

# MultiBLiMP 1.0: A Massively Multilingual Benchmark of Linguistic Minimal Pairs

Jaap Jumelet<sup>1</sup>, Leonie Weissweiler<sup>2</sup>, and Arianna Bisazza<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Groningen    <sup>2</sup>The University of Texas at Austin  
jumeletjaap@gmail.com, weissweiler@utexas.edu, a.bisazza@rug.nl

## Abstract

We introduce MultiBLiMP 1.0, a massively multilingual benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs, covering 101 languages, 6 linguistic phenomena and containing more than 125,000 minimal pairs. Our minimal pairs are created using a fully automated pipeline, leveraging the large-scale linguistic resources of Universal Dependencies and UniMorph. MultiBLiMP 1.0 evaluates abilities of LLMs at an unprecedented multilingual scale, and highlights the shortcomings of the current state-of-the-art in modelling low-resource languages.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) are often trained on highly multilingual corpora, which enable users to interact with them in a wide range of languages (Grattafiori et al., 2024; Üstün et al., 2024). Multilingual evaluation, however, has mostly focused on their *functional linguistic competence* through tasks requiring world knowledge and language understanding (Singh et al., 2024a,b), while little work has assessed their *formal linguistic competence*, i.e. “knowledge of rules and statistical regularities of a language” (Mahowald et al., 2024). In multilingual contexts, the latter is commonly approximated intrinsically through perplexity (Chang et al., 2024) or extrinsically through performance in generative tasks such as translation or summarization (Dang et al., 2024a). These approaches do not truly disentangle formal from functional competence. Moreover, they are very coarse-grained and do not inform us on which specific constructions a model does (not) master.

Both shortcomings are addressed by the design of targeted syntactic evaluation benchmarks, typically structured as pairs of grammat-




Figure 1: Gemma3-27B accuracy per language on MultiBLiMP 1.0, plotted against language frequency in Common Crawl. MultiBLiMP enables fine-grained evaluation of linguistic abilities on a language-level.

ical/ungrammatical sentences differing by a single syntactic aspect (Linzen et al., 2016; Warstadt et al., 2020), where a formally competent LM is expected to assign higher probability to the grammatical version. Such datasets, however, exist only for English and a few other, mostly high-resource languages (Gulordava et al., 2018; Mueller et al., 2020; Taktasheva et al., 2024).

To accelerate progress in this direction, we introduce **MultiBLiMP 1.0**, a massively multilingual benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs covering subject-verb agreement for number, person, and gender; created automatically using two large-scale linguistic resources: Universal Dependencies (Zeman et al., 2024) and UniMorph (Batsuren et al., 2022). MultiBLiMP is not only a *benchmark*, but also a *pipeline* for the automatic creation of highly multilingual benchmarks (Fig. 2), which can scale to many more syntactic phenomena. Taking subject-verb agreement as a use case, we present a first version of the benchmark including more

<sup>1</sup>Code: [github.com/jumelet/multiblmp](https://github.com/jumelet/multiblmp)  
Data: [huggingface.co/datasets/jumelet/multiblmp](https://huggingface.co/datasets/jumelet/multiblmp)




Figure 2: Pipeline of the minimal pair creation procedure of MultiBLiMP 1.0.

than 125,000 minimal pairs across 101 languages. We use this to evaluate 17 LLMs, finding that linguistic competence is strongly driven by model size and language frequency in training data (Fig. 1), is acquired during pre-training, and can deteriorate by post-training.

Besides its practical relevance for LM evaluation, MultiBLiMP enables the study the learnability of specific linguistic constructions cross-lingually in a unified framework, at a much larger scale than currently possible (Mueller et al., 2020), with future applications in LM interpretability (Brinkmann et al., 2025) and quantitative typology (Levshina et al., 2023; Baylor et al., 2024).

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Targeted Syntactic Evaluations

**On minimal pairs** Evaluations based on minimal pairs have been criticised as potentially not reflecting real-world behaviour if they do not follow the natural frequency distribution of the data, but infrequent verbs remain important to test the systematicity of the models (Newman et al., 2021; Vamvas and Sennrich, 2021). The best way to evaluate instruction-tuned LLMs on minimal pairs and grammaticality has also been debated: Dentella et al. (2023) found GPT3’s abilities lacking using prompting, but Hu et al. (2024) re-examine the data using perplexity scoring and find models and human judgments highly correlated. It has further been argued that binary notions of grammatical acceptability are reductive (Weissweiler et al., 2025), and indeed, Hu et al. (2024) also found better correlation by using gradient values for both models and humans, compared to Dentella et al. (2023) who treated both as binary.

We do not perform gradient evaluations here as this would require human judgements for all sentences (Juzek, 2024). However, it is crucial to note that minimal pairs like those used here are immune to this issue, as sentences are not objectively evaluated as grammatical or ungrammatical, but rather compared, and as they differ only in one morphosyntactic feature, they are immune to semantic effects such as those reported by Kauf et al. (2024).

**English** Minimal pairs to assess subject-verb agreement in LMs were first introduced by Linzen et al. (2016). Specifically, they extracted sentences from Wikipedia and flipped the number of the verb without detecting the subject, finding that models at that time struggled considerably with the distance between the subject and the verb, as well as intervening nouns and other attractors. This work was extended by Marvin and Linzen (2018), who generated sentences with context-free grammars, enabling them to increase the difficulty of agreement across phrases and clauses. The monolingual predecessor to our work is BLiMP (Warstadt et al., 2020), a set of minimal pairs generated with templates for many linguistic phenomena by sampling from a vocabulary. Hu et al. (2020) and Gauthier et al. (2020) both present similar large-scale collections of syntactic evaluation for English.

**Other monolingual benchmarks** Minimal pair benchmarks have recently been developed for various other languages, using different methods. Some use existing annotated sentences from UD, some craft templates, and some others are built by translating an English dataset. For Chinese, CLiMP (Xiang et al., 2021) generate their minimal pairs with templates adapted from BLiMP, while SLING (Song et al., 2022) edit a constituency treebank with

templates and then verify the results with human annotators. ZhoBLiMP (Liu et al., 2024) employ a mixture of pairs translated from BLiMP, extracted from syntax journals and textbooks, manipulated with templates. JBLiMP (Someya and Oseki, 2023) extract minimal pairs for from journal articles on Japanese syntax. BLiMP-NL Suijkerbuijk et al. (2024) create ten sentence pairs per paradigm by hand for Dutch, as well as 90 more sentences generated by ChatGPT and then hand-checked. Closer to our approach, RuBLiMP (Taktasheva et al., 2024) create pairs from UD-parsed sentences using perturbation rules. Most of these monolingual benchmarks cover agreement as well as other, possibly language-specific, syntactic phenomena.

**Multilingual** Four multilingual minimal pair datasets are known to us. The largest, CLAMS (Mueller et al., 2020), creates pairs for English, German, Hebrew, Italian, and Russian for subject-verb agreement by having native speakers translate the sentences from Marvin and Linzen (2018) where applicable. Gulordava et al. (2018) similarly cover English, Hebrew, Italian, and Russian for subject-verb agreement with sentences from UD treebanks, in which content words are swapped out with others of the same POS to test the models’ reliance on semantics. For low-resource languages, LINDSEA (Leong et al., 2023) present minimal pairs for Tamil and Indonesian which are notably evaluated using prompting with GPT3.5 and GPT-4. Kryvosheieva and Levy (2024) create minimal pairs specifically for Swahili noun class agreement, Hindi split ergativity and Basque verb agreement, each chosen for their complexity.

We see MultiBLiMP 1.0 being complementary to all these efforts. While language-specific benchmarks can provide tremendous depth on the syntactic system of a language, it will prove challenging to scale such efforts to a wide variety of languages. Our approach, on the other hand, focuses on ‘wide coverage’ and can therefore be of use for both the evaluation of highly multilingual LLMs and for quantitative typological studies.

## 2.2 Representation Sharing in LLMs

A branch of work has evaluated the degree to which multilingual models make use of shared syntactic representations across languages. Early studies analyzed mBERT (Devlin et al., 2019) and smaller-scale LSTM models trained on a few languages, finding mixed evidence of sharing (Pires et al.,

2019; Mueller et al., 2020; Dhar and Bisazza, 2021; Chi et al., 2020). Focusing on modern-scale LLMs, Wendler et al. (2024) find that Llama2 models (Touvron et al., 2023) trained on English-dominated corpora use English to some degree as an internal pivot language to solve tasks in other languages. Brinkmann et al. (2025) find significant overlap between the representations for number, gender, tense and other morphosyntactic features. Similarly, Stanczak et al. (2022) find overlap in the presentations of morphosyntactic features, particularly for number. Ferrando and Costa-jussà (2024) show the similar structures of circuits for SVA in English and Spanish. The emergence of this kind of interpretability highlights the exciting opportunities presented by MultiBLiMP 1.0 for massively multilingual interpretability.

## 3 Linguistic Resources

We briefly describe here our key linguistic resources: Universal Dependencies and UniMorph.

### 3.1 Universal Dependencies

Universal Dependencies (UD, v2.15, Zeman et al., 2024) is a multilingual treebank collection, containing 294 treebanks for 167 languages. Besides syntactic dependency relations, UD also contains rich morphological feature annotations that we leverage in our pipeline. An example of a UD-annotated sentence can be found in Fig. 2, step 1.

Treebanks are only included if they consist of the standard variety of their language: dialects and writing standards are split into separate categories, and treebanks of historical or spoken language are discarded. We then consider the union of all remaining treebanks for each language. A list of the excluded treebanks can be found in App. A.1.

### 3.2 UniMorph

UniMorph (UM, v4.0, Batsuren et al., 2022) is a multilingual collection of morphological feature annotations, which define word-level features such as NUMBER, MOOD, or GENDER. UM contains annotations for nouns, verbs, and adjectives. It covers 183 languages in total, 81 of which are also covered by UD. Similarly to UD, it uses a universal annotation scheme (Sylak-Glassman et al., 2015), making it highly suitable for our goal of defining a language-independent inflection mechanism to create minimal pairs. UM annotations contain the lemma and morphological features of a word form,

making it possible to efficiently disambiguate and create inflections. For example, the English word *saw* is represented with the following four entries, expressing its various meanings:

lemma	form	features
see	saw	V;PST
saw	saw	N;SG
saw	saw	V;NFIN;IMP+SBJV
saw	saw	V;PRS;3;IND;PL

Note that features can be left implicit: the first entry of past tense *see* does not specify PERSON or NUMBER, indicating that this form covers all values of those features. We preprocess UM features to be compatible with UD features (SG  $\rightarrow$  *Sing*, PRS  $\rightarrow$  *Pres*, etc.), and transliterate languages that use different scripts from those in UD.

**UD Features** To broaden the number of languages for which we can create inflections, we leverage the morphological feature annotations that are present in UD, extending the approach of UDLexicons (Sagot, 2018)—which covers 38 languages—to the 142 languages in UD that contain annotations. For each language, we extract the  $\langle$ lemma, form, feature $\rangle$  triplets for each token in the dependency trees. To ensure the quality of these triplets, we incorporate their frequency to filter out potential annotation errors. We make the assumption that a  $\langle$ lemma, feature $\rangle$  tuple should map onto a single form; if the tuple yields multiple forms, it is likely that a feature has been annotated erroneously. In such cases, we discard all entries occurring three times less than the most frequent entry. This procedure results in 4.2M unique triplets for 142 languages, 61 of which are not covered by UM.

## 4 Pipeline


Our pipeline for creating minimal pairs consists of four stages. First, we **extract** suitable candidates for a phenomenon using dependency parse trees (§4.1). This allows us to determine the key items of interest for a phenomenon, for example, the subject and main finite verb in subject-verb agreement. Next, we **validate** whether the agreement phenomenon is present in that language based on UD collocation statistics (§4.2). We then **inflect** one of the words with respect to a particular feature (e.g. NUMBER) to create an agreement violation (§4.3). By replacing the item with this inflected form, we create the ungrammatical counterpart for the minimal pair. Finally, we create a minimal pair

dataset for each language, **balancing** the morphological features and amount of pairs (§4.4). We now explain this procedure in more detail; a graphical overview is provided in Figure 2.

### 4.1 Candidate Extraction

The 167 UD languages form the initial set of candidate languages we consider for our benchmark. After having excluded some treebanks as described in §3.1, we also set various sentence-level constraints. Specifically, we discard samples containing reparandum dependencies or a Style, Foreign or Typo feature, which typically signal sentences that are malformed in some way.

**Filters** To extract candidates for a particular linguistic phenomenon, we define filters based on dependency edges, part-of-speech tags and morphological features. In this paper, we focus in particular on various forms of subject-verb and subject-participle agreement. The filters for this phenomenon are defined as follows:



That is, we look for nsubj dependency edges between a NOUN and VERB and collect any auxiliary verb connected to it. For finding subject-participle agreement relations, we place an additional constraint on the morphological features of the verb of VERBFORM=PART. We drop subjects containing conjunctions, since these may have conflicting feature values. Furthermore, we drop verbs that have an outgoing expl, csubj:outer, or nsubj:outer dependency, since these indicate clausal subject constructions that may invalidate our minimal pair formation methodology.

### 4.2 Agreement Validation

Determining whether a particular phenomenon exists in a given language, and how it can be expressed as a minimal pair, is challenging. We address this with a data-driven procedure that computes the probability of a language containing a phenomenon, based on UD and UM annotations.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>An alternative to approaching this from a data-driven perspective would be to use typological databases like Grambank (Skirgård et al., 2023) and WALS (Dryer and Haspelmath, 2013), but their discrete nature and framing agreement in terms of being *possible* and not *compulsory* (Baylor et al., 2023) made them unsuitable for our goals.



$\phi^n$	$\phi^v$	WO	$P_{agr}(\phi^v \phi^n, \text{WO})$	
			Dutch	Turkish
PL	PL		<b>98.9</b>	16.1
PL	SG	SV	1.1	83.9
SG	SG		<b>98.8</b>	<b>97.5</b>
SG	PL		1.2	2.5
PL	PL		<b>99.0</b>	0.0
PL	SG	VS	1.0	100.0
SG	SG		<b>99.2</b>	<b>98.2</b>
SG	PL		0.8	1.8

Table 1: Dutch and Turkish agreement probabilities for subject-verb number agreement. Significant agreement is denoted in **boldface**.

This acts as a final filter on the minimal pairs, ensuring that our perturbed sentences are actually ungrammatical in a given language.

**Agreement** The agreement phenomena we focus on can be turned into a minimal pair by inflecting the agreement feature on one of the words:

$$\begin{array}{c} \textit{The boys walk} \Rightarrow \textit{*The boys walks} \\ \text{N;PL V;PL} \qquad \qquad \text{N;PL V;SG} \end{array}$$

Evaluating agreement in this way requires that the inflected form is ungrammatical in this context. For example, if we were to inflect a past tense verb for NUMBER in English, the inflected form would remain the same. Another example is Turkish, where number is marked *optionally* on the verb:

$$\begin{array}{c} \textit{Oğlanlar yürüyorlar} \Rightarrow \textit{Oğlanlar yürüyor} \\ \text{N;PL V;PL} \qquad \qquad \text{N;PL V;SG} \end{array}$$

Both these constructions are correct, and the construction with the singular verb is even more frequent. A LM provided with this minimal pair would likely assign a higher probability to the sentence with the singular verb and be penalized for it, resulting in an incorrect assessment of the model’s grammatical abilities.

**Requirements** Based on these observations, we define two requirements to determine if a language contains agreement for some feature  $\phi$ : (1) it must be possible to inflect  $\phi$  for both elements of the agreement relation; (2) inflecting  $\phi$  for one of the elements must result in a grammatical violation. To test these, we make use of both UD and UM. Req. 1 is easily checked using the morphological features of a word: for all entries of a particular word class in a morphological lexicon, we check if it contains distinct forms for different values of  $\phi$ . Req. 2 is more challenging.

**Collocations** We approach Req. 2 from a collocational perspective: in a language having strict subject-verb agreement for  $\phi$ , we expect a very high collocation between nouns and verbs of the same feature value, and a low collocation between nouns and verbs of opposite values. This can be expressed as conditional probability:

$$P_{agr}(\phi) = P(\phi^v = x | \phi^n = x) \approx 1 \quad (1)$$

We compute these probabilities for each language and phenomenon individually, based on the subject-verb relations we extract from UD (§4.1). For each subject and verb, we fetch all matching rows from the UM and UD lexicons, collecting the set of feature values corresponding to that form. For example, English *walked* would map to {SG, PL} since past tense forms are the same for both numbers in English. We measure feature collocations as follows: if  $|\phi^v| = 1$  and  $|\phi^n| = 1$  then collocate  $\langle \phi^v, \phi^n \rangle$ , and if  $|\phi^v| = 1$  and  $\phi^v \subseteq \phi^n$  then collocate  $\langle \phi^v, \phi^v \rangle$  (vice versa for  $\phi^n$ ). If  $\phi$  is undefined for the subject or verb we do not count any collocations.

Equation (1), however, is a simplified approximation of agreement in a language. For instance, French subject-participle agreement depends on the auxiliary: participles inflect for NUMBER and GENDER with an *être* auxiliary, but not with an *avoir* auxiliary (*elles sont montées* vs. *elles ont monté*). Arabic has flexible subject-verb order and does not inflect for plural in VS order, but only has agreement in SV order for human subjects. Person agreement in Dutch also depends on word order: second person singular verbs in VS order lose their second person ending and coincide with first person (*jij doet* vs. *doe jij*). In our pipeline we therefore condition Equation 1 on a binary word order feature, but leave a more fine-grained exploration of agreement conditions open for future work.

**Significance** Since our procedure depends on the amount of co-occurrence counts we can extract from UD for a language, we need to determine whether the collocation probability is statistically significant. For this, we conduct a binomial test to assess whether Equation 1 was significantly greater than the baseline  $p_0 = 0.9$ . To rule out agreement, we conduct a binomial test in the opposite direction. If neither test is significant, we mark agreement as being *uncertain*. For significance we use  $\alpha = 0.1$  with Bonferroni correction. We only proceed to the minimal pair creation step for the language con-




Figure 3: Distribution of language families present in MultiBLiMP 1.0. See Appendix B.1 for a detailed version of this figure, including the individual languages.

ditions that have certain and uncertain agreement. The conditions with no agreement are discarded.

**Results** Table 1 shows our validation results on subject-verb number agreement for two languages: Dutch, which has number agreement for all conditions, and Turkish, which rarely inflects plural verbs. As expected, Dutch number agreement is marked as significant for both singular and plural, whereas Turkish agreement only passes the test for singular. The number of languages passing the validation for each phenomenon is discussed in §5.

### 4.3 Inflection

To form the ungrammatical counterpart of a sentence extracted from UD, we inflect a specific word to a different feature that makes the sentence ungrammatical. For example, to create a minimal pair for subject-verb number agreement for *The boy walks*, we inflect *walks* for NUMBER=SING to create *\*The boy walk*. While we focus here on GENDER, PERSON, and NUMBER, this can work for any agreement feature annotated on the verb.

Our inflection procedure has two stages. We start by defining the feature to inflect for, with a candidate word from the filtered treebank of § 4.1. The first stage is to find the corresponding lemma and morphological features of this word in the UD and UM databases, based on its form and the features that were annotated in the UD tree. This may yield multiple candidate lemmas and features, de-

pending on the level of detail of the UD features. In the second stage, we then find all matching rows containing *opposite values* of the feature that we inflect for. The inflected forms of these matching rows are the inflection candidates that we use to create the minimal pairs. By considering all opposite values we may create multiple pairs from a single sentence, e.g. *He is [..]* → *He are/am [..]*.

### 4.4 Dataset Balancing

To level data imbalances, we limit the number of minimal pairs per language condition to 100 items. We obtain these 100 items using a weighted down-sampling procedure that also balances sentence-level features. The features we incorporate in this procedure are: *subject form*, *verb form*, *subject-verb distance*, *all attractors congruent*, and *all attractors incongruent*. The latter two indicate whether the intervening material between subject and verb contained items that had a congruent or incongruent feature with respect to the inflected feature. We define the sampling probability of a minimal pair as the inverse joint probability of its features, assuming feature independence:

$$P(x) = \prod_i P(x_i) \quad Q(x) = \frac{P(x)^{-1}}{\sum_i P(\mathbf{x}_i)^{-1}}$$

The feature probability  $P(x_i)$  is expressed as the relative frequency of the feature. By sampling from  $Q$  (without replacements), we can balance all features simultaneously.

## 5 MultiBLiMP 1.0

We run our minimal pair creation pipeline for two agreement phenomena and three features: subject-verb and subject-participle agreement for NUMBER, PERSON, and GENDER. Within each condition we create sub-conditions based on the inflected feature (e.g. SG → PL, 2 → 3, etc.), and the order of subject and verb. Our procedure results in **128,321 minimal pairs** across **101 languages**. The total number of minimal pairs we obtain before balancing is 1.4 million. We provide an aggregated overview of the number of languages per condition in Table 2, and a sample of pairs in App. A.2. Subject-verb number agreement is the most common agreement type, with 90 languages, whereas we find subject-participle person agreement for only 3 languages. We also provide a detailed breakdown of the language families that are currently covered in MultiBLiMP 1.0 in Figure 3. There is a strong

NUMBER	SG		PL		DU		Total		
	SV	VS	SV	VS	SV	VS	SV	VS	BOTH
S-Verb	88 (74)	82 (63)	73 (58)	58 (43)	8 (3)	3 (2)	89 (79)	84 (65)	90 (80)
S-Participle	35 (33)	28 (21)	23 (18)	19 (13)	3 (0)	1 (0)	35 (33)	30 (22)	35 (33)
GENDER	MASC		NEUT		FEM		Total		
	SV	VS	SV	VS	SV	VS	SV	VS	BOTH
S-Verb	31 (16)	27 (16)	13 (7)	13 (6)	30 (13)	25 (11)	34 (19)	30 (16)	34 (22)
S-Participle	26 (25)	25 (20)	11 (8)	11 (8)	20 (17)	20 (12)	26 (25)	26 (21)	26 (25)
PERSON	1		2		3		Total		
	SV	VS	SV	VS	SV	VS	SV	VS	BOTH
S-Verb	71 (42)	55 (25)	63 (32)	38 (15)	83 (62)	69 (38)	86 (66)	74 (44)	87 (68)
S-Participle	2 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	2 (2)	1 (0)	3 (2)	1 (0)	3 (2)
TOTAL							100 (85)	90 (66)	101 (87)

Table 2: The number of unique languages that yielded at least 10 minimal pairs, for each agreement condition. The number between brackets denotes the number of languages for which the binomial test of §4.2 was significant. SV and VS denote the subject-verb word order.

Indo-European (IE) bias present in our minimal pairs, caused both by the over-representation of such languages in UD, as well as our choice to focus on agreement phenomena, which tend to be more present in IE languages. In future iterations of MultiBLiMP, we intend to broaden our coverage by focusing on a more diverse set of phenomena.

## 6 LM Evaluation Setup

### 6.1 Language Models

We evaluate the following LMs, accessed via HuggingFace (Wolf et al., 2020): **Llama3** (Grattafiori et al., 2024) in sizes 8B and 70B; base and post-trained. We also evaluate **Tülu3** (Lambert et al., 2025), which is a post-trained model on the Llama3 base models. **Aya-expans** (Dang et al., 2024b), in sizes 8B and 32B, has been post-trained on a set of 23 languages, 18 of which are in MultiBLiMP 1.0. We include **Gemma3** (Team, 2025) in sizes 4B, 12B and 27B; base and post-trained, which were pre-trained on a balanced multilingual distribution of 140 languages. **OLMo2** (OLMo et al., 2025) in size 32B; base and post-trained. **EuroLLM** (Martins et al., 2024), for size 9B, which is pre-trained on 35 (mostly) European languages, 32 of which are present in MultiBLiMP 1.0.

**Monolingual LMs** The aforementioned LMs are all multilingual, i.e. trained on a mixture of different languages. To place their performance into perspective, we also evaluate the **Goldfish** suite (Chang et al., 2024), a collection of monolingual LMs each trained on the same amount of data. This

allows us to control for language frequency differences, which is not possible for the pre-trained LMs. In our experiments we consider the models trained on 1GB of data, or the *full* models for languages with less than 1GB available data. All models have 500M parameters. Goldfish models exist for 70 out of the 101 languages in MultiBLiMP. As a monolingual English baseline, we also evaluate on **GPT2-xl** (Radford et al., 2019).

### 6.2 Training Corpus Language Distribution

In our experiments we connect model performance to the language distribution of the training data. Since the training corpora of most LLMs (except OLMo2) are not publicly available, we estimate this distribution based on the language frequencies of Kargaran et al. (2024), which were computed on a 3.9T token split of the Common Crawl corpus. Common Crawl provides a good reflection of the language distribution of the web-scraped data that is at the core of many LLM training corpora.

### 6.3 Metrics

Following prior work (Marvin and Linzen, 2018) we measure the grammaticality of the predictions of the LMs based on the probability it assigns to a grammatical sentence versus an ungrammatical one. We chose to evaluate on the sentence-level, and not at the position of the key items, as has been done previously (Linzen et al., 2016; Jumelet and Hupkes, 2018), as this yields the same metric for both subject-verb orders. We use two metrics in our experiments. The accuracy score is based on the number of items for which the LM assign a higher

Model	Size	Variant	Subject-Verb			Subject-Participle			Resources			Languages					#best
			#	P	G	#	P	G	Low	Mid	High	GF	Aya	EU	Eng	All	
Llama3	8B	base	84.2	87.8	88.0	89.4	94.0	88.0	77.2	90.3	96.2	89.4	95.2	92.7	99.4	86.9	0
	8B	it	82.6	86.6	86.8	88.4	94.8	86.5	75.7	88.9	95.6	88.3	94.6	91.4	99.4	85.6	0
	8B	tülu3	81.7	86.2	85.5	87.3	94.9	85.6	74.7	88.1	95.3	87.6	94.0	90.9	98.6	84.9	0
	70B	base	<b>87.4</b>	<b>91.2</b>	91.1	92.1	<b>97.5</b>	91.2	<b>81.1</b>	93.9	97.8	92.6	97.1	95.5	99.0	<b>90.2</b>	7
Aya	8B	it	76.9	82.4	81.8	80.8	93.3	79.3	68.3	82.3	96.3	83.3	95.7	88.0	99.0	80.4	0
	32B	it	82.9	87.8	88.1	87.4	95.1	87.0	75.7	89.4	97.7	89.0	97.3	92.8	98.4	86.4	1
Gemma3	4B	base	82.8	87.2	86.0	88.8	93.3	86.0	71.1	93.0	96.4	89.2	95.3	94.6	98.2	85.8	0
	4B	it	73.4	79.1	76.9	79.3	87.9	76.9	63.9	82.7	88.2	80.0	86.6	85.1	93.4	77.1	0
	12B	base	85.4	90.2	89.6	91.1	95.5	90.3	75.8	95.4	97.7	92.0	96.8	96.6	99.0	88.8	0
	12B	it	79.2	84.6	83.1	85.1	93.0	83.8	69.5	89.4	92.6	85.9	91.4	90.9	95.6	82.9	0
	27B	base	87.2	91.1	<b>91.3</b>	<b>92.8</b>	96.6	<b>91.7</b>	78.3	<b>96.3</b>	<b>98.0</b>	93.2	<b>97.4</b>	<b>97.1</b>	98.6	<b>90.2</b>	3
	27B	it	82.7	87.0	86.3	88.7	95.8	86.7	73.1	92.3	94.4	88.9	93.7	93.3	96.0	85.8	0
OLMo2	32B	base	79.8	85.0	80.2	85.7	88.2	80.9	74.4	84.6	92.5	85.1	90.8	87.8	<b>99.5</b>	82.7	0
	32B	it	78.2	83.9	79.1	84.2	87.1	80.0	72.5	83.6	91.9	84.0	90.0	86.9	99.1	81.5	0
EuroLLM	9B	base	82.7	86.5	87.6	89.1	71.5	89.4	72.6	92.0	95.7	88.9	94.9	96.7	99.4	85.8	0
GPT2	1.6B	x1	61.1	67.8	55.9	63.2	53.2	57.4	62.8	61.2	68.4	63.5	66.0	64.0	98.3	63.4	0
Goldfish	500M	base	92.4	95.3	92.2	95.2	98.2	90.9	88.0	95.6	95.9	<b>93.8</b>	95.2	95.8	96.4	93.8	14

Table 3: Average accuracies per LM, split out for different phenomena and language subsets. GF is the language subset of Goldfish languages; Aya the subset of Aya languages; EU the subset of EuroLLM languages; Eng the performance on English. The best performing model per category is denoted in **boldface**, but we exclude Goldfish models from this ranking as they are only evaluated on a subset of languages. #best denotes the number of languages for which this model was significantly better than the others.

probability to the grammatical sentence ( $s^+$ ):

$$Acc(\mathcal{M}; \mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{1} [P_{\mathcal{M}}(s^+) > P_{\mathcal{M}}(s^-)]$$

for model  $\mathcal{M}$  and minimal pair dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ . We also measure the *certainty* of a model’s judgment as the log probability difference for the minimal pair:

$$\Delta(\mathcal{M}; \mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{D}} \ln P_{\mathcal{M}}(s^+) - \ln P_{\mathcal{M}}(s^-)$$

## 7 Experimental Results

### 7.1 General Performance

The average accuracies of all models are presented in Table 3. Results are split into various categories: the six agreement phenomena; three language splits based on resourcedness; the language subsets of the Goldfish, Aya, and EuroLLM models; performance on English and the overall average. The low-, mid-, and high-resource splits are based on the Common Crawl language frequencies: low-resource for the least frequent 60% languages, mid-resource for the languages in the 60–90% frequency range, and high-resource for the most frequent 10% languages. We also denote the

number of languages for which a model was significantly better than all other models.<sup>3</sup>

Llama3-70B-base and Gemma3-27B-base perform best overall, both scoring 90.2% on average. These two models also score best on all the categories, with the Llama model scoring better on low-resource languages, and Gemma better on mid- and high-resource languages. Gemma3-27B-base outperforms the Aya and EuroLLM models on their specific language subsets, validating the claim of Team (2025) that its better balance of languages leads to strong multilingual performance. Interestingly, both these models are still being outperformed by the 500M Goldfish model series. The Goldfish models are significantly better on 14 languages, whereas Llama3-70B and Gemma3-27B are best for 7 and 3 languages, respectively. We present the best model per language in App. B.2.

Performance is strongly driven by model size: for all model types, performance increases with number of parameters. Furthermore, instruction tuning has a *detrimental* effect on performance, which is especially prevalent for the Gemma3 mod-

<sup>3</sup>We conduct a McNemar test between the best and second-best model based on the item-level binary grammaticality judgments, with  $p < 0.1$  as significance threshold.






Figure 4: Average accuracy score per language, plotted for Llama3-8B against various other models.




Figure 5: The  $\beta$  coefficient estimates of OLS models fitted on  $\Delta$  scores of Llama3-70B and Gemma3-27B.

els. For all models, performance increases with language frequency, demonstrating much of the variance in linguistic ability can be explained by data disparity. The performance of GPT2-xl shows that LLMs must be endowed with strong multilingual abilities to perform well on MultiBLiMP. We show each model’s performance per language in Appendix B.3.

## 7.2 Cross-Model Comparisons

We plot the language-level performance of various models against each other in Figure 4. Each model is compared against Llama3-8B to investigate different factors driving performance.

In Figure 4a we consider the impact of **model size**, comparing the 8B model to the 70B model. The average performance went up from 86.9% to 90.2% for this model, driven by gradual improvements: no language improved by more than 10%,

but almost all languages improved to some degree. We also conduct a McNemar test between the two models, with  $p < 0.05$ , resulting in Llama3-70B being significantly better for 48 languages, and none the other way around.

Next, we consider the impact of **language-specific post- and pre-training** in Fig. 4b and 4c, comparing Llama3-8B to Aya-8B and EuroLLM-9B. We have highlighted the specific languages on which Aya has been post-trained, and EuroLLM has been pre-trained. Languages outside this selection do not appear to benefit from cross-lingual transfer, as both Aya and EuroLLM perform worse than Llama3-8B in the languages they were *not* trained on, and McNemar testing shows Llama3-8B is significantly better than Aya for 49 languages, and better than EuroLLM for 31 languages. Language-specific *pre-training* has a far stronger effect on linguistic ability than post-training: EuroLLM significantly outperforms Llama3-8B on 19 of its 32 languages, whereas Aya only outperforms it on 4 out of its 18 languages.

Finally, we look at the impact of **monolingual vs multilingual language modelling** in Figure 4d. Goldfish models significantly outperform Llama3-8B for 39 out of 70 languages, whereas Llama only does so for 7 languages. This warrants a more detailed investigation in future work, to assess if this difference is solely driven by differences in data frequency and data quality, or by the multilingual LLM having to handle all these languages at once.

## 7.3 What Factors Drive Performance?

We set up a linear modelling experiment in which we predict the  $\Delta$  scores (§6.3) of a few models based on various factors that we hypothesize to

be driving model judgments. We include the following fixed effects in our regression model: the six agreement **phenomena** as categorical variables; **subject-verb distance**; **perplexity** of the grammatical sentence; **sentence length**; **subword delta** expressing the difference in the number of subwords for the grammatical and ungrammatical key item; two binary features denoting if the intervening material between subject and verb contained **congruent** or **incongruent attractors**; and the **language frequency** of §6.2. To interpret this model we plot the  $\beta$  coefficients for the standardized factors, fitted for the two best-performing LLMs.

As shown in Fig. 5, the phenomenon coefficients show that person agreement yields high  $\Delta$  scores (i.e. more confidence in detecting the grammatical sentence). This can be due to the fact that first and second person subjects tend to be closed-class pronouns, whereas gender and number agreement requires acquisition of open-class subject features. Surprisingly, subject-verb distance does *not* have a negative impact on  $\Delta$ : one might expect agreement to be more challenging for long-distance dependencies. An increase in sentence perplexity strongly *decreases*  $\Delta$ : the more surprised a model is by a sentence, the less likely it is to make the right grammaticality judgment. Another important factor with a negative effect is the *subword delta*: if the correct form of the verb is split into *more* subwords than the incorrect form, the model is more likely to make a wrong judgment. As we expected, incongruent attractors result in a decrease in  $\Delta$ , while congruent attractors boost it. Finally, language frequency has a positive effect on performance. A more detailed breakdown of this effect is shown in Fig. 1, where we highlight the languages that over- and underperform with respect to a fitted logistic curve. An interesting question for future work would be to investigate the extent to which the variance in performance is driven by typological features.

## 8 Discussion and Conclusion

**Takeaways for Model Training** Based on the results of evaluating 17 LMs on MultiBLiMP 1.0 and analyzing the results, we formulate several recommendations for the training of future massively multilingual models. Based on the comparison between Aya and EuroLLM in fig. 4, we surmise that to boost specific focus languages, fine-tuning is not as effective as pre-training. We observed that the Goldfish models significantly outperform LLMs

as large as 70B parameters on 14 out of 101 languages, many of them low-resource. This suggests that formal linguistic competence can greatly suffer when the training data of a particular language only forms a tiny part of the general mix—especially if that language is not closely related to the bulk of this mix. Thus, communities of languages underserved by current NLP technology may be best helped not by integrating their languages into LLM projects, but by more targeted regional LM initiatives. Our finding that the accuracy on MultiBLiMP 1.0 depended strongly on the difference in number of subwords between the correct and the incorrect inflection is in keeping with previous work (Rust et al., 2021, e.g.) which suggested that performance differences between languages in multilingual LLMs are strongly driven by the space allocated to the language in the tokenizer. Taken together, these results call for new tokenization strategies to mitigate this issue (Mielke et al., 2021).

**The Potential of Multilingual Annotated Resources in the Age of LLMs** The creation of MultiBLiMP 1.0 was only possible due to the existence of UD and UniMorph, both large resources created by a large number of annotators over many years. While these resources have become increasingly marginalised since the introduction of LLMs, we see this work as a prime example of their continued usefulness. The wealth of linguistic knowledge that is captured by these resources will continue to prove invaluable for informed linguistic evaluation of LLMs (Opitz et al., 2025).

**Future Work** We see two major opportunities for future work. First, we plan to expand MultiBLiMP 1.0 to more constructions beyond agreement, investigating more diverse phenomena not attested in English and broadening the current language set. Second, this benchmark presents a unique opportunity for computational typology, due to the diverse set of languages included and the number of phenomena covered. We hope that MultiBLiMP will enable learnability studies across typologically diverse languages, bringing new insights into their linguistic structure, but also into the work that is needed to put them onto equal footing in language modelling.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Amir Kargaran for providing the language frequencies in CommonCrawl. We further thank Ahmet Üstün, Charlotte Pouw,

Jirui Qi, Kanishka Misra and Will Merrill, as well as the GronNLP group for helpful feedback. Jaap Jumelet and Arianna Bisazza were supported by NWO grant VI.Vidi.221C.009. Leonie Weisweiler was supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from the German Research Foundation (DFG). This work used the Dutch national e-infrastructure with the support of the SURF Cooperative using grant no. EINF-13403.

## References

- Khuyagbaatar Batsuren, Omer Goldman, Salam Khalifa, Nizar Habash, Witold Kieraś, Gábor Bella, Brian Leonard, Garrett Nicolai, Kyle Gorman, Yustinus Ghanggo Ate, Maria Ryskina, Sabrina Mielke, Elena Budianskaya, Charbel El-Khaissi, Tiago Pimentel, Michael Gasser, William Abbott Lane, Mohit Raj, Matt Coler, et al. 2022. [UniMorph 4.0: Universal Morphology](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 840–855, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Emi Baylor, Esther Ploeger, and Johannes Bjerva. 2023. [The past, present, and future of typological databases in NLP](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 1163–1169, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emi Baylor, Esther Ploeger, and Johannes Bjerva. 2024. [Multilingual gradient word-order typology from Universal Dependencies](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 42–49, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jannik Brinkmann, Chris Wendler, Christian Bartelt, and Aaron Mueller. 2025. [Large language models share representations of latent grammatical concepts across typologically diverse languages](#). *CoRR*, abs/2501.06346.
- Tyler A. Chang, Catherine Arnett, Zhuowen Tu, and Benjamin K. Bergen. 2024. [Goldfish: Monolingual language models for 350 languages](#).
- Ethan A. Chi, John Hewitt, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. [Finding universal grammatical relations in multilingual BERT](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5564–5577, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Dang, Shivalika Singh, Daniel D’souza, Arash Ahmadian, Alejandro Salamanca, Madeline Smith, Aidan Peppin, Sungjin Hong, Manoj Govindassamy, Terrence Zhao, Sandra Kublik, Meor Amer, Viraat Aryabumi, Jon Ander Campos, Yi Chern Tan, Tom Kocmi, Florian Strub, Nathan Grinsztajn, Yannis Flet-Berliac, et al. 2024a. [Aya expand: Combining research breakthroughs for a new multilingual frontier](#). *CoRR*, abs/2412.04261.
- John Dang, Shivalika Singh, Daniel D’souza, Arash Ahmadian, Alejandro Salamanca, Madeline Smith, Aidan Peppin, Sungjin Hong, Manoj Govindassamy, Terrence Zhao, Sandra Kublik, Meor Amer, Viraat Aryabumi, Jon Ander Campos, Yi-Chern Tan, Tom Kocmi, Florian Strub, Nathan Grinsztajn, Yannis Flet-Berliac, et al. 2024b. [Aya expand: Combining research breakthroughs for a new multilingual frontier](#).
- Vittoria Dentella, Fritz Günther, and Evelina Leivada. 2023. [Systematic testing of three language models reveals low language accuracy, absence of response stability, and a yes-response bias](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(51):e2309583120.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). 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 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Prajit Dhar and Arianna Bisazza. 2021. [Understanding cross-lingual syntactic transfer in multilingual recurrent neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd Nordic Conference on Computational Linguistics (NoDaLiDa)*, pages 74–85, Reykjavik, Iceland (Online). Linköping University Electronic Press, Sweden.

- Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath, editors. 2013. *WALS Online (v2020.4)*. Zenodo.
- Javier Ferrando and Marta R. Costa-jussà. 2024. [On the similarity of circuits across languages: a case study on the subject-verb agreement task](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 10115–10125, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jon Gauthier, Jennifer Hu, Ethan Wilcox, Peng Qian, and Roger Levy. 2020. [SyntaxGym: An online platform for targeted evaluation of language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 70–76, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, et al. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#).
- Kristina Gulordava, Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Tal Linzen, and Marco Baroni. 2018. [Colorless green recurrent networks dream hierarchically](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1195–1205, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jennifer Hu, Jon Gauthier, Peng Qian, Ethan Wilcox, and Roger Levy. 2020. [A systematic assessment of syntactic generalization in neural language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1725–1744, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jennifer Hu, Kyle Mahowald, Gary Lupyán, Anna Ivanova, and Roger Levy. 2024. [Language models align with human judgments on key grammatical constructions](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(36):e2400917121.
- Jaap Jumelet and Dieuwke Hupkes. 2018. [Do language models understand anything? on the ability of LSTMs to understand negative polarity items](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 222–231, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom S Juzek. 2024. [The syntactic acceptability dataset \(preview\): A resource for machine learning and linguistic analysis of English](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 16113–16120, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.
- Amir Hossein Kargaran, François Yvon, and Hinrich Schuetze. 2024. [Glotcc: An open broad-coverage commoncrawl corpus and pipeline for minority languages](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, pages 16983–17005. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Carina Kauf, Emmanuele Chersoni, Alessandro Lenci, Evelina Fedorenko, and Anna A Ivanova. 2024. [Log probabilities are a reliable estimate of semantic plausibility in base and instruction-tuned language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 7th BlackboxNLP Workshop: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 263–277, Miami, Florida, US. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daria Kryvosheieva and Roger Levy. 2024. [Controlled evaluation of syntactic knowledge in multilingual language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2411.07474.
- Nathan Lambert, Jacob Morrison, Valentina Pyatkin, Shengyi Huang, Hamish Ivison, Faeze Brahman, Lester James V. Miranda, Alisa Liu, Nouha Dziri, Shane Lyu, Yuling Gu, Saumya Malik, Victoria Graf, Jena D. Hwang, Jiangjiang Yang, Ronan Le Bras, Oyvind Tafjord, Chris Wilhelm, Luca Soldaini, et al. 2025. [Tulu 3: Pushing frontiers in open language model post-training](#).
- Wei Qi Leong, Jian Gang Ngui, Yosephine Susanto, Hamsawardhini Rengarajan, Kengatharaiyer Sarveswaran, and William-Chandra Tjhi.



2023. [BHASA: A holistic southeast asian linguistic and cultural evaluation suite for large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2309.06085.
- Natalia Levshina, Savithry Namboodiripad, Marc Allasonnière-Tang, Mathew Kramer, Luigi Talamo, Annemarie Verkerk, Sasha Wilmoth, Gabriela Garrido Rodriguez, Timothy Michael Gupton, Evan Kidd, et al. 2023. Why we need a gradient approach to word order. *Linguistics*, 61(4):825–883.
- Tal Linzen, Emmanuel Dupoux, and Yoav Goldberg. 2016. [Assessing the ability of LSTMs to learn syntax-sensitive dependencies](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:521–535.
- Yikang Liu, Yeting Shen, Hongao Zhu, Lilong Xu, Zhiheng Qian, Siyuan Song, Kejia Zhang, Jialong Tang, Pei Zhang, Baosong Yang, Rui Wang, and Hai Hu. 2024. [Zhoblmp: a systematic assessment of language models with linguistic minimal pairs in chinese](#). *CoRR*, abs/2411.06096.
- Kyle Mahowald, Anna A. Ivanova, Idan A. Blank, Nancy Kanwisher, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Evelina Fedorenko. 2024. [Dissociating language and thought in large language models](#). *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 28(6):517–540.
- Pedro Henrique Martins, Patrick Fernandes, João Alves, Nuno M. Guerreiro, Ricardo Rei, Duarte M. Alves, José Pombal, Amin Farajian, Manuel Faysse, Mateusz Klimaszewski, Pierre Colombo, Barry Haddow, José G. C. de Souza, Alexandra Birch, and André F. T. Martins. 2024. [Eurollm: Multilingual language models for europe](#).
- Rebecca Marvin and Tal Linzen. 2018. [Targeted syntactic evaluation of language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1192–1202, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sabrina J. Mielke, Zaid Alyafeai, Elizabeth Salesky, Colin Raffel, Manan Dey, Matthias Gallé, Arun Raja, Chenglei Si, Wilson Y. Lee, Benoît Sagot, and Samson Tan. 2021. [Between words and characters: A brief history of open-vocabulary modeling and tokenization in NLP](#). *CoRR*, abs/2112.10508.
- Aaron Mueller, Garrett Nicolai, Panayiota Petrou-Zeniou, Natalia Talmina, and Tal Linzen. 2020. [Cross-linguistic syntactic evaluation of word prediction models](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5523–5539, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Benjamin Newman, Kai-Siang Ang, Julia Gong, and John Hewitt. 2021. [Refining targeted syntactic evaluation of language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3710–3723, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Team OLMo, Pete Walsh, Luca Soldaini, Dirk Groeneveld, Kyle Lo, Shane Arora, Akshita Bhagia, Yuling Gu, Shengyi Huang, Matt Jordan, Nathan Lambert, Dustin Schwenk, Oyvind Tafjord, Taira Anderson, David Atkinson, Faeze Brahman, Christopher Clark, Pradeep Dasigi, Nouha Dziri, et al. 2025. [2 olmo 2 furious](#).
- Juri Opitz, Shira Wein, and Nathan Schneider. 2025. [Natural language processing relies on linguistics](#).
- Telmo Pires, Eva Schlinger, and Dan Garrette. 2019. [How multilingual is multilingual BERT?](#) In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4996–5001, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#). *OpenAI*. Accessed: 2024-11-15.
- Phillip Rust, Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulić, Sebastian Ruder, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. [How good is your tokenizer? on the monolingual performance of multilingual language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3118–3135, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Benoît Sagot. 2018. [A multilingual collection of CoNLL-U-compatible morphological lexicons](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International*

- Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Shivalika Singh, Angelika Romanou, Clémentine Fourier, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Jian Gang Ngui, Daniel Vila-Suero, Peerat Limkonchotiwat, Kelly Marchisio, Wei Qi Leong, Yosephine Susanto, Raymond Ng, Shayne Longpre, Wei-Yin Ko, Madeline Smith, Antoine Bosselut, Alice Oh, André F. T. Martins, Leshem Choshen, Daphne Ippolito, et al. 2024a. [Global MMLU: understanding and addressing cultural and linguistic biases in multilingual evaluation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2412.03304.
- Shivalika Singh, Freddie Vargus, Daniel D’souza, Börje Karlsson, Abinaya Mahendiran, Wei-Yin Ko, Herumb Shandilya, Jay Patel, Deividas Matciunas, Laura O’Mahony, Mike Zhang, Ramith Hettiarachchi, Joseph Wilson, Marina Machado, Luisa Moura, Dominik Krzemiński, Hakimeh Fadaei, Irem Ergun, Ifeoma Okoh, et al. 2024b. [Aya dataset: An open-access collection for multilingual instruction tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11521–11567, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hedvig Skirgård, Hannah J. Haynie, Damián E. Blasi, Harald Hammarström, Jeremy Collins, Jay J. Latache, Jakob Lesage, Tobias Weber, Alena Witzlack-Makarevich, Sam Passmore, Angela Chira, Luke Maurits, Russell Dinnage, Michael Dunn, Ger Reesink, Ruth Singer, Claire Bower, Patience Epps, Jane Hill, et al. 2023. [Grambank reveals the importance of genealogical constraints on linguistic diversity and highlights the impact of language loss](#). *Science Advances*, 9.
- Taiga Someya and Yohei Oseki. 2023. [JBLiMP: Japanese benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2023*, pages 1581–1594, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yixiao Song, Kalpesh Krishna, Rajesh Bhatt, and Mohit Iyyer. 2022. [SLING: Sino linguistic evaluation of large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4606–4634, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Karolina Stanczak, Edoardo Ponti, Lucas Torroba Hennigen, Ryan Cotterell, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2022. [Same neurons, different languages: Probing morphosyntax in multilingual pre-trained models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1589–1598, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michelle Suijkerbuijk, Zoë Prins, Marianne de Heer Kloots, Jelle Zuidema, and Stefan L. Frank. 2024. [Blimp-nl: A corpus of dutch minimal pairs and acceptability judgements for language model evaluation](#). *PsyArXiv*.
- John Sylak-Glassman, Christo Kirov, David Yarowsky, and Roger Que. 2015. [A language-independent feature schema for inflectional morphology](#). 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 674–680, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ekaterina Taktasheva, Maxim Bazhukov, Kirill Koncha, Alena Fenogenova, Ekaterina Artemova, and Vladislav Mikhailov. 2024. [RuBLiMP: Russian benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9268–9299, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gemma Team. 2025. [Gemma 3](#).
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, et al. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#).
- Ahmet Üstün, Viraat Aryabumi, Zheng Yong, Wei-Yin Ko, Daniel D’souza, Gbemileke Onilude,

- Neel Bhandari, Shivalika Singh, Hui-Lee Ooi, Amr Kayid, Freddie Vargus, Phil Blunsom, Shayne Longpre, Niklas Muennighoff, Marzieh Fadaee, Julia Kreutzer, and Sara Hooker. 2024. [Aya model: An instruction finetuned open-access multilingual language model](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15894–15939, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jannis Vamvas and Rico Sennrich. 2021. [On the limits of minimal pairs in contrastive evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourth BlackboxNLP Workshop on Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 58–68, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Warstadt, Alicia Parrish, Haokun Liu, Anhad Mohananey, Wei Peng, Sheng-Fu Wang, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2020. [BLiMP: The benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs for English](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:377–392.
- Leonie Weissweiler, Kyle Mahowald, and Adele Goldberg. 2025. [Linguistic generalizations are not rules: Impacts on evaluation of LMs](#).
- Chris Wendler, Veniamin Veselovsky, Giovanni Monea, and Robert West. 2024. [Do llamas work in English? on the latent language of multilingual transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15366–15394, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, et al. 2020. [Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Beilei Xiang, Changbing Yang, Yu Li, Alex Warstadt, and Katharina Kann. 2021. [CLiMP: A benchmark for Chinese language model evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2784–2790, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daniel Zeman, Joakim Nivre, Mitchell Abrams, Elia Ackermann, Noëmi Aepli, Hamid Aghaei, Željko Agić, Amir Ahmadi, Lars Ahrenberg, Chika Kennedy Ajede, Arofat Akhundjanova, Furkan Akkurt, Gabrielè Aleksandravičiūtė, Ika Alfina, Avner Algom, Khalid Alnajjar, Chiara Alzetta, Erik Andersen, Matthew Andrews, et al. 2024. [Universal dependencies 2.15](#). LINDAT/CLARIAH-CZ digital library at the Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics (ÚFAL), Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University.

Language	Corpus	Characteristics
Vietnamese	TueCL	Spoken
Hebrew	IAHLTKneset	Spoken
Hebrew	IAHLT	Incompatible with HTB
Latvian	Cairo	Only 20 sentences
German	LIT	Historical
German	HDT	Annotation quality
Czech	Poetry	Genre
Russian	Poetry	Genre
Slovenian	SST	Spoken
Faroese	FarPaHC	Historical
Icelandic	IcePaHC	Historical
English	GUM	Spoken (among others)
English	Pronouns	Niche
English	ESLSPok	Spoken
English	CTeTex	Technical genre
Sanskrit	UFAL	Comparatively small
French	ParisStories	Spoken
French	Rhapsodie	Spoken
Galician	CTG	Low star rating
Italian	Old	Historical
Italian	Valico	Learner corpus
Romanian	Nonstandard	Genre
Romanian	ArT	Dialect
Spanish	COSER	Spoken
Class. Chinese	TueCL	Comparatively small

Table 4: Excluded Treebanks with Reasons

## A Category 1: Additional Details

### A.1 Excluded Treebanks and Criteria

We exclude a number of treebanks for various reasons. For low-resource languages, treebanks are only excluded where absolutely necessary, for high-resource languages, treebanks may be excluded to make the resulting genres and annotation schemata more uniform. An overview of the treebanks we removed is provided in Table 4. We remove diacritics from Latin, Slovenian, and Western Farsi, and cantillations from Biblical Hebrew to ensure consistency between their UD and UM data sources.. We transliterate Uyghur from Arabic to Latin, Sanskrit from Latin to Devanagari, and Tatar from Latin to Cyrillic using the official guidelines <https://suzlek.antat.ru/about/TAAT2019/8.pdf>. We skip all UD languages that do not have an ISO-639-3 code: code-switched Frisian Dutch, Turkish German, and Telugu English, as well as Cappadocian, Maghrebi Arabic French, Pomak.

### A.2 Minimal Pair Sample

Fig. 6.




Nhengatu	SV-P	Awá kuri ti uruyari, [ <b>tauyuká</b> / <b>*peyuká</b> ] kuri arupí aé.
Gheg Albanian	SV-P	dhe ata e [ <b>pan</b> / <b>*pam</b> ] se ky isht ërrxue .
Wolof	SV-#	Njiitam Séydu Nuura Njaay woyof [ <b>na</b> / <b>*nañu</b> ]!
Low German	SV-#	De jungens [ <b>lachen</b> / <b>*lach</b> ] luudhals: »Ney, dat büst du!«
Faroese	SV-#	Í 2008 [ <b>var</b> / <b>*vóru</b> ] ASFALT tó avlýst.
Latin	SV-G	sese propediem cum magno exercitu ad urbem [ <b>accessurum</b> / <b>*accessuram</b> ].
Breton	SV-#	Ne [ <b>lennan</b> / <b>*lennomp</b> ]-me ket al lizher.
Kirghiz	SV-P	Балдар ыйлакташып, кечирим сурашып, экинчи кайталабайбыз деп убада [ <b>беришет</b> / <b>*бердик</b> ].
Hebrew	SP-#	"מי ש יוצא הרבה מביא חזרה לכלוך רב", [ <b>אומרת</b> / <b>*אומרות</b> ] מימרה טורקית
Spanish	SP-#	Ninguno de los dos escritores ha [ <b>colaborado</b> / <b>*colaborados</b> ] en los guiones.
Moksha	SV-#	Вестъ очижитъ карта попсъ алашаса кудрядс [ <b>ѣрась</b> / <b>*ѣгась</b> ].
Skolt Sami	SV-P	Son [ <b>vuálgg</b> / <b>*vuálgam</b> ], tõid neävveez kuádd.
French	SP-G	L'argent qui devait financer le film n'est jamais [ <b>arrivé</b> / <b>*arrivée</b> ].

Figure 6: Sample of sentences from MultiBLiMP 1.0. The full dataset can be found at [huggingface.co/datasets/jumet/multiblmp](https://huggingface.co/datasets/jumet/multiblmp)

## B Category 2: Complementary Results

### B.1 Language Distribution

Distribution of the number of language families and languages present in MultiBLiMP 1.0:



## B.2 Best Models per Language

Model	Language	Accuracy
Goldfish	Albanian	99.2 ( $p = 0.041$ )
	Buriat	91.3 ( $p = 0.002$ )
	Catalan	97.7 ( $p = 0.004$ )
	Erzya	73.7 ( $p = 0.000$ )
	Faroese	99.6 ( $p = 0.006$ )
	Galician	98.3 ( $p = 0.001$ )
	Icelandic	98.4 ( $p = 0.000$ )
	Ligurian	94.5 ( $p = 0.000$ )
	Marathi	95.2 ( $p = 0.001$ )
	Northern Kurdish	94.7 ( $p = 0.033$ )
	Northern Sami	96.9 ( $p = 0.000$ )
	Welsh	99.4 ( $p = 0.000$ )
	Wolof	97.0 ( $p = 0.000$ )
Yakut	95.8 ( $p = 0.029$ )	
Llama3-70B	Church Slavonic	68.1 ( $p = 0.009$ )
	Gothic	75.4 ( $p = 0.000$ )
	Komi-Zyrian	77.2 ( $p = 0.070$ )
	Latin	92.1 ( $p = 0.026$ )
	Old French	81.8 ( $p = 0.001$ )
	Old Russian	80.0 ( $p = 0.024$ )
	Sanskrit	81.4 ( $p = 0.000$ )
aya-32b	French	99.5 ( $p = 0.063$ )
gemma3-27b	Bulgarian	99.2 ( $p = 0.000$ )
	Gheg Albanian	80.4 ( $p = 0.050$ )
	Polish	98.8 ( $p = 0.002$ )

## B.3 Language-specific Results

Table 5.

