new release resolves various tagging errors in the original dataset. Most of these corrections are made by manually fixing annotation errors flagged by our mapping pipeline.

## 2 Related Work

There has been a great deal of interest in designing and developing Persian dependency treebanks (Pouramini and Mozayani, 2007; Seraji et al., 2012, 2014, 2016; Rasooli et al., 2011b, 2013; Ghayoomi and Kuhn, 2014). Among them, the Uppsala UD treebank (Seraji et al., 2016) is the only treebank with Universal Dependencies. We have found some caveats in the Uppsala Universal Treebank (Seraji et al., 2016). This causes annotation discrepancies in some frequently used dependency relations such as *compound:lvc*, *cop*, *csubj*, *fixed*, *obl*, and *xcomp* (see §A for more details).

We primarily focus on converting the Persian dependency treebank (PerDT) (Rasooli et al., 2013). PerDT has been used in previous studies for Persian dependency parsing (Khallash et al., 2013; Feely et al., 2014; Nourian et al., 2015; Pakzad and Minaei-Bidgoli, 2016). It has been extended to other representations including semantic roles (Mirzaei and Moloodi, 2016) and discourse (Mirzaei and Safari, 2018). It is also included in the HamleDT collection (Rosa et al., 2014).

## 3 Approach

In the conversion process, we have noticed several key differences between PerDT and UD. We decompose the conversion process into 3 steps: 1) tokenization, 2) part-of-speech mapping, 3) systematic changes to PerDT, and 4) dependency relation mapping. In this section, we briefly describe the mentioned steps.

### 3.1 Tokenization

There are two key differences in PerDT tokenization from UD: 1) Multiword inflections of simple verbs in Persian are grouped as one word with spaces in between parts following the deterministic rules from (Rasooli et al., 2011a). We follow the guidelines in (Rasooli et al., 2013, Table 3) to find out the main verb and make other parts an “aux” dependent of the main verb. We introduce the “AUX” part-of-speech tag and “aux” dependency relation (“aux:pass” for passive verbs) in this UD tokenization scheme. 2) Clitics are only detached from words in cases for which they play an object or verbal role. Other clitics are pronominal clitics attached to nouns, prepositions, pronouns and adjectives. By looking at the word lemma, we recover those pronouns, and detach them, and assign their heads to the closest nominal word with the “MOZ” (*Ezafe*) dependency label.

### 3.2 POS Mapping

This is the most straightforward step except for proper nouns. We could only discover a small portion of them by finding noun phrases with an identifier (IDEN POS tag for words such as “Dr.” or “Mr.”). In addition to mapping the IDEN POS to PROP, we use a recent BERT-based Persian named-entity tagger (Taher et al., 2020) to recover additional proper nouns. The tagger can find 7 different entities including date, location, money, organization, percent, person and time. We only consider the *person* and *location* entities, and manually revise the results to add missing entities, foreign words and the name of months. Table 1 shows the mappings.

### 3.3 Systematic Changes to PerDT

Before starting to convert the treebank (Dadegan Research Group, 2012), we have made the following systematic changes to PerDT:

PerDT	Condition	UD
V		VERB
N	NER=False NER=True	NOUN PROPN
SUBR		SCONJ
CONJ		CCONJ
ADV		ADV
ADJ	NER=False NER=True	ADJ PROPN
PR		PRON
PUNC		PUNCT
ADR		INTJ
IDEN		PROPN
PART	Word=را Word∈{آخر، خوب} Otherwise	ADP INTJ PART
PREM		DET
PRENUM	Cardinal Ordinal	NUM ADJ
PREP		ADP
POSTP		ADP
POSTNUM	Cardinal Ordinal	NUM ADJ
PSUS		INTJ

Table 1: Mapping rules for part-of-speech tags.




Figure 2: The result of applying rotations of conjunctions for the sentence *Why didn't you defend in the court and acted like that?*. In this example, case rotation for preposition is also shown.

- We convert the order of verbal conjunctions in the original data. In PerDT, verbal conjunctions are conventionally attached from the end to the beginning (Dadegan Research Group, 2012).<sup>2</sup> We find this convention unintuitive and reverted the order of conjunctions. Figure 2 shows an example of such rotation.
- Words such as “billion”, “million”, “thousand” are tagged as nouns.<sup>3</sup> This might be due to the fact that these words can be inflected as plurals while number should not be inflected in Persian. We believe that a better tagging decision for these words is number since their inflection as plurals is due to a special kind

PerDT	Precondition	Pre-action	UD
ACL PRD		CMR (mark) [fig.3b]	ccomp
ADV	?→{ADJ,ADV} Otherwise		advmod obl
AJCONJ AVCONJ NCONJ PCONJ VCONJ		Conj rotation [fig.3a]	conj
AJUCL		CMR (mark) [fig.3b]	advcl
APOSTMOD APREMOD	?→{ADP} ?→{NUM} ?→nominal ?→{ADJ} ?→DET ?→{ADV}	CMR (case) [fig.3b]	obl nummod nmod amod det advmod
ADVC NEZ AJPP VPP VPRT		CMR (case) [fig.3b]	obl:arg
APP			appos
COMPPP	∃ dep Otherwise	CMR (case) [fig.3b]	case fixed
NEZ			
ENC NE NPRT NVE		CMR (case) [fig.3b]	compound:lv compound:lv
LVP			compound:lv
NCL	?→SCONJ Otherwise	CMR (mark) [fig.3b]	acl
MESU		Dep →Head (Flip)	nmod
MOS	AUX→? Otherwise	Dep →Head (Flip)	cop xcomp
MOZ	?→NOUN ?→ADJ Otherwise	CMR (case) [fig.3b]	nmod amod advmod
NADV	?→NOUN ?→ADJ Otherwise	CMR (case) [fig.3b]	nmod amod advmod
NPOSTMOD			amod
NPP	{NVE ENC}→? Otherwise	NPP rotation [fig.3c] CMR (case) [fig.3b]	obl:arg nmod
NPREMOD	?→DET ?→ cardinal Otherwise		det nummod amod
OBJ	∃ OBJ2 sib. Otherwise		iobj obj
OBJ2			obj
PARCL	?→CCONJ Otherwise	Dep →Head (Flip)	conj parataxis
PART			mark
PUNC			punct
PROG	Active→? Passive→?		aux aux:pass
ROOT			root
SBJ	Active→? Passive→?		nsubj nsubj:pass
TAM			xcomp
VCL	Modal verb→? ∃ MOS, SUBJ sib. Otherwise	Dep →Head (Flip) CMR (mark) [fig.3b]	aux csubj ccomp
PREDEP	NUM→? NOUN→PRON ?→CCONJ ?→NOUN Last mapping		advmod dislocated cc obl advmod
POSDEP	NOUN→{هم، تیر} ?→NOUN ?→CCONJ Last mapping		dep obl cc advmod

Table 2: Mapping rules for dependencies. PerDT labels are described in Rasooli et al. (2013, Table 2). First *Preconditions* (2nd column) should satisfy. Afterwards, *Preactions* (3rd column) are applied before applying the UD conversions (4th column). These preactions are depicted in Figure 3.

<sup>2</sup>Examples in <https://bit.ly/2Mfz1iH>

<sup>3</sup>Examples in <https://bit.ly/2Y105Yv>

Correction Type		#	%
Lemma	Systematic	3694	0.762
	Others	59	0.012
POS	Systematic	529	0.109
	Others	298	0.061
FPOS	Systematic	3693	0.762
	Others	90	0.018
Dependency head	Systematic	27407	5.658
	Others	967	0.199
Dependency label	Systematic	18516	3.823
	Others	656	0.135
Word Form		39	0.008

Table 3: Statistics of PerDT corrections. By systematic, we mean deterministic corrections such as verbal conjunctions (see §3.3 for details).

of *zero derivation* or *conversion* numbers to nouns in particular contexts (Booij, 2012).

- PerDT assumes that all inflections of “شدن” [ʃodæn] is passive and its lemma is “کردن” [kædæn]. We have changed this assumption and use the superficial lemma for those instances. The decision makes our data similar to the annotations of Seraji et al. (2016).

Table 3 shows the statistics of changes that we have made to the data including systematic changes and fixes to incorrect annotations.

### 3.4 Dependency Relation Mapping

PerDT contains 43 syntactic relations for which many of them cannot easily map to UD. Moreover, conjunctions in PerDT are arranged from the beginning of the sentence to the end in chain-style manner. More importantly, compared to UD scheme for which content words are considered as heads, PerDT assigns prepositions as the head of prepositional phrases and auxiliary verbs as the head of sentences.

Before applying the conversion rules, we label words that are not well-edited and typed as more than one token as *goeswith*. We then label proper noun phrases that are not syntactically compositional as *flat:name*. We also analyze complex numbers as *flat:num* and their coordinating conjunctions as *cc* dependent of each following word. Afterwards we follow the rules in Table 2. As depicted in the Table, there are conditions that should be satisfied before applying a conversion, and some actions such as flipping a head with its dependent are needed before certain mappings. Finally, we label the few remaining undecided dependencies as *dep*.

Part	Data	Sen.#	Tok.#	Word	Types#	
					Lemma	Verb
Train	UDT	4798	122K	13.9K	6.7K	1226
	<b>Ours</b>	<b>26196</b>	<b>459K</b>	<b>34.9K</b>	<b>20.7K</b>	<b>5275</b>
Dev	UDT	599	15K	3.9K	2.0K	278
	<b>Ours</b>	<b>1456</b>	<b>26K</b>	<b>7.0K</b>	<b>5.2K</b>	<b>1427</b>
Test	UDT	600	16K	3.9K	3.1K	385
	<b>Ours</b>	<b>1455</b>	<b>24K</b>	<b>6.7K</b>	<b>5.1K</b>	<b>1671</b>
All	UDT	5997	154K	15.8K	7.6K	1387
	<b>Ours</b>	<b>29107</b>	<b>509K</b>	<b>36.7K</b>	<b>21.6K</b>	<b>5413</b>

Table 4: Statistics of our data vs. UDT (Seraji et al., 2016) in different data splits.

## 4 Experiments and Analysis

The general statistics of our data vs. the Uppsala treebank (Seraji et al., 2016) are shown in Table 4. We observe that our data is superior in many aspects including size and diversity compared to the Uppsala Treebank (Seraji et al., 2016). The most important fact about PerDT is that its sentences are intentionally sampled in order to cover almost all verbs from the Verb Valency Lexicon (Rasooli et al., 2011b) leading to 3.9 times more verb lemmas than the Uppsala Treebank. Table 5 shows the counts of each dependency label in the converted Data.

**Supervised Parsing** We evaluate the resulting data by training UDPipe V.2 (Straka and Straková, 2017) along with the pre-trained fastText (Grave et al., 2018) embeddings on our data. We also evaluate our models on the Uppsala treebank (Seraji et al., 2016). Table 6 shows the parsing results using a trained model on our data and the Uppsala Treebank evaluated by the CoNLL 2018 shared task evaluation scripts (Zeman et al., 2018). It is worth noting that the goal of this evaluation is not to show which dataset brings in better parsing accuracy: it is clear that the bigger the dataset is, the higher the accuracy can be. Our goal is to show that there is a significant performance difference between the models trained on the two datasets by using the exact same training pipeline. As shown in Table 6, we see that there is a huge tagging and parsing performance difference when we move across the datasets. There are two possible reasons: domain mismatch, and annotation discrepancy. Our analysis show that annotation discrepancy plays an important role here. As described in §A, there are some core incompatibilities between the Uppsala treebank (Seraji et al., 2016) and Universal Dependencies guidelines. Our detailed analysis




Figure 3: A graphical depiction of rotation rules used in this work (see Table 2 for their use cases).

Label	Frequency	%
case	71118	14.1
conj	23739	4.7
acl	10034	1.9
obl	30737	6.1
punct	44336	8.8
cop	6366	1.2
det	10273	2
advmod	9158	1.8
aux:pass	822	0.1
nmod	59442	11.6
appos	1059	0.2
aux	12886	0.16
amod	22576	4.4
compound:lv	32339	6.4
nsubj:pass	822	0.1
nsubj	27181	5.4
name:flat	7899	1.5
dep	2035	0.4
cc	21300	4.2
root	29107	5.8
advcl	4228	0.8
obj	19999	3.9
xcomp	4920	0.9
parataxis	82	0.01
ccomp	6945	1.3
obl:arg	21510	4.2
flat:num	607	0.1
nummod	5459	1
mark	11982	2.3
fixed	144	0.02
compound:lv	439	0.08
csbj	682	0.1
vocative	174	0.03
compound	42	0.008
iobj	6	0.001
dislocated	1	0.0001

Table 5: Frequency of each universal label the converted dataset.

shows that most of cross-dataset errors come from errors in *nmod*, *obl*, *fixed*, and *xcomp*. This is in fact consistent with our manual analysis in §A.

**Delexicalized Model Transfer** One way to verify our claim about increased consistency of our UD conversion with the UD guidelines is to learn a transfer model. In this setting, we follow the delexicalized parser transfer approach which have been extensively used in previous work (Zeman

Test Data	PerDT (Ours)			Seraji et al. (2016)		
ID tagger	×	×	✓	×	×	✓
ID parser	×	×	✓	×	×	✓
Tokens	99.9	<b>99.99</b>		100	100.0	
Words	99.1	<b>99.64</b>		99.7	99.59	
UPOS	82.9	<b>96.11</b>		81.9	<b>95.75</b>	
Lemmas	80.7	<b>96.20</b>		90.2	<b>89.55</b>	
UAS	71.2	71.2	<b>88.4</b>	69.5	69.8	<b>83.5</b>
LAS	64.4	62.6	<b>85.2</b>	62.1	61.0	<b>79.4</b>
CLAS	59.9	59.3	<b>81.6</b>	56.9	56.1	<b>74.8</b>
MLAS	49.5	54.5	<b>78.9</b>	46.0	53.9	<b>73.0</b>
BLEX	44.6	56.9	<b>78.2</b>	52.1	49.0	<b>65.5</b>

Table 6: Parsing results based on the CoNLL shared task 2018 (Zeman et al., 2018) evaluation. ID stands for in-domain for which the same training set is used for training a UDPipe model (Straka and Straková, 2017)

and Resnik, 2008; McDonald et al., 2011; Täckström et al., 2012). We sample the same number of tokens as of Seraji et al. (2016) from PerDT. Afterwards, we delexicalize both of the treebanks, and learn a parser using the Yara Parser (Rasooli and Tetreault, 2015). We train two models with 15 epochs and evaluate them on the delexicalized test set of the Universal English Web Treebank (Silveira et al., 2014). The model trained on PerDT significantly outperforms the other model by 2% both in unlabeled and labeled attachment score (47.31 vs 45.37 UAS, 38.59 vs. 36.45 LAS). This is a strong indicator that our data is more compatible with the UD annotations.

## 5 Conclusion

We have introduced our approach in making PerDT (Rasooli et al., 2013) universal. During this process, we have faced different challenges such as annotation errors in the original data, tokenization inconsistencies, lack of named entities, part-of-speech and dependency label mapping. Due to automatic conversions and potential annotation errors in the original treebank, there is always a chance of some annotation incompatibilities between our treebank and the Universal guidelines. Therefore, we cannot claim that our conversion is perfect. How-



ever, our experiments have shown that our data is more compatible with the Universal Dependencies guidelines than the Uppsala treebank (Seraji et al., 2016).

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Morteza Rezaei-Sharifabadi for his efforts in getting copyright permissions and making our treebank publicly available. We also thank Daniel Zeman for helping us in the process of releasing this treebank.

## Appendix

### A Problems in the Universal Annotations of the Uppsala Universal Treebank

We briefly mention some of the problems in the Uppsala Universal Treebank (Seraji et al., 2016):

- Seraji et al. (2016) does not determine the *csubj* label in their analysis. For example, in “**lazem** **ʔæst** **ʔu beresæd**” (it is necessary for him to arrive), it is obvious that what comes after “**ʔæst**” is the clausal subject of the adjectival sentence predicate “**lazem**”. A simple syntactic test supports this viewpoint: one can convert the clausal complement “**ʔu beresæd**” to a noun phrase “**residæn-e u**” (his arrival). The new phrase plays the *nsubj* role of the sentence. Therefore, the clausal complement of the sentence should be *csubj*. Our converted data contains 682 cases of *csubj*.
- Seraji et al. (2016) considers prepositional and possessive complements of adjectival heads as *nmod* and *nmod:poss* respectively. Their analysis clearly stands in contradiction to UD annotation guideline in which *nmod* is used just for dependents of a nominal head. *obl* is much better suited for these cases.
- Seraji et al. (2016) consider “شدن” [ʃodæn] (to become) as copula. What UD asserts under the *cop* (copula) label is that “the equivalents of to become are not copulas despite the fact that traditional grammar may label them as such.” Instead, it should be deemed as a verbal predicate and its second complement as *xcomp*.
- “پیدا کردن” (“*peyda kærðæn*”) and “حاصل کردن” (“*hasel kærðæn*”) are considered as two-word light verbs (Moloodi and Kouhestani, 2017). We consider the non-verbal part as the first part of the two-word light verb, and use the *compound:lv* label for it (439 cases in PerDT). However, Seraji et al. (2016) annotate the non-verbal elements of these complex predicates as *obj* and considers “*peyda*” as a nonverbal element.
- *iobj* label is absent in (Seraji et al., 2016), most likely due to the low frequency of this syntactic relation. Our converted treebank contains 6 cases of *iobj*.
- Proper nouns are not labeled in (Seraji et al., 2016). Ours covers proper nouns (more than 23K tokens).

## References

- Waleed Ammar, George Mulcaire, Miguel Ballesteros, Chris Dyer, and Noah A. Smith. 2016. *Many languages, one parser*. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:431–444.
- Geert Booij. 2012. *The grammar of words: An introduction to linguistic morphology*. Oxford University Press.
- Ethan A Chi, John Hewitt, and Christopher D Manning. 2020. Finding universal grammatical relations in multilingual bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.04511*.
- Dadegan Research Group. 2012. Persian dependency treebank, annotation manual and user guide. *Supreme Council of Information and Communication Technology (SCICT), Tehran, Iran*.
- Weston Feely, Mehdi Manshadi, Robert Frederking, and Lori Levin. 2014. *The CMU METAL Farsi NLP approach*. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’14)*, pages 4052–4055, Reykjavik, Iceland. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Masood Ghayoomi and Jonas Kuhn. 2014. Converting an HPSG-based treebank into its parallel dependency-based treebank. In *LREC*, pages 802–809.
- Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Prakhar Gupta, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. 2018. *Learning word vectors for 157 languages*. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Languages Resources Association (ELRA).
- John Hewitt and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. *A structural probe for finding syntax in word representations*. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language*

- Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4129–4138, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gholamhossein Karimi-Doostan. 2011. Separability of light verb constructions in Persian. *Studia Linguistica*, 65(1):70–95.
- Mojtaba Khallash, Ali Hadian, and Behrouz Minaei-Bidgoli. 2013. An empirical study on the effect of morphological and lexical features in Persian dependency parsing. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Statistical Parsing of Morphologically-Rich Languages*, pages 97–107, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ryan McDonald, Joakim Nivre, Yvonne Quirnbach-Brundage, Yoav Goldberg, Dipanjan Das, Kuzman Ganchev, Keith Hall, Slav Petrov, Hao Zhang, Oscar Täckström, Claudia Bedini, Núria Bertomeu Castelló, and Jungmee Lee. 2013. Universal dependency annotation for multilingual parsing. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 92–97, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ryan McDonald, Slav Petrov, and Keith Hall. 2011. Multi-source transfer of delexicalized dependency parsers. In *Proceedings of the conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 62–72. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Azadeh Mirzaei and Amirsaeid Moloodi. 2016. Persian proposition bank. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2016)*, pages 3828–3835, Portorož, Slovenia. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Azadeh Mirzaei and Pegah Safari. 2018. Persian discourse treebank and coreference corpus. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Languages Resources Association (ELRA).
- Amirsaeid Moloodi and Manouchehr Kouhestani. 2017. The role of metaphor and metonymy in the semantics of Persian adjectival preverbs: A cognitive linguistics approach. *Language Art*, 2(2):91–105.
- Tahira Naseem, Harr Chen, Regina Barzilay, and Mark Johnson. 2010. Using universal linguistic knowledge to guide grammar induction. In *Proceedings of the 2010 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1234–1244, Cambridge, MA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joakim Nivre, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Filip Ginter, Jan Hajič, Christopher D Manning, Sampo Pyysalo, Sebastian Schuster, Francis Tyers, and Daniel Zeman. 2020. Universal dependencies v2: An evergrowing multilingual treebank collection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10643*.
- Alireza Nourian, Mohammad Sadegh Rasooli, Mohsen Imany, and Hesham Faili. 2015. On the importance of ezafe construction in Persian parsing. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 877–882, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Atefeh Pakzad and Behrouz Minaei-Bidgoli. 2016. An improved joint model: Pos tagging and dependency parsing. *Journal of AI and Data Mining*, 4(1):1–8.
- Ahmad Pouramini and Naser Mozayani. 2007. An annotation scheme for a Persian treebank. *Proceedings of Computational Linguistics In the Netherlands, CLIN*.
- Mohammad Sadegh Rasooli, Hesham Faili, and Behrouz Minaei-Bidgoli. 2011a. Unsupervised identification of Persian compound verbs. In *Mexican International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 394–406. Springer.
- Mohammad Sadegh Rasooli, Manouchehr Kouhestani, and Amirsaeid Moloodi. 2013. Development of a Persian syntactic dependency treebank. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 306–314, Atlanta, Georgia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mohammad Sadegh Rasooli, Amirsaeid Moloodi, Manouchehr Kouhestani, and Behrouz Minaei-Bidgoli. 2011b. A syntactic valency lexicon for Persian verbs: The first steps towards Persian dependency treebank. In *5th Language & Technology Conference (LTC): Human Language Technologies as a Challenge for Computer Science and Linguistics*, pages 227–231.
- Mohammad Sadegh Rasooli and Joel Tetreault. 2015. Yara parser: A fast and accurate dependency parser. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.06733*.
- Rudolf Rosa, Jan Mašek, David Mareček, Martin Popel, Daniel Zeman, and Zdeněk Žabokrtský. 2014. HamleDT 2.0: Thirty dependency treebanks stanfordized. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2014)*, pages 2334–2341, Reykjavik, Iceland. European Languages Resources Association (ELRA).
- Mojgan Seraji, Filip Ginter, and Joakim Nivre. 2016. Universal dependencies for Persian. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2016)*, pages 2361–2365, Portorož, Slovenia. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Mojgan Seraji, Carina Jahani, Beáta Megyesi, and Joakim Nivre. 2014. A Persian treebank with Stanford typed dependencies. In *Proceedings of the*

- Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2014)*, pages 796–801, Reykjavik, Iceland. European Languages Resources Association (ELRA).
- Mojgan Seraji, Beáta Megyesi, and Joakim Nivre. 2012. Bootstrapping a Persian dependency treebank. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology*, 7(18).
- Natalia Silveira, Timothy Dozat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Samuel Bowman, Miriam Connor, John Bauer, and Chris Manning. 2014. [A gold standard dependency corpus for English](#). In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2014)*, pages 2897–2904, Reykjavik, Iceland. European Languages Resources Association (ELRA).
- Milan Straka and Jana Straková. 2017. [Tokenizing, pos tagging, lemmatizing and parsing ud 2.0 with udpipes](#). In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2017 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pages 88–99, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Oscar Täckström, Dipanjan Das, Slav Petrov, Ryan McDonald, and Joakim Nivre. 2013. [Token and type constraints for cross-lingual part-of-speech tagging](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1:1–12.
- Oscar Täckström, Ryan McDonald, and Jakob Uszkoreit. 2012. [Cross-lingual word clusters for direct transfer of linguistic structure](#). In *Proceedings of the 2012 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 477–487, Montréal, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ehsan Taher, Seyed Abbas Hoseini, and Mehrmoush Shamsfard. 2020. Beheshti-NER: Persian named entity recognition using BERT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.08875*.
- Ian Tenney, Dipanjan Das, and Ellie Pavlick. 2019. [BERT rediscovers the classical NLP pipeline](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4593–4601, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daniel Zeman, Jan Hajič, Martin Popel, Martin Potthast, Milan Straka, Filip Ginter, Joakim Nivre, and Slav Petrov. 2018. [CoNLL 2018 shared task: Multilingual parsing from raw text to universal dependencies](#). In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2018 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pages 1–21, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daniel Zeman and Philip Resnik. 2008. [Cross-language parser adaptation between related languages](#). In *Proceedings of the IJCNLP-08 Workshop on NLP for Less Privileged Languages*.
- Meishan Zhang, Yue Zhang, and Guohong Fu. 2019. [Cross-lingual dependency parsing using code-mixed TreeBank](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 997–1006, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.



# Supplementary Material for The Persian Dependency Treebank Made Universal

Anonymous EMNLP submission

## 1 Systematic Changes to PerDT

Before starting to convert the treebank (?), we have made the following systematic changes to the PerDT data.

- We convert the order of verbal conjunctions in the original data. In PerDT, verbal conjunctions are conventionally attached from the end to the beginning (?).<sup>1</sup> We find this convention unintuitive and reverted the order of conjunctions. Figure 1 shows an example of such rotation.
- Words such as “billion”, “million”, “thousand” are tagged as nouns.<sup>2</sup> This might be due to the fact that these words can be inflected as plurals while number should not be inflected in Persian. We believe that a better tagging decision for these words is number since their inflection as plurals is due to a special kind of *zero derivation* or *conversion* numbers to nouns in particular contexts (?).
- PerDT assumes that all inflection of “شدن” [ʃodæn] is passive and its lemma is “کردن” [kædæn]. We have changed this assumption and use the superficial lemma for those instances. ? also does a similar thing to this paper.

Table 1 shows the statistics of changes that we have made to the data including systematic changes and fixes to incorrect annotations.

## 2 Treebank Statistics

Table 2 shows the counts of each dependency label in the converted Data.




Figure 1: The result of applying rotations of conjunctions for the sentence *Why didn't you defend in the court and acted like that?*. In this example, case rotation for preposition is also shown.

Correction Type		#	%
Lemma	Systematic	3694	0.762
	Others	59	0.012
POS	Systematic	529	0.109
	Others	298	0.061
FPOS	Systematic	3693	0.762
	Others	90	0.018
Dependency head	Systematic	27407	5.658
	Others	967	0.199
Dependency label	Systematic	18516	3.823
	Others	656	0.135
Word Form		39	0.008

Table 1: Statistics of PerDT corrections. By systematic, we mean deterministic corrections such as verbal conjunctions.

<sup>1</sup>Examples in <https://bit.ly/2Mfz1iH>

<sup>2</sup>Examples in <https://bit.ly/2Y105Yv>

Label	#	%	Label	#	%	Label	#	%
case	70206	13.7	conj	23616	4.6	acl	10035	1.9
obl	28249	5.5	punct	44306	8.7	cop	6364	1.2
det	10193	2	advmod	13383	2.6	aux:pass	822	0.1
nmod	59442	11.6	appos	1059	0.2	aux	12886	0.16
amod	22593	4.4	compound:lvc	32339	6.3	nsubj:pass	530	0.1
nsubj	27355	5.3	name:flat	7895	1.5	dep	2033	0.3
cc	21083	4.1	root	29107	5.7	advcl	4231	0.8
obj	19999	3.9	xcomp	4920	0.9	parataxis	82	0.01
ccomp	6940	1.3	obl:arg	21302	4.1	flat:num	588	0.1
nummod	5420	1	mark	11986	2.3	fixed	1468	0.2
compound:lv	439	0.08	csubj	682	0.1	vocative	174	0.03
compound	42	0.008	iobj	6	0.001	dislocated	1	0.0001

Table 2: Frequency of each universal label the converted dataset.