ByT5: Towards a token-free future with pre-trained byte-to-byte models

Linting Xue* **Aditya Barua*** **Noah Constant*** **Rami Al-Rfou***
Sharan Narang **Mihir Kale** **Adam Roberts** **Colin Raffel**
Google Research

Abstract

Most widely-used pre-trained language models operate on sequences of tokens corresponding to word or subword units. Encoding text as a sequence of tokens requires a tokenizer, which is typically created as an independent artifact from the model. *Token-free* models that instead operate directly on raw text (bytes or characters) have many benefits: they can process text in any language out of the box, they are more robust to noise, and they minimize technical debt by removing complex and error-prone text preprocessing pipelines. Since byte or character sequences are longer than token sequences, past work on token-free models has often introduced new model architectures designed to amortize the cost of operating directly on raw text. In this paper, we show that a standard Transformer architecture can be used with minimal modifications to process byte sequences. We carefully characterize the trade-offs in terms of parameter count, training FLOPs, and inference speed, and show that byte-level models are competitive with their token-level counterparts. We also demonstrate that byte-level models are significantly more robust to noise and perform better on tasks that are sensitive to spelling and pronunciation. As part of our contribution, we release a new set of pre-trained byte-level Transformer models based on the T5 architecture, as well as all code and data used in our experiments.[1]

1 Introduction

Machine learning models for text-based natural language processing (NLP) tasks are trained to perform some type of inference on input text. An important consideration when designing such a model is the way that the text is represented. A historically common representation is to assign a unique *token* ID to each word in a finite, fixed vocabulary. A given piece of text is thus converted into a sequence of tokens by a *tokenizer* before being fed into a model for processing. An issue with using a fixed vocabulary of words is that there is no obvious way to process a piece of text that contains an *out-of-vocabulary* word. A standard approach is to map all unknown words to the same `<UNK>` token, which prevents the model from distinguishing between different out-of-vocabulary words.

Subword tokenizers (Sennrich et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2016; Kudo and Richardson, 2018) present an elegant solution to the out-of-vocabulary problem. Instead of mapping each word to a single token, subword tokenizers decompose words into smaller subword units with a goal of minimizing the total length of the token sequences for a fixed vocabulary size. As an example, a subword tokenizer might tokenize the word *doghouse* as the pair of tokens *dog* and *house* even if *doghouse* is not in the subword vocabulary. This flexibility has caused subword tokenizers to become the *de facto* way to tokenize text over the past few years.

However, subword tokenizers still exhibit various undesirable behaviors. Typos, variants in spelling and capitalization, and morphological changes can all cause the token representation of a root word or phrase to change completely, which can result in the model making mispredictions. Furthermore, unknown characters (e.g. from a new language that was not used when the subword vocabulary was built) are still typically out-of-vocabulary for a subword model. While the *byte-level fallback* feature of tokenizers like SentencePiece (Kudo and Richardson, 2018) can allow for processing out-of-vocabulary characters, it nevertheless will typically result in only training the byte-level tokens' embeddings on a small fraction of the data.

A more natural solution that avoids the aforemen-

*Equal Contribution. Please direct correspondence to { lintingx, adityabarua, nconstant, rmyeid, sharannarang, mihirkale, adarob } @google.com, craffel@gmail.com

[1] https://github.com/google-research/byt5



Figure 1: Comparison of pre-training example creation and network architecture between mT5 (Xue et al., 2020) and ByT5 (this work). **mT5**: Text is split into SentencePiece tokens, spans of around 3 tokens are masked (red), and the encoder/decoder transformer stacks have equal depth. **ByT5**: Text is processed as UTF-8 bytes, spans of around 20 bytes are masked, and the encoder is 3 times deeper than the decoder. Non-ASCII characters map onto multi-byte sequences. ⟨X⟩, ⟨Y⟩, and ⟨Z⟩ represent sentinel tokens.

tioned pitfalls would be to create *token-free* models, i.e. NLP models that do not rely on a learned vocabulary to map words or subword units to tokens. Such models can be seen as operating on raw text directly. We are not the first to make the case for token-free models, and a more comprehensive treatment of their various benefits can be found in recent work by Clark et al. (2021). In this work, we make use of the fact that text data is generally stored as a sequence of bytes. Therefore, feeding byte sequences directly into the model would allow the model to process arbitrary sequences of text. This approach is well-aligned with the philosophy of end-to-end learning, which endeavors to train models to directly map from raw data to predictions. It also has a concrete benefit in terms of model size: The large vocabularies of word- or subword-level models often result in many parameters being devoted to the vocabulary matrix. In contrast, a byte-level model by definition only requires 256 embeddings. By migrating word representations out of a sparse vocabulary matrix and into dense network layers, models should be able to generalize more effectively across related terms (e.g. *book* / *books*) and orthographic variations. Finally, from a practical standpoint, using a token-based model can complicate adaptation to new languages or new terminology, whereas, by definition, token-free models can process any text sequence.

The main drawback of byte-level models is that byte sequences tend to be significantly longer than token sequences. For example, given that the average word length in English is about five characters, an English-language byte or character sequence will typically be about five times longer than the corresponding word-level token sequence. Since computational costs of machine learning models tend to scale with sequence length, much previous work on character- and byte-level models has explored ways to process long sequences efficiently using convolutions with pooling (Zhang et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2017) or adaptive computation time (Graves, 2016).

In this work, we take a simpler approach and show that the Transformer architecture can be straightforwardly adapted to process byte sequences without a dramatically unfavorable increase in computational cost. We focus on the T5 framework (Raffel et al., 2020), where all text-based NLP problems are cast to a text-to-text format. This approach makes it simple to tackle an NLP task by generating a sequence of bytes conditioned on some input bytes. Our proposed **ByT5** architecture is described in section 3. The design stays relatively close to mT5 (the multilingual variant of T5 introduced by Xue et al. (2020)), with the differences illustrated in fig. 1. Through extensive experiments on a diverse set of English and multi-

lingual NLP tasks (presented in section 4), we show that ByT5 is competitive with a subword-level baseline, despite being pre-trained on 4 times less text. We also confirm in section 5 that byte-level models are dramatically more robust to corruptions of the input text. Throughout, we carefully characterize the trade-offs of our design decisions in terms of computational cost and parameter count, discussed in more detail in sections 6 and 7. The end result is a set of pre-trained ByT5 models that we release alongside this paper.

2 Related Work

The early neural language models of Sutskever et al. (2011) and Graves (2013) operated directly on character sequences. This precedent led many papers to use character-level language modeling as a benchmark to evaluate different neural architectures (Kalchbrenner et al., 2016; Chung et al., 2017; Ha et al., 2017; Zilly et al., 2017; Melis et al., 2018; Al-Rfou et al., 2019). Choe et al. (2019) showed that byte language models can match the perplexity of the word-level models when given the same model capacity. However, standard practice in real-world scenarios has remained to use word- or subword-level models.

A number of *character-aware* architectures have been proposed that make use of character-level features but still rely on a tokenizer to identify word boundaries. These approaches include ELMo (Peters et al., 2018), CharacterBERT (El Boukkouri et al., 2020) and many others (Ling et al., 2015; Chung et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2016; Józefowicz et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2020; Wei et al., 2021). Separately, some work has endeavored to ameliorate issues with tokenization, for example by adapting vocabularies to new languages (Garcia et al., 2021) or randomly choosing different subword segmentations to improve robustness in low-resource and out-of-domain settings (Kudo, 2018). These methods do not meet our goal of simplifying the NLP pipeline by removing text preprocessing.

Previous work has developed token-free approaches for specific tasks. Gillick et al. (2016) propose a byte-level model for span labeling, and several token-free models have been proposed for machine translation (Lee et al., 2017; Costa-jussà et al., 2017; Cherry et al., 2018). There have also been a few recent efforts to develop general-purpose token-free pre-trained language models for transfer learning. Akbik et al. (2018) show strong results on sequence labeling with character-level pre-training and release "Flair" models covering four languages. More recently, Clark et al. (2021) develop CANINE, which shows gains over multilingual BERT by working with characters instead of word-piece tokens, though the "CANINE-S" model still uses a tokenizer during pre-training to define targets for the masked language modeling task. Our work differs from these in that (a) we train encoder-decoder models that extend to generative tasks, (b) our models work directly with UTF-8 bytes, and (c) we explore the effect of model scale, training models beyond 10 billion parameters.

3 ByT5 Design

Our goal in designing ByT5 is to take an existing token-based model and perform the minimal set of modifications to make it token-free, thereby limiting experimental confounds. We base ByT5 on the recent mT5 model (Xue et al., 2020), which was trained on a large corpus of unlabeled multilingual text data called mC4 and achieved state-of-the-art on many community benchmarks. We release ByT5 in five sizes analogous to T5 and mT5 (Small, Base, Large, XL, XXL). We aim for ByT5 to cover the same use cases as mT5: it is a general-purpose pre-trained text-to-text model covering 100+ languages. We expect ByT5 will be particular useful for tasks operating on short-to-medium length text sequences (a few sentences or less), as these will incur less slowdown in fine-tuning and inference.

3.1 Changes from mT5

Compared to mT5, we make the following key changes in designing ByT5: First and foremost, we dispense with the SentencePiece (Kudo and Richardson, 2018) vocabulary and feed UTF-8 bytes directly into the model without any text preprocessing. The bytes are embedded to the model hidden size using a vocabulary of 256 possible byte values. An additional 3 IDs are reserved for special tokens: padding, end-of-sentence, and an unused `<UNK>` token that we include only for convention.

Second, we modify the pre-training task. mT5 uses the "span corruption" pre-training objective first proposed by Raffel et al. (2020) where spans of tokens in unlabeled text data are replaced with a single "sentinel" ID and the model must fill in the missing spans. Rather than adding 100 new tokens for the sentinels, we find it sufficient to reuse the final 100 byte IDs. While mT5 uses an average span

		mT5				ByT5				
Size	Params	Vocab	d_{model}	d_{ff}	# Enc/Dec	Vocab	d_{model}	d_{ff}	# Enc	# Dec
Small	300M	85%	512	1024	8	0.3%	1472	3584	12	4
Base	582M	66%	768	2048	12	0.1%	1536	3968	18	6
Large	1.23B	42%	1024	2816	24	0.06%	1536	3840	36	12
XL	3.74B	27%	2048	5120	24	0.04%	2560	6720	36	12
XXL	12.9B	16%	4096	10240	24	0.02%	4672	12352	36	12

Table 1: Comparison of mT5 and ByT5 architectures. For a given named size (e.g. "Large"), the total number of parameters and layers is fixed. The "Vocab" columns indicate the percentage of vocabulary-related parameters, covering both the input embedding matrix and the decoder softmax layer. ByT5 moves these parameters out of the vocab and into the transformer layers, as well as shifting to a 3:1 ratio of encoder to decoder layers.

length of 3 subword tokens, we find that masking longer byte-spans is valuable. Specifically, we set our mean mask span length to 20 bytes, and show ablations of this value in section 6.

Third, we find that ByT5 performs best when we decouple the depth of the encoder and decoder transformer stacks. While T5 and mT5 used "balanced" architectures, we find byte-level models benefit significantly from a "heavier" encoder. Specifically, we set our encoder depth to 3 times that of the decoder. Intuitively, this heavier encoder makes the model more similar to encoder-only models like BERT. By decreasing decoder capacity, one might expect quality to deteriorate on tasks like summarization that require generation of fluent text. However, we find this is not the case, with heavy encoder byte models performing better on both classification and generation tasks. We ablate the effect of encoder/decoder balance in section 6.

Finally, as not all byte sequences are legal according to the UTF-8 standard, we drop any illegal bytes in the model's output.[2] Apart from the above changes, we follow mT5 in all hyperparameter settings. Like mT5, we set our sequence length to 1024 "tokens" (in this case bytes), and train for 1 million steps over batches of 2^{20} tokens.

3.2 Comparing the Models

The modifications we make in the ByT5 models change both the model's size and computational cost compared to the corresponding mT5 models. Our goal in this paper is to show that straightforward modifications to the Transformer architecture can allow for byte-level processing while incurring reasonable trade-offs in terms of cost. Characterizing these trade-offs requires a clear definition of precisely what precisely is meant by "cost", since there are many axes along which it is possible to measure a model's size and computational requirements.

Models that use a word- or subword-level vocabulary typically include a vocabulary matrix that stores a vector representation of each token in the vocabulary. They also include an analogous matrix in the output softmax layer. For large vocabularies (e.g. those in multilingual models), the vocabulary matrix can make up a substantial proportion of the model's parameters. For example, the vocabulary and softmax output matrices in the recent mT5-Base model amount to 256 million parameters, or about 66% of the total parameter count. Switching to a byte-level model therefore allows allocating these parameters elsewhere in the model, e.g. by adding layers or making existing layers "wider". To compensate for reduction in total parameter count from changing from a token-based to token-free model, we adjust our ByT5 model hidden size (d_{model}) and feed-forward dimensionality (d_{ff}) to be *parameter-matched* with mT5, while maintaining a ratio of roughly 2.5 between d_{ff} and d_{model}, as recommended by Kaplan et al. (2020). Table 1 shows the resulting model architectures across all five model sizes.

Separately, as previously mentioned, changing from a word- or subword-level token sequences to byte sequences will tend to increase the (tokenized) sequence length of a given piece of text. The self-attention mechanism at the core of the ubiquitous Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017) has a quadratic time and space complexity in the sequence length, so byte sequences can result in a significantly higher computational cost. While recurrent neural networks and modified attention mechanisms (Tay et al., 2020) can claim a better computational complexity in the sequence length,

[2] This is achieved with the Python bytes-decoding function `bytes.decode("utf-8", errors="ignore")`.

the cost nevertheless still scales up as sequences get longer.

Thus far, we have been discussing easy-to-measure quantities like the parameter count and FLOPs. However, not all FLOPs are equal, and the real-world cost of a particular model will also depend on the hardware it is run on. One important distinction is to identify operations that can be easily parallelized (e.g. the encoder's fully-parallelizable processing) and those that cannot (e.g. autoregressive sampling in the decoder during inference). For byte-level encoder-decoder models, if the decoder is particularly large, autoregressive sampling can become comparitively expensive thanks to the longer sequence lengths of byte sequences. Relatedly, mapping an input token to its corresponding vector representation in the vocabulary matrix is essentially "free" in terms of FLOPs since it can be implemented by addressing a particular row in memory. Therefore, reallocating parameters from the vocabulary matrix to the rest of the model will typically result in a model that requires more FLOPs to process a given input sequence (see section 7 for detailed comparison).

Finally, we note that another important measure of efficiency is data efficiency, i.e. how much data is required for the model to reach a good solution. For NLP problems, this can be measured either in terms of the number of tokens or the amount of raw text seen during training. Specifically, a byte-level model trained on the same number of tokens as a word- or subword-level model will have been trained on less text data. In Figure 2, we show the compression rates of mT5 SentencePiece tokenization, measured as the ratio of UTF-8 bytes to tokens in each language split of the mC4 corpus used in pre-training. This ratio ranges from 2.5 (Maltese) to 9.0 (Khmer). When considering the mC4 corpus as a whole, sampled according to the mT5 pre-training mixing ratios, we have an overall compression rate of 4.1 bytes per SentencePiece token. On the one hand, this 4-times lengthening could be seen as an advantage for ByT5: with longer sequences, the model gets more compute to spend encoding a given piece of text. On the other hand, given a fixed input sequence length and number of training steps, the model will be exposed to 4 times less actual text during pre-training.

With these factors in mind, we choose to focus on the following measures of efficiency in our experiments: Parameter count, inference time, and pre-training efficiency. Parameter count is a simple and easy-to-measure quantity that directly relates to the amount of memory required to use a model. Inference time is a real-world measurement of the model's computational cost that represents a "worst-case" measurement for byte-level models given the potential additional cost of autoregressive sampling. Finally, pre-training efficiency allows us to measure whether byte-level models can learn a good solution after seeing less pre-training data.

4 Core Results

In this section, we compare ByT5 against mT5 on a wide range of tasks. We show that ByT5 is competitive with mT5 on standard English and multilingual NLP benchmarks and outperforms mT5 at small model sizes. Additionally ByT5 excels on free-form generation tasks and transliteration.

4.1 English Classification Tasks

	GLUE		SuperGLUE	
Model	mT5	ByT5	mT5	ByT5
Small	75.6	**80.5**	60.2	**67.8**
Base	83.0	**85.3**	72.5	**74.0**
Large	**87.6**	87.0	**81.9**	80.4
XL	**88.7**	87.9	**84.7**	83.1
XXL	**90.7**	90.1	**89.2**	88.6

Table 2: Performance of mT5 and ByT5 across different model sizes on GLUE and SuperGLUE. For each benchmark, we fine-tune on the constituent tasks together (i.e. we train multi-task models), select the best checkpoint per task based on validation set performance, and report average validation set scores over all tasks.

On the widely-adopted GLUE (Wang et al., 2019b) and SuperGLUE (Wang et al., 2019a) text classification benchmarks, we find ByT5 beats mT5 at the Small and Base sizes, but mT5 has the advantage at larger sizes, as shown in table 2. The strong performance of ByT5 at smaller sizes likely stems from the large increase in dense parameters over mT5. While the overall models are parameter-matched, most of the mT5 Small and Base parameters are "locked" in vocab-related matrices and only accessed when a particular token is present. We suspect that replacing these with "dense" parameters activated across all examples encourages more efficient parameter usage and sharing.



Figure 2: Per-language compression rates of the mT5 SentencePiece vocabulary, measured over the mC4 pre-training corpus. For each language, we measure the ratio of UTF-8 bytes to tokens over all mC4 data in that language.

	GEM-XSum		TweetQA	
Model	mT5	ByT5	mT5	ByT5
Small	6.9	**9.1**	54.4 / 58.3	**65.7 / 69.7**
Base	8.4	**11.1**	61.3 / 65.1	**68.7 / 72.2**
Large	10.1	**11.5**	67.9 / 72.0	**70.0 / 73.6**
XL	11.9	**12.4**	68.8 / 72.4	**70.6 / 74.7**
XXL	14.3	**15.3**	70.8 / 74.3	**72.0 / 75.7**

Table 3: Performance of mT5 and ByT5 across different model sizes on English generation benchmarks. For GEM-XSum, we report the best BLEU score on the validation set. For TweetQA, we select the checkpoint with best BLEU-1 on the validation set and report BLEU-1 and ROUGE-L.

4.2 English Generation Tasks

We also compare ByT5 with mT5 on two generative tasks. The XSum English abstractive summarization task (Narayan et al., 2018) requires models to summarize a news article in a single sentence. For better comparison to recent work, we adopt the version of the task defined in the GEM benchmark (Gehrmann et al., 2021). We also evaluate on TweetQA (Xiong et al., 2019), an abstractive question-answering task built from tweets mentioned in news articles. This tests models' understanding of the often "messy" and informal language used on social media.

Table 3 shows that ByT5 outperforms mT5 on both of these generative tasks, across all model sizes. On GEM-XSum, ByT5 comes close (15.3 vs. 17.0) to highest score reported by Gehrmann et al. (2021), a PEGASUS model (Zhang et al., 2020) pre-trained specifically for abstractive summarization. On TweetQA, ByT5 outperforms the BERT baseline of Xiong et al. (2019), which scored 67.3 BLEU-1 and 62.6 ROUGE-L.

4.3 Cross-lingual Benchmarks

Changes to vocabulary and tokenization are likely to affect different languages in different ways. To test the effects of moving to byte-level modeling on cross-lingual understanding, we compare parameter-matched ByT5 and mT5 models on tasks from the popular XTREME benchmark suite (Hu et al., 2020). Specifically we evaluate on the same six tasks as mT5. These consist of two classification tasks: XNLI (Conneau et al., 2018) and PAWS-X (Yang et al., 2019), three extractive QA tasks: XQuAD (Artetxe et al., 2020), MLQA (Lewis et al., 2020) and TyDiQA (Clark et al., 2020), and one structured prediction task: WikiAnn NER (Pan et al., 2017).

Table 4 shows that ByT5 is quite competitive overall. On the most realistic *in-language* setting, where some gold training data is available in all languages, ByT5 outperforms mT5 across all tasks and model sizes. On the *translate-train* setting, ByT5 beats mT5 at smaller sizes, but the results are mixed at larger sizes.

We report results on the *zero-shot* setting for completeness, but emphasize that this setting is less aligned with practical applications. On zero-shot extractive QA tasks, text-to-text models evaluated in a purely generative fashion are know to exhibit "accidental translation" and other illegal predictions (Xue et al., 2020). While we observe that ByT5 is particularly susceptible to this issue, we feel this is not a useful means of assessing generative models' abilities, as it is unrealistic to expect a generative model fine-tuned exclusively on English targets to make non-English predictions. We believe the better way to measure these pre-trained models' zero-shot abilities on extractive QA would be to compare apples-to-apples with sequence-labeling models like mBERT and XLM-R, by restricting the possible outputs to the space of legal spans. We leave this comparison for future work.

	Small		Base		Large		XL		XXL	
	mT5	ByT5	mT5	ByT5	mT5	ByT5	mT5	ByT5	mT5	ByT5
In-language multitask (models fine-tuned on gold data in all target languages)										
WikiAnn NER	86.4	**90.6**	88.2	**91.6**	89.7	**91.8**	91.3	**92.6**	92.2	**93.7**
TyDiQA-GoldP	74.0 / 62.7	**82.6 / 73.6**	79.7 / 68.4	**86.4 / 78.0**	85.3 / 75.3	**87.7 / 79.2**	87.6 / 78.4	**88.0 / 79.3**	88.7 / 79.5	**89.4 / 81.4**
Translate-train (models fine-tuned on English data plus translations in all target languages)										
XNLI	72.0	**76.6**	79.8	**79.9**	**84.4**	82.8	**85.3**	85.0	**87.1**	85.7
PAWS-X	79.9	**88.6**	89.3	**89.8**	**91.2**	90.6	**91.0**	90.5	91.5	**91.7**
XQuAD	64.3 / 49.5	**74.0 / 59.9**	75.3 / 59.7	**78.5 / 64.6**	81.2 / 65.9	**81.4 / 67.4**	82.7 / 68.1	**83.7 / 69.5**	**85.2 / 71.3**	84.1 / 70.2
MLQA	56.6 / 38.8	**67.5 / 49.9**	67.6 / 48.5	**71.9 / 54.1**	73.9 / 55.2	**74.4 / 56.1**	75.1 / 56.6	**75.9 / 57.7**	**76.9** / 58.3	**76.9 / 58.8**
TyDiQA-GoldP	49.8 / 35.6	**64.2 / 50.6**	66.4 / 51.0	**75.6 / 61.7**	75.7 / 60.1	**80.1 / 66.4**	80.1 / 65.0	**81.5 / 67.6**	**83.3** / 69.4	83.2 / **69.6**
Cross-lingual zero-shot transfer (models fine-tuned on English data only)										
XNLI	67.5	**69.1**	**75.4**	**75.4**	**81.1**	79.7	**82.9**	82.2	**85.0**	83.7
PAWS-X	82.4	**84.0**	**86.4**	86.3	**88.9**	87.4	**89.6**	88.6	90.0	**90.1**
WikiAnn NER	50.5	**57.6**	55.7	**62.0**	58.5	**62.9**	**65.5**	61.6	**69.2**	67.7
XQuAD	58.1 / 42.5	**66.3 / 49.7**	**67.0 / 49.0**	66.6 / 48.1	**77.8 / 61.5**	61.5 / 43.9	**79.5 / 63.6**	57.7 / 43.0	**82.5 / 66.8**	79.7 / 63.6
MLQA	54.6 / 37.1	**60.9 / 43.3**	64.4 / 45.0	**66.6 / 47.3**	**71.2 / 51.7**	65.6 / 45.0	**73.5 / 54.4**	65.1 / 46.5	**76.0 / 57.4**	71.6 / 54.9
TyDiQA-GoldP	36.4 / 24.4	**54.9 / 39.9**	59.1 / 42.4	**69.6 / 54.2**	68.4 / 50.9	**75.4 / 59.4**	**77.8 / 61.8**	63.2 / 49.2	**82.0 / 67.3**	75.3 / 60.0

Table 4: ByT5 and mT5 performance on a subset of XTREME tasks. Our evaluation setup follows Xue et al. (2020). For QA tasks we report F1 / EM scores.

4.4 Per-Language Breakdowns

We explored per-language breakdowns on several tasks to see if there were trends as to which languages benefit or hurt the most from the switch to byte-level processing. We hypothesized that languages with rich inflectional morphology (such as Turkish) might benefit the most from the move away from a fixed vocabulary. We were also curious to see if any patterns emerged regarding language family (e.g. Romance vs. Slavic), written script (e.g. Latin vs. non-Latin characters), character set size, or data availability (high vs. low resource).

Figure 3 shows the per-language gaps between ByT5-Large and mT5-Large on two tasks: TyDiQA-GoldP and XNLI zero-shot. One notable trend is that the gap is fairly stable across languages. For example, ByT5 is better in each individual language on TyDiQA-GoldP, while mT5 is consistently better on XNLI. Comparing across languages, we observe that languages with a higher SentencePiece token compression rate (e.g. Thai and Telugu) tend to favor mT5, whereas those with a lower compression rate (e.g. Indonesian and Vietnamese) tend to favor ByT5. We did not observe any robust trends regarding morphological complexity, language family, script, character set size, or data availability.

4.5 Transliteration

Given its direct access to the "raw" text signal, we expect ByT5 to be well-suited to tasks that are sensitive to the spelling or pronunciation of text. One such task is transliteration, where an input in one script has to be "translated" into another script.

Model	Character Error Rate (↓)	
	mT5	ByT5
Small	20.7	**9.8**
Base	19.2	**9.9**
Large	18.1	**10.5**
XL	17.3	**10.6**
XXL	16.6	**9.6**
Roark et al. 2020	12.2	

Table 5: Average character error rates (↓) on Dakshina single-word transliteration (Latin to native script) across twelve South Asian languages. ByT5 outperforms the parameter-matched mT5 by a large margin, and beats the Roark et al. 2020 transformer baseline on all languages (see appendix A for per-language scores).

To test this hypothesis, we compare ByT5 with mT5 on the Dakshina single-word transliteration benchmark (Roark et al., 2020). This task looks at 12 South Asian languages that are traditionally written with Brahmic or Perso-Arabic scripts but may also be written using Latin characters in informal contexts. The single-word transliteration task asks a model to "translate" a word written in Latin script to the native script and measures accuracy in terms of character error rate.[3]

In table 5, we see that ByT5 gives a significant win over mT5, reducing the error rate by between 39–53% depending on the model size, with gains

[3]For simplicity, we fine-tune a single multitask model covering all 12 languages, with a prefix indicating the target language, as opposed to Roark et al. (2020), who train a separate model for each language. In preliminary experiments, we observed similar performance when training on each language separately.



(a) TyDiQA-GoldP gap by language

(b) XNLI gap by language

(c) TyDiQA-GoldP gap by compression

(d) XNLI gap by compression

Figure 3: Per-language performance gaps between ByT5-Large and mT5-Large. **Top**: (a) Gaps on TyDiQA-GoldP. (b) Gaps on XNLI zero-shot. **Bottom**: The same gaps as a function of each language's "compression rate".

in each of the 12 languages (see appendix A for per-language breakdowns). ByT5 also beats the character-level transformer baseline of Roark et al. (2020) by a significant margin. We note that on this task, ByT5 performance is similar across all model sizes. This indicates that large capacity is not needed to learn a strong transliteration model, provided that the model is character-aware.

5 Experiments on Synthetic Noise

Text on modern digital platforms is noisy and exhibits complex character-level phenomena such as typos, character repetitions, and non-standard case changes (Caswell et al., 2020). Beyond these, errors can be introduced by other components of NLP systems such as pipelines involving automatic speech recognition. We have already seen strong ByT5 performance on the "messy" text in TweetQA. In this section, we move to even noisier text and explore model performance on inputs that have been corrupted with *artificial* noise of various kinds. Across a range of noising schemes, we find that ByT5 outperforms mT5, demonstrating higher robustness to noise across tasks and languages.

5.1 Noising Schemes

We experiment with six different noising schemes: (1) **Drop**: Each character has a 10% chance of being dropped. (2) **Add/Drop/Mutate**: At each character position, there is a 10% chance of applying one of three actions, with equal likelihood: *Add* (inserts a random character from the input), *Drop* (deletes this character) or *Mutate* (replaces this character with a random character from the input). (3) **Repetitions**: Each character has a 20% chance of being selected for repetition. If selected, 1–3 repetitions (with equal likelihood) are appended after the original character. (4) **Antspeak**: Each character is capitalized and padded with spaces. For example, "abc def" becomes " A B C D E F ". (5) **Uppercase**: Each character is converted to uppercase. Here, we restrict to languages whose scripts distinguish case (for XNLI: Bulgarian, English, French, German, Greek, Russian, Spanish, Swahili, Turkish, Vietnamese; for TyDiQA-GoldP: English, Finnish, Indonesian, Russian, Swahili). (6) **Random case**: Each character is set to a random case (upper or lower). Again, only languages whose scripts distinguish case are considered.

5.2 Learnable Noise

We first consider the easier setting of *learnable* noise, where noise is applied during both fine-tuning and evaluation. We evaluate on XNLI zeroshot and TyDiQA-GoldP. For XNLI, both the premise and hypothesis are noised, and the model predicts an entailment label as usual. For TyDiQA, we add noise to the context, but leave the question and answer unchanged. Thus, in many cases, the model needs to first locate the noisy answer, and then "undo" the noise to produce the target.

		Learnable Noise		Unseen Noise
	Model	XNLI (accuracy)	TyDiQA-GoldP (F1)	XNLI (accuracy)
Clean	mT5	81.1	85.3	81.1
	ByT5	79.7	87.7	79.7
Drop	mT5	−10.2	−19.9	−18.3
	ByT5	**−8.2**	**−18.4**	**−11.4**
Add/Drop/Mutate	mT5	−9.2	−28.5	−11.4
	ByT5	**−8.0**	**−24.3**	**−10.9**
Repetitions	mT5	−8.5	−11.0	−12.3
	ByT5	**−4.1**	**−3.1**	**−5.9**
Antspeak	mT5	−32.0	−17.5	−34.4
	ByT5	**−8.7**	**−4.3**	**−24.4**
Uppercase	mT5	−7.0	−7.6	−8.1
	ByT5	**−1.5**	**−1.0**	**−1.7**
Random Case	mT5	−25.7	−13.9	−19.2
	ByT5	**−1.5**	**−1.2**	**−5.9**

Table 6: Degradation of mT5 and ByT5 under various types of noise. "Clean" shows performance on the original task. Subsequent rows show the delta from "clean" when adding different types of synthetic noise. Learnable noise is added in training and eval, while unseen noise only affects eval. Scores are averaged across all languages present in the task, except for "Uppercase" and "Random Case", where only languages distinguishing upper/lowercase are considered (and deltas are relative to clean averages restricted to the same languages).

Table 6 shows the differing ability of ByT5 and mT5 to adapt to learnable noise. We measure the degradation of the task metric between the clean and noisy settings. We observe that mT5 degrades more in the presence of noise than ByT5, across all six noise conditions. In the most extreme contrast, rANdOm CaSE (often used as an affective device on social media[4]) is hugely detrimental to mT5, with losses of −25.7 and −13.9 points, while ByT5 only suffers by −1.5 and −1.2 points. ByT5 is also remarkably robust to UPPERCASE and repetitions. These effects are consistent across nearly all languages, with details shown in appendix A.

[4]For example, see https://knowyourmeme.com/memes/mocking-spongebob.

5.3 Unseen Noise

We also test robustness to noise that is unseen during training but injected during evaluation. This is relevant in making models more future-proof as well as more resilient to accidental or adversarial spelling mistakes (Pruthi et al., 2019; Sun et al., 2020). We evaluate only XNLI and skip TyDiQA-GoldP in this setting, as it is unreasonable to expect a generative model that was fine-tuned to always copy spans from the context to spontaneously "undo" corruptions and predict novel spans. The rightmost column of table 6 shows that in this more challenging setting, ByT5 is once again more resilient to noise. While some types of unseen noise like A N T S P E A K are highly detrimental, ByT5 sees only minor degradations for casing noise.

6 Ablation Study

Model	Params	Description
ByT5-Large	1.23B	Baseline ByT5 model
mT5-Large	1.23B	Baseline mT5 model
(a) ByT5-36/12-668M	668M	encoder:36, decoder:12
(b) ByT5-24/24-718M	718M	encoder:24, decoder:24
(c) ByT5-12/36-768M	768M	encoder:12, decoder:36
(d) mT5-36/12-1.18B	1.18B	encoder:36, decoder:12
(e) ByT5-Large-Span3	1.23B	Mean noise span 3.0
(f) ByT5-Large-Span40	1.23B	Mean noise span 40.0
(g) CharT5-36/12-1.23B	1.23B	47K character vocab

Table 7: Models used in our ablation study.

To better understand the importance of various design choices, we train ablation models and compare their performance against our baselines on three tasks: XNLI zeroshot, TyDiQA-GoldP and GEM-XSum. Our baseline and ablation models are listed in table 7. The baselines are the parameter-matched ByT5-Large and mT5-Large models discussed above.

6.1 Matched Transformer Layer Size

Model (a) ByT5-36/12-668M is identical to ByT5-Large except that d_{model} and d_{ff} are matched to mT5-Large. This results in a model with around 668 million parameters, around 54% the size of ByT5-Large and mT5-Large. As seen in table 8, this model is still quite competitive, and outperforms the roughly similarly sized mT5-Base by a large margin (cf. table 4). This is evidence that the value of ByT5 does not come solely from using wider transformer layers.

Model	XNLI (Accuracy)	TyDiQA-GoldP (F1)	GEM-XSum (BLEU)
ByT5-Large (1.23B)	**79.7**	87.7	11.5
mT5-Large (1.23B)	81.1	85.3	10.1
(a) ByT5-36/12-668M	78.3	87.8	12.3
(b) ByT5-24/24-718M	75.4	83.0	7.1
(c) ByT5-12/36-768M	73.5	83.1	8.3
(d) mT5-36/12-1.18B	81.5	87.1	10.8
(e) ByT5-Large-Span3	79.4	87.4	10.2
(f) ByT5-Large-Span40	78.9	**88.3**	**12.6**
(g) CharT5-36/12-1.23B	79.0	87.6	11.2

Table 8: Ablation results on XNLI zeroshot, TyDiQA-GoldP, and GEM-XSum.

6.2 Encoder/Decoder Balance

To investigate the effect of decoupling encoder and decoder depth, we train two additional ByT5 models with d_{model} and d_{ff} matched to mT5-Large: (b) ByT5-24/24-718M, a "balanced" model with 24/24 encoder/decoder layers, and (c) ByT5-12/36-768M, a "heavy decoder" model. As decoder layers have extra parameters used for decoder-encoder attention, these models are bigger than our default heavy encoder setup. Yet despite the extra parameters, these configurations underperform across all tasks, including even the generative GEM-XSum task that we might expect to benefit from a stronger decoder.

To test whether a heavier encoder benefits mT5 as well, we train (d) mT5-36/12-1.18B, a model with the same configuration as mT5-Large, but switching to 36/12 encoder/decoder layers. As with ByT5, we observe benefits across all three tasks. However, the gains ($+0.4$, $+1.8$, $+0.7$) are much smaller than those of ByT5 ($+2.9$, $+4.8$, $+5.2$).

We suspect a heavy encoder may be particularly important in vocabulary-free models as the encoder stack must stand in for the missing high-capacity token embedding matrix, allowing the model to learn a "soft lexicon" covering potentially millions of idiosyncratic mappings from word forms to meanings. In concurrent work, Wies et al. (2021) also observe that models with tiny vocabularies benefit from additional depth. One reason why the decoder may not need as much capacity is that during inference, the decoder is run autoregressively, with one forward pass through the entire decoder stack per token prediction. Given the increased resolution of byte sequences, this means ByT5 predictions will benefit from 2–9 times more passes through the decoder stack depending on the language (see fig. 2), as compared to mT5. In this light, even a shallower byte decoder may be sufficient to compete with a larger subword decoder.

6.3 Masked Span Length

The T5 *mean span length* hyperparameter controls the average length of the masked spans used in the unsupervised pre-training objective. For T5 and mT5, this was 3 SentencePiece tokens. For ByT5, we hypothesize that predicting such short byte-spans would be too easy of a task, as this would often just require reconstructing part of a single word (regardless of language). Our final ByT5 models use mean span length of 20 bytes, which results in more challenging reconstruction tasks. We also show ablations (e–f) with span length 3 and 40. In table 8 we see that our baseline with length 20 performs the best on the classification task XNLI, whereas length 40 performs better on TyDiQA-GoldP and GEM-XSum, both of which require generating a natural language text output.

6.4 Character Vocabulary

A character-level vocabulary serves as an intermediate point between a large subword-level vocabulary and a tiny byte vocabulary. As a point of comparison, we train (g) CharT5-36/12-1.23B: a model with a vocabulary of 47,198 characters, the same encoder/decoder ratio as ByT5, and the same overall parameter count as ByT5-Large and mT5-Large. To achieve this matched parameter count, we set d_{model}=1376 and d_{ff}=3840. The resulting proportion of vocab-related parameters is 11% (compared to 42% for mT5-Large and 0.06% for ByT5-Large). The vocabulary itself is implemented using the SentencePiece library, but with an added restriction that tokens may only represent single characters. The characters cover all those seen in a sample of 4 million documents taken from the mC4 pre-training corpus, mixing languages with the ratios used during pre-training. We still use the *byte-level fallback* mechanism, so no character is out-of-vocabulary.

In table 8, we see that CharT5 is fairly competitive, but performs slightly worse than ByT5 on all three tasks. We suspect this may be due to two factors: (i) CharT5 reserves a capacity for rare characters, and these parameters would be better allocated in the transformer layers, and (ii) using UTF-8 bytes increases the sequence length for non-ASCII text, resulting in extra computational budget for encoding and decoding languages with non-Latin scripts.

7 Speed Comparisons

	sequences / sec		einsum ops $\times 1e^{12}$	
	mT5	ByT5	mT5	ByT5
Small	1646	1232 (0.75×)	87	98 (1.13×)
Base	747	576 (0.77×)	168	194 (1.15×)
Large	306	232 (0.76×)	346	416 (1.20×)
XL	94	70 (0.74×)	1000	1220 (1.22×)
XXL	33	25 (0.76×)	1660	2070 (1.25×)

Table 9: Comparison of mT5 vs. ByT5 on pre-training speed and computation. **Left**: Sequences per second pre-training on a TPUv3-64 device. **Right**: Total einsum operations for a forward pass, as logged by the T5 framework.

Table 9 compares the *pre-training* FLOPs of ByT5 vs. mT5, as well as the pre-training speed on fixed hardware, as sequences per second with sequence length of 1024. Across all model sizes, ByT5 requires roughly $1.2\times$ more operations, resulting in roughly $0.75\times$ as many sequences per second.

	XNLI zeroshot		GEM-XSum	
	mT5	ByT5	mT5	ByT5
Small	2.6	2.9 (1.1×)	6.4	9.5 (1.5×)
Base	4.1	4.4 (1.1×)	10.1	16.9 (1.7×)
Large	9.1	12.3 (1.4×)	8.6	53.3 (6.2×)
XL	11.1	17.8 (1.6×)	12.1	66.1 (5.5×)
XXL	14.9	30.4 (2.0×)	21.8	153.5 (7.0×)

Table 10: Time required (seconds) to infer predictions for 512 test set examples of XNLI (classification) and GEM-XSum (generation). We use a TPUv3-32 for XNLI and a TPUv3-128 for GEM-XSum.

Table 10 compares the *inference* speed of ByT5 and mT5 by measuring the time required to infer predictions over 512 examples from the test sets of a classification task (XNLI zeroshot) and a generation task (GEM-XSum). On XNLI, the inputs are sentence pairs, and labels are digits {0, 1, 2}, so both models can make a prediction in a single decoder step. For GEM-XSum, inputs are entire news articles and targets are single sentences. Due to wider transformer layers and increased sequence lengths, ByT5 is between 1.1 to 2.0 times slower for classification and between 1.5 to 7.0 times slower for generation, depending on the model size.

The time required for *fine-tuning* is more variable across tasks. When holding batch size constant at a fixed number of tokens, we find that ByT5 typically takes more fine-tuning steps than mT5 to reach optimal performance on a holdout set. For example, ByT5-Large took $1.2\times$ as many steps as mT5-Large to reach peak validation performance on XNLI zeroshot, $2.6\times$ as many steps for TyDiQA-GoldP, and $4.5\times$ as many for GEM-XSum. This overall trend is expected, in that fewer labeled examples fit into each ByT5 fine-tuning batch. However, on tasks that strongly favor byte-level representations, ByT5 reaches peak performance in *fewer* fine-tuning steps, suggesting that the model can generalize better from a small number of training examples. For example, on ByT5-Large took $2.5\times$ fewer steps than mT5-Large to reach peak performance on Dakshina.

Overall, we believe that the additional pre-training cost (roughly $+33\%$ wall time) and the additional fine-tuning cost (for some tasks) is justified in many applications by the benefits of reduced system complexity, better robustness to noise, and improved task performance on many benchmarks.

8 Conclusion

In this work, we presented ByT5, a token-free variant of multilingual T5 (Xue et al., 2020) that simplifies the NLP pipeline by doing away with vocabulary building, text preprocessing and tokenization. In terms of downstream task quality, we showed ByT5 is competitive with parameter-matched mT5 models that rely on SentencePiece vocabulary. Specifically, ByT5 outperforms mT5 in any of these four scenarios: (1) at model sizes under 1 billion parameters, (2) on generative tasks, (3) on multilingual tasks with in-language labels, and (4) in the presence of various types of noise.

Through ablations, we showed that byte-level encoder-decoder models benefit from a "heavier" encoder (decoupling encoder and decoder depth), and that the pre-training task benefits from masking longer ID sequences. We also showed that for fixed parameter count, character-level models give similar but somewhat worse results.

Interestingly, the gains we observe with ByT5 are achieved *despite* the fact that the model is pre-trained on 4 times less text than mT5. This suggests that byte-level models could be more data efficient learners.

These gains in design simplicity, task quality and data efficiency come at the cost of additional computation. Our "hands-off" approach of feeding raw UTF-8 bytes directly into the transformer costs $+33\%$ pre-training time, as well as longer

inference time (10–50% longer for small models, and 100–600% longer for our largest models). As such, there is significant room for improvement. We believe techniques such as hash embeddings, local attention and down-sampling (Clark et al., 2021), as well as sparse computation (Fedus et al., 2021) can help address latency issues, removing the remaining barriers to a token-free future.

Acknowledgements

We thank Jon Clark and Dan Garrette for discussion around token-free approaches, and Noam Shazeer for help around model parallelism in T5.

References

Alan Akbik, Duncan Blythe, and Roland Vollgraf. 2018. Contextual string embeddings for sequence labeling. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1638–1649, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Rami Al-Rfou, Dokook Choe, Noah Constant, Mandy Guo, and Llion Jones. 2019. Character-level language modeling with deeper self-attention. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 33(01):3159–3166.

Mikel Artetxe, Sebastian Ruder, and Dani Yogatama. 2020. On the cross-lingual transferability of monolingual representations. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4623–4637, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Isaac Caswell, Theresa Breiner, Daan van Esch, and Ankur Bapna. 2020. Language ID in the wild: Unexpected challenges on the path to a thousand-language web text corpus. *CoRR*, abs/2010.14571.

Colin Cherry, George Foster, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, and Wolfgang Macherey. 2018. Revisiting character-based neural machine translation with capacity and compression. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4295–4305, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Dokook Choe, Rami Al-Rfou, Mandy Guo, Heeyoung Lee, and Noah Constant. 2019. Bridging the gap for tokenizer-free language models. *CoRR*, abs/1908.10322.

Junyoung Chung, Sungjin Ahn, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Hierarchical multiscale recurrent neural networks. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.

Junyoung Chung, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2016. A character-level decoder without explicit segmentation for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1693–1703, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jonathan H. Clark, Eunsol Choi, Michael Collins, Dan Garrette, Tom Kwiatkowski, Vitaly Nikolaev, and Jennimaria Palomaki. 2020. TyDi QA: A benchmark for information-seeking question answering in typologically diverse languages. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:454–470.

Jonathan H. Clark, Dan Garrette, Iulia Turc, and John Wieting. 2021. CANINE: pre-training an efficient tokenization-free encoder for language representation. *CoRR*, abs/2103.06874.

Alexis Conneau, Ruty Rinott, Guillaume Lample, Adina Williams, Samuel Bowman, Holger Schwenk, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2018. XNLI: Evaluating cross-lingual sentence representations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2475–2485, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Marta R. Costa-jussà, Carlos Escolano, and José A. R. Fonollosa. 2017. Byte-based neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Subword and Character Level Models in NLP*, pages 154–158, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Hicham El Boukkouri, Olivier Ferret, Thomas Lavergne, Hiroshi Noji, Pierre Zweigenbaum, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. 2020. CharacterBERT: Reconciling ELMo and BERT for word-level open-vocabulary representations from characters. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6903–6915, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.

William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. 2021. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *CoRR*, abs/2101.03961.

Xavier Garcia, Noah Constant, Ankur P. Parikh, and Orhan Firat. 2021. Towards continual learning for multilingual machine translation via vocabulary substitution. *CoRR*, abs/2103.06799.

Sebastian Gehrmann, Tosin P. Adewumi, Karmanya Aggarwal, Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi, Aremu Anuoluwapo, Antoine Bosselut, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Miruna-Adriana Clinciu, Dipanjan Das, Kaustubh D. Dhole, Wanyu Du, Esin Durmus, Ondrej Dusek, Chris Emezue, Varun Gangal, Cristina Garbacea, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Yufang Hou, Yacine Jernite, Harsh Jhamtani, Yangfeng

Ji, Shailza Jolly, Dhruv Kumar, Faisal Ladhak, Aman Madaan, Mounica Maddela, Khyati Mahajan, Saad Mahamood, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Pedro Henrique Martins, Angelina McMillan-Major, Simon Mille, Emiel van Miltenburg, Moin Nadeem, Shashi Narayan, Vitaly Nikolaev, Rubungo Andre Niyongabo, Salomey Osei, Ankur P. Parikh, Laura Perez-Beltrachini, Niranjan Ramesh Rao, Vikas Raunak, Juan Diego Rodriguez, Sashank Santhanam, João Sedoc, Thibault Sellam, Samira Shaikh, Anastasia Shimorina, Marco Antonio Sobrevilla Cabezudo, Hendrik Strobelt, Nishant Subramani, Wei Xu, Diyi Yang, Akhila Yerukola, and Jiawei Zhou. 2021. The GEM benchmark: Natural language generation, its evaluation and metrics. *CoRR*, abs/2102.01672.

Dan Gillick, Cliff Brunk, Oriol Vinyals, and Amarnag Subramanya. 2016. Multilingual language processing from bytes. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1296–1306, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Alex Graves. 2013. Generating sequences with recurrent neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1308.0850.

Alex Graves. 2016. Adaptive computation time for recurrent neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1603.08983.

David Ha, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. 2017. Hypernetworks. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.

Junjie Hu, Sebastian Ruder, Aditya Siddhant, Graham Neubig, Orhan Firat, and Melvin Johnson. 2020. XTREME: A massively multilingual multi-task benchmark for evaluating cross-lingual generalisation. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4411–4421. PMLR.

Rafal Józefowicz, Oriol Vinyals, Mike Schuster, Noam Shazeer, and Yonghui Wu. 2016. Exploring the limits of language modeling. *CoRR*, abs/1602.02410.

Nal Kalchbrenner, Lasse Espeholt, Karen Simonyan, Aäron van den Oord, Alex Graves, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. 2016. Neural machine translation in linear time. *CoRR*, abs/1610.10099.

Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *CoRR*, abs/2001.08361.

Yoon Kim, Yacine Jernite, David Sontag, and Alexander M. Rush. 2016. Character-aware neural language models. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, AAAI'16, page 2741–2749. AAAI Press.

Taku Kudo. 2018. Subword regularization: Improving neural network translation models with multiple subword candidates. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 66–75, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Taku Kudo and John Richardson. 2018. SentencePiece: A simple and language independent subword tokenizer and detokenizer for neural text processing. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 66–71, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jason Lee, Kyunghyun Cho, and Thomas Hofmann. 2017. Fully character-level neural machine translation without explicit segmentation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:365–378.

Patrick Lewis, Barlas Oguz, Ruty Rinott, Sebastian Riedel, and Holger Schwenk. 2020. MLQA: Evaluating cross-lingual extractive question answering. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7315–7330, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Wang Ling, Isabel Trancoso, Chris Dyer, and Alan W. Black. 2015. Character-based neural machine translation. *CoRR*, abs/1511.04586.

Gábor Melis, Chris Dyer, and Phil Blunsom. 2018. On the state of the art of evaluation in neural language models. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.

Shashi Narayan, Shay B. Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Don't give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1797–1807, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Xiaoman Pan, Boliang Zhang, Jonathan May, Joel Nothman, Kevin Knight, and Heng Ji. 2017. Cross-lingual name tagging and linking for 282 languages. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1946–1958, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Matthew Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Deep contextualized word representations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages

2227–2237, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Danish Pruthi, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Zachary C. Lipton. 2019. Combating adversarial misspellings with robust word recognition. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5582–5591, Florence, Italy. 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.

Brian Roark, Lawrence Wolf-Sonkin, Christo Kirov, Sabrina J. Mielke, Cibu Johny, Isin Demirsahin, and Keith Hall. 2020. Processing South Asian languages written in the Latin script: the dakshina dataset. In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 2413–2423, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.

Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1715–1725, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Lichao Sun, Kazuma Hashimoto, Wenpeng Yin, Akari Asai, Jia Li, Philip S. Yu, and Caiming Xiong. 2020. Adv-BERT: BERT is not robust on misspellings! Generating nature adversarial samples on BERT. *CoRR*, abs/2003.04985.

Ilya Sutskever, James Martens, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2011. Generating text with recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML'11, page 1017–1024, Madison, WI, USA. Omnipress.

Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Dara Bahri, and Donald Metzler. 2020. Efficient transformers: A survey. *CoRR*, abs/2009.06732.

Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.

Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. 2019a. SuperGLUE: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.

Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019b. GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Changhan Wang, Kyunghyun Cho, and Jiatao Gu. 2020. Neural machine translation with byte-level subwords. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(05):9154–9160.

Junqiu Wei, Qun Liu, Yinpeng Guo, and Xin Jiang. 2021. Training multilingual pre-trained language model with byte-level subwords. *CoRR*, abs/2101.09469.

Noam Wies, Yoav Levine, Daniel Jannai, and Amnon Shashua. 2021. Which transformer architecture fits my data? A vocabulary bottleneck in self-attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03928*.

Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V. Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, Jeff Klingner, Apurva Shah, Melvin Johnson, Xiaobing Liu, Lukasz Kaiser, Stephan Gouws, Yoshikiyo Kato, Taku Kudo, Hideto Kazawa, Keith Stevens, George Kurian, Nishant Patil, Wei Wang, Cliff Young, Jason Smith, Jason Riesa, Alex Rudnick, Oriol Vinyals, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2016. Google's neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. *CoRR*, abs/1609.08144.

Wenhan Xiong, Jiawei Wu, Hong Wang, Vivek Kulkarni, Mo Yu, Shiyu Chang, Xiaoxiao Guo, and William Yang Wang. 2019. TWEETQA: A social media focused question answering dataset. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5020–5031, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2020. mT5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer. *CoRR*, abs/2010.11934.

Yinfei Yang, Yuan Zhang, Chris Tar, and Jason Baldridge. 2019. PAWS-X: A cross-lingual adversarial dataset for paraphrase identification. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3687–3692, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. 2020. PEGASUS: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 11328–11339. PMLR.

Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc.

Julian Georg Zilly, Rupesh Kumar Srivastava, Jan Koutník, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2017. Recurrent highway networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4189–4198. PMLR.

A Per-Language Results

Table 11 shows per-language results on the Dakshina single-word transliteration experiments from section 4. Tables 12–14 show the per-language results on the synthetic noise experiments from section 5.

Model	bn	gu	hi	kn	ml	mr	pa	sd	si	ta	te	ur	avg
Roark et al. 2020	13.2	11.9	13.4	6.3	9.0	11.6	17.4	20.5	9.1	8.4	6.2	19.0	12.2
mT5-Small	24.6	19.1	20.3	14.7	18.6	16.1	23.2	28.5	17.7	20.5	15.0	29.7	20.7
ByT5-Small	**10.9**	**8.8**	**10.0**	**4.2**	**7.0**	**7.9**	**14.4**	**17.4**	**7.9**	**6.7**	**4.9**	**17.0**	**9.8**
mT5-Base	22.9	18.1	18.6	12.7	17.1	15.5	21.8	27.4	16.9	18.7	13.4	27.6	19.2
ByT5-Base	**10.9**	**8.8**	**9.8**	**4.5**	**7.4**	**8.2**	**14.7**	**17.7**	**7.9**	**7.0**	**5.0**	**17.2**	**9.9**
mT5-Large	21.9	16.9	17.4	11.2	15.6	14.1	21.5	26.2	15.7	17.0	12.4	27.1	18.1
ByT5-Large	**11.8**	**9.5**	**10.5**	**4.7**	**7.7**	**8.8**	**15.8**	**18.1**	**8.3**	**7.5**	**5.2**	**17.6**	**10.5**
mT5-XL	20.3	16.1	16.1	10.9	14.4	13.7	21.0	25.7	15.3	16.4	11.1	26.5	17.3
ByT5-XL	**12.4**	**9.7**	**10.3**	**4.8**	**8 .0**	**8.9**	**15.6**	**18.6**	**8.4**	**7.8**	**5.1**	**18.1**	**10.6**
mT5-XXL	19.7	15.9	15.6	9.5	13.3	13.8	20.4	25.2	15.3	15.1	10.4	25.3	16.6
ByT5-XXL	**11.3**	**8.6**	**9.3**	**4.2**	**6.9**	**7.8**	**14.1**	**17.0**	**7.6**	**7.0**	**4.8**	**16.9**	**9.6**

Table 11: Character error rates (↓) on **Dakshina single-word transliteration** (Latin to native script) across twelve South Asian languages. ByT5 outperforms the parameter-matched mT5 by a large margin, and beats the Roark et al. 2020 transformer baseline on all languages.

	Model	en	ar	bg	de	el	es	fr	hi	ru	sw	th	tr	ur	vi	zh	avg
Clean	mT5	89.4	79.8	84.1	83.4	83.2	84.2	84.1	77.6	81.5	75.4	79.4	80.1	73.5	81	80.3	81.1
	ByT5	88.3	78.7	82.6	82.8	82	84.4	83.2	75.6	80.5	75.4	75.4	79.2	72.5	79.2	76.2	79.7
Drop	mT5	−8.5	−11.7	−11.6	−12.6	−9.3	−9.3	−11.3	−9.8	−10.1	−12.1	−10.3	−11.7	−8.6	−10.8	**−5.1**	−10.2
	ByT5	**−5.0**	**−9.1**	**−10.0**	**−9.6**	**−7.6**	**−7.7**	**−9.2**	**−6.7**	**−8.5**	**−11.6**	**−6.0**	**−10.5**	**−8.4**	**−6.8**	−5.6	**−8.2**
Add/Drop/Mutate	mT5	−8.3	−10.0	−9.9	−11.1	−8.1	−9.2	−10.1	**−8.0**	−9.1	−12.0	−10.1	−11.3	**−7.8**	−8.3	**−4.7**	−9.2
	ByT5	**−5.3**	**−9.7**	**−8.8**	**−8.6**	**−7.7**	**−7.4**	**−7.2**	−8.5	**−8.2**	**−10.8**	**−9.0**	**−9.5**	−9.2	**−5.1**	−5.1	**−8.0**
Repetitions	mT5	−5.0	−9.2	−7.6	−12.9	−7.3	−7.5	−8.9	−7.5	−7.0	−14.6	−9.7	−11.1	−7.4	−9.4	−3.0	−8.5
	ByT5	**−0.5**	**−6.2**	**−4.1**	**−3.3**	**−5.5**	**−1.5**	**−1.8**	**−5.4**	**−4.5**	**−8.7**	**−6.0**	**−4.0**	**−6.7**	**−2.2**	**−1.8**	**−4.1**
Antspeak	mT5	−16.3	−32.1	−35.6	−36.5	−34.2	−32.8	−35.3	−33.6	−34.6	−32.0	−35.4	−37.3	−31.3	−33.5	−19.4	−32.0
	ByT5	**−0.1**	**−11.9**	**−16.9**	**−1.7**	**−15.3**	**−1.1**	**−2.3**	**−11.2**	**−12.3**	**−11.5**	**−7.4**	**−4.3**	**−12.0**	**−15.5**	**−6.4**	**−8.7**
Uppercase	mT5	−2.4	-	−5.8	−9.8	−10.6	−2.9	−6.4	-	−6.2	−8.5	-	−8.0	-	−9.6	-	−7.0
	ByT5	**−0.1**	-	**−1.6**	**−1.0**	**−4.1**	**−0.5**	**−0.8**	-	**−1.7**	**−1.2**	-	**−2.4**	-	**−1.6**	-	**−1.5**
Random Case	mT5	−13.2	-	−25.0	−30.3	−24.3	−22.0	−25.1	-	−21.2	−31.6	-	−35.1	-	−29.4	-	−25.7
	ByT5	**+0.2**	-	**−2.7**	**−0.8**	**−3.7**	**−0.6**	**−0.7**	-	**−2.8**	**−1.6**	-	**−1.3**	-	**−1.3**	-	**−1.5**

Table 12: Degradation on **XNLI zeroshot** (accuracy) when adding noise during training and evaluation, comparing ByT5 and mT5. The "clean" condition shows performance on the original task. The subsequent rows show the delta from "clean" when adding different types of synthetic noise. The "avg" column shows deltas relative to the "clean" average, restricting to those languages present in the row.

	Model	en	ar	bn	fi	id	ko	ru	sw	te	avg
Clean	mT5	81.9	87.3	86.7	85.1	87.3	79.2	83.5	85.8	90.6	85.3
	ByT5	84.1	88.3	87.8	87.8	91.8	84.9	84.8	88.2	91.7	87.7
Drop	mT5	−16.9	−19.2	−27.0	−19.4	−17.6	**−18.1**	−20.2	−15.3	−25.2	−19.9
	ByT5	**−14.5**	**−18.4**	**−24.3**	**−16.9**	**−16.3**	−22.3	**−16.9**	**−14.1**	**−22.1**	**−18.4**
Add/Drop/Mutate	mT5	−18.2	−27.7	−34.4	−29.4	−22.4	**−31.3**	−26.2	−25.5	−41.0	−28.5
	ByT5	**−13.9**	**−22.2**	**−31.4**	**−22.3**	**−20.5**	−31.4	**−22.2**	**−21.3**	**−33.6**	**−24.3**
Repetitions	mT5	−10.5	−8.8	−11.7	−14.1	−10.0	−6.7	−12.3	−6.6	−18.0	−11.0
	ByT5	**−3.5**	**−2.0**	**−1.8**	**−3.3**	**−3.3**	**−4.7**	**−3.1**	**−0.6**	**−6.0**	**−3.1**
Antspeak	mT5	−20.2	−15.2	−28.4	−19.0	−17.3	−12.2	−17.9	−14.0	−13.3	−17.5
	ByT5	**−4.1**	**−4.2**	**−5.0**	**−2.5**	**−6.4**	**−10.1**	**−2.4**	**−0.6**	**−3.0**	**−4.3**
Uppercase	mT5	−6.0	-	-	−10.3	−7.9	-	−10.5	−3.4	-	−7.6
	ByT5	**−0.5**	-	-	**−1.0**	**−2.4**	-	**−0.6**	**−0.7**	-	**−1.0**
Random Case	mT5	−16.2	-	-	−16.9	−13.8	-	−13.6	−9.0	-	−13.9
	ByT5	**−1.7**	-	-	**−1.1**	**−2.0**	-	**−1.3**	**0.0**	-	**−1.2**

Table 13: Degradation on **TyDiQA-GoldP** (F1 score) when adding noise during training and evaluation, comparing ByT5 and mT5.

	Model	en	ar	bg	de	el	es	fr	hi	ru	sw	th	tr	ur	vi	zh	avg
Clean	mT5	89.4	79.8	84.1	83.4	83.2	84.2	84.1	77.6	81.5	75.4	79.4	80.1	73.5	81	80.3	81.1
	ByT5	88.3	78.7	82.6	82.8	82	84.4	83.2	75.6	80.5	75.4	75.4	79.2	72.5	79.2	76.2	79.7
Drop	mT5	−18.0	−18.4	−19.5	−23.5	−13.4	−19.1	−19.1	−15.9	−16.4	−27.1	−14.8	−24.9	−17.2	−19.0	−8.5	−18.3
	ByT5	**−11.9**	**−13.5**	**−13.2**	**−12.1**	**−10.5**	**−11.5**	**−10.7**	**−10.1**	**−11.9**	**−13.8**	**−10.3**	**−13.1**	**−12.0**	**−9.6**	**−7.2**	**−11.4**
Add/Drop/Mutate	mT5	**−11.3**	**−13.2**	−12.0	**−11.8**	−10.6	**−10.9**	**−9.4**	−12.0	−12.0	**−12.3**	−12.4	−12.3	−12.0	−9.5	−9.0	−11.4
	ByT5	−13.6	−13.4	**−11.3**	−14.0	**−10.4**	−13.5	−11.5	**−9.5**	**−11.1**	−13.3	**−7.2**	**−12.2**	**−10.9**	**−9.4**	**−2.6**	**−10.9**
Repetitions	mT5	−14.9	−12.6	−11.2	−16.5	−10.3	−12.0	−13.5	−11.2	−11.1	−17.2	−12.0	−14.8	−10.6	−11.8	−4.4	−12.3
	ByT5	**−4.3**	**−7.4**	**−6.3**	**−7.4**	**−6.4**	**−5.0**	**−5.0**	**−5.4**	**−5.6**	**−12.4**	**−4.5**	**−7.5**	**−6.7**	**−2.9**	**−1.0**	**−5.9**
Antspeak	mT5	−41.4	−31.6	−38.2	−41.1	−37.9	−37.2	−38.0	−32.8	−34.6	−36.8	−31.5	−41.2	−31.2	−36.0	−5.8	−34.3
	ByT5	**−25.9**	**−17.5**	**−31.4**	**−35.8**	**−26.6**	**−27.4**	**−32.8**	**−13.8**	**−29.6**	**−34.8**	**−9.6**	**−26.4**	**−20.1**	**−32.2**	**−2.1**	**−24.4**
Uppercase	mT5	−5.1	-	−7.6	−9.6	−11.6	−3.7	−7.3	-	−7.7	−9.3	-	−9.2	-	−10.2	-	−8.1
	ByT5	**−0.1**	-	**−2.2**	**−0.5**	**−4.9**	**−0.5**	**−1.2**	-	**−1.8**	**−1.1**	-	**−2.0**	-	**−2.2**	-	**−1.7**
Random Case	mT5	−21.0	-	−17.1	−21.3	−17.5	−16.7	−19.6	-	−16.8	−24.9	-	−18.9	-	−18.5	-	−19.2
	ByT5	**−3.6**	-	**−5.2**	**−6.3**	**−5.9**	**−5.2**	**−4.7**	-	**−6.4**	**−10.8**	-	**−6.9**	-	**−4.4**	-	**−5.9**

Table 14: Degradation on **XNLI zeroshot** (accuracy) when adding noise only during evaluation, comparing ByT5 and mT5. The "clean" condition shows performance on the original task. The subsequent rows show the delta from "clean" when adding different types of synthetic noise. The "avg" column shows deltas relative to the "clean" average, restricting to those languages present in the row.