

Opera Graeca Adnotata: Building a 34M+ Token Multilayer Corpus for Ancient Greek

Giuseppe G. A. Celano

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science

Institute of Computer Science

Leipzig University

celano@informatik.uni-leipzig.de

Abstract

In this article, the beta version 0.1.0 of Opera Graeca Adnotata (OGA), the largest open-access multilayer corpus for Ancient Greek (AG) is presented. OGA consists of 1,687 literary works and 34M+ tokens coming from the PerseusDL and OpenGreekAndLatin GitHub repositories, which host AG texts ranging from about 800 BCE to about 250 CE. The texts have been enriched with seven annotation layers: (i) tokenization layer; (ii) sentence segmentation layer; (iii) lemmatization layer; (iv) morphological layer; (v) dependency layer; (vi) dependency function layer; (vii) Canonical Text Services (CTS) citation layer. The creation of each layer is described by highlighting the main technical and annotation-related issues encountered. Tokenization, sentence segmentation, and CTS citation are performed by rule-based algorithms, while morphosyntactic annotation is the output of the COMBO parser trained on the data of the Ancient Greek Dependency Treebank. For the sake of scalability and reusability, the corpus is released in the standoff formats PAULA XML and its offspring LAULA XML.

1 Introduction

Multilayer corpora contain a variety of different annotations modeled as independent layers. Contrary to corpora with inline annotations, multilayer corpora have the unique advantage of *scalability* and *reusability*, in that a potentially infinite number of annotation layers can be added standoff, which are connected to each other by references to base texts in a graph structure.¹

An example of an open-access multilayer corpus for a modern language is the National Corpus of Polish² (Przepiórkowski et al., 2011), which is en-

coded standoff according to the P5 TEI formalism: Polish texts mostly coming from newspapers and magazines are tokenized, sentence segmented, and annotated for morphosyntax, named entities, and word sense disambiguation.³

A number of historical language corpora have also been annotated with different layers of linguistic information, such as Coptic Scriptorium⁴ (Schroeder and Zeldes, 2016) and RIDGES Herbolology⁵ (Odebrecht et al., 2017), which are both provided in standoff PAULA XML. RIDGES Herbolology, for example, contains German herbal texts ranging from 1478 to 1870, annotated with three different transcription layers, i.e., a diplomatic one, which is the closest to the original text, and two normalization layers called “clean” and “norm,” respectively: the former aims to address the issue of a few character variations of the diplomatic transcription, while the latter offers a higher-level uniformity according to the principles of modern German orthography.

Besides morphosyntactic annotation, it is noteworthy that the standoff nature of the RIDGES corpus allows addition of, for example, lexical layers, such as the one specifying a token’s language (e.g., whether it is in German or Latin) and the one containing the full name of a person name, both of which would be difficult to add to syntactic annotation inline.

In the present article, I describe the beta version of Opera Graeca Adnotata (OGA), a multilayer corpus for Ancient Greek (AG) (Celano, 2023), focusing on its design, as well as on the technical and annotation-related issues encountered while dealing with a large-size dataset consisting of 1,687 texts and 34,172,140 tokens, which represents the

¹While Zeldes (2018) proposes a definition of “multilayer” with reference to independent annotation *types*, I adopt a definition where independence simply refers to formally separate standoff annotation layers, regardless of how content-wise independent layers are.

²<https://nkjp.pl/>

³Data can be downloaded at <https://clip.ipipan.waw.pl/NationalCorpusOfPolish>.

⁴<http://copticcriptorium.org>

⁵<https://www.laudatio-repository.org/browse/corpus/PySSCnMB7CArCQ9CNKFY/corpora>

largest open-access corpus so far published for AG.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, related work is presented, while Section 3 introduces the standoff formalism of PAULA XML and its offspring LAULA XML. In Section 4 and its subsections, the texts (Section 4.1) and their seven annotation layers are described: (i) tokenization layer (Section 4.2); (ii) sentence segmentation layer (Section 4.3); (iii) lemmatization layer (Section 4.4); (iv) morphological layer (Section 4.4); (v) dependency layer (Section 4.4); (vi) dependency function layer (Section 4.4); (vii) Canonical Text Services (CTS) citation layer (Section 4.5). Section 5 concludes the article with a short summary and final remarks.

2 Related Work

There exist a few noticeable corpora for AG. The *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*⁶ is the largest non-open-access corpus for AG (110M+ words); its texts are accessible only via a query interface with limited functionality (mostly word form and lemma search). The open-access counterpart of TLG is represented by Perseus Digital Library⁷ and its offspring Scaife Viewer,⁸ whose collection of literary AG texts coincides with that of OGA (see Section 4.1): both websites aim to offer a reading environment for historical texts.

Among the ever-growing number of open-access resources, treebanks are particularly worth mentioning, in that they contain a variety of texts manually annotated for morphosyntax (see Celano, 2019 for an overview), which many other resources, including OGA, (at least partly) rely on.

The Diorisis corpus⁹ offers lemmatization and morphological analyses of 820 texts and 10,191,371 tokens (Vatri and McGillivray, 2018). More recently, the GLAUx project aims to provide a larger morphosyntactically and semantically annotated corpus, i.e., the GLAUx corpus (Keersmaekers, 2021): at the moment, a demo version has been released,¹⁰ consisting of 13,374,342 morphosyntactically annotated tokens.¹¹

⁶<https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/>

⁷<https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>

⁸<https://scaife.perseus.org/>

⁹https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/The_Diorisis_Ancient_Greek_Corpus/6187256

¹⁰<https://github.com/perseids-publications/glaux-trees/tree/master/public/xml>

¹¹More recently, an attempt to annotate Ancient Greek more accurately is detailed in Keersmaekers and Van Hal (2023), but no new data has yet been published.

The above-mentioned annotated corpora share the characteristic of being encoded in a project-specific format, which is meant to provide consumable, but hardly reusable, data.

3 PAULA XML and LAULA XML

PAULA XML (*Potsdamer AUstauschformat Linguistischer Annotationen*) is an established open-access standoff format for linguistic annotation (Dipper, 2005). It was inspired by LAF (Linguistic Annotation Framework, Ide and Romary, 2004), and therefore has many commonalities with the non-open-access GrAF format (Graph Annotation Format, Ide and Suderman, 2007).

In PAULA XML, a base text is directly or indirectly referenced by identifiers contained in annotation layers, each of which is stored in a separate file.¹² All together, the files form an acyclic graph. A base text embeds the transcription of an original text within a shallow XML structure, so that it can typically be referenced by at least one annotation layer, i.e., a tokenization layer, which identifies tokens by referencing character offsets. Each thus identified token is associated with an ID, i.e., a unique identifier that can in turn be referenced in other annotation layers.

Indeed, as shown in Figure 1, the XPointer expressions within the tokenization layer reference the base text by specifying the start offset of a token—numbering starts with 1 and not 0—and its length. The XPointer expressions are associated with IDs, which can then be used, for example, in the morphological layer to associate each of them with the corresponding morphological annotation contained in the `value` attribute.

Such a model has the advantage of offering an elegant solution to the issue of overlapping markup. For example, a layer for prosody annotation could refer to tokens different from morphosyntactic tokens: for different tokenization layers to reference the same base text would then guarantee that their schemata can be compared.

Currently, OGA contains the following annotation layers (see Figure 2): (i) tokenization layer; (ii) sentence segmentation layer;¹³ (iii) lemmatization

¹²Standoff annotation is typically performed by using separate files for each annotation layer and indeed, this is the PAULA XML model. However, it is to be noted that standoff annotation is primarily defined by a referencing mechanism keeping markup data and text to markup separate, without this necessarily implying separation in different files. However, for scalability purposes, different files are typically used.

¹³This layer is available in LAULA XML, but not in PAULA




Figure 1: Logic of standoff annotation layers in PAULA XML

layer; (iv) morphological layer; (v) dependency layer; (vi) dependency function layer; (vii) CTS citation layer.

Notably, PAULA XML requires a base text to be inserted in the `<body>` element of an XML file, without any XML markup within it. This has an impact for OGA, its main texts being extracted from often complex EpiDoc TEI XML texts (see Section 4.2).

PAULA XML is part of a set of technologies developed for annotation of multilayer corpora, which includes ANNIS¹⁴ (Krause and Zeldes, 2014), a query engine, Salt, a meta model for manipulating linguistics data, Pepper, a converter between different annotation formats, and Hexatomic, an annotation editor.

One disadvantage of PAULA XML is that the size of a corpus tends to grow exponentially as new texts and/or annotation layers are added. For example, the directory containing the PAULA files of OGA 0.1.0 is as large as about 15 GB (unzipped). For this reason, OGA files are processed using a lighter and more efficient XML structure, called LAULA XML (*Leipziger AUSTAUSCHFORMAT Linguistischer Annotationen*), which retains the logic of PAULA XML, but its repeating element and attribute names are shortened to one character (e.g., `<mark>` becomes `<m>` and `<feature>` `<f>`); moreover, information that in PAULA XML can only be added inside XML comments is conveniently encoded, in LAULA XML, within XML attributes, whose content can usually be retrieved much faster

XML (see Section 4.3).

¹⁴<https://corpus-tools.org/annis/>

by XPath parsers.

LAULA XML also allows original TEI XML files to be directly referenced, without the need of modifying texts, a particularly convenient property for corpora such as OGA, whose main texts only consist of EpiDoc TEI XML files (see Section 4.1). In general, PAULA XML is used as a serialization format for the sake of ANNIS, the query engine facilitating corpus query, while LAULA XML has been created for a more efficient XML parsing of the texts.

4 The OGA pipeline

Due to the high number of texts and annotation layers to process, OGA is created automatically, with minimal human inspection: it is the output of a number of scripts, whose content is summarized in the following subsections. Because of its large size, the corpus, a few related resources, and its documentation is made available on Zenodo.¹⁵

4.1 The Texts

The main texts of OGA 0.1.0 come from two GitHub repositories: (i) Canonical Greek¹⁶ and (ii) First1KGreek.¹⁷ While the former contains Classical Greek texts, which mostly coincide with the ones available on Perseus Digital Library 4.0,¹⁸ the latter aims to complement the former by adding one edition of any Greek work composed until about 250 CE.

Since at least 2017, these texts have been edited actively for correction of OCR errors and, more in general, for compliance with more recent standards. In particular, there has been an ongoing effort to transition older XML files into EpiDoc P5 TEI XML files and provide each text with CTS structure (see Section 4.5). New releases of both repositories are issued on a frequent basis.

The texts in OGA 0.1.0 are a subset of those of the releases 0.0.5217465242 (Canonical Greek) and 1.1.5225573344 (First1KGreek), amounting to 1,687 texts out of 1,801. Indeed, only CTS-compliant files are selected and only the first file for a work is chosen, if, as occurs in a few cases, more than one file (i.e., edition) is available.

¹⁵<https://zenodo.org/records/8158675>

¹⁶<https://github.com/PerseusDL/canonical-greekLit/?tab=readme-ov-file>

¹⁷<https://github.com/PerseusDL/canonical-greekLit/>

¹⁸<https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>




Figure 2: Architecture of Standoff PAULA XML for OGA

Although correction of the original texts is outside the scope of OGA, some automatic encoding normalization is performed because characters with similar glyphs are often confused and therefore inconsistently encoded with different Unicode codepoints.

More precisely, NFC normalization is applied to address the issue of characters such as “epsilon with an acute accent,” which can be encoded as the Unicode codepoint U+03AD or U+1F73, the former being in the “Greek and Coptic” chart, while the latter in the “Greek Extended” one: only the codepoint U+03AD is, however, the NFC-normalized codepoint, and therefore NFC normalization will make encoding of this character uniform.

NFC-normalization cannot, however, solve all character inconsistency-related issues. For this reason, an *ad-hoc* script tries to normalize the encoding of the rather frequently occurring apostrophe character, for which—as in the encoding of other languages—different Unicode codepoints tend to be used.

More precisely, the codepoints COMBINING COMMA ABOVE (U+0313), GREEK KORONIS (U+1FBD), APOSTROPHE (U+0027), and RIGHT SINGLE QUOTATION MARK (U+2019) are substituted with MODIFIER LETTER APOSTROPHE (U+02BC). Since the APOSTROPHE (U+0027) and RIGHT SINGLE QUOTATION MARK (U+2019) at the end of a word cannot be unambiguously identified as representing an apostrophe, a word list for the most common elided Greek words is used to this end, which is also made available in the corpus release.

4.2 Tokenization

Since the original texts are encoded as EpiDoc TEI XML texts, preprocessing is needed to separate the

text of a work, which annotation layers refer to, from its paratext, which is not annotated. This is a non-trivial task with heavily marked-up historical texts, because the distinction between text and paratext is signalled in TEI documents via use of many different XML elements that serve different functions.

For example, the element <note>, as the name itself suggests, contains a note, and therefore its content can be safely identified as paratext. Similarly, the contents of elements such as <app> and <bibl> can be discarded, in that they unambiguously identify paratext related to critical apparatus and bibliography, respectively.

The content of other TEI elements is, however, part of a text: for example, <foreign> contains a foreign language term, while <add> signals a text addition by an editor, which should arguably be considered as part of the main text.

In a few cases, the semantics, and consequently the structure, of a TEI element is complex. For example, <choice> presents a number of alternative readings for a specific passage: it can contain <sic> to highlight a certain word form whose correction is given in its sibling element <corr>; or it can contain the sibling elements <abbr> and <expan> for an abbreviation and its expansion, respectively.

Currently, OGA contains a morphosyntactic tokenization of the texts performed rule-based, in that there is almost a one-to-one correspondence between graphic words and morphosyntactic tokens. The most notable exception to this occurs in case of crasis, i.e., the phonological phenomenon whereby two words can be univerted: for example, the word $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ consists of the words $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (“and”) and $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (“that”). Since they belong to different POS, they need to be separated in a morphosyntactic tokenization schema. Luckily, most cases

of crasis can be unambiguously identified because of the punctuation mark “coronis” (i.e., the Unicode codepoint COMBINING COMMA ABOVE, U+0313) placed on a non-initial vowel.

On the basis of this formal criterion, the texts have been searched for words with a coronis and a list of them, which is also made available in the OGA release, has been compiled and used for tokenization. Cases where a coronis is more difficult to identify, as when a smooth breathing is on a word-initial vowel, have been left untreated.

Notably, XPointer expressions in a PAULA XML tokenization layer reference a base text that only consists of a long string contained in a <body> element (see Figure 1), in that no XML markup is allowed in it; on the other hand, since base texts in LAULA XML coincide with the original EpiDoc TEI XML texts, tokenization layers can reference them conveniently through XPath expressions that follow their CTS structures (see Section 4.5).

4.3 Sentence Segmentation

Similarly to tokenization, sentence segmentation is achieved in OGA through a rule-based algorithm. In fact, sentence boundaries are signaled unambiguously in modern editions of AG texts by the period, semicolon, and middle dot punctuation marks.

The algorithm also addresses the issue of use of parentheses—mostly of editorial meaning—in conjunction with other sentence-final punctuation marks, in that their order is not standardized, but usually follows a modern language’s style rules.

The sentence segmentation layer is made available only in LAULA XML; in fact, as explained in Section 4.1, PAULA XML is mainly used as a serialization format for ANNIS, which can display and query annotations without the help of sentence boundaries.

4.4 Morphosyntactic Annotation

The morphosyntactic annotation in OGA 0.1.0 is performed automatically using the COMBO parser,¹⁹ trained on the data of the Ancient Greek Dependency Treebank 2.1 (AGDT).

COMBO is a jointly trained POS tagger, lemmatizer, and dependency parser,²⁰ which participated in the 2018 CoNLL Universal Dependency Shared Task and ranked among the best parsers (3-5 for

LAS, 4 for MLAS, and 3-4 for BLEX).²¹ COMBO also scored among the best systems when specifically evaluated on the AG data, which derive from AGDT 2.1: more precisely, the UD conversion contains a subset of the data (approximately 2/5 of the sentences/tokens contained in AGDT 2.1).

Differently from other parsers, COMBO is open access, easy to use and, most importantly, can also be trained on treebanks whose annotation schema is similar to—but does not coincide with—that of Universal Dependency (UD).

When trained on the original AGDT data, COMBO returns F1 scores for UPOS, FEATS, and LEMMA comparable to the 2018 Shared Task ones; however, the scores for XPOS, UAS, and LAS differ by about 10.8% on average (see Table 1).

The AGDT annotation scheme derives from that of the Prague Dependency Treebank²² (Hajič et al., 2018) and consists of four annotation layers: (i) morphological layer; (ii) lemma layer; (iii) dependency layer; (iv) dependency function layer.

The morphological annotation is represented as a 9-character string, where the first character is the part of speech of a token and the remaining characters its morphological features. The lemma annotation refers to the dictionary entry for a token: remarkably, the AGDT annotation schema follows the convention of representing lemmas as *single* word forms, even if, in traditional grammar, lemmas consist of more word forms, which describe a token more accurately: for example, a lemma for a noun in an AG dictionary consists not only of its nominative form, as in AGDT, but also of its genitive, which conveys relevant information about its declension.

The syntactic annotation follows a dependency formalism, which consists in the identification of directed relations between a head token and its dependent token—with a head token being able to have more than one dependent, but not viceversa. When considered together, all relations form a directed acyclic graph, more commonly described as an (upside-down) syntactic tree. Each syntactic dependency is also typed with a syntactic label expressing the function a dependent has with reference to its head (e.g., subject or attribute).

Dependency grammar formalism is quite popular in computational linguistics because it represents a

¹⁹<https://github.com/360er0/COMBO>

²⁰For brevity’s sake, I just call it “parser.”

²¹<https://universaldependencies.org/conll18/results.html>

²²<https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/prague-dependency-treebank>

Treebank	UPOS	XPOS	FEATS	LEMMA	UAS	LAS
UD Ancient Greek Perseus	91.78	72.33	90.24	84.65	80.27	74.20
AGDT 2.1	94.04	85.41	89.48	88.95	71.47	63.55

Table 1: Comparison of F1 scores for the COMBO parser trained on the AGDT 2.1 texts and on their partial conversion into the UD annotation scheme (the UD scores are from 2018 Shared Task).

balanced trade-off between syntactic analysis precision and annotation feasibility. Describing the many details of the syntactic annotation is outside the scope of the article: the reader is referred for them to Celano (2019) and the annotation guidelines (Crane and Bamman, 2008; Celano, 2014).

4.5 CTS Citation

CTS citation refers, in general, to a protocol to retrieve passages from a literary work by means of URNs (Blackwell and Smith, 2020), which include identifiers for an author, work, edition, and passage.

In reference to the annotation layer, however, the phrase “CTS citation” is used with a narrower scope, just to indicate a tag for the passage assigned to each token.²³ For example, since Herodotus’ Histories are divided into books, chapters, and sections, a CTS citation tag provides each token of this work with the number of the book, chapter, and section it belongs to.

Indeed, OGA base texts are based only on those EpiDoc TEI XML texts containing a `<refsDecl n="CTS">` element (within the `<encodingDesc>` element), in which an XPath expression is provided for identification of work divisions. For example, in the file `tlg1600.tlg001.perseus-grc2.xml` (corresponding to *Flavii Philostrati Opera*, Vol. 2), the following XPath expression is given:

```
/tei:TEI/tei:text/tei:body
/tei:div/tei:div[@n="$1"]
/tei:div[@n="$2"]
```

. The variables \$1 and \$2 stand, respectively, for the numbers of the first and second kind of division (div), which, in this case, correspond to “book” and “chapter”—the division names are also specified within a `<refsDecl>` element.

The importance of the CTS citation layer for philological, historical, and linguistic studies cannot be overstated, considering how heavily they rely on the network of references made possible through such passage numbering system.

²³Actually, an identifier for an author, work, edition is contained in the file name of each original text file, and is retained also in the OGA file names.

5 Conclusion and Outlook

In this paper, the architecture of the beta version 0.1.0 of the OGA corpus has been presented. The base texts and their seven annotation layers have been described: (i) tokenization layer; (ii) sentence segmentation layer; (iii) lemmatization layer; (iv) morphological layer; (v) dependency layer; (vi) dependency function layer; (vii) CTS citation layer. The layers are serialized as standoff PAULA XML and standoff LAULA XML for maximum scalability and reusability.

I examined the issues and challenges related to character encoding normalization and to the rule-based tokenization of base texts, which are often extracted from complex EpiDoc TEI XML files. The main elements of the automatic morphosyntactic annotation and CTS citation layer have also been outlined.

A stable version of OGA is planned to be released with an evaluation of the performance of the tokenizer and sentence segmenter and with a refinement of the morphosyntactic annotation. Other annotation layers, such as an IPA transcription one, are also planned to be added.

6 Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG project number 408121292).

References

- Christopher W Blackwell and Neel Smith. 2020. [The cite architecture \(cts/cite\) for analysis and alignment. *it - Information Technology*, 62\(2\):91–98.](#)
- Giuseppe G. A. Celano. 2014. Guidelines for the Annotation of the Ancient Greek Dependency Treebank 2.0. https://github.com/PerseusDL/treebank_data/edit/master/AGDT2/guidelines.
- Giuseppe G. A. Celano. 2019. [The dependency treebanks for Ancient Greek and Latin](#). In Monica Berti, editor, *Digital Classical Philology. Ancient Greek and Latin in the Digital Revolution*, page 279–298. De Gruyter.

- Giuseppe G. A. Celano. 2023. *Opera Graeca Annotata*. Version 0.1.0. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8158675>.
- Gregory Crane and David Bamman. 2008. Guidelines for the Syntactic Annotation of the Ancient Greek Dependency Treebank 1.1. https://github.com/PerseusDL/treebank_data/edit/master/AGDT2/guidelines.
- Stefanie Dipper. 2005. Xml-based stand-off representation and exploitation of multi-level linguistic annotation. In *Proceedings of Berliner XML Tage 2005 (BXML 2005)*, pages 39–50, Berlin, Germany.
- Jan Hajič, Eduard Bejček, Alevtina Bémová, Eva Buráňová, Eva Hajičová, Jiří Havelka, Petr Homola, Jiří Kárník, Václava Kettnerová, Natalia Klyueva, Veronika Kolářová, Lucie Kučová, Markéta Lopatková, Marie Mikulová, Jiří Mírovský, Anna Nedoluzhko, Petr Pajas, Jarmila Panevová, Lucie Poláková, Magdaléna Rysová, Petr Sgall, Johanka Spoustová, Pavel Straňák, Pavlína Synková, Magda Ševčíková, Jan Štěpánek, Zdeňka Uřešová, Barbora Vidová Hladká, Daniel Zeman, Šárka Zikánová, and Zdeněk Žabokrtský. 2018. *Prague Dependency Treebank 3.5*. LINDAT/CLARIN digital library at the Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics (ÚFAL), Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University.
- Nancy Ide and Laurent Romary. 2004. *International standard for a linguistic annotation framework*. *Natural Language Engineering*, 10(3–4):211–225.
- Nancy Ide and Keith Suderman. 2007. *GrAF: A graph-based format for linguistic annotations*. In *Proceedings of the Linguistic Annotation Workshop*, pages 1–8, Prague, Czech Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alek Keersmaekers. 2021. *The GLAUx corpus: methodological issues in designing a long-term, diverse, multi-layered corpus of Ancient Greek*. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Computational Approaches to Historical Language Change 2021*, pages 39–50, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alek Keersmaekers and Toon Van Hal. 2023. *Creating a large-scale diachronic corpus resource: Automated parsing in the Greek papyri (and beyond)*. *Natural Language Engineering*, page 1–30.
- Thomas Krause and Amir Zeldes. 2014. *ANNIS3: A new architecture for generic corpus query and visualization*. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 31(1):118–139.
- Carolin Odebrecht, Malte Belz, Amir Zeldes, Anke Lüdeling, and Thomas Krause. 2017. *Ridges Herbiology: Designing a diachronic multi-layer corpus*. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 51:695–725.
- Adam Przepiórkowski, Mirosław Bańko, Rafał L Górski, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Marek Łaziński, and Piotr Pezik. 2011. National corpus of Polish. In *Proceedings of the 5th Language & Technology Conference: Human Language Technologies as a Challenge for Computer Science and Linguistics*, pages 259–263. Fundacja Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza Poznań.
- Caroline T. Schroeder and Amir Zeldes. 2016. *Raiders of the lost corpus*. *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, 10(2).
- Alessandro Vatri and Barbara McGillivray. 2018. *The Diorisis Ancient Greek Corpus: Linguistics and literature*. *Research Data Journal for the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(1):55–65.
- Amir Zeldes. 2018. *Multilayer Corpus Studies*. Routledge.