

## TextCritical.net - Task #479

Feature # 466 (Closed): Lemma lookup

### Diogenes Analyses Importer

12/17/2012 05:57 AM - Luke Murphey

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Start date:</b>	12/24/2012
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>	Luke Murphey	<b>% Done:</b>	100%
<b>Category:</b>		<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	0.2		
<b>Description</b>			
Need to write an importer that takes the analyses file and marks up the lemma entries with the appropriate meaning.			
<b>Subtasks:</b>			
Bug # 492: Analysis entries are not matching the extraction regular expression			<b>Closed</b>

### History

#### #1 - 12/17/2012 05:58 AM - Luke Murphey

- Status changed from New to In Progress

#### #2 - 12/17/2012 06:21 AM - Luke Murphey

hmm, lining up the analyses file with the lemma is proving difficult. Consider the following which shows that matches are not occurring:

```
Forms discovered, count=2, line_number=100000, form_number=1
Forms discovered, count=2, line_number=100000, form_number=2
Forms discovered, count=2, line_number=100000, form_number=3
Forms discovered, count=2, line_number=100000, form_number=4
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100001, form_number=1
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100001, form_number=2
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100001, form_number=3
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100001, form_number=4
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100001, form_number=5
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100001, form_number=6
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100002, form_number=1
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100002, form_number=2
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100002, form_number=3
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100003, form_number=1
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100003, form_number=2
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100003, form_number=3
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100004, form_number=1
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100004, form_number=2
Forms discovered, count=1, line_number=100004, form_number=3
Forms discovered, count=0, line_number=100005, form_number=1
Forms discovered, count=0, line_number=100005, form_number=2
```

Here are lines 100000 through 100005:

```
a)nalou=to
  {7566000 9 a)na__lou=to,a)nali/skw use up imperf ind mp 3rd sg (doric aeolic)}
  {7566000 9 a)na_lou=to,a)nali/skw use up imperf ind mp 3rd sg (homeric ionic)}
  {7566000 9 a_)nalou=to,a)nalo/w use up imperf ind mp 3rd sg (doric aeolic)}
  {7566000 9 a)nalo/w use up imperf ind mp 3rd sg (homeric ionic)}
a)naloume/nas
  {7585355 9 a)naloume/na_s,a)na/llomai leap fut part mid fem acc pl (attic epic doric)}
  {7585355 9 a)naloume/na_s,a)na/llomai leap fut part mid fem gen sg (doric)}
  {7566000 9 a)na_loume/na_s,a)nali/skw use up pres part mp fem acc pl}
  {7566000 9 a)na_loume/na_s,a)nali/skw use up pres part mp fem gen sg (doric aeolic)}
  {7566000 9 a)naloume/na_s,a)nalo/w use up pres part mp fem acc pl}
  {7566000 9 a)naloume/na_s,a)nalo/w use up pres part mp fem gen sg (doric aeolic)}
a)naloume/nh
  {7585355 9 a)na/llomai leap fut part mid fem nom/voc sg (attic epic)}
```

```

{7566000 9 a)na_loume/nh,a)nali/skw use up pres part mp fem nom/voc sg (attic epic ionic)}
{7566000 9 a)nalo/w use up pres part mp fem nom/voc sg (attic epic ionic)}
a)naloume/nhn
{7585355 9 a)na/llomai leap fut part mid fem acc sg (attic epic)}
{7566000 9 a)na_loume/nhn,a)nali/skw use up pres part mp fem acc sg (attic epic ionic)}
{7566000 9 a)nalo/w use up pres part mp fem acc sg (attic epic ionic)}
a)naloume/nhs
{7585355 9 a)na/llomai leap fut part mid fem gen sg (attic epic)}
{7566000 9 a)na_loume/nhs,a)nali/skw use up pres part mp fem gen sg (attic epic ionic)}
{7566000 9 a)nalo/w use up pres part mp fem gen sg (attic epic ionic)}
a)naloume/nou
{7585355 9 a)na/llomai leap fut part mid masc/neut gen sg (attic epic doric)}
{7566000 9 a)na_loume/nou,a)nali/skw use up pres part mp masc/neut gen sg}
{7566000 9 a)nalo/w use up pres part mp masc/neut gen sg}

```

### #3 - 12/17/2012 07:12 AM - Luke Murphey

I wonder, should I just import the analyses file directly? Or rather, what does the lemmata file give me that the analyses file doesn't?

### #4 - 12/17/2012 07:59 AM - Luke Murphey

From lemmata:

```

a(/bra {537850 9 a(/bra_,a(/bra favourite slave fem nom/voc/acc dual){537850 9 a(/bra_,a(/bra favo
urite slave fem nom/voc sg (attic doric aeolic)}
a(/brai {537850 9 a(/bra favourite slave fem nom/voc pl}{537850 9 a(/bra_|,a(/bra favourite slave
fem dat sg (attic doric aeolic)}
a(/brais {537850 9 a(/bra favourite slave fem dat pl}
a(/bran {537850 9 a(/bra_n,a(/bra favourite slave fem acc sg (attic doric aeolic)}
a(/bras {537850 9 a(/bra_s,a(/bra favourite slave fem acc pl}{537850 9 a(/bra_s,a(/bra favourite s
lave fem gen sg (attic doric aeolic)}
a(/bra| {537850 9 a(/brai,a(/bra favourite slave fem nom/voc pl}{537850 9 a(/bra_|,a(/bra favourit
e slave fem dat sg (attic doric aeolic)}
...
a(bra=n {537850 9 a(/bra favourite slave fem gen pl (doric aeolic)}{555266 9 a(bro/s graceful m
asc/fem gen pl (doric)}
...
a(brw=n {537850 9 a(/bra favourite slave fem gen pl}{555266 9 a(bro/s graceful fem gen pl){5552
66 9 a(bro/s graceful masc/neut gen pl}{555266 9 a(bro/s graceful masc/fem/neut gen pl}

```

From the analysis:

```

a(/bra 537850 a(/bra (fem nom/voc/acc dual) (fem nom/voc sg (attic doric aeolic)) a(/brai (fem nom/vo
c pl) (fem dat sg (attic doric aeolic)) a(/brais (fem dat pl) a(/bran (fem acc sg (attic doric aeolic))
a(/bras (fem acc pl) (fem gen sg (attic doric aeolic)) a(/bra| (fem nom/voc pl) (fem dat sg (attic doric
aeolic)) a(bra=n (fem gen pl (doric aeolic)) a(brw=n (fem gen pl)

```

It seems like the lemma contains all forms of a lemma within a single line. The analysis file breaks up the forms onto each line with the line containing all possible meanings for the form. If this is the case, then I really need to be using the analyses file and not the lemma.

**#5 - 12/20/2012 04:56 AM - Luke Murphey**

The greek-analyses file has 911871 lines.

The following search will return the progress of the analyses import:

```
sourcetype="django" | stats max(line_number) as line_number | eval progress=100*line_number/911871
```

**#6 - 12/20/2012 04:59 AM - Luke Murphey**

You can clear out the entries in the database related to the Greek lemma:

```
drop table reader_lemma  
drop table reader_case  
drop table reader_dialect  
drop table reader_worddescription  
drop table reader_worddescription_cases  
drop table reader_worddescription_dialects  
drop table reader_wordform
```

**#7 - 12/20/2012 05:01 AM - Luke Murphey**

Some of the entries in the analyses file that are not in the greek-lemmata file. These can found with the following search:

```
sourcetype="django" "Unable to find the lemma for an analysis entry" | stats count(sourcetype)
```

**#8 - 12/20/2012 07:03 PM - Luke Murphey**

Successfully imported 911871 entries from the analyses file. However, the lemmas could not be found for 5,581 entries (see attached for a list).

The unmatched entries can be viewed with the following Splunk search:

```
sourcetype="django" "Unable to find the lemma for an analysis entry" | sort _time | table form line_number form_number
```

**#9 - 12/20/2012 07:21 PM - Luke Murphey**

- File *unmatched\_analyses.csv* added

**#10 - 12/20/2012 08:01 PM - Luke Murphey**

It seems to take about six hours to import the analyses.

**#11 - 12/20/2012 08:01 PM - Luke Murphey**

- % Done changed from 0 to 60

#### #12 - 12/20/2012 08:05 PM - Luke Murphey

Some leftover issues:

1. ζφάγρια lists the definition as "ransom paid for a prisoner taken alive) reward for life saved" (note the unmatched parenthesis)
2. Some entries are getting imported correctly because they have exclamation marks which are not valid beta-code from what I can tell so far

#### #13 - 12/20/2012 08:24 PM - Luke Murphey

- % Done changed from 60 to 70

#### #14 - 12/21/2012 03:56 PM - Luke Murphey

- Tracker changed from Bug to Task

#### #15 - 12/22/2012 07:03 PM - Luke Murphey

- % Done changed from 70 to 90

Some entries have leading characters that are preventing them from being matched accordingly.

#### #16 - 12/24/2012 06:00 PM - Luke Murphey

Lots of forms are being skipped. You can view them with the following search:

```
sourcetype="django" "Unable to find the lemma for an analysis entry" | table form line_number form_number
```

Also, many are not matching the regex. You can see these with the following search:

```
sourcetype="django" "Analysis entry does not match the regex" | table form line_number form_number
```

#### #17 - 12/24/2012 06:14 PM - Luke Murphey

The importer is now taking about 80 seconds to import 1,000 entries. The import started at 04:13:27 and has imported 352,000 at 2012-12-24 12:05:36. It is importing about 12 entries per second.

#### #18 - 12/24/2012 06:25 PM - Luke Murphey

Moving the commit to the file level did not improve performance noticeably.

#### #19 - 12/24/2012 06:33 PM - Luke Murphey

I tried deferring loading of all fields in the lemma query to speed up performance (<http://stackoverflow.com/questions/2846029/django-set-foreign-key-using-integer>) but this didn't seem to help much.

#### #20 - 12/24/2012 06:43 PM - Luke Murphey

Time to load each entry seems to take about 0.03 seconds.

**#21 - 12/24/2012 06:55 PM - Luke Murphey**

The slowdown seems to be in the query of the lemmas for the lemma ID associated with the reference number. This is somewhat surprising since the reference field is indexed.

**#22 - 12/24/2012 07:04 PM - Luke Murphey**

Actually, the reference number field was not indexed for some reason. I manually created it with:

```
Create index "lemma_reference_number" ON "reader_lemma" ("reference_number");
```

**#23 - 12/25/2012 04:22 AM - Luke Murphey**

Many entries have single quotes at odd places ('να, εὔσθ'). Perhaps I should drop these entirely.

**#24 - 12/27/2012 04:57 AM - Luke Murphey**

- Status changed from In Progress to Closed

**Files**

---

unmatched_analyses.csv	164 KB	12/20/2012	Luke Murphey
------------------------	--------	------------	--------------