

A New Pair of GloVes

Riley Carlson, John Bauer and Christopher D. Manning

Stanford NLP Group

Stanford University

353 Jane Stanford Way, Stanford CA 94305-9035, U.S.A.

{rileydc, horatio, manning}@stanford.edu

Abstract

This report documents, describes, and evaluates new 2024 English GloVe (Global Vectors for Word Representation) models. While the original GloVe models built in 2014 have been widely used and found useful, languages and the world continue to evolve and we thought that current usage could benefit from updated models. Moreover, the 2014 models were not carefully documented as to the exact data versions and preprocessing that were used, and we rectify this by documenting these new models. We trained two sets of word embeddings using Wikipedia, Gigaword, and a subset of Dolma. Evaluation through vocabulary comparison, direct testing, and NER tasks shows that the 2024 vectors incorporate new culturally and linguistically relevant words, perform comparably on structural tasks like analogy and similarity, and demonstrate improved performance on recent, temporally dependent NER datasets such as non-Western newswire data.

1 Introduction

Neural semantic word vector space models represent each word with a real-valued vector called a word embedding. One widely used set of word embeddings are the GloVe word embeddings introduced by [Pennington et al. \(2014\)](#). This algorithm leverages a global co-occurrence matrix built with a focus on local context. The GloVe model trains on this global matrix with the resulting weights being the word embeddings in which similar words are grouped closer together in the vector space. The resulting word embeddings encode semantic relationships in a dense vector space, making them useful for various NLP tasks. Despite the rise of transformer-based models, pre-trained static embeddings like GloVe remain valuable for low-resource settings, computationally effi-

cient models, and interpretability-focused applications.

Our motivations for updating the word embeddings with more recent data are that new words have emerged and existing words have shifted semantic meaning since the original training in 2014. For example, ‘covid’ does not have a representation in the 2014 embeddings. Embeddings with this updated lexicon have many benefits when used in downstream tasks such as reducing out-of-vocabulary issues. In order to reflect the current usage of English words, new embeddings trained on recent language are needed.

In this work, we incorporate a Minimum Frequency Threshold (MFT) into the vocabulary selection process for training updated word embeddings, building on insights from the work on GloVe-V ([Vallebueno et al., 2024](#)). The use of an MFT allows us to strike a balance between filtering out excessively rare and noisy words while retaining less frequent but contextually important terms. The GloVe-V framework extends this approach by introducing statistical uncertainty estimates, which account for variability in embedding positions due to data sparsity. This enables training word vectors that are not only robust and expressive but also better suited for downstream tasks where rare words often hold critical importance, ensuring adaptability to modern language usage ([Vallebueno et al., 2024](#)).

Through this paper, we detail the exact training procedures and demonstrate that the 2024 word embeddings have an updated lexicon reflecting today’s language usage and cultural trends. They perform comparably to the 2014 embeddings on word analogy and similarity tasks, indicating similar structural and core semantic expressiveness. Furthermore, the 2024 embeddings show improved performance on

temporally dependent Named Entity Recognition (NER) datasets.

In this report, we first describe the training data used to create two different sets of word embeddings, including the chosen corpora and preprocessing steps. Then, we outline the training process for easy reproducibility. Finally, we present evaluation metrics for the embeddings, including new vocabulary coverage, direct evaluation, and performance in downstream tasks.

2 Data: 2014 vs. 2024

2014 Data	2024 Data
Wikipedia & Gigaword – 6 billion tokens)	Wikipedia (2024) & Gigaword (5th edition) – 11.9 billion
Common Crawl – 42 and 840 billion	Dolma subset – 220 billion
Twitter – 27 billion	

Table 1: Comparison of the data sources used to train word embeddings in 2014 and 2024, including corpus sizes (in billions of tokens).

For the 2024 embeddings, we use 3 corpora to train 2 sets of embeddings: Wikipedia, Gigaword, and Dolma. For ample comparison to the 2014 Wikipedia and Gigaword embeddings, we adopt the same corpora with an updated Wikipedia dump. The Wikipedia corpus, a dataset of Wikipedia articles, is a useful source for word definitions in a more naturally occurring environment than, say, a dictionary. Along with Wikipedia, Gigaword (Parker et al., 2011) was used. Specifically for the 2024 vectors, we used the 5th edition of Gigaword. This corpus consists of English newswire from 4 to 7 distinct international news outlets (depending on the year) between 1994–2010. Since 2014, the Wikipedia dumps have roughly doubled in the number of tokens. To rebalance this growth, we put two copies of Gigaword in the training corpus.

In addition to the aforementioned corpora, we also utilize Dolma v1.6 (Soldaini et al., 2024). This corpus, which was released in January of 2024, consists of 3 trillion tokens from books, programming scripts, reference materials, scholarly articles, and online content. We take a subset of over 1TB from Dolma. Table 2 shows the subsets of Dolma taken and the

Dataset	Percent Taken	Tokens (Billions)
Common Crawl	5%	87.2
C4	40%	60
Reddit	100%	68.9
Project Gutenberg	100%	2.3

Table 2: Dolma Training Subset

number of tokens used. Specifically, we have web pages from Common Crawl and C4 (Raffel et al., 2020), books from Project Gutenberg, and social media from Reddit. C4 consists of data up to 2019 while the others are up to 2023.

3 Methods

First, we will describe the three corpora used to train the different embeddings in more detail, in addition to any preprocessing steps taken. Next, we will describe the training process used for all embeddings. Then, the different evaluation experiments will be presented.

3.1 Corpus #1: Wikipedia and Gigaword

The Wikipedia part of the training corpus for the 2024 vectors was downloaded from the Wikipedia dump at <https://dumps.wikimedia.org/enwiki/20240720/enwiki-20240720-pages-meta-current.xml.bz2>. The data was then extracted using WikiExtractor (Attardi, 2015). The Wikipedia data was cleaned by removing tags such as `<doc>` and `<unk>` tokens.

The data was preprocessed using Stanford’s CoreNLP tokenizer (version 4.4.1)¹ using lowercase letters. The Wikipedia and Gigaword corpora were then merged with Gigaword being included twice. Together, this corpus is about 60GB with Gigaword accounting for about 74% and Wikipedia accounting for the rest.

The vocabulary size for the Wiki/Giga vectors was selected following the methodology outlined by Vallebuena et al. (2024). Specifically, the size of the vocabulary was determined by setting a MFT for words to be included in

¹<https://nlp.stanford.edu/software/tokenizer.html>

the corpus. Through experiments with vectors trained using different MFTs, it was observed that an MFT of 20 yielded the highest average cosine similarity between the trained vectors and their Weighted Least Squares (WLS) vectors. A high cosine similarity with the WLS vectors indicates that the trained embeddings closely align with the statistically optimal solution derived from the cooccurrence matrix, reflecting robust and accurate word representations (Vallebuena et al., 2024). For this corpus, using an MFT of 20 resulted in a vocabulary size of 1,291,146 words.

3.2 Corpus #2: Dolma

Like the other corpora, we preprocessed using Stanford’s CoreNLP tokenizer in the same manner. After preprocessing, we removed `<unk>` tokens. A maximum vocabulary size of 1.2 million was used. The vocabulary building process was done independently on the different subsets of Dolma and merged at the end to have 1.2 million vocabulary size. Further, the cooccurrence matrix was created by merging the cooccurrence matrices on the merged vocabulary.

3.3 Training

The training process was consistent across all embeddings and corpora. For each embedding, the vocabulary and cooccurrence matrix were first constructed. The vocabulary size was set to over 1.2 million for the Wikipedia and Gigaword corpus and 1.2 million for the Dolma corpus. A symmetric context window of size 10 was used to define cooccurrences. Once the cooccurrence matrix was built, it was shuffled with a fixed seed of 123 for the Wiki/Giga matrix and 2024 for Dolma matrix.

Embeddings of dimensions 50, 100, 200, and 300 were trained for the Wikipedia and Gigaword corpus, and 300-dimensional embeddings were trained for the Dolma corpus. The embeddings were optimized using GloVe’s original optimizer, AdaGrad. The training process was executed using the `demo.sh` script provided in the [GloVe repository](#) with more documentation in the `Training_README.md` file. The hyperparameters used during training are summarized in Table 3.

Hyperparameter	Value
Learning Rate	0.05*
Alpha	0.75
XMax	100
Seed	2024*
Epochs: (50d, 100d)	50
Epochs: (200d, 300d)	100

Table 3: Training hyperparameter summary for 50d, 100d, 200d, and 300d word embeddings trained on Wiki/Giga and 300d trained on Dolma

*0.075 learning rate and 123 seed used for 50d Wiki/Giga vectors

3.4 Evaluation: Updated Lexicon

To assess the quality of the embeddings, we examine the words present in the 2024 embeddings but absent from the 2014 embeddings to determine if new commonly used words are reflected in the updated embeddings. The 2014 and 2024 embedding vocabularies from the Wikipedia and Gigaword corpora were compared, as well as the 2024 Dolma embedding vocabularies with those from the 2014 840B vectors trained on Common Crawl. By representing the vocabularies as sets, we compute the difference by subtracting the 2014 set from the 2024 set. From this resulting set, we select 39 representative examples for each training corpus to illustrate our findings.

3.5 Evaluation: Direct Evaluation

We performed direct evaluation tasks on the embeddings, comparing them with the 2014 embeddings. The evaluation focused on two primary tasks: word analogy and word similarity.

For the word analogy task, the goal is to predict a fourth word in the analogy format `word_1 : word_2 :: word_3 : ?` and compare it against a gold-standard labeled word to calculate accuracy. We use two benchmark datasets:

- **Google Analogy dataset** (Mikolov et al., 2013a), which comprises 8,869 semantic and 10,675 syntactic word pairs.
- **MSR Analogy dataset** (Mikolov et al., 2013b), containing 8,000 syntactic word pairs.

For the word similarity task, embeddings were evaluated by assigning similarity scores to word pairs and comparing these scores to human-annotated benchmarks. We use three benchmark datasets:

- **WordSim353** (Finkelstein et al., 2001), which contains 353 word pairs classified as highly similar, less similar but related, or unrelated.
- **SimLex999** (Hill et al., 2015), comprising 999 word pairs annotated with semantic similarity scores.
- **MEN** (Bruni et al., 2014), which includes 3,000 word pairs annotated with human-judged relatedness scores.

To perform these evaluations, we utilized the embedding evaluation package developed by Jastrzebski et al. (2017), which supports analysis on both word analogy and word similarity datasets.

3.6 Evaluation: NER

To further assess the performance of the new embeddings, we evaluate on the downstream task Named Entity Recognition (NER). In this task, tokens in a sentence are tagged with predefined entity categories such as persons, locations, organizations, and other proper nouns, enabling structured information extraction from text. For this evaluation, we use Stanford’s Stanza NER² model (Qi et al., 2020), modified to replace the default word embeddings with the ones we trained. We train a model for each word embedding and dataset.

For NER evaluation, we trained and tested models using three datasets, separately for the 2014 and 2024 embeddings:

- **CoNLL-03**: Published in 2003, this dataset includes entities for persons, locations, organizations, and miscellaneous categories (entities not covered by the other categories) (Tjong Kim Sang and De Meulder, 2003).
- **CoNLL-PP**: An improved version of CoNLL-03 introduced by Liu and Ritter (2023), featuring updated and modernized

data. We trained models on CoNLL-03 and evaluated them on the CoNLL-PP test set.

- **English Worldwide Newswire**: This dataset, introduced in (Shan et al., 2023), consists of over 1,000 English newswire articles published in 2023. These articles were sourced from 47 countries, excluding American news outlets, to ensure a non-Western focus and recent language use. The dataset includes references to major events such as the COVID-19 pandemic, providing a unique opportunity to evaluate how embeddings trained on pre-2020 data (2014 embeddings) generalize to recent contexts.
- **Emerging and Rare entity recognition (WNUT 17)**: This 6 class dataset by Derczynski et al. (2017) includes entities from user-generated text on platforms such as Youtube, Twitter, and Reddit. The entities are rarer and often unseen, making them challenging even for humans to tag in noisy text. This data aims to improve the detection and classification of uncommon entities in dynamic, real-world text scenarios.

The training subsets of these datasets were used to train the models with default parameters and no embedding finetuning or character language modeling, and the dev and test subsets were used for evaluation. We report F1 scores per entity and per token.

4 Results

We present results for the three evaluation metrics: updated lexicon, direct evaluation, and downstream evaluation.

4.1 Updated Lexicon

Here, we show qualitatively words that are present in the new 2024 embeddings and not in the 2014 embeddings. The new Wikipedia and Gigaword vectors provide a much larger vocabulary. Between the 2024 Wikipedia and double Gigaword and the 2014 Wikipedia and Gigaword embeddings, there were over 700K new words (not including numbers and words containing non-Latin alphabetical letters). Between the 2024 Dolma embeddings and the

²<https://stanfordnlp.github.io/stanza/ner.html>

Direct Evaluation: Analogy & Similarity

Embedding	Analogy		Word Similarity		
	Google	MSR	WordSim353	SimLex999	MEN
2014 50d Wiki/Giga	0.462	0.355	0.448	0.265	0.652
2024 50d Wiki/Giga	0.455	0.329	0.431	0.256	0.637
2014 100d Wiki/Giga	0.631	0.550	0.477	0.298	0.681
2024 100d Wiki/Giga	0.601	0.486	0.455	0.291	0.672
2014 200d Wiki/Giga	0.698	0.595	0.515	0.340	0.710
2024 200d Wiki/Giga	0.696	0.574	0.480	0.326	0.688
2014 300d Wiki/Giga	0.717	0.614	0.544	0.371	0.737
2024 300d Wiki/Giga	0.718	0.594	0.486	0.338	0.690
2024 300d Dolma	0.708	0.623	0.470	0.270	0.651

Table 4: Accuracy of 2014 and 2024 embeddings on word analogy datasets Google and MSR and Spearman’s Rank Correlation on word similarities datasets WordSim353, SimLex999, and MEN.

2024 Updated Lexicon (Wikipedia)

afrobeats	antiracism	asmr
binance	bipoc	blockchain
brexit	chatbot	clickbait
covid	fyp	cryptocurrency
deepfake	docuseries	doja
doordash	draftkings	rizz
nonbinary	fintech	fortnite
skibidi*	idk	jungkook
latinx	lgbtqia	microaggression
lstm	metoo	microplastic
pickleball	retweet	zelenskyy
teladoc	web3	tiktok
transwoman	girlboss	viserys

Table 5: 39 word samples of new words included in Wiki/ Giga embeddings compared to the 2014 Wiki/Giga vectors.

* Not in Dolma vectors

2024 Updated Lexicon (Dolma)

dinkies	profeminist [†]	theranos [†]
chatgpt [†]	adagrad	databricks [†]
huggingface	tarboosh [†]	gamestonk
badbunny	yeet [†]	patreon [†]
brainrot	xgboost [†]	bytedance [†]
fakenews	periodt	duolingo [†]
mansplains	pytorch [†]	absofreakinglutely
squidgame	trumpism [†]	clapback
highkey	bffr	situationship
cybertruck [†]	boujee [†]	alphafold [†]
glowup	openai [†]	scikit
bingewatch	tensorflow [†]	kubernetes [†]
aapi [†]	airpods [†]	deeplearning

Table 6: 39 word samples of new words included in the Dolma embeddings compared to the 2014 840B Common Crawl vectors.

[†] Also in Wiki/Giga vectors

2014 Common Crawl 840B embeddings, there are over 500K new words (not including numbers and words containing non-Latin alphabetical letters). In Tables 5 and 6, we report 39 newly present words chosen by the authors that are of a cultural, political, and technological nature.

4.2 Word Embedding Evaluation

We report the results of the 2014 and 2024 embeddings on word analogy and similarity datasets in Table 4. Analogy tasks are assessed using the Google and MSR datasets, with accuracy as the metric. Word similarity tasks

are evaluated on WordSim353, SimLex999, and MEN using Spearman’s Rank Correlation coefficient (ρ).

For the analogy tasks, the 2024 embeddings perform roughly similarly to the 2014 embeddings on the Google dataset, but have a slightly lower performance on the MSR dataset. Further, across both datasets, accuracy improves consistently as the dimension size increases for both 2014 and 2024 embeddings.

For the word similarity tasks, the 2024 embeddings perform competitively with the 2014 embeddings across most datasets and dimensions. Both 2024 300-dimensional embeddings

NER Scores: CoNLL

Embedding	Per Entity (2003)	Per Entity (PP)	Per Token (2003)	Per Token (PP)
2014 50d Wiki/Giga	89.52	81.58	89.30	80.77
2024 50d Wiki/Giga	89.74	83.64	89.43	82.23
2014 100d Wiki/Giga	90.62	84.40	90.41	82.73
2024 100d Wiki/Giga	90.34	83.53	90.16	82.04
2014 200d Wiki/Giga	90.88	84.21	90.91	82.89
2024 200d Wiki/Giga	90.69	84.36	90.46	82.75
2014 300d Wiki/Giga	90.60	84.25	90.43	82.70
2024 300d Wiki/Giga	90.72	84.06	90.50	82.74
2024 300d Dolma	90.05	85.14	90.12	83.69

Table 7: Average Test F1 scores per entity and per token on CoNLL-03 (Tjong Kim Sang and De Meulder, 2003) and CoNLL-PP (Liu and Ritter, 2023) for 2014 and 2024 embeddings. We used Stanford’s Stanza NER model with no embedding finetuning trained on CoNLL-03.

NER Scores: Worldwide

Embedding	Per Entity	Per Token
2014 50d Wiki/Giga	82.1	81.04
2024 50d Wiki/Giga	84.64	83.88
2014 100d Wiki/Giga	85.29	84.58
2024 100d Wiki/Giga	85.55	84.25
2014 200d Wiki/Giga	84.41	83.53
2024 200d Wiki/Giga	85.68	84.92
2014 300d Wiki/Giga	84.53	83.89
2024 300d Wiki/Giga	84.89	84.11
2024 300d Dolma	86.23	85.27

Table 8: Average Test F1 scores per entity and per token for 2014 and 2024 embeddings on Worldwide dataset (Shan et al., 2023). We used Stanford’s Stanza NER model with no embedding finetuning trained on Worldwide dataset.

NER Scores: WNUT17

Embedding	Per Entity	Per Token
2014 50d Wiki/Giga	32.95	31.05
2024 50d Wiki/Giga	35.65	33.10
2014 100d Wiki/Giga	36.48	33.39
2024 100d Wiki/Giga	36.33	34.23
2014 200d Wiki/Giga	35.68	33.31
2024 200d Wiki/Giga	37.46	35.63
2014 300d Wiki/Giga	36.64	33.73
2024 300d Wiki/Giga	37.17	33.33
2024 300d Dolma	39.44	34.22

Table 9: Average Test F1 scores per entity and per token for 2014 and 2024 embeddings on WNUT17 dataset (Derczynski et al., 2017). We used Stanford’s Stanza NER model with no embedding finetuning trained on WNUT17 dataset.

show a drop in rank correlation compared to the 2014 embeddings, particularly on SimLex999. This decline is addressed in the Discussion section.

4.3 NER

We evaluated the 2014 and 2024 embeddings on NER tasks using four datasets: CoNLL-03, CoNLL-PP, Worldwide, and WNUT 17. For these datasets, we report test F1 scores on a per-entity and per-token basis. The results are summarized in Tables 7, 8, and 9.

The results across the four NER datasets demonstrate that the 2024 embeddings generally outperform their 2014 counterparts, with particularly notable improvements on temporally dependent datasets. For the CoNLL datasets in Table 7, the 2024 embeddings perform comparably on CoNLL-03 but show clear advantages on the modernized CoNLL-PP version, with the 2024 50d Wiki/Giga embeddings achieving the highest relative improve-

ment in per-entity scores (83.64 vs. 81.58). On the Worldwide dataset in Table 8, the 2024 embeddings demonstrate consistent improvements across both per-entity and per-token F1 scores, with the 2024 50d Wiki/Giga embeddings achieving a per-entity F1 score of 84.64, significantly outperforming the 82.1 score of their 2014 counterparts. The challenging WNUT17 dataset in Table 9 shows a significant drop in overall performance compared to CoNLL and Worldwide (F1 scores ranging between 30–40), but the 2024 embeddings consistently outperform their 2014 counterparts, with the 2024 200d Wiki/Giga embeddings achieving the highest per-entity and per-token F1 scores of 37.46 and 35.63, respectively.

Across all three datasets, the 2024 embeddings demonstrate the most pronounced gains in lower dimensions, particularly at 50d, where the differences between 2024 and 2014 embeddings are the largest. While higher dimensions (200d and 300d) achieve the best absolute F1

scores, the relative gains between 2024 and 2014 embeddings are less pronounced at these dimensions. These trends suggest that the 2024 embeddings perform as well as or better than the 2014 embeddings on datasets that align temporally with their training data, while showing marked improvements on modern, linguistically diverse datasets that better reflect contemporary language usage and cultural trends.

5 Discussion

The 2024 word embeddings introduce a diverse range of new vocabulary that reflects cultural, technological, and linguistic shifts over the past decade, including words associated with globally significant events ('covid' and 'brexit'), modern slang ('brainrot' and 'periodt'), emerging technologies ('chatgpt' and 'blockchain'), and popular products ('airpods'). While many slang terms are absent from the Wikipedia & Gigaword training data because modern slang takes time to transition from social media to Wikipedia, the diverse Dolma dataset compensates by capturing informal and conversational language. The inclusion of acronyms ('idk'), linguistic blends ('absofreakinglutely'), and derivations ('retweet') reveals evolving patterns in word formation driven by digital communication and social media. By capturing these shifts, the 2024 embeddings align with current vernacular and offer practical benefits for downstream tasks, such as reducing out-of-vocabulary issues in modern datasets, while further exploration of these new words provides opportunities for linguistic and sociological research.

In the analogy tasks reported in Table 4, the 2014 embeddings performed slightly better, with minimal differences on the Google dataset (within 0.01–0.03 accuracy) but larger gaps on the MSR dataset, particularly for lower dimensions where differences reached 0.07 for 100d and 0.03 for 50d embeddings. There were about 1100 instances that the 2014 50d predicted correctly, but the 2024 50d predicted incorrectly. About half of these errors were geography-based (e.g., `cairo, egypt : bern, _`). The other half is mainly instances in which 2024 embeddings predicted a synonym of the golden answer. For example in simple, simpler: `cold, _`, the 2024 embeddings predicted

'cooler' instead of 'colder'. Although the 2024 50d embeddings made these mistakes, the 2014 embeddings made these common mistakes as well. There were about 900 instances that the 2024 50d predicted correctly, but the 2014 50d predicted incorrectly. These errors were roughly half geography-based and the other using synonyms (using 'knows' instead of 'thinks' in `write, writes : think, _`). In the errors of the geography-based ones, the 2024 embeddings do "know" the right answer, but the closest neighbor wasn't the right answer. For example, the 2024 embeddings do know that Bern is in Switzerland, although sometimes the closest neighbor is not Switzerland. This can be seen in 2024 embeddings not getting `afghanistan : bern, _` right, but getting `cairo, egypt : bern, _` correct. The same phenomenon was seen in the 2014 embeddings. The MSR dataset errors saw more instances of using a synonym in the syntactic word analogies.

With this, the 2024 and 2014 embeddings perform roughly the same on the analogy tasks. This equal performance is expected as these tasks primarily rely on syntactic structures and commonly used words, which have remained relatively stable over the past decade.

For the word similarity tasks, there were differences in the Spearman's Rank Correlation coefficients between the embeddings. To put these difference in perspective, we looked at the word pairs for which there was a difference of 0.3 between the embedding's prediction and the human evaluation (which was scaled to $-1 - 1$, instead of $0-10$). For the MEN dataset, there are 70 word pairs where the 2024 300d embedding's predictions fall within the threshold while the 2014 300d embeddings diverge. Conversely, there are 197 word pairs where the 2024 embeddings diverge while the 2014 embeddings remain within the threshold. For the SimLex999 dataset, these numbers are 14 and 43, respectively, and for the WS353 dataset, they are 10 and 24.

Comparing the two embedding models on MEN, the 2024 embeddings excel at capturing close synonyms and hypernym-hyponym relations (e.g., `cemetery - graveyard, stair - staircase, ice - snow, sea - water`). In these instances, the 2024 model aligns closely with the high similarity ratings in the dataset, while

the 2014 embeddings tend to underestimate their similarity. This suggests that the 2024 embeddings may do a more precise job at clustering terms that share core, near-equivalent meanings or clear part-whole relationships.

However, there are also cases where 2014 outperforms 2024. These often involve looser thematic or distributional associations, such as color words (blue – red, purple – yellow) or common everyday items that the dataset treats as reasonably similar by virtue of category or context (e.g., daffodil – tulip, puddle – splash, chicken – lamb, potato – tomato). In these scenarios, the 2024 model either overestimates or underestimates similarity, whereas 2014 captures these broader relationships more accurately.

On the WS353 dataset, we observe a similar pattern to what emerged in previous comparisons. The 2024 embeddings tend to capture near-synonyms and clearly related category pairs more precisely. For instance, pairs such as gem – jewel or coast – shore have high ground-truth similarity scores that 2024 aligns with closely, whereas the 2014 embeddings underestimate these tight connections. The same holds for other near-synonym or hypernym-hyponym examples like magician – wizard or lobster – food, suggesting that 2024 more reliably encodes strong, direct lexical relationships.

Conversely, 2014 excels with looser or more contextual associations, where the concepts are functionally or thematically related rather than strictly synonymous. For example, plane – car or energy – laboratory receive moderately high similarity ratings in WS353, reflecting that they share an overarching category or context (transportation, scientific research). The 2024 model underestimates these relationships, implying it is not capturing certain broad or looser conceptual links as well.

On SimLex-999, we again see the two models excelling in different areas. The 2024 embeddings struggle with some pairs that share a domain or have moderate conceptual overlap, such as disease – infection or river – sea. Although these pairs are not synonyms, SimLex-999 rates them fairly high in similarity, which 2024 underestimates more than 2014 does. Similarly, 2024 sometimes undervalues near-synonymous verbs (e.g., deserve – earn, remain

– retain, replace – restore), suggesting it can lose track of subtle lexical overlaps even though those pairs have a significant degree of semantic closeness.

Furthermore, in the top ten deviations for the 2024 Dolma 300-dimensional embeddings and the human annotations, all ten examples were the model having a high similarity between antonyms (e.g., agree – argue). For the 2024 Wiki/Giga 300-dimensional vectors, six out of the 10 were highly similar antonyms with the other 4 being synonyms not being given a high enough similarity (e.g., creator – maker).

Overall, across MEN, WS353, and SimLex-999, a consistent pattern emerges: the 2024 embeddings are especially good at capturing strong, direct relationships (near-synonyms, hypernym-hyponym links, and part-whole connections) while sometimes underestimating more contextual associations. In contrast, the 2014 embeddings tend to do better on looser thematic or distributional relationships (e.g., color words, shared domains, functional overlaps) but occasionally fail on the most obvious, high-similarity pairs like strict synonyms.

In contrast to the direct evaluation results where it was not clear which embedding performed better, the NER evaluations reveal the 2024 embeddings outperforming the 2014 embeddings on newer and out-of-domain datasets. On the classic 2003 CoNLL dataset, the results are nearly identical, suggesting that 2014 embeddings remain sufficient for corpora that mirror their original training domain and era. However, on CoNLL-PP and the newer Worldwide and WNUT-17 datasets, the 2024 embeddings show consistent improvements.

An inspection of the confusion matrices helps illuminate why 2024 embeddings perform better on more recent data. For example, Table 12 highlights how the 2024-based model reduces misclassifications of newly prominent entities into the O (no entity) category or the wrong type (e.g., labeling ‘COVID-19’ as O). Instead, the updated embeddings capture contemporary terms and are thus more likely to assign them correct tags, often MISC, rather than leaving them unlabeled or confusing them with LOC, ORG, or PER. Similarly, in Table 13, we see that the 2024 model is less likely to confuse non-Western person names with locations, a

NER WNUT-17 Confusion Matrix

t \ p	O	CORP	CREATIVE-WRK	GROUP	LOC	PER	PROD
O	58	8	-61	-1	-18	8	6
CORP	0	5	0	2	-6	-1	0
CREATIVE-WRK	26	-3	-39	7	8	-2	3
GROUP	1	1	-2	4	1	-3	-2
LOC	-1	1	-7	-4	16	-4	-1
PER	2	5	-7	15	-5	-10	0
PROD	186	10	1	7	3	11	35

Table 10: 2024/2014 300d Wiki/Giga confusion matrix differences on the WNUT-17 test set

Example NER Tagging

Sentence	2024	2014
His repeated questioning of the system has prompted the Supreme Court to open an investigation into Bolsonaro . (Worldwide)	PER	LOC
Nationwide, COVID-19 infections in United States are at their peak with an average of 193,863 new cases reported each day over the past week ... (CoNLL-PP)	MISC	O
Man Finna bring me a 🍕 up to my job. 😊 ³ (WNUT-17)	O	PER

Table 11: Example sentences from NER datasets with the correct tagging of the bolded word from the 2024 model is shown compared against 2014 model’s tagging.

NER CoNLL-PP Confusion Matrix

t \ p	O	LOC	MISC	ORG	PER
O	-17	-3	5	18	-3
LOC	-3	-19	2	21	-1
MISC	12	-8	8	1	-12
ORG	13	-21	13	2	-7
PER	22	-3	-4	-12	-3

Table 12: 2024/2014 300d Wiki/Giga confusion matrix differences on the CoNLL-PP test set

NER Worldwide Confusion Matrix

t \ p	O	LOC	MISC	ORG	PER
O	-19	24	68	-52	-21
LOC	14	-29	24	-2	-7
MISC	6	-48	138	-70	-26
ORG	32	-36	63	-30	-29
PER	23	1	-6	-2	-16

Table 13: 2024/2014 300d Wiki/Giga confusion matrix differences on the Worldwide test set

shift that reflects more exposure to or better representation of such entities in the newer corpus.

These patterns are evident in the example sentences in Table 11. In the first sentence, coming from Worldwide, the 2024 embeddings were able to tag ‘Bolsonaro’ as a person, whereas 2014 tagged it as a location.

The second example, coming from CoNLL-PP shows 2024 correctly labeling COVID-19, while the 2014 embeddings did not label it. This is a case in which a word that is part of recent usage should be correctly tagged. The

last example from WNUT-17 shows how difficult the dataset is for tagging. Despite this, the 2024 model was able to see that ‘finna’ is slang and did not tag it, although the 2014 model tagged it as a person. This is an example of the 2024 embeddings better capturing colloquial vernacular.

Overall, we see that the 2024 embeddings better represent current language usage, compared to the 2014 embeddings. In situations where there is temporal dependency (e.g., chatbots, NER taggers, etc.), the 2024 embeddings should be used.

³Thank you Twemoji for the emojis!

6 Conclusion

We presented new GloVe word embeddings, introducing two sets of vectors trained on updated corpora from Wikipedia, Gigaword, and a subset of Dolma. These embeddings provide valuable new vocabulary, reflecting cultural and technological shifts over the last decade and offering linguists rich data to analyze the evolution of English, particularly in the context of social media’s rising influence.

On word analogy, the new embeddings perform comparably to the 2014 embeddings, demonstrating equal structural and core semantic expressiveness. For word similarity tasks, the higher dimension 2024 embeddings occasionally overestimate the semantic similarity between antonyms. Nonetheless, the 2024 embeddings show clear advantages in temporally dependent NER datasets, such as non-Western-oriented newswire data.

These findings underline the importance of updating word embeddings to keep pace with linguistic and cultural change. The 2024 embeddings represent a meaningful advancement for modern language modeling, offering tools that are better aligned with contemporary usage. Their ability to capture recent cultural, technological, and linguistic shifts makes them particularly valuable for human-centered NLP applications, such as improving chatbot interactions and designing systems that adapt to diverse and evolving user needs.

References

- Giusepppe Attardi. 2015. WikiExtractor. <https://github.com/attardi/wikiextractor>.
- Elia Bruni, Nam Khanh Tran, and Marco Baroni. 2014. Multimodal distributional semantics. *J. Artif. Int. Res.*, 49(1):1–47.
- Leon Derczynski, Eric Nichols, Marieke van Erp, and Nut Limsopatham. 2017. [Results of the WNUT2017 shared task on novel and emerging entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text*, pages 140–147, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lev Finkelstein, Evgeniy Gabrilovich, Yossi Matias, Ehud Rivlin, Zach Solan, Gadi Wolfman, and Eytan Ruppin. 2001. [Placing search in context: The concept revisited](#). *ACM Transactions on Information Systems - TOIS*, 20:406–414.
- Felix Hill, Roi Reichart, and Anna Korhonen. 2015. [SimLex-999: Evaluating semantic models with \(genuine\) similarity estimation](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 41(4):665–695.
- Stanisław Jastrzebski, Damian Leśniak, and Wojciech Marian Czarnecki. 2017. [How to evaluate word embeddings? On importance of data efficiency and simple supervised tasks](#). ArXiv preprint arXiv:1702.02170.
- Shuheng Liu and Alan Ritter. 2023. [Do CoNLL-2003 named entity taggers still work well in 2023?](#) In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8254–8271, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013a. [Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space](#). ArXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781.
- Tomas Mikolov, Wen-tau Yih, and Geoffrey Zweig. 2013b. [Linguistic regularities in continuous space word representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 746–751, Atlanta, Georgia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Robert Parker, David Graff, Junbo Kong, Ke Chen, and Kazuaki Maeda. 2011. *English Gigaword Fifth Edition*. Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia, PA. LDC2011T07.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. 2014. [GloVe: Global vectors for word representation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peng Qi, Yuhao Zhang, Yuhui Zhang, Jason Bolton, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. [Stanza: A python natural language processing toolkit for many human languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 101–108, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Alexander Shan, John Bauer, Riley Carlson, and Christopher Manning. 2023. [Do “English” named entity recognizers work well on global](#)

[Englishes?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 11778–11791, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Luca Soldaini, Rodney Kinney, Akshita Bhagia, Dustin Schwenk, David Atkinson, Russell Authur, Ben Bogin, Khyathi Chandu, Jennifer Dumas, Yanai Elazar, Valentin Hofmann, Ananya Harsh Jha, Sachin Kumar, Li Lucy, Xinxu Lyu, Nathan Lambert, Ian Magnusson, Jacob Morrison, Niklas Muennighoff, Aakanksha Naik, Crystal Nam, Matthew E. Peters, Abhilasha Ravichander, Kyle Richardson, Zejiang Shen, Emma Strubell, Nishant Subramani, Oyvind Tafjord, Pete Walsh, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A. Smith, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Iz Beltagy, Dirk Groeneveld, Jesse Dodge, and Kyle Lo. 2024. [Dolma: An Open Corpus of Three Trillion Tokens for Language Model Pretraining Research](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00159*.

Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang and Fien De Meulder. 2003. [Introduction to the CoNLL-2003 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Natural Language Learning at HLT-NAACL 2003*, pages 142–147.

Andrea Vallebuono, Cassandra Handan-Nader, Christopher D Manning, and Daniel E. Ho. 2024. [Statistical uncertainty in word embeddings: GloVe-V](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9032–9047, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.