

Dravidian language family through Universal Dependencies lens

Taraka Rama
Independent Researcher

Sowmya Vajjala
National Research Council, Canada
sowmya.vajjala@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca

Abstract

The Universal Dependencies (UD) project aims to create a cross-linguistically consistent dependency annotation for multiple languages, to facilitate multilingual NLP. It currently supports 114 languages. Dravidian languages are spoken by over 200 million people across the world, and yet there are only two languages from this family in UD. This paper examines some of the morphological and syntactic features of Dravidian languages and explores how they can be annotated in the UD framework.

1 Introduction

Treebanks are one of the basic resources needed for developing tools for natural language processing. However, developing a treebank requires significant annotation effort and early NLP research featured large treebank projects such as Penn Treebank (Marcus et al., 1993) and Prague Dependency Treebank (Böhmová et al., 2003) each following their own annotation schema. Recently, the Universal Dependencies (UD)¹ became a popular framework to create cross-linguistically consistent dependency treebanks. Such consistent dependency annotations are also useful for language typology and multilingual NLP studies.

The Dravidian family consists of about 80² language varieties (languages and dialects) that are spoken by more than 220 million people across the world. Until now, only 2 of the 114 languages represented in UD 2.8 belong to the Dravidian family—Tamil and Telugu. While there are treebanks for some of the major Dravidian languages in the Pāṇinian *kāraṅka* framework (Rao et al., 2014), there are no computational tools to convert or compare the Pāṇinian treebanks with the treebanks annotated in the UD framework. In this paper, we describe the characteristics of Dravidian languages with representative examples from a language from each of the four major branches (Figure 1a shows the phylogenetic tree) as representative examples, and discuss the UD framework annotation effort for this language family.


This paper is organized as follows: We introduce the Dravidian language family and its salient features, and survey relevant literature in the section that follows (§2). We will note our observations about some specific issues related to word tokenization including lemmatization (§3), annotating morphology (§4), part-of-speech tagging (§5), and syntax (§6) for Dravidian languages in the sections that follow, comparing how similar issues were addressed in UD, where possible. Finally, Section 7 summarizes the paper’s main points of discussion.

2 Dravidian Languages and Treebanks


The Dravidian language family consists of around 80 language varieties, and is the *sixth* largest language family in the world in terms of the number of speakers. Dravidian languages are primarily spoken in South Asia, concentrated around South and Central India (Figure 1b). In addition, the languages are also spoken in many other parts of the world, through diaspora. Of these, four languages – Telugu, Tamil, Kannada, and Malayalam – are among the official languages of India. All the four languages have their own writing systems and a long standing (written) literary tradition. The Dravidian language family has four subgroups: South I, South II, Central, and North Dravidian (Figure 1a). The South Dravidian I

¹The latest released version <http://hdl.handle.net/11234/1-3687> has 202 treebanks in 114 languages.

²<https://glottolog.org/resource/languid/id/drav1251>



(a) Dravidian family according to Glottolog.



(b) Map of the Dravidian languages with colors showing the subgroups.

Figure 1: Dravidian Languages’ subgrouping and geographical distribution.

subgroup consists of three of the four major literary Dravidian languages Tamil, Kannada, and Malayalam. We take Tamil as a representative language for this group. Telugu belongs to the South Dravidian II branch. We will analyze examples from Gadaba and Brahui languages that represent Central and North Dravidian subgroups respectively.

Major family features Dravidian languages are agglutinative languages where suffixation and compounding are used instead of prefixes and infixes to express grammatical relations. Reduplication and echo-words are frequently seen in Dravidian languages, as is commonly seen in other language families of this linguistic area (Emeneau, 1956). The major word classes in Dravidian languages are: nominals (nouns, pronouns, numerals, adverbs of time and place), adjectives, verbs, adverbs, and clitics (Krishnamurti, 2003, ch 2). Negation is typically conveyed through verbal morphosyntax. Articles are not present as a separate word class, and their function is conveyed through other grammatical means (Steever, 2019, ch 1). The languages are relatively free word order, with Subject-Object-Verb being the dominant word order. Inclination towards pro-drop is an important feature of all languages of this family. Most Dravidian languages have a clusivity distinction. Dative subject constructions are a common phenomenon. Relative clauses typically precede the head noun. The passive voice is rarely used.

2.1 Dravidian Treebanks

Dravidian languages are under-represented in treebanking projects. All the research in this direction has focused on the Pāṇinian framework for dependency annotations (Begum et al., 2008). Husain (2009) and Husain et al. (2010) describe a Telugu dependency treebank in Pāṇinian framework, developed for a shared task on dependency parsing, which is not available under an open license. In the recent past, Tandon and Sharma (2017) described freely available treebanks for Indian languages in the same framework, that consisted of three Dravidian languages – Telugu, Tamil, and Kannada. Nallani et al. (2020) describe an enhanced Telugu dependency treebank building on the previous work in the Pāṇinian framework. Rao et al. (2014) described annotation guidelines for Kannada using Pāṇinian framework. Ramasamy and Žabokrtskỳ (2012) developed a Prague dependency style treebank for Tamil which is different from the Pāṇinian framework based treebanks for the Dravidian languages.

UD and Dravidian Languages Within the universal dependencies framework, Dravidian languages are among the least represented groups. Small treebanks exist for two major Dravidian languages: (1) Tamil (Ramasamy and Žabokrtskỳ, 2012), converted from Prague style dependencies, approximately 500 sentences, (2) Telugu (Rama and Vajjala, 2018), developed from scratch based on a Telugu grammar book examples, about 1300 sentences. While there is some research on converting Hindi Pāṇinian treebank to Universal Dependencies in the past (Tandon et al., 2016), we are not aware of any such conversion effort

for the Dravidian languages.

Given this background, there is a need for Dravidian language treebanks, to increase the diversity of UD and develop NLP resources, and support linguistic typology research. Considering that there is a large amount of recent research into developing treebanks from scratch for very under-resourced (and sometimes, endangered) languages such as Albanian (Toska et al., 2020) and St. Lawrence Island Yupik (Park et al., 2021), we believe that there should be efforts to build treebanks for various Dravidian languages as well. Past research (Bharati et al., 2002; Begum et al., 2008) described few challenges in annotation efforts for Indian languages, although the discussion entirely focused on Hindi. To our knowledge, this is the first paper to specifically address Dravidian language issues in the context of universal dependencies treebanking.

Notes on transcription Following the South Asian transcription system employed in Dravidian scholarship, a bar under a consonant \bar{t} represents alveolar sound, a dot under a consonant \dot{t} represents a retroflex sound. Tamil retroflex approximant $\bar{ɻ}$ is written as \bar{z} and a alveolar tap $ṛ$ through \bar{r} . Vowel length is shown with a macron \bar{a} .

3 Word Tokenization/Lemmatization

Dravidian languages are agglutinative in nature and inflection is a widely seen phenomenon. It is common to see multi-word tokens in a typical sentence or have single token sentences with dropped subjects. UD framework supports an extension of the original CONLL-X annotation scheme, to annotate such multi-word tokens, where words are indexed with integers, and multi-word tokens are indexed with integer ranges. While this seems to be a common annotation procedure with 67/114 languages in UD 2.8 using it, Park et al. (2021) recently argued for a morpheme level annotation for highly inflected languages which might be a possible direction for annotating Dravidian language treebanks in UD.

For example, consider the following two single token sentences from Telugu, shown in Figure 2. The first one is a compound/serial verb with dropped subject from Old Telugu (ancestral language from the fifteenth century), along with its contemporary variant (Steever, 2019, p. 200). The second sentence is a question with a non-overt copula, where the two words in the sentence are fused into one. A dependency annotation following token level convention in these cases will only show a PUNCT relation between the root (which is the single token) and the punctuation marker. A morpheme level annotation may be more suited for such case, as shown in Figure 2.



Figure 2: Token and Morpheme level annotation

Although the existing Dravidian language treebanks in UD do not have such morpheme level annotation, it will be worthwhile to weigh this aspect while developing new Dravidian treebanks in future. However, it is worth noting that there are no ready to use, easily accessible tokenizers/morph analyzers/lemmatizers for most of these languages as of now. The Unimorph (Kirov et al., 2018) project, which currently supports morphological analyzers for three Dravidian languages (Telugu, Tamil, Kannada), can be used as a starting point for this purpose.

4 Morphological Features

Morphological specification of a word in UD consists of three levels: lemma, morphological features, and POS tags. We discussed the lemma annotation in the previous section. In this section, we discuss some common morphological features in Dravidian languages and how they could be addressed within the UD framework. Dravidian languages have two major word classes: nouns and verbs (Krishnamurti, 2003). Nouns possess number/gender and are inflected for case, along with pronouns and numerals, which are considered nominals in the Dravidian comparative scholarship. Adverbs of time and place can also inflect for case. Verbs show agreement with number, gender and person of its agent and are inflected for tense, aspect, mood and modality. Case relations are expressed either by bound morphemes or by post positions. Negation is typically conveyed through verbal morphosyntax i.e., verbs have both positive and negative forms. The following subsections discuss some specific morphological features in the context of Dravidian languages and UD. We mapped the morphological features in the comparative handbooks to the UD schema.

4.1 Clitics

Clitic is a bound morpheme that is phonologically dependent on a host, but syntactically independent (Velupillai, 2012, ch 5). In UD, clitics are language specific features, where some languages (e.g., Polish) mark it as a Yes/No feature, while others (e.g., Finnish and Skolt-Sami) use feature values that express the function of the clitic (e.g., question, focus). In Dravidian languages, clitics perform various functions, such as: interrogative (e.g., Tamil: *avanā* - “is it him?”), emphasis (e.g., Telugu: *adē nā pustakam* - “**That** is my book”), and conjunction (Tamil: *kamalavō carōjavō* - “either Kamala **or** Saroja”). Any constituent can be turned into a question using a clitic, as illustrated by the following Tamil examples in Figure 3.

- | | |
|---|---|
| (3) <i>avan</i> <i>nērru</i> <i>va-nt-āṅ-ā?</i>
that.man-Nom yesterday come-Past-3 Sing Masc Int
'Did he come yesterday?' | (4) <i>kaṇṇaṅ</i> <i>eppozutu</i> <i>varu-kir-āṅ?</i>
Kannan-Nom when come-Pres-3 Sing Masc
'When is Kannan coming?' |
|---|---|

Figure 3: Interrogative Clitics in Tamil

Additionally, Brahui has first and second person clitic pronouns, which have a genitive meaning when suffixed to a nominal and dative-accusative when suffixed to a verb (Steever, 2019, p. 397), as shown in Figure 4.

- | | |
|--|--|
| (5) <i>bāva-ta</i> <i>pārē</i>
father-Gen say-Past-3 Sing
'His/Her father said.' | (6) <i>bāva-tā</i> <i>pārē-tā</i>
father-Gen Plur say-Past-3 Plur Acc
'Their father said to them.' |
|--|--|

Figure 4: Clitics in Brahui

Considering these diverse functions, it is perhaps appropriate to mark the value of the clitic feature in Dravidian languages in terms of its function in the sentence, rather than a binary yes/no value. Sometimes, clitics may also appear as separate tokens, which we will discuss in the next section.

4.2 Compound Words

Compounds might need a special treatment, as suggested by de Marneffe et al. (2021), since they can appear both with and without word boundary in Dravidian languages. When appearing with a word boundary, they can be related by a dependency relation (*compound*) along with a subtype (e.g., *redup*, *svc*) where needed. However, when they appear as a single token in a sentence, a language specific feature *compound* may be used, as is currently being done with languages such as Sanskrit, Estonian, and Romanian.

Reduplication is a frequently observed morphological process in South Asian languages, especially among the Indo-aryan and Dravidian language families. Echo words and onomatopoeia are also observed




Figure 5: Morphological analysis for Reduplication

with reduplication (Abbi, 1994). These can be considered a special case of compound words. However, within or outside UD, there is no consistent scheme for annotating these phenomenon, and it is generally considered a language specific feature. While some treebanks annotated reduplication as a syntactic relation *compound:redup* (e.g., Naija, Turkish, and Uyghur), others annotated it as a morphological feature Echo, taking a value “Rdp” or “Ech” with or without annotating the syntactic relation explicitly as a compound or *compound:redup* (e.g., Hindi).

In the Hindi treebank (Bhat et al., 2017), it was proposed that reduplication and echo words have their own POS tags. However, since these words play different syntactic roles in a sentence, it is more appropriate to consider reduplication as a morphological feature, and use the POS tags as per their role in the sentence. In the case of reduplication within a single word, we could annotate the morphological feature of the word indicating the same, and POS tag can follow the role of the word in the sentence. If the reduplicated compound appears as two words instead of one, they can be connected by the dependency relation *compound*, with its subtype *redup*. This is illustrated in the Tamil example below.

However, a challenging scenario for analysis comes with sentences where the reduplicated word also known as echo words such as *puli-gili* ‘tigers and the like’ (Emeneau, 1956, p. 10) where the first syllable in the previous word is replaced by *gi-* in the Dravidian family. Consider the following Telugu sentence from Krishnamurti (2003, p. 487).

- (8) vāḍi-ki illu lēdu , gillu lēdu .
 He-Acc house not-VERB , thing-compound=redup not-VERB .
 ‘He has no house and nothing of that sort’

Reduplicated words don’t always have a meaning of their own (e.g., *gillu* in this example). Considering that such sentence constructions are common in all several Dravidian languages, we need a standardized way of annotating the morphological features of such words.

Onomatopoeia hasn’t been discussed much in Universal Dependencies research, to our knowledge. While Badmaeva and Tyers (2017) propose to treat them as interjections, Vasquez et al. (2018) propose to use the tag “X”, and consider them as closed part of speech. However, there hasn’t been any discussion on the morphological tagging of these words. We propose to use the POS tag and dependency relation for these words according to their syntactic function (e.g., adverb), and use a new morphological feature to indicate that it is an onomatopoeic word. Such words can also be reduplicative words in Dravidian languages. In that case, we can follow the same annotation procedure described earlier for compound words and reduplicative compounds.

5 Part-of-speech annotation

Dravidian languages have two primary classes of words: Nominals and Verbals. Nominals in Dravidian include nouns, pronouns, numerals and time and place adverbs, and are the class of words that are inflected for *case* (Krishnamurti, 2003, ch. 6). All nominals except adverbs are also inflected for person, gender and number. In this section, we discuss some of the POS tags, showing how the UD framework can be used for Dravidian language context.

Numerals In Dravidian languages, numerals can be inflected for case and can sometimes perform the function of an adjective or an adverb. Inflected numerals should be POS-tagged as per syntactic function, and not NUM, as long as they are not a part of a numeric expression. This is *in agreement* with UD’s recommendation to tag pronominal numerals and quantifiers as DET, instead of NUM.

Adverbs of time and place These typically behave like a noun morphologically in Dravidian languages, and are inflected for case. Hence, as in the UD Telugu treebank (Rama and Vajjala, 2018), it would be appropriate to treat them as Nouns for Dravidian languages, marking the dependency relation according to its function in the sentence.

Adpositions (ADP) Postpositions are used in Dravidian languages to indicate case. They can also sometimes perform an adverbial function, to indicate temporal or location information, as nominal modifiers. Some languages, for example Brahui, also borrowed prepositions from its Indo-Aryan neighbor Baluchi (Steever, 2019). All of these should be tagged ADP in Dravidian languages. The following two examples illustrate the use of postpositions in Tamil.

- (9) avan kōyil-ai pārttu pōy iru-kkir-ān
 that.man-Nom temple-Acc towards go-Sub be-Pres-1|Sing
 PRON NOUN ADP VERB VERB
 ‘He has gone towards the temple’

Quantifiers are treated as a sub-group of nominals by Krishnamurti (2003). However, UD framework includes (pronominal) quantifiers such as *many*, *few* under the POS tag DET. Annotating as DET would maintain consistency across UD languages in the Dravidian treebanks.

5.1 Clitics

Clitics are treated as a separate part of speech class in the comparative Dravidian linguistic scholarship. When they appear as a separate token, clitics typically function as tag questions, as shown in the Telugu example below (Figure 6). There is no clear guideline on how to POS tag such items in UD. Since this is most likely a closed list of words in a language, we can perhaps annotate them as PART. The following three Telugu sentences illustrate how clitics can appear as separate tokens in a sentence.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(10) idi mī illu gadū?
 This your house, isn’t
 DET PRON NOUN PART
 ‘This is your house, isn’t it?’</p> | <p>(11) idi gadū mī illu?
 This isn’t your house
 DET PART PRON NOUN
 ‘Isn’t this your house?’</p> |
|---|---|

Figure 6: Clitics as separate words highlighted in bold.

5.2 Adverbs

Onomatopoeic words are used as manner adverbs in many Dravidian languages without any inflection (Krishnamurti, 2003, p 406). Adverbs of manner can also come with a suffix. These phenomena are illustrated using Telugu and Tamil examples in Figure 7.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(12) nuvvu gaḍa-gaḍā māḷḷaḍutāvu .
 you fast-fast talk-Prog-2 Sing .
 PRON ADV VERB PUNCT
 ‘You talk fast’.</p> | <p>(13) onne viṭa ava vēkam-a pēcu-va .
 you-Acc than she fast speak-3 Fem Sing .
 PRON ADP PRON ADV VERB PUNCT
 ‘She speaks faster than you’</p> |
|--|---|

Figure 7: Adverbs in Telugu and Tamil

5.3 Auxiliary Verbs (AUX)

Dravidian languages do not have a separate class of auxiliary verbs, and words that function as auxiliary verbs can also be the main verbs in other sentences. Hence they are not a closed class. This is illustrated in the following example from Telugu.

- (14) meeru inṭilō unḍaṅḍi . (15) aa pustakam nāku ivvaṅḍi .
 you at-home be-Hon-3Plur . that book me-Case=Dat give-Hon-3Plur .
 ‘(You) stay at home’ ‘Give me that book’
- (16) nannu ikkaḍa unḍan-ivvaṅḍi .
 I-Acc here stay-give .
 ‘Let me stay here’

Figure 8: Auxiliary Verbs in Telugu

In these examples, the verb *unḍu* is a main verb in the first example, but is a supplementary verb in another. Hence, it may be appropriate to tag them as VERB and connect them through a compound relation. Further, it is not uncommon to see the two words appear as one compound word without a separator between them. Hence, it is appropriate to tag such words as VERB instead of AUX, and not use the AUX tag in Dravidian treebanks.

5.4 Conjunction

Dravidian languages typically indicate co-ordination through juxtaposition, instead of using an overt conjunction. Sometimes, it is also indicated by non-finite word forms. Thus, it is appropriate to use the POS tag reflecting the syntactic function of the word, as shown in the following Tamil sentence (Figure 9).




Figure 9: Conjunctional suffices are in **bold**.


While explicit conjunction words (e.g., *mariyu* ‘and’ in Telugu) can be tagged with a CCONJ/SCONJ tag, But in most cases, since such usage is uncommon, it will be indicated through dependency relations. These are some of the issues we encountered while studying the POS tagging of Dravidian languages from the perspective of the UPOS tagset. The next section discusses some of the syntactic characteristics of these languages, and how they can be annotated in the UD framework.

6 Syntactic Annotation


The dominant word order in the Dravidian languages is Sentence-Object-Verb (SOV) order, although the rich morphology allows a relatively free word order. Adpositions typically follow the noun, adverb precedes the verb, dependent clauses precede main clauses, genitives precede the nouns they modify and the main verbs precede auxiliaries (Steever, 2019, Ch. 1). They are also pro-drop languages, and hence, a pronominal subject may be optionally deleted from the sentence, but its identity can be inferred from the word ending in most cases. Dravidian languages also feature non-verbal predicates. In this section, we will discuss some specific syntactic features of Dravidian languages within the UD framework.

6.1 Free word order

The rich nominal and verbal morphology in Dravidian languages allow a relatively free word order, and it is possible to change the unmarked word order of the constituents, keeping the verb at the end without effecting the meaning and perhaps the dependency structure of the sentence. This is illustrated in the Tamil sentences shown in Figure 10 below (Krishnamurti, 2003, p. 425).



‘Yesterday, the minister gave the child a prize.’



‘Yesterday, (it was) **the minister** (who) gave the child a prize.’

(20) mantiri-avarkal kuṟaint-ai-kku p.paric-ai k.koṭuttāru **nērru** .

‘**It was yesterday**, that the minister gave the child the prize.’

(21) nērru mantiri-avarkal p.paric-ai k.koṭuttāru **kuṟaint-ai.kku** .

‘Yesterday, (it was) **to the child** (that) the minister gave a prize..’

Figure 10: Free word order that allows shift in **focus** (shown in bold).

In this sentence, the adverb of time (which we treat as a nominal), the subject, and the direct and indirect objects can be shifted to any position keeping the verb in the final position. The dependency trees for examples (20) and (21) would be similar to (19) with the root being the word in focus. Cleft constructions can be formed by the use of clitics to shift focus.

6.2 Non-verbal predication

In Dravidian languages, the predicate of a simple sentence can be not always a verb, and can be a nominal. This can also be observed in sentences that are questions. Figure 11 illustrates two such sentences from Gadaba.

6.3 Dative subjects

In dative subject constructions, the subject of some forms of verbs appears as a post-positional phrase with the nominal subject in the sentence-initial position in dative case (Krishnamurti, 2003, p. 450). All the Dravidian languages show dative constructions. Typically, the subject of a “verb of emotion, sensation, cognition or possession appears in the dative case” (Steever, 2019, p. 29). This can be followed by a predicate represented either by a noun phrase or a verb phrase. UD’s dependency annotation scheme does not have a relation to indicate such constructions. Rama and Vajjala (2018) used a relation `nsubj:nc` to indicate such relations (`nc` stands for non-canonical from the Persian treebank). It is perhaps appropriate to use either that or a new relation `nsubj:dat` for such constructions, when annotating dative subjects.




Figure 13: Relative Clause in Telugu

The following Telugu and Tamil examples from Figure 14 illustrate the use of adverbial clauses.






Figure 14: Adverbial Clauses. Examples (29) and (31) are Telugu and (30) is Tamil.

7 Discussion

We discussed a few morphological and syntactic features of Dravidian languages in the context of Universal Dependencies framework, taking four languages, one from each of its subgroups – Tamil, Telugu, Gadaba, and Brahui – as examples. Neither the phenomenon we discussed here are not exclusively Dravidian, nor are they exhaustive. We hope more issues will be identified (and solutions will be developed) as efforts to develop (or convert) treebanks for Dravidian languages in UD framework grow in future.

Acknowledgements

Sowmya Vajjala contributed to this research as an employee of the National Research Council of Canada, thereby establishing a copyright belonging to the Crown in Right of Canada, that is, to the Government of Canada.

References

- Anvita Abbi. 1994. *Semantic universals in Indian languages*. Indian Institute of Advanced Study.
- Elena Badmaeva and Francis M Tyers. 2017. A Dependency Treebank for Buryat. In *TLT*, pages 1–12.
- Rafiya Begum, Samar Husain, Arun Dhvaj, Dipti Misra Sharma, Lakshmi Bai, and Rajeev Sangal. 2008. Dependency annotation scheme for Indian languages. In *Proceedings of the Third International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: Volume-II*.
- Akshar Bharati, Rajeev Sangal, Vineet Chaitanya, Amba Kulkarni, Dipti Misra Sharma, and KV Ramakrishnamacharyulu. 2002. Anncorra: Building tree-banks in Indian languages. In *COLING-02: The 3rd Workshop on Asian Language Resources and International Standardization*.
- Riyaz Ahmad Bhat, Rajesh Bhatt, Annahita Farudi, Prescott Klassen, Bhuvana Narasimhan, Martha Palmer, Owen Rambow, Dipti Misra Sharma, Ashwini Vaidya, Sri Ramagurumurthy Vishnu, et al. 2017. The hindi/urdu treebank project. In *Handbook of Linguistic Annotation*, pages 659–697. Springer.
- Alena Böhmová, Jan Hajič, Eva Hajičová, and Barbora Hladká. 2003. The Prague dependency treebank. In *Treebanks*, pages 103–127. Springer.
- Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Christopher D Manning, Joakim Nivre, and Daniel Zeman. 2021. Universal dependencies. *Computational Linguistics*, 47(2):255–308.
- Murray B Emeneau. 1956. India as a linguistic area. *Language*, 32(1):3–16.
- Samar Husain, Prashanth Mannem, Bharat Ram Ambati, and Phani Gadde. 2010. The ICON-2010 tools contest on Indian language dependency parsing. *Proceedings of ICON-2010 Tools Contest on Indian Language Dependency Parsing, ICON*, 10:1–8.
- Samar Husain. 2009. Dependency parsers for indian languages. *Proceedings of ICON-09 NLP Tools Contest: Indian Language Dependency Parsing*.
- Christo Kirov, Ryan Cotterell, John Syllak-Glassman, Géraldine Walther, Ekaterina Vylomova, Patrick Xia, Manaal Faruqui, Sabrina J Mielke, Arya D McCarthy, Sandra Kübler, et al. 2018. Unimorph 2.0: Universal morphology. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*.
- Bhadriraju Krishnamurti. 2003. *The Dravidian Languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mitch Marcus, Beatrice Santorini, and Mary Ann Marcinkiewicz. 1993. Building a Large Annotated Corpus of English: The Penn Treebank. *Computational Linguistics*, 19(2):313–330.
- Sneha Nallani, Manish Shrivastava, and Dipti Misra Sharma. 2020. A Fully Expanded Dependency Treebank for Telugu. In *Proceedings of the WILDRE5–5th Workshop on Indian Language Data: Resources and Evaluation*, pages 39–44.
- Hyunji Park, Lane Schwartz, and Francis Tyers. 2021. Expanding Universal Dependencies for polysynthetic languages: A case of St. Lawrence Island Yupik. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Indigenous Languages of the Americas*, pages 131–142, Online, June. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Taraka Rama and Sowmya Vajjala. 2018. A dependency treebank for Telugu. In *Proceedings of the 16th international workshop on treebanks and linguistics theories*, pages 119–128.
- Loganathan Ramasamy and Zdeněk Žabokrtský. 2012. Prague Dependency Style Treebank for Tamil. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*, pages 1888–1894.
- Ashwath B Rao, SN Murali Krishna, and Ashalatha Nayak. 2014. Developing a dependency treebank for Kannada. *International Journal of Engineering Sciences and Research*, 15:5–7.

Sanford B Steever. 2019. *The Dravidian Languages*. Routledge.

Juhi Tandon and Dipti Misra Sharma. 2017. Unity in diversity: A unified parsing strategy for major Indian languages. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Dependency Linguistics (Depling 2017), September 18-20, 2017, Università di Pisa, Italy*, pages 255–265. Linköping University Electronic Press.

Juhi Tandon, Himani Chaudhry, Riyaz Ahmad Bhat, and Dipti Misra Sharma. 2016. Conversion from Paninian karakas to universal dependencies for Hindi dependency treebank. In *Proceedings of the 10th Linguistic Annotation Workshop held in conjunction with ACL 2016 (LAW-X 2016)*, pages 141–150.

Marsida Toska, Joakim Nivre, and Daniel Zeman. 2020. Universal dependencies for Albanian. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Universal Dependencies (UDW 2020)*, pages 178–188.

Alonso Vasquez, Renzo Ego Aguirre, Candy Angulo, John Miller, Claudia Villanueva, Željko Agić, Roberto Zariquiey, and Arturo Oncevay. 2018. Toward universal dependencies for Shipibo-Konibo. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Universal Dependencies (UDW 2018)*, pages 151–161.

Viveka Velupillai. 2012. *An Introduction to Linguistic Typology*. John Benjamins Publishing.