

Wikinflection Corpus: A (Better) Multilingual, Morpheme-Annotated Inflectional Corpus

Eleni Metheniti* †, Günter Neumann ‡

*CLLE-CNRS, †IRIT-CNRS, ‡DFKI

* †Toulouse, France ‡Saarbrücken, Germany

eleni.metheniti@{*univ-tlse2.fr, †irit.fr}, ‡neumann@dfki.de

Abstract

Multilingual, inflectional corpora are a scarce resource in the NLP community, especially corpora with annotated morpheme boundaries. We are evaluating a generated, multilingual inflectional corpus with morpheme boundaries, generated from the English Wiktionary (Metheniti and Neumann, 2018), against the largest, multilingual, high-quality inflectional corpus of the UniMorph project (Kirov et al., 2018). We confirm that the generated Wikinflection corpus is not of such quality as UniMorph, but we were able to extract a significant amount of words from the intersection of the two corpora. Our Wikinflection corpus benefits from the morpheme segmentations of Wiktionary/Wikinflection and from the manually-evaluated morphological feature tags of the UniMorph project, and has 216K lemmas and 5.4M word forms, in a total of 68 languages.

Keywords: inflection, morphological inflection, inflectional corpus, inflection annotation

1. Introduction

Inflection is the linguistic process in which a word acquires morphological features, which allow it to create syntactic dependencies with its context or express an additional nuance without changing the word’s core meaning, e.g. number, time. To create inflection on a word-surface level, different languages make different choices on what transformations will occur to the stem of the word, what morphemes will be added (at the end, start, middle, and how many of them). Knowledge on the way a language creates inflections is crucial, in order to be able to identify and create different forms of the base word, the *lemma*, (re-inflection) and be able to reverse the process (lemmatization).

In this paper, we are describing our method of creating a multilingual inflectional corpus, using two available inflectional corpora; the corpus from the UniMorph project (Kirov et al., 2018), and the corpus we generated from the paper and code of the Wikinflection project (Metheniti and Neumann, 2018). The UniMorph corpus is the largest to date inflectional corpus, including 108 languages and ~ 10.7 word forms, and has been extensively evaluated and enriched with other resources. However, it only includes entire word forms, without information on a sub-word level; meanwhile, Wikinflection generates a corpus of 6.4M words in ~ 140 languages, and offers the morpheme segmentations of word forms as they exist in the English Wiktionary templates. We test the robustness and quality of the generated Wikinflection corpus by generating an iteration of the Wikinflection corpus and running our old evaluation script. In addition, we also evaluate Wikinflection with the UniMorph corpus. Results show that Wikinflection is of lower quality than UniMorph, due to the lack of manual evaluation, with the most serious problem being the inability to capture all grammatical tags for some word forms.

From our findings, we were also able to create a new corpus, the Wikinflection corpus, from the generated corpus of Wikinflection and the UniMorph corpus, by evaluating

Wikinflection with UniMorph. Our corpus has 216K lemmas and 5.4M word forms, in 68 languages, with the morpheme segmentations for every word form from Wikinflection and evaluated on word forms with UniMorph and using the morphological feature tags of UniMorph, converted to the Universal Dependencies tag set (Nivre et al., 2018). Our corpus is released on GitHub¹.

2. Previous Work

There is a limited amount of corpora with inflectional information made available to the NLP community, because manual segmentation and evaluation are difficult, costly and time-consuming. Automatic segmentation is favoured, with semi-supervised or unsupervised methods (Cotterell et al., 2015; Ruokolainen et al., 2016; Cotterell et al., 2016). Only a few corpora have a significant number of entries that are annotated for morphological inflections and with segmented words; *CELEX* for English, Russian, German and Dutch (Baayen et al., 1996), the *Tübingen Treebank of Written German* for German (Telljohann et al., 2004), *Korpus 2000* for Danish (Asmussen, 2001), *Corpus Of Serbian Language (CSL)* for Serbian (Kostič, 2001), *Stockholm Umeå Corpus* for Swedish (Ejerhed et al., 2006), the dataset of the *Morpho Challenge* for English, Finnish and Turkish (Kurimo et al., 2010), *Italian Content Words v3* for Italian (Grella, 2018).

A widely-used source for gathering data and creating corpora is Wiktionary, the open-access, crowd-sourced multilingual dictionary of the Wikimedia foundation. The Wiktionary, in its many source languages, offers various linguistic information on the target words; while some is easily accessible from the XML dump files, such as translations (Acs et al., 2013) and lexical-semantic information (Zesch et al., 2008), other information is not explicitly present, but is generated. The conjugation and declension of lemmas is, unfortunately, not readily available via

¹github.com/lenakmeth/Wikinflection-Corpus

the parsing tools and the resources made available by the Wikimedia foundation, but is created with the use of *inflectional templates* and *inflectional modules*. Every time the online HTML page of a lemma is accessed, the inflectional templates (human-readable templates of inflectional classes, created by the Wiktionary community) and modules (machine-readable code in `Lua`) linked to this lemma are used to generate the inflectional tables in the page. Therefore, the inflectional paradigm is not explicitly embedded in the static XML file that generates the online page².

However, there have been some attempts to mine Wiktionary for its inflectional information. *IWNLP* (Liebeck and Conrad, 2015) is a parser for the German Wiktionary, which is able to access the lemma’s inflectional template and recreate its inflectional paradigm. Their method involved re-implementing the `Lua` modules for inflectional templates of Wiktionary into `C#`, and then using these inflectional templates alongside lemmas to generate inflectional paradigms with inflectional segmentations (as given by the templates). While they achieved very high quality and accuracy, their method requires great effort and is only used on a fraction of the German words in Wiktionary.

The *Universal Morphology* (UniMorph) project is a long-standing project which has released the largest multilingual inflectional corpus to date (UniMorph 2.0), generated by the English Wiktionary (Kirov et al., 2018). Their approach to extracting the relevant information from the Wiktionary is different than that of Liebeck and Conrad (2015); they used the static HTML pages of Wiktionary instead of the offline resources, which allowed them to capture word forms that are explicitly written and not generated by a template or word forms which are dictionary entries but not lemmas. These word forms, however, are not segmented to their morphemes, as such information is only available through templates in Wiktionary. They annotated their inflectional paradigms with their own UniMorph schema (Sylak-Glassman et al., 2015), which aims to capture all morphological features of human languages in one unified notation. Unlike the 1.0 version of UniMorph (Kirov et al., 2016), the UniMorph 2.0 corpus is generated by the inflectional tables of the lemma, the tables were grouped based on similarity, and human annotators evaluated, annotated and corrected the pairs of word forms and generated morphological feature tags. This ensured that the UniMorph 2.0 corpus has gold-standard word forms and high-quality annotations for all the 400K inflectional paradigms and 10.7M word forms present.

Another approach to mine the English Wiktionary for inflectional information is *Wikinflection* (Metheniti and Neumann, 2018). Our approach made use of the static HTML inflectional tables of the Wiktionary, to recreate inflectional templates which could then be associated (with the Wiktionary’s dynamic links) and used with lemmas in the Wiktionary XML dump file, to generate inflectional paradigms with inflectional morpheme boundaries, where the segments added by the template are considered to be the word’s

inflectional morphemes. We also offered a script to randomly evaluate the inflectional templates, by randomly selecting one corresponding lemma and inflectional paradigm for each template, and checking the lemma’s HTML page on Wiktionary. Before evaluation, our generated corpus has 225.453 inflectional paradigms and 1.708 inflectional templates, generating 8.426.480 inflected words, in a total of 199 languages. After performing some random evaluations, we reported different numbers for each evaluation; random evaluation 3 returned 210.172 inflectional paradigms and 1.521 templates, and 6.024.077 word forms for 138 languages. We have thoroughly documented the shortcomings of generating inflections without extensive and human evaluation, mostly due to the conflicting styles and templates used across different target languages in the English Wiktionary; our approach to massively gather information from the diversely structured tables of the Wiktionary led sometimes to partial loss of morphological tags. In addition, we were also critical of our own method of evaluation, because it is prone to errors and returns different results in every evaluation run.

3. Re-evaluating Wikinflection

In our previous paper, we (Metheniti and Neumann, 2018) presented our method of generating inflections by reverse-engineering the process in which the Wiktionary server generates inflections on command, every time the page of a dictionary entry is loaded. From the Wiktionary XML dump file, we find words that are lemmas and have inflectional information, we gather the dynamic links that connect a lemma to its corresponding inflectional template, and then we look up the HTML pages for these inflectional templates. With the parsed templates and the information provided in the dynamic link (stem, stem allomorphs, phonetic additions), we expect to be able to exactly recreate the inflectional paradigms as presented in the HTML page of a lemma, and maintain the morpheme boundaries among the stem/stem allomorph and the inflectional morphemes.

A method of evaluation, however, is necessary; for each of the 1.708 unique inflectional templates, we randomly choose a lemma associated with that template, we look up the online HTML page for the lemma in Wiktionary, and we remove any generated word forms which were not found in the HTML page. This method of evaluation was selected because there are not large enough corpora for all the 199 languages for which Wikinflection has generated paradigms, and even in high-resource languages, some inflected types are very rare. However, this method of evaluation does not guarantee gold-standard quality; as the authors document, three different executions of our evaluation script produced corpora of different sizes; for example, when the template for Latin second declension was evaluated with the noun *campus* “campus”, all word forms were deemed correct and thus no corrections were made in the template, but when it was evaluated with the proper noun *Herostratus*, the word forms associated with the plural number were not found because the proper noun does not exist in plural.

We decided to run the Wikinflection code, generate the corpus via the Metheniti and Neumann (2018) script and

²We have previously explained in detail the process of generating inflections in Wiktionary in Metheniti and Neumann (2018).

<i>Corpus type</i>	<i>No. lan- guages</i>	<i>Inflectional templates</i>	<i>No. Lemmas</i>	<i>No. Words</i>
Non-evaluated	149	1.810	274.798	9.320.503
Wiktionary Evaluation	140	1.614	254.712	6.447.613
UniMorph Evaluation	68	977	216.624	5.410.746

Table 1: The size of the generated Wikinflection corpus (number of languages present, number of (correct and updated) inflectional templates, number of lemmas and number of inflected word forms. The first row refers to the generated corpus from Wikinflection, without evaluation, the second row refers to the Wikinflection corpus after the one random evaluation we performed using Wiktionary and our Wikinflection script, and the third row refers to the evaluation we performed using the UniMorph corpus.

then, at first, evaluate with the evaluation script we previously used and provided in the Wikinflection repository³. We used the latest English Wiktionary XML dump file (November 21, 2019) alongside the Python3 code. The results of the generated corpus, before evaluation, are shown in the first row of Table 1; we assume that our numbers are higher than the ones reported for the generated corpus in Metheniti and Neumann (2018) (mentioned in Section 2.) because the Wiktionary is constantly adding new dictionary entries and improving the existing templates. We then ran the evaluation script as provided by the authors, and we report the results in the second row of Table 1. The numbers are, foreseeably, lower than in the non-evaluated corpus, and are close to the evaluation runs that the authors have reported in our previous work. However, we still cannot guarantee that these evaluated, generated paradigms are of high quality; the evaluation log showed us which random lemma was picked for each inflectional template and how many word forms were corrected from each template. We manually checked a few of the corrected templates, by accessing the HTML pages of the inflectional templates and the chosen lemmas, and we noticed the problems with the evaluation. For example, the inflectional template *es-conj-ír*⁴ for verbs ending in *-ír* in Spanish; even after the evaluation, there were four duplicate forms of the infinitive form in the template. On the other hand, the inflectional template *fi-decl-käsi-kulkija*⁵ for Finnish nouns was erroneously found entirely incorrect, because the randomly chosen word for this template, *Uusi-Kaledonia*⁶ “New Caledonia”, is a proper noun without plural, and different rules in Wiktionary applied outside of inflectional templates implement these transformations in the lemma’s page.

Since, in order to perform an evaluation on all the Wikinflection languages, we need a source of inflected forms as big and multilingual as in the Wiktionary, we considered

that we could use the UniMorph corpus for evaluation, as it is also created with the use of the English Wiktionary, is larger than the Wikinflection corpus, and is manually evaluated. We downloaded the current versions of the repositories for each available language, and in Table 2 we are presenting the current size of each language’s corpus. We ran the evaluation in the same method followed as in Metheniti and Neumann (2018); we are randomly selecting one corresponding lemma for every non-evaluated template, we are generating its inflectional paradigm, and then we are checking the existence of each word form in the UniMorph corpus. We then check, for each word, whether its morphological tags from the generated template and the morphological tags of UniMorph are a (partial) match⁷, and if they are, we overwrite them with the UniMorph features in the corresponding position of the template. In order to perform this, we have to convert the UniMorph schema to the Universal Dependencies schema (Nivre et al., 2018), because Wikinflection is built on Universal Dependencies. We used a conversion list provided by McCarthy et al. (2018) in their Github repository⁸.

We are presenting the results of our evaluation with UniMorph in Table 1 as well. First of all, we notice a drop in the remaining languages, because UniMorph has 108 languages compared to the 149 in Wikinflection, and the reason that we have even fewer is that UniMorph was enriched with sources other than Wiktionary (e.g. corpora in Italian, Grela (2018)), or some languages in Wiktionary do not have any inflectional templates with significant inflectional information (e.g. Ancient Greek). The number of inflectional templates has been halved, but we can deduce that the remaining templates are of good quality since they have been evaluated with UniMorph, and we also ensured to get rid of the duplicate word forms in the templates. We notice that the Wikinflection corpus lacks some high-resource languages present in UniMorph, such as French, or has a dramatically smaller number of lemmas and word forms, such as in Arabic and Portuguese. This is probably due to the lack of or the bad structure of the inflectional templates for these languages in Wiktionary, which Wikinflection was not able to parse. However, we notice that for some languages (e.g. Ingrian, Veps) the evaluated Wikinflection has more word forms than UniMorph; this is because we evaluate the templates, and generate the word forms. It is possible that the UniMorph project has not fully queried all the HTML pages for dictionary entries for a language, but since we are using the XML file, we have access to all dictionary entries and can create inflections for whichever lemmas are linked with inflectional templates.

In order to check the improvement in quality that the evaluation with UniMorph brought, we decided to pick one of the randomly chosen words from the previous Wiktionary evaluation, so that we can compare all the evaluated and non evaluated outputs with a human evaluation. We se-

³github.com/lenakmeth/Wikinflection

⁴en.wiktionary.org/wiki/Template:es-conj-%C3%ADr

⁵en.wiktionary.org/wiki/Template:fi-decl-k%C3%A4si-kulkija

⁶en.wiktionary.org/wiki/Uusi-Kaledonia

⁷We are not looking for a one-to-one match of the UniMorph and the Wikinflection tags, as long as the word form matches. Wikinflection’s tags are problematic, and it would be impossible to get a perfect match.

⁸github.com/unimorph/ud-compatibility

lected⁹ the Spanish verb *sofreír* “to fry lightly”, which is linked to the inflectional template *es-conj-ír* which was problematic in the Wiktionary evaluation, and we examined the paradigms from the corpora and the evaluations. We are presenting four different paradigms of this lemma; the non-evaluated lemma from Wikinflection (Table 4), the paradigm from the UniMorph corpus (Table 5), the Wiktionary-evaluated, generated paradigm from Wikinflection (Table 6) and the UniMorph-evaluated generated paradigm (Table 7). First, we notice the many duplicate forms in the Wikinflection paradigms, a problem which also exists in the Wiktionary-evaluated corpus, but is dealt with with our UniMorph evaluation. Second, we notice that in Wikinflection, both in the non-evaluated and the evaluated versions, there are word forms with incomplete tags; by copying the UniMorph tags, we are ensuring the complete morphological annotation of each word form. Overall, our generated and evaluated paradigm is not complete, but the word forms present are unique, correct and fully annotated both for morpheme boundaries and morphological features.

4. A new corpus: Wikinflection + UniMorph

Following this evaluation process, we believe that it would be beneficial to release the result of evaluating Wikinflection with UniMorph as an open-access resource. This corpus includes the segmentations of inflectional morphemes for every word form, as found in the Wiktionary templates and in Wikinflection, is evaluated with the use of the manually-evaluated UniMorph, and has UniMorph’s manually-annotated morphological tags. We opted for the use of the Universal Dependencies 2 schema, as opposed to the original UniMorph, since we have already converted the tags to the UD tags on the evaluation stage, and also because currently the UD schema is more commonly used in NLP applications (e.g. dependency parsers). The full list of languages and lemmas and word forms per language can be found in Table 3. We are also going to make use of the ISO 639-3 language codes, as UniMorph does, to ensure uniform language tags; both the Wiktionary and Wikinflection use different versions of the ISO 639 protocol for languages (e.g. the tag *fi* for Finnish is from ISO 639-1, and ISO 639-3 uses *fin*). An example of the format of our corpus can be seen in Table 7, for the lemma *sofreír*.

As happened during the the evaluation of Wikinflection with the Wiktionary, we run in the risk of false negatives, when evaluating an inflectional template with a random lemma that possibly does not have all forms of a template. Therefore, we ran the evaluation twice, and the corpus and the numbers we report in Table 3 are the results of two evaluation runs with UniMorph and their combination.

5. Discussion

Our work started as an effort to assess the quality of the Wikinflection corpus, the largest inflectional corpus to date (openly available) to include inflectional morpheme boundaries. We discovered that the corpus, because it is automatically generated, has several weaknesses, especially when

⁹Out of the randomly evaluated words and templates, we chose a language and grammar which we are familiar with, in order to also be able to evaluate the word forms personally.

compared to UniMorph, a carefully-evaluated inflectional corpus from a long-standing research project. However, we were able to evaluate Wikinflection with the use of UniMorph, and discovered that a significant portion of Wikinflection is on par with the UniMorph standards. From our evaluation results, we used the intersection of the two corpora to create a new one, with the strengths of each: the morpheme boundaries of Wikinflection and the gold-standard morphological tags of UniMorph.

We are aware of the weaknesses of our work; our inflectional paradigms are not complete, because of the method the inflectional information is parsed by and included in Wikinflection. We also aim to perform a more in-depth analysis of the corpora, on a manual level, to ensure that there are no false positives/negatives cause by the inflectional templates of Wiktionary and Wikinflection. However, we are confident that the quality of the Wikinflection corpus, after the evaluation with UniMorph, is on par with the UniMorph standards, for the present word forms and morphological feature tags.

Finally, we would like to address the fact that the inflectional morphemes, in Wiktionary and subsequently in Wikinflection and our corpus as well, are in most cases composites and not broken down to the smallest possible units; for example, *sofreiremos* “we will fry lightly” (see Tables 4-7) is decomposed to *sofre-iremos*, but should have been analyzed as:

*sofre-ir*_[+future]-*emos*_[+1st.pers.plural]

This is a weakness of the way inflectional templates in Wiktionary are crafted, and if we would like to deal with this issue (which could prove serious for agglutinative languages such as Finnish), we would need language-specific knowledge and many resources, to ensure gold-standard quality. We aim to address this in a following edition of our corpus, but even with this problem, we see merit in releasing our work to be freely used by the NLP community, especially since our corpus currently includes a meaningful number of word forms for many low-resource languages (Ingrian, Pashto, Classic Syriac, Veps).

6. Acknowledgements

This work was partially funded by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 grant agreements No. 731724 (iREAD) and No. 777107 (Precise4Q), and by the BMBF project DeepLee ((01IW17001). This work also benefited from the support of CNRS (80|PRIME-2019 project MoDiCLI). We would like to sincerely thank Arya McCarthy for his help during the last months of our project, and we would also like to thank Nabil Hathout and Tim Van de Cruys for their support.

7. Bibliographical References

- Acs, J., Pajkossy, K., and Kornai, A. (2013). Building basic vocabulary across 40 languages. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on Building and Using Comparable Corpora*, pages 52–58, Sofia, Bulgaria, August. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Asmussen, J. (2001). *Korpus 2000. Korpuslingvistik (NyS30)*.

- Baayen, R. H., Piepenbrock, R., and Gulikers, L. (1996). *Celex2. Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia*.
- Cotterell, R., Müller, T., Fraser, A., and Schütze, H. (2015). Labeled morphological segmentation with semi-Markov models. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 164–174, Beijing, China, July. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cotterell, R., Kumar, A., and Schütze, H. (2016). Morphological segmentation inside-out. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2325–2330, Austin, Texas, November. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ejerhed, E., Källgren, G., and Brodda, B. (2006). Stockholm-Umeå corpus version 2.0. *Stockholm University, Dep. of Linguistics and Umeå University, Dep. of Linguistics*.
- Grella, M. (2018). Italian content words v3. LINDAT/CLARIN digital library at the Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics (ÚFAL), Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University.
- Kirov, C., Sylak-Glassman, J., Que, R., and Yarowsky, D. (2016). Very-large scale parsing and normalization of Wiktionary morphological paradigms. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'16)*, pages 3121–3126, Portorož, Slovenia, May. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Kirov, C., Cotterell, R., Sylak-Glassman, J., Walther, G., Vylomova, E., Xia, P., Faruqui, M., Mielke, S., McCarthy, A., Kübler, S., Yarowsky, D., Eisner, J., and Hulden, M. (2018). UniMorph 2.0: Universal Morphology. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan, May. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Kostič, D. (2001). Kvantitativni opis strukture srpskog jezika – Korpus srpskog jezika. [Quantitative description of Serbian language structure – Corpus of Serbian language.]. *Belgrade, Serbia: Institute for Experimental Phonetics and Speech Pathology, Belgrade and Laboratory for Experimental Psychology, University of Belgrade*.
- Kurimo, M., Virpioja, S., Turunen, V. T., et al. (2010). Proceedings of the Morpho Challenge 2010 Workshop. In *Morpho Challenge Workshop; 2010; Espoo*. Aalto University School of Science and Technology.
- Liebeck, M. and Conrad, S. (2015). IWNLP: Inverse Wiktionary for natural language processing. 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 414–418, Beijing, China, July. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- McCarthy, A. D., Silfverberg, M., Cotterell, R., Hulden, M., and Yarowsky, D. (2018). Marrying Universal Dependencies and Universal Morphology. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Universal Dependencies (UDW 2018)*, pages 91–101, Brussels, Belgium, November. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Metheniti, E. and Neumann, G. (2018). Wikinflection: Massive Semi-Supervised Generation of Multilingual Inflectional Corpus from Wiktionary. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Workshop on Treebanks and Linguistic Theories (TLT 2018), December 13–14, 2018, Oslo University, Norway*, number 155, pages 147–161. Linköping University Electronic Press.
- Nivre, J., Abrams, M., Agić, Ž., et al. (2018). Universal Dependencies 2.3. LINDAT/CLARIN digital library at the Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics (ÚFAL), Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University.
- Ruokolainen, T., Kohonen, O., Sirts, K., Grönroos, S.-A., Kurimo, M., and Virpioja, S. (2016). A comparative study of minimally supervised morphological segmentation. *Computational Linguistics*, 42(1):91–120, March.
- Sylak-Glassman, J., Kirov, C., Yarowsky, D., and Que, R. (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, July. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Telljohann, H., Hinrichs, E., and Kübler, S. (2004). The Tüba-D/Z treebank: Annotating German with a context-free backbone. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'04)*, Lisbon, Portugal, May. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Zesch, T., Müller, C., and Gurevych, I. (2008). Extracting lexical semantic knowledge from Wikipedia and Wiktionary. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'08)*, Marrakech, Morocco, May. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).

Language	ISO 639-3	Words	Lemmas	Language	ISO 639-3	Words	Lemmas	Language	ISO 639-3	Words	Lemmas
Adyghe	ady	20475	1666	Scottish Gaelic	gla	781	73	Dutch	nld	55467	4993
Old English	ang	42425	1867	Irish	gle	107298	7464	Norwegian Nynorsk	nno	15319	4689
Arabic	ara	140003	4134	Manx	glv	14	1	Norwegian Bokmål	nob	19238	5527
Mapudungun	arn	783	26	Middle High German	gmh	708	29	Occitan	oci	8316	174
Asturian	ast	29797	436	Middle Low German	gml	1513	52	Livonian languages	olo	3187*	203*
Azerbaijani	aze	8004	340	Gothic	got	0*	0*	Old Saxon	osx	22287	863
Bashkir	bak	12168	1084	Ancient Greek	grc	41593	2431	Polish	pol	201024	10185
Belarusian	bel	16113	1027	Haida	hai	7040	41	Portuguese	por	303996	4001
Bengali	ben	4443	136	Serbo Croatian	hbs	840799	24419	Pashto	pus	6945	395
Tibetan	bod	353	65	Hebrew	heb	13818	510	Quechua	que	180004	1006
Breton	bre	2294	44	Hindi	hin	54438	258	Romanian	ron	80266	4405
Bulgarian	bul	55730	2468	Hungarian	hun	490394	13989	Russian	rus	473481	28068
Catalan	cat	81576	1547	Armenian	hye	338461	7033	Sanskrit	san	33847	917
Czech	ces	134527	5125	Icelandic	isl	76915	4775	Old Irish	sga	1089	49
Old Church Slavonic	chu	4148	152	Italian	ita	509574	10009	Slovenian	slv	60110	2535
Central Kurdish	ckb	22990	274	Ingrian	izh	1099	50	Northern Sami	sme	62677	2103
Cornish	cor	469	9	Greenlandic	kal	368	23	Spanish	spa	382955	5460
Crimean Tatar	crh	7514	1230	Kannada	kan	6402	159	Albanian	sqi	33483	589
Kashubian	csb	509	37	Georgian	kat	74412	3782	Swahili	swc	10092	100
Welsh	cym	10641	183	Kazakh	kaz	357	26	Swedish	swe	78411	10553
Danish	dan	25503	3193	Kabardian	kbd	3092	250	Classical Syriac	syc	3652	160
German	deu	179339	15060	Khakas	kjh	1200	75	Tatar	tat	7832	1283
Lower Sorbian	dsb	20121	994	Khaling	klr	156097	591	Telugu	tel	1548	127
Modern Greek	ell	199763	11906	Northern Kurdish	kmr	216370	15083	Tajik	tgk	77	75
English	eng	115523	22765	Karelian	krl	682	20	Turkmen	tuk	810	68
Estonian	est	38215	886	Latin	lat	509182	17214	Turkish	tur	275460	3579
Basque	eus	11889	26	Latvian	lav	136998	7548	Ukrainian	ukr	20904	1493
Faroese	fao	45474	3077	Lithuanian	lit	34130	1458	Urdu	urd	12572	182
Persian	fas	37128	273	Livonian	liv	3987	203	Uzbek	uzb	1260	15
Finnish	fin	2490377	57642	Ladin	lld	180	7656	Venetian	vec	18227	368
French	fra	367732	7535	Ludian	lud	400*	124*	Veps	vep	33196*	868*
Middle French	frn	36970	603	Macedonian	mkd	168057	10313	Votic	vot	1430	55
Old French	fro	123374	1700	Maltese	mlt	3584	112	Classical Armenian	xcl	97181	4300
North Frisian	frr	3204	51	Murrinhpatha	mwf	1110	29	Norman	xno	280	5
West Frisian	fry	1429	85	Neapolitan	nap	1808	40	Yiddish	yid	7986	803
Friulian	fur	8071	168	Navajo	nav	12354	674	Zulu	zul	49119	566
Galician	gal	36801	486	Low German	nds	0*	0*	TOTAL		10688113	385573

Table 2: The languages of the UniMorph 2.0 corpus and their current statistics. With an asterisk (*) are marked the languages for which there are available resources on the Github repository of the project (github.com/unimorph) but no statistics were mentioned in the project’s website (unimorph.github.io) as of November 21, 2019. We collected the relevant repositories and added the counts to this table. Please note that the UniMorph project claims to have corpora for 110 languages, but only 108 are currently available (accessed November 21, 2019).

Language	ISO 639-3	Words	Lemmas	Language	ISO 639-3	Words	Lemmas	Language	ISO 639-3	Words	Lemmas
Adyghe	ady	56	4	Irish	gle	48055	10118	Low German	nds	1478	238
Old English	ang	56833	4332	Middle High German	gmh	84	9	Dutch	nld	19816	4710
Arabic	ara	36	6	Middle Low German	gml	495	40	Occitan	oci	808	404
Asturian	ast	30141	373	Gothic	got	13447	1052	Old Saxon	osx	15167	838
Belarusian	bel	378	35	Ancient Greek	grc	366	72	Polish	pol	142805	4878
Tibetan	bod	24	8	Hindi	hin	188	96	Portuguese	por	1059	353
Bulgarian	bul	344	108	Hungarian	hun	467958	24099	Pashto	pus	3227	469
Catalan, Valencian	cat	2042	28	Armenian	hye	3715	317	Romanian	ron	7879	1507
Czech	ces	32	3	Icelandic	isl	488	88	Old Irish	sga	752	88
Church Slavic	chu	1252	124	Ingrian	izh	19712	64	Slovenian	slv	113	15
Welsh	cym	25423	401	Kalaallisut, Greenlandic	kal	544	34	Northern Sami	sme	45693	3460
Danish	dan	12040	5999	Kannada	kan	9	3	Spanish, Castilian	spa	712070	7277
German	deu	47388	5234	Georgian	kat	73833	3978	Albanian	sqi	7307	207
Lower Sorbian	dsb	18844	914	Kazakh	kaz	1281	183	Swedish	swe	14891	1761
Modern Greek	ell	4	1	Kabardian	kbd	56	4	Classical Syriac	syc	58676	1692
English	eng	74	25	Khakas	kjh	24	6	Turkmen	tuk	1092	91
Estonian	est	85200	1878	Latin	lat	187389	13451	Turkish	tur	2823	883
Basque	eus	78	2	Latvian	lav	88841	8061	Ukrainian	ukr	42	3
Faroese	fao	41816	3446	Lithuanian	lit	29932	1497	Urdu	urd	722	223
Persian	fas	10668	94	Livonian languages	liv	412	289	Veps	vep	12300	820
Finnish	fin	3046391	94609	Macedonian	mkd	39805	4881	Votic	vot	528	66
Middle French	frn	632	34	Maltese	mlt	64	36	Classical Armenian	xcl	4981	566
Old French	fro	15	3	Neapolitan	nap	108	36	TOTAL		5410746	216624

Table 3: The languages and sizes of our corpus, created by the intersection of the Wikiflection and UniMorph corpora.

Word	Template	Features	POS	Prefix	Suffix	Infix	Stem
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreiendo	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger	VERB	-	iendo	-	sofre
sofreiendo	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger	VERB	-	iendo	-	sofre
sofreiendo	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger	VERB	-	iendo	-	sofre
sofreiendo	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger	VERB	-	iendo	-	sofre
sofreido	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing	VERB	-	ido	-	sofre
sofreido	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing	VERB	-	ido	-	sofre
sofreida	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing	VERB	-	ida	-	sofre
sofreida	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing	VERB	-	ida	-	sofre
sofreidas	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Plur	VERB	-	idos	-	sofre
sofreidas	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur	VERB	-	idos	-	sofre
sofreidas	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur	VERB	-	idas	-	sofre
sofreidas	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur	VERB	-	idas	-	sofre
sofreo	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing; Person=3;Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	o	-	sofre
sofrees	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	es	-	sofre
sofreés	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	is	-	sofre
sofreee	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	e	-	sofre
sofreemos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	imos	-	sofre
sofreéis	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	is	-	sofre
sofreeen	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	en	-	sofre
sofreía	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing; Person=3;Mood=Ind;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ía	-	sofre
sofreías	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Ind; Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ías	-	sofre
sofreía	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Ind; Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ía	-	sofre
sofreíamos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Ind; Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	íamos	-	sofre
sofreíais	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	íais	-	sofre
sofreían	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ían	-	sofre
sofreí	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3; Mood=Ind;Tense=Past	VERB	-	í	-	sofre
sofreíste	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Ind;Tense=Past	VERB	-	íste	-	sofre
sofreíó	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Ind;Tense=Past	VERB	-	ió	-	sofre
sofreímos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Ind;Tense=Past	VERB	-	ímos	-	sofre
sofreísteis	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Past	VERB	-	ísteis	-	sofre
sofreieron	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Past	VERB	-	ieron	-	sofre
sofreíre	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3; Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	íre	-	sofre
sofreírás	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	írás	-	sofre
sofreirá	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	irá	-	sofre
sofreiremos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	iremos	-	sofre
sofreiréis	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	iréis	-	sofre
sofreirán	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	irán	-	sofre
sofreiría	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	iría	-	sofre
sofreirías	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	irías	-	sofre
sofreiría	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	iría	-	sofre
sofreiríamos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	iríamos	-	sofre
sofreiríais	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	iríais	-	sofre
sofreirían	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	irían	-	sofre
sofreía	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3; Mood=Sub;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	a	-	sofre
sofreías	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Sub;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	ás	-	sofre
sofreíavos	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Sub;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	ávos2	-	sofr
sofreía	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Sub;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	a	-	sofre
sofreíamos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Sub;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	amos	-	sofre
sofreíais	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Sub;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	áis	-	sofre
sofreían	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Sub;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	án	-	sofre
sofreiera	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3; Mood=Sub;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	iera	-	sofre
sofreieras	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Sub; Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ieras	-	sofre
sofreiera	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Sub; Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	iera	-	sofre
sofreiríamos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Sub; Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	iríamos	-	sofre
sofreiríais	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Sub;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	iríais	-	sofre
sofreirían	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Sub;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	irían	-	sofre
sofreiese	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3; Mood=Sub;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	iese	-	sofre
sofreíese	es-conj-ír	Mood=Sub;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	iese	-	sofre
sofreíese	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Sub; Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ieses	-	sofre
sofreíese	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Sub; Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	iese	-	sofre
sofreíese	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Sub; Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ieses	-	sofre
sofreíesemos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Sub; Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	íesemos	-	sofre
sofreíeseis	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Sub;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ieseis	-	sofre
sofreíesen	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Sub;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	iesen	-	sofre
sofreiere	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3;Mood=Sub	VERB	-	iere	-	sofre
sofreieres	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Sub	VERB	-	ieres	-	sofre
sofreiere	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Sub	VERB	-	iere	-	sofre
sofreirémos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Sub	VERB	-	irémos	-	sofre
sofreiréis	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Sub	VERB	-	iréis	-	sofre
sofreieren	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Sub	VERB	-	ieren	-	sofre
sofreie	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Pos	VERB	-	e	-	sofre
sofreí	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Pos	VERB	-	í	-	sofre
sofreía	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Pos	VERB	-	a	-	sofre
sofreíamos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Pos	VERB	-	amos	-	sofre
sofreíd	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Pos	VERB	-	íd	-	sofre
sofreían	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Pos	VERB	-	án	-	sofre
no sofreas	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Neg	VERB	no	as	-	sofre
no sofreía	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Neg	VERB	no	a	-	sofre
no sofreamos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Neg	VERB	no	amos	-	sofre
no sofreáis	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Neg	VERB	no	áis	-	sofre
no sofrean	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Neg	VERB	no	an	-	sofre

Table 4: The lemma *sofreír* in non-evaluated Wikinflection.

Lemma	Word	Features
sofreír	no sofríais	V;NEG;IMP;2;PL
sofreír	no sofríamos	V;NEG;IMP;1;PL
sofreír	no sofrían	V;NEG;IMP;3;PL
sofreír	no sofrías	V;NEG;IMP;2;SG
sofreír	no sofría	V;NEG;IMP;3;SG
sofreír	sofreíais	V;IND;PST;2;PL;IPFV
sofreír	sofreíamos	V;IND;PST;1;PL;IPFV
sofreír	sofreían	V;IND;PST;3;PL;IPFV
sofreír	sofreías	V;IND;PST;2;SG;IPFV
sofreír	sofreía	V;IND;PST;1;SG;IPFV
sofreír	sofreía	V;IND;PST;3;SG;IPFV
sofreír	sofreidas	V;PTCP;PST;FEM;PL
sofreír	sofreida	V;PTCP;PST;FEM;SG
sofreír	sofreidos	V;PTCP;PST;MASC;PL
sofreír	sofreido	V;PTCP;PST;MASC;SG
sofreír	sofreíd	V;POS;IMP;2;PL
sofreír	sofreímos	V;IND;PRS;1;PL
sofreír	sofreíais	V;IND;PST;1;PL;PFV
sofreír	sofreirán	V;IND;FUT;3;PL
sofreír	sofreirás	V;IND;FUT;2;SG
sofreír	sofreiría	V;IND;FUT;3;SG
sofreír	sofreiréis	V;IND;FUT;2;PL
sofreír	sofreiremos	V;IND;FUT;1;PL
sofreír	sofreiré	V;IND;FUT;1;SG
sofreír	sofreiríais	V;COND;2;PL
sofreír	sofreiríamos	V;COND;1;PL
sofreír	sofreirían	V;COND;3;PL
sofreír	sofreirías	V;COND;2;SG
sofreír	sofreiría	V;COND;1;SG
sofreír	sofreiría	V;COND;3;SG
sofreír	sofreír	V;NFIN
sofreír	sofreísteis	V;IND;PST;2;PL;PFV
sofreír	sofreíste	V;IND;PST;2;SG;PFV
sofreír	sofreí	V;IND;PRS;2;PL
sofreír	sofreí	V;IND;PRS;1;SG;PFV
sofreír	sofríais	V;SBJV;PRS;2;PL
sofreír	sofríamos	V;POS;IMP;1;PL
sofreír	sofríamos	V;SBJV;PRS;1;PL
sofreír	sofrían	V;POS;IMP;3;PL
sofreír	sofrían	V;SBJV;PRS;3;PL
sofreír	sofrías	V;SBJV;PRS;2;SG
sofreír	sofría	V;POS;IMP;3;SG
sofreír	sofría	V;SBJV;PRS;3;SG
sofreír	sofreiendo	V;CVB;PRS
sofreír	sofríen	V;IND;PRS;3;PL
sofreír	sofríerais	V;SBJV;PST;2;PL;LGSPEC1
sofreír	sofríeramos	V;SBJV;PST;1;PL;LGSPEC1
sofreír	sofrieran	V;SBJV;PST;3;PL;LGSPEC1
sofreír	sofrieras	V;SBJV;PST;2;SG;LGSPEC1
sofreír	sofriera	V;SBJV;PST;1;SG;LGSPEC1
sofreír	sofriera	V;SBJV;PST;3;SG;LGSPEC1
sofreír	sofríereis	V;SBJV;FUT;2;PL
sofreír	sofríerémos	V;SBJV;FUT;1;PL
sofreír	sofríerán	V;SBJV;FUT;3;PL
sofreír	sofríerías	V;SBJV;FUT;2;SG
sofreír	sofríere	V;SBJV;FUT;1;SG
sofreír	sofríere	V;SBJV;FUT;3;SG
sofreír	sofríeron	V;IND;PST;3;PL;PFV
sofreír	sofríeseis	V;SBJV;PST;2;PL
sofreír	sofríesemos	V;SBJV;PST;1;PL
sofreír	sofríesen	V;SBJV;PST;3;PL
sofreír	sofríese	V;SBJV;PST;2;SG
sofreír	sofríese	V;SBJV;PST;1;SG
sofreír	sofríese	V;SBJV;PST;3;SG
sofreír	sofríe	V;IND;PRS;2;SG
sofreír	sofríe	V;IND;PRS;3;SG
sofreír	sofríe	V;POS;IMP;2;SG
sofreír	sofrío	V;IND;PRS;1;SG
sofreír	sofrío	V;IND;PST;3;SG;PFV

Table 5: The lemma *sofreír* in UniMorph.

Word	Template	Features	POS	Prefix	Suffix	Infix	Stem
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreído	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing	VERB	-	ído	-	sofre
sofreído	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing	VERB	-	ído	-	sofre
sofreís	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	ís	-	sofre
sofreímos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	ímos	-	sofre
sofreís	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres	VERB	-	ís	-	sofre
sofreía	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3;Mood=Ind;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ía	-	sofre
sofreías	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Ind;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ías	-	sofre
sofreía	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Ind;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ía	-	sofre
sofreíamos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Ind;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	íamos	-	sofre
sofreíais	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	íais	-	sofre
sofreían	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Aspect=Imp;Tense=Imp	VERB	-	ían	-	sofre
sofreí	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3;Mood=Ind;Tense=Past	VERB	-	í	-	sofre
sofreíste	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Ind;Tense=Past	VERB	-	íste	-	sofre
sofreímos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Ind;Tense=Past	VERB	-	ímos	-	sofre
sofreísteis	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Past	VERB	-	ísteis	-	sofre
sofreiré	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	iré	-	sofre
sofreirás	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	irás	-	sofre
sofreirá	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	irá	-	sofre
sofreiremos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	iremos	-	sofre
sofreiréis	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	iréis	-	sofre
sofreirán	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut	VERB	-	irán	-	sofre
sofreiría	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Ger;Number=Sing;Person=3;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	iría	-	sofre
sofreirías	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	irías	-	sofre
sofreiría	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=2;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	iría	-	sofre
sofreiríamos	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Person=3;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	iríamos	-	sofre
sofreiríais	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	iríais	-	sofre
sofreirían	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Cnd	VERB	-	irían	-	sofre
sofreí	es-conj-ír	Number=Sing;Person=1;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Pos	VERB	-	í	-	sofre
sofreíd	es-conj-ír	Number=Plur;Mood=Imp;Polarity=Pos	VERB	-	íd	-	sofre

Table 6: The lemma *sofreír* in Wiktionary-evaluated Wikinflection.

Word	Template	Features	POS	Prefix	Suffix	Infix	Stem
sofreír	es-conj-ír	VerbForm=Inf	VERB	-	ír	-	sofre
sofreído	es-conj-ír	Tense=Past;Gender=Masc;Number=Sing	VERB	-	ído	-	sofre
sofreída	es-conj-ír	Tense=Past;Gender=Fem;Number=Sing	VERB	-	ída	-	sofre
sofreídos	es-conj-ír	Tense=Past;Gender=Masc;Number=Plur	VERB	-	idos	-	sofre
sofreídas	es-conj-ír	Tense=Past;Gender=Fem;Number=Plur	VERB	-	idas	-	sofre
sofreís	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Pres;Person=2;Number=Plur	VERB	-	ís	-	sofre
sofreímos	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Past;Person=1;Number=Plur;Aspect=Perf	VERB	-	ímos	-	sofre
sofreía	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Past;Person=3;Number=Sing;Aspect=Imp	VERB	-	ía	-	sofre
sofreías	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Past;Person=2;Number=Sing;Aspect=Imp	VERB	-	ías	-	sofre
sofreíamos	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Past;Person=1;Number=Plur;Aspect=Imp	VERB	-	íamos	-	sofre
sofreíais	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Past;Person=2;Number=Plur;Aspect=Imp	VERB	-	íais	-	sofre
sofreían	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Past;Person=3;Number=Plur;Aspect=Imp	VERB	-	ían	-	sofre
sofreí	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Past;Person=1;Number=Sing;Aspect=Perf	VERB	-	í	-	sofre
sofreíste	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Past;Person=2;Number=Sing;Aspect=Perf	VERB	-	íste	-	sofre
sofreísteis	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Past;Person=2;Number=Plur;Aspect=Perf	VERB	-	ísteis	-	sofre
sofreiré	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut;Person=1;Number=Sing	VERB	-	iré	-	sofre
sofreirás	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut;Person=2;Number=Sing	VERB	-	irás	-	sofre
sofreirá	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut;Person=3;Number=Sing	VERB	-	irá	-	sofre
sofreiremos	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut;Person=1;Number=Plur	VERB	-	iremos	-	sofre
sofreiréis	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut;Person=2;Number=Plur	VERB	-	iréis	-	sofre
sofreirán	es-conj-ír	Mood=Ind;Tense=Fut;Person=3;Number=Plur	VERB	-	irán	-	sofre
sofreiría	es-conj-ír	Mood=Cnd;Person=3;Number=Sing	VERB	-	iría	-	sofre
sofreirías	es-conj-ír	Mood=Cnd;Person=2;Number=Sing	VERB	-	irías	-	sofre
sofreiríamos	es-conj-ír	Mood=Cnd;Person=1;Number=Plur	VERB	-	iríamos	-	sofre
sofreiríais	es-conj-ír	Mood=Cnd;Person=2;Number=Plur	VERB	-	iríais	-	sofre
sofreirían	es-conj-ír	Mood=Cnd;Person=3;Number=Plur	VERB	-	irían	-	sofre
sofreíd	es-conj-ír	Polarity=Pos;Mood=Jus;Person=2;Number=Plur	VERB	-	íd	-	sofre

Table 7: The lemma *sofreír* in UniMorph-evaluated Wikinflection.