

Disambiguation and Morphological Analysis of Linear B Sign Sequences

The DĀMOS corpus

- ▶ Only online, (not yet) annotated corpus of Mycenaean Greek
- ▶ Still unlicensed, will be Open Access
- ▶ All 5800 known Linear B documents are available
- ▶ Currently annotation is done manually
 - ▶ Query database for potentially interesting words
 - ▶ Look up rules for sign sequence expansion
 - ▶ Disambiguate
 - ▶ Verify using dictionary
 - ▶ Requires knowledge of ancient Greek, English, and Spanish

The DĀMOS corpus

- ▶ Write an annotation support tool
- ▶ Let a machine do all the heavy lifting
- ▶ Automatize at much as possible of the pipeline
- ▶ Luckily no syntactic analysis needed (not much syntax in the corpus)

A Short History of Linear B

- ▶ Script used to write earliest dialect of Greek, Mycenaean
- ▶ Used in Crete and the mainland between 1400 and 1200 BCE
- ▶ Extant texts (mainly on clay tablets) are solely for temporary administrative records
- ▶ Syllabic, i.e. each sign corresponds to a single syllable
- ▶ Some ideograms for objects and units of measure
- ▶ Overall slightly less than 200 unique signs

A Short History of Linear B

- ▶ Descends from the Linear A script
 - ▶ Predecessor remains undeciphered
- ▶ Current consensus that Linear A was used to write a language unrelated to Greek
- ▶ Decipherment took more than 70 years
- ▶ Groundwork by Alice Kober, full decipherment by Michael Ventris and John Chadwick [Ventris53]

A Short History of Linear B

- ▶ Construction of combinatoric sign grids
- ▶ Assumption that inflection usually happens in the last syllable and won't change consonant
- ▶ Creation of an internally consistent grammar
- ▶ Guessing a single word and checking if everything else falls into place (a-mi-ni-so → Amnissos)
- ▶ Understanding is still not complete

A Short History of Linear B

a		a ₂		e		i		o		u	
ai				je				jo			
ja				we		wi		wo			
wa											
da				de		di		do		da ₂	
ka				ke		ki		ko		ku	
ma				me		mi		mo			
na				ne		ni		no		nu	
pa		pa ₂ ?		pe		pi		po		nu ₂ ?	
ra		ra ₂		qe		qi		qo			
sa				re		ri		ro		ru	
ta		ta ₂ ?		se		si		so			
				te		ti		to		tu	
				z?e				z?o			

Figure: Syllabary [Ventris53]

A Short History of Linear B

	1008	1009	100A	100B	100C	100D	100E	100F
0	𐀀 10080	𐀁 10090	𐀂 100A0	𐀃 100B0	𐀄 100C0	𐀅 100D0	𐀆 100E0	𐀇 100F0
1	𐀈 10081	𐀉 10091	𐀊 100A1	𐀋 100B1	𐀌 100C1	𐀍 100D1	𐀎 100E1	𐀏 100F1
2	𐀐 10082	𐀑 10092	𐀒 100A2	𐀓 100B2	𐀔 100C2	𐀕 100D2	𐀖 100E2	𐀗 100F2
3	𐀘 10083	𐀙 10093	𐀚 100A3	𐀛 100B3	𐀜 100C3	𐀝 100D3	𐀞 100E3	𐀟 100F3
4	𐀠 10084	𐀡 10094	𐀢 100A4	𐀣 100B4	𐀤 100C4	𐀥 100D4	𐀦 100E4	𐀧 100F4
5	𐀨 10085	𐀩 10095	𐀪 100A5	𐀫 100B5	𐀬 100C5	𐀭 100D5	𐀮 100E5	𐀯 100F5
6	𐀰 10086	𐀱 10096	𐀲 100A6	𐀳 100B6	𐀴 100C6	𐀵 100D6	𐀶 100E6	𐀷 100F6
7	𐀸 10087	𐀹 10097	𐀺 100A7	𐀻 100B7	𐀼 100C7	𐀽 100D7	𐀾 100E7	𐀿 100F7
8	𐁀 10088	𐁁 10098	𐁂 100A8	𐁃 100B8	𐁄 100C8	𐁅 100D8	𐁆 100E8	𐁇 100F8
9	𐁈 10089	𐁉 10099	𐁊 100A9	𐁋 100B9	𐁌 100C9	𐁍 100D9	𐁎 100E9	𐁏 100F9
A	𐁐 1009A	𐁑 1009A	𐁒 100AA	𐁓 100BA	𐁔 100CA	𐁕 100DA	𐁖 100EA	𐁗 100FA
B	𐁘 1008B	𐁙 1009B	𐁚 100AB	𐁛 100BB	𐁜 100CB	𐁝 100DB	𐁞 100EB	
C	𐁠 1008C	𐁡 1009C	𐁢 100AC	𐁣 100BC	𐁤 100CC	𐁥 100DC	𐁦 100EC	
D	𐁨 1008D	𐁩 1009D	𐁪 100AD	𐁫 100BD	𐁬 100CD	𐁭 100DD	𐁮 100ED	
E	𐁰 1008E	𐁱 1009E	𐁲 100AE	𐁳 100BE	𐁴 100CE	𐁵 100DE	𐁶 100EE	
F	𐁸 1008F	𐁹 1009F	𐁺 100AF	𐁻 100BF	𐁼 100CF	𐁽 100DF	𐁾 100EF	

Figure: Ideograms [Unicode13]

Methodology

- ▶ Syllabary for an unrelated language
- ▶ Sign sequences are phonetic approximations of Mycenaean words
- ▶ Not able to express all phonetic features of Greek
 - ▶ Consonant clusters
 - ▶ Ending consonants
 - ▶ Diphthongs
- ▶ Scribes created various hacks to circumvent script limitations
- ▶ Possibly weaknesses in the assigned phonetic values
- ▶ Possibly two very similar dialects

Methodology - Ambiguity and Irregularities

- ▶ po-me - ποιμήν - shepherd
 - ▶ Dative singular: po-me-ne - ποιμήνεί
 - ▶ Nominative singular: po-me-ne - ποιμήνές
- ▶ i-qo → ίππος
- ▶ i-ko → ιχος or ικος or ισκος
- ▶ No syntax to aid reconstruction of intended declension

Methodology - Preprocessing

- ▶ Almost no preprocessing necessary
- ▶ Scribes were helpful
 - ▶ Comma between words
 - ▶ Signs on neatly drawn lines
 - ▶ No hyphenation
 - ▶ Medium encouraged fixing mistakes
- ▶ Considerable effort invested into correctly identifying signs
- ▶ Lack of syntax → One to one correspondence of lines to sentence-ish constructs

Methodology - First approaches

- ▶ Approximate matching using n-grams
- ▶ Create dictionary of Mycenaean words
- ▶ Run spell checker on sign sequences
- ▶ Produces nonsensical suggestions
 - ▶ Phonetic gap too large

Methodology

- ▶ Stochastic language models won't work
- ▶ Average text length 14 signs
- ▶ Roughly 150 documents exceed 50 signs (not words!)
- ▶ Longest text around 600 signs

Methodology

- ▶ Tried-and-True rule based analyzers
- ▶ Good track records with other Greek dialects [Crane91]
- ▶ Two step process is reduced to single problem
- ▶ Easily adapted to state-of-the-art knowledge
 - ▶ ...and limited by it

Methodology

- ▶ Drawback: Have to assemble rule set
 - ▶ Even worse: there are multiple to choose from
 - ▶ Worst of all: all are written in different languages
 - ▶ Collaborator agreed to assist

Methodology - Basic Script Rules

- ▶ $p \rightarrow p^h, b, p$
- ▶ $k \rightarrow k^h, g, k$
- ▶ $r \rightarrow r, l$
- ▶ $q \rightarrow k^w, g^w$
- ▶ Syllables with initial consonant clusters are written with signs matching the vowel of the syllable
- ▶ Ending consonants are omitted (ti-ri-po-de \rightarrow tripodes)
- ▶ Much more complex ones possible (some site specific [Hooker80])

Methodology - Measurement

- ▶ Measurement of success/failure quite complex
- ▶ No training set to verify against
- ▶ Did build Ad-Hoc references from literature for ngram similarity test
- ▶ Have to rely on subjective impressions from collaborators

Outlook

- ▶ Assemble rule set
- ▶ Convert it into a sensible format
 - ▶ Using endless chains of regular expressions is not satisfactory
 - ▶ In an ideal world rule set and source code is kept apart
- ▶ Functional Morphology sounds appropriate





Outlook

- ▶ Plan to have robust results until finals
- ▶ Maybe incorporate the ngram similarity algorithm as a postprocessing step
- ▶ Try to extend tool's application to more than annotation assistance
 - ▶ If output is stable across known similar texts look for notably worse results
- ▶ Unfortunately, irreducibly complex

Propaganda

- ▶ Bring civili...computer science to the barbarians
- ▶ It hurts to see how they do things
- ▶ Find/Show appropriate tools for working with small and barely understood information systems
- ▶ Hopefully, won't need constant funding (and maintenance) to be of use

References

-  Evidence for Greek Dialect in the Mycenaean Archives, Ventris and Chadwick, The Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. 73 (1953), pp. 84-103
-  Generating and parsing classical Greek, Crane, Literary and Linguistic Computing 6.4 (1991) pp. 243-245
-  The Unicode Standard 6.3
-  Linear B: An Introduction, Hooker, Bristol Classical Press, 1980