

Vector Semantics



Why vector models of meaning? computing the similarity between words

“**fast**” is similar to “**rapid**”

“**tall**” is similar to “**height**”

Question answering:

Q: “How **tall** is Mt. Everest?”

Candidate A: “The official **height** of Mount Everest is 29029 feet”



Word similarity for plagiarism detection

MAINFRAMES

Mainframes **are primarily** referred to large computers with **rapid**, advanced processing capabilities that **can execute and perform tasks equivalent to many** Personal Computers (PCs) machines networked together. It is characterized with **high quantity**

Random Access Memory (RAM), very large secondary storage devices, and **high-speed** processors to cater for the needs of the computers under its service.

Consisting of advanced components, mainframes have the capability of running multiple large applications required by **many and most enterprises and organizations**. This is one of its advantages. Mainframes are also suitable to cater for those applications (**programs**) or files that are of **very high**

MAINFRAMES


Mainframes **usually are** referred to those computers with **fast**, advanced processing capabilities that **could perform by itself** tasks **that may require a lot of** Personal Computers (PC) Machines. **Usually mainframes would have lots of** RAMs, very large secondary storage devices, and **very fast** processors to cater for the needs of those computers under its service.

Due to the advanced components mainframes have, **these computers** have the capability of running multiple large applications required by most enterprises, **which is** one of its advantage. Mainframes are also suitable to cater for those applications or files that are of **very large** demand




Word similarity for historical linguistics: semantic change over time

Sagi, Kaufmann Clark 2013



Kulkarni, Al-Rfou, Perozzi, Skiena 2015





Distributional models of meaning

= vector-space models of meaning

= vector semantics

Intuitions: Zellig Harris (1954):

- “oculist and eye-doctor ... occur in almost the same environments”
- “If A and B have almost identical environments we say that they are synonyms.”

Firth (1957):

- “You shall know a word by the company it keeps!”



Intuition of distributional word similarity

- Nida example:

A bottle of **tesgüino** is on the table

Everybody likes **tesgüino**

Tesgüino makes you drunk

We make **tesgüino** out of corn.

- From context words humans can guess **tesgüino** means
 - an alcoholic beverage like **beer**
- Intuition for algorithm:
 - Two words are similar if they have similar word contexts.



Four kinds of vector models

Sparse vector representations

1. Mutual-information weighted word co-occurrence matrices

Dense vector representations:

2. Singular value decomposition (and Latent Semantic Analysis)
3. Neural-network-inspired models (skip-grams, CBOW)
4. Brown clusters



Shared intuition

- Model the meaning of a word by “embedding” in a vector space.
- The meaning of a word is a vector of numbers
 - Vector models are also called “embeddings”.



Term-document matrix

- Each cell: count of term t in a document d : $\text{tf}_{t,d}$:
 - Each document is a count vector in \mathbb{N}^v : a column below

	As You Like It	Twelfth Night	Julius Caesar	Henry V
battle	1	1	8	15
soldier	2	2	12	36
fool	37	58	1	5
clown	6	117	0	0



Term-document matrix

- Two documents are similar if their vectors are similar

	As You Like It	Twelfth Night	Julius Caesar	Henry V
battle	1	1	8	15
soldier	2	2	12	36
fool	37	58	1	5
clown	6	117	0	0



The words in a term-document matrix

- Each word is a count vector in \mathbb{N}^D : a row below

	As You Like It	Twelfth Night	Julius Caesar	Henry V
battle	1	1	8	15
soldier	2	2	12	36
fool	37	58	1	5
clown	6	117	0	0



The words in a term-document matrix

- Two **words** are similar if their vectors are similar

	As You Like It	Twelfth Night	Julius Caesar	Henry V
battle	1	1	8	15
soldier	2	2	12	36
fool	37	58	1	5
clown	6	117	0	0



Term-context matrix for word similarity

- Two words are similar in meaning if their context vectors are similar

	aardvark	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar	...
apricot	0	0	0	1	0	1	
pineapple	0	0	0	1	0	1	
digital	0	2	1	0	1	0	
information	0	1	6	0	4	0	



The word-word or word-context matrix

- Instead of entire documents, use smaller contexts
 - Paragraph
 - Window of ± 4 words
- A word is now defined by a vector over counts of context words
- Instead of each vector being of length D
- Each vector is now of length $|V|$
- The word-word matrix is $|V| \times |V|$



Word-Word matrix

Sample contexts ± 7 words

sugar, a sliced lemon, a tablespoonful of
 their enjoyment. Cautiously she sampled her first
 well suited to programming on the digital
 for the purpose of gathering data and **apricot** preserve or jam, a pinch each of,
pineapple and another fruit whose taste she likened
computer. In finding the optimal R-stage policy from
information necessary for the study authorized in the

	aardvark	digital	data	pinch	result	sugar	...
apricot	0	0	0	1	0	1	
pineapple	0	0	0	1	0	1	
computer	0	2	1	0	1	0	
information	0	1	6	0	4	0	
...



Word-word matrix


- We showed only 4x6, but the real matrix is 50,000 x 50,000
 - So it's very sparse
 - Most values are 0.
 - That's OK, since there are lots of efficient algorithms for sparse matrices.
- The size of windows depends on your goals
 - The shorter the windows , the more syntactic the representation
 - ± 1-3 very syntactic
 - The longer the windows, the more semantic the representation
 - ± 4-10 more semantic



2 kinds of co-occurrence between 2 words

(Schütze and Pedersen, 1993)

- First-order co-occurrence (**syntagmatic association**):
 - They are typically nearby each other.
 - wrote is a first-order associate of book or poem.
- Second-order co-occurrence (**paradigmatic association**):
 - They have similar neighbors.
 - wrote is a second- order associate of words like said or remarked.



Vector Semantics

Positive Pointwise Mutual Information (PPMI)



Problem with raw counts

- Raw word frequency is not a great measure of association between words
 - It's very skewed
 - “the” and “of” are very frequent, but maybe not the most discriminative
- We'd rather have a measure that asks whether a context word is particularly informative about the target word.
 - Positive Pointwise Mutual Information (PPMI)



Pointwise Mutual Information

Pointwise mutual information:

Do events x and y co-occur more than if they were independent?

$$\text{PMI}(X,Y) = \log_2 \frac{P(x,y)}{P(x)P(y)}$$

PMI between two words: (Church & Hanks 1989)

Do words x and y co-occur more than if they were independent?



Positive Pointwise Mutual Information

- PMI ranges from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$
- But the negative values are problematic
 - Things are co-occurring less than we expect by chance
 - Unreliable without enormous corpora
 - Imagine w_1 and w_2 whose probability is each 10^{-6}
 - Hard to be sure $p(w_1, w_2)$ is significantly different than 10^{-12}
 - Plus it's not clear people are good at "unrelatedness"
 - So we just replace negative PMI values by 0



Computing PPMI on a term-context matrix

- Matrix F with W rows (words) and C columns (contexts)
- f_{ij} is # of times w_i occurs in context c_j

$$p_{ij} = \frac{f_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^W \sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}$$

$$p_{i^*} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^W \sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}$$

$$p_{*j} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^W f_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^W \sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}$$

aardvark	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar
0	0	0	1	0	1
0	0	0	1	0	1
0	2	1	0	1	0
0	1	6	0	4	0

apricot
 pineapple
 digital
 information

$$pmi_{ij} = \log_2 \frac{p_{ij}}{p_{i^*} p_{*j}}$$

$$ppmi_{ij} = \begin{cases} pmi_{ij} & \text{if } pmi_{ij} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$



$$p_{ij} = \frac{f_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^W \sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}$$

apricot
pineapple
digital
information

	Count(w,context)				
	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar
apricot	0	0	1	0	1
pineapple	0	0	1	0	1
digital	2	1	0	1	0
information	1	6	0	4	0

$$p(w=\text{information}, c=\text{data}) = 6/19 = .32$$

$$p(w=\text{information}) = 11/19 = .58$$

$$p(c=\text{data}) = 7/19 = .37$$

$$p(w_i) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^C f_{ij}}{N}$$

$$p(c_j) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^W f_{ij}}{N}$$

p(w,context)

p(w)

	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar	p(w)
apricot	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.11
pineapple	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.11
digital	0.11	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.21
information	0.05	0.32	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.58



$$pmi_{ij} = \log_2 \frac{p_{ij}}{p_{i^*} p_{*j}}$$

		p(w,context)					p(w)
		computer	data	pinch	result	sugar	
apricot		0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.11
pineapple		0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.11
digital		0.11	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.21
information		0.05	0.32	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.58
p(context)		0.16	0.37	0.11	0.26	0.11	

- $pmi(\text{information}, \text{data}) = \log_2 (.32 / (.37 * .58)) = .57$

PPMI(w,context)

	computer	data	pinch	result	sugar
apricot	-	-	2.25	-	2.25
pineapple	-	-	2.25	-	2.25
digital	1.66	0.00	-	0.00	-
information	0.00	0.57	-	0.47	-



Weighting PMI

- PMI is biased toward infrequent events
 - Very rare words have very high PMI values
- Two solutions:
 - Give rare words slightly higher probabilities
 - Use add-one smoothing (which has a similar effect)



Weighting PMI: Giving rare context words slightly higher probability

- Raise the context probabilities to $\alpha=0.75$:


$$\text{PPMI}_\alpha(w, c) = \max\left(\log_2 \frac{P(w, c)}{P(w)P_\alpha(c)}, 0\right)$$

$$P_\alpha(c) = \frac{\text{count}(c)^\alpha}{\sum_c \text{count}(c)^\alpha}$$

- This helps because $P_\alpha(c) > P(c)$ for rare c
- Consider two events, $P(a) = .99$ and $P(b)=.01$

$$P_\alpha(a) = \frac{0.99^{0.75}}{0.99^{0.75} + 0.01^{0.75}} = 0.97 \quad P_\alpha(b) = \frac{0.01^{0.75}}{0.99^{0.75} + 0.01^{0.75}} = 0.03$$

26



Vector Semantics

Measuring similarity: the cosine



Measuring similarity

- Given 2 target words v and w
- We'll need a way to measure their similarity.
- Most measure of vectors similarity are based on the:
- **Dot product or inner product** from linear algebra

$$\text{dot-product}(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) = \vec{v} \cdot \vec{w} = \sum_{i=1}^N v_i w_i = v_1 w_1 + v_2 w_2 + \dots + v_N w_N$$

- High when two vectors have large values in same dimensions.
- Low (in fact 0) for **orthogonal vectors** with zeros in complementary distribution



Problem with dot product

$$\text{dot-product}(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) = \vec{v} \cdot \vec{w} = \sum_{i=1}^N v_i w_i = v_1 w_1 + v_2 w_2 + \dots + v_N w_N$$

- Dot product is longer if the vector is longer. Vector length:

$$|\vec{v}| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i^2}$$

- Vectors are longer if they have higher values in each dimension
- That means more frequent words will have higher dot products
- That's bad: we don't want a similarity metric to be sensitive to word frequency



Solution: cosine

- Just divide the dot product by the length of the two vectors!

$$\frac{\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}}{|\vec{a}| |\vec{b}|}$$

- This turns out to be the cosine of the angle between them!

$$\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} = |\vec{a}| |\vec{b}| \cos \theta$$

$$\frac{\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}}{|\vec{a}| |\vec{b}|} = \cos \theta$$



Cosine for computing similarity

$$\cos(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) = \frac{\vec{v} \cdot \vec{w}}{\|\vec{v}\| \|\vec{w}\|} = \frac{\vec{v}}{\|\vec{v}\|} \cdot \frac{\vec{w}}{\|\vec{w}\|} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i w_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2}}$$

Dot product

Unit vectors


v_i is the PPMI value for word v in context i
 w_i is the PPMI value for word w in context i .

$\cos(\vec{v}, \vec{w})$ is the cosine similarity of \vec{v} and \vec{w}



Cosine as a similarity metric

- -1: vectors point in opposite directions
 - +1: vectors point in same directions
 - 0: vectors are orthogonal
-
- Raw frequency or PPMI are non-negative, so cosine range 0-1





$$\cos(\vec{v}, \vec{w}) = \frac{\vec{v} \cdot \vec{w}}{|\vec{v}| |\vec{w}|} = \frac{\vec{v}}{|\vec{v}|} \cdot \frac{\vec{w}}{|\vec{w}|} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i w_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N v_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2}}$$

Which pair of words is more similar?

$$\text{cosine(apricot,information)} = \frac{2+0+0}{\sqrt{4+0+0} \sqrt{1+36+1}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{38}} = .16$$


$$\text{cosine(digital,information)} = \frac{0+6+2}{\sqrt{0+1+4} \sqrt{1+36+1}} = \frac{8}{\sqrt{38}\sqrt{5}} = .58$$

$$\text{cosine(apricot,digital)} = \frac{0+0+0}{\sqrt{1+0+0} \sqrt{0+1+4}} = 0$$

	large	data	computer
apricot	2	0	0
digital	0	1	2
information	1	6	1




Visualizing vectors and angles




	large	data
apricot	2	0
digital	0	1
information	1	6



Clustering vectors to visualize similarity in co-occurrence matrices





Vector Semantics

Context types



Using syntax to define a word's context

- Zellig Harris (1968)

“The meaning of entities, and the meaning of grammatical relations among them, is related to the restriction of combinations of these entities relative to other entities”

- **Two words are similar if they have similar syntactic contexts**

Duty and **responsibility** have similar syntactic distribution:

Modified by adjectives	additional, administrative, assumed, collective, congressional, constitutional ...
Objects of verbs	assert, assign, assume, attend to, avoid, become, breach..



Co-occurrence vectors based on syntactic dependencies

Dekang Lin, 1998 “Automatic Retrieval and Clustering of Similar Words”

- Each dimension: a context word in one of R grammatical relations
 - Subject-of- “absorb”
- Instead of a vector of $/V/$ features, a vector of $R/V/$
- Example: counts for the word *cell* :

	subj-of , absorb	subj-of , adapt	subj-of , behave	...	pobj-of , inside	pobj-of , into	...	nmod-of , abnormality	nmod-of , anemia	nmod-of , architecture	...	obj-of , attack	obj-of , call	obj-of , come from	obj-of , decorate	...	nmod , bacteria	nmod , body	nmod , bone marrow
cell	1	1	1	...	16	30	...	3	8	1	...	6	11	3	2	...	3	2	2

Similarities Captured by Window vs Syntactic Contexts

Target Word	BoW5	BoW2	DEPS
batman	nightwing aquaman catwoman superman manhunter	superman superboy aquaman catwoman batgirl	superman superboy supergirl catwoman aquaman
florida	gainesville fla jacksonville tampa lauderdale	fla alabama gainesville tallahassee texas	texas louisiana georgia california carolina
object-oriented	aspect-oriented smalltalk event-driven prolog domain-specific	aspect-oriented event-driven objective-c dataflow 4gl	event-driven domain-specific rule-based data-driven human-centered
dancing	singing dance dances dancers tap-dancing	singing dance dances breakdancing clowning	singing rapping breakdancing miming busking

Target words and their 5 most-similar words, as induced by different embeddings

(Levy & Goldberg 2014)



Alternative to PPMI for measuring association

- **tf-idf** (that's a hyphen not a minus sign)
- The combination of two factors
 - **Term frequency** (Luhn 1957): frequency of the word (can be logged)
 - **Inverse document frequency** (IDF) (Sparck Jones 1972)
 - N is the total number of documents
 - df_i = “document frequency of word i ”
 - N = # of documents with word i
 - $w_{ij} = \text{word } i \text{ in document } j$


$$w_{ij} = tf_{ij} idf_i$$

$$idf_i = \log\left(\frac{N}{df_i}\right)$$



tf-idf not generally used for word-word similarity

- But is by far the most common weighting when we are considering the relationship of words to documents




Vector Semantics

Evaluating similarity



Evaluating similarity

- Extrinsic (task-based, end-to-end) Evaluation:
 - Question Answering
 - Spell Checking
 - Essay grading
- Intrinsic Evaluation:
 - Correlation between algorithm and human word similarity ratings
 - Wordsim353: 353 noun pairs rated 0-10. $sim(plane,car)=5.77$
 - Taking TOEFL multiple-choice vocabulary tests
 - Levied is closest in meaning to:
imposed, believed, requested, correlated



Vector Semantics

Dense Vectors



Sparse versus dense vectors

- PPMI vectors are
 - **long** (length $|V| = 20,000$ to $50,000$)
 - **sparse** (most elements are zero)
- Alternative: learn vectors which are
 - **short** (length 200-1000)
 - **dense** (most elements are non-zero)




Sparse versus dense vectors

- Why dense vectors?
 - Short vectors may be easier to use as features in machine learning (less weights to tune)
 - Dense vectors may generalize better than storing explicit counts
 - Sparse vectors don't capture the fact that the contexts 'hotel' and 'motel' are similar



Three methods for getting short dense vectors

- Singular Value Decomposition (SVD)
 - A special case of this is called LSA – Latent Semantic Analysis
- “Neural Language Model”-inspired predictive models
 - skip-grams and CBOW
- Brown clustering



Vector Semantics

Dense Vectors via SVD




Intuition

- Approximate an N-dimensional dataset using fewer dimensions
- By first rotating the axes into a new space
- In which the highest order dimension captures the most variance in the original dataset
- And the next dimension captures the next most variance, etc.
- Many such (related) methods:
 - PCA – principle components analysis
 - Factor Analysis
 - SVD




Dimensionality reduction






Dimensionality reduction





Dimensionality reduction





Dimensionality reduction



PCA dimension 1



Singular Value Decomposition

Any rectangular $w \times c$ matrix X equals the product of 3 matrices:

W: rows corresponding to original but m columns represents a dimension in a new latent space, such that

- M column vectors are orthogonal to each other
- Columns are ordered by the amount of variance in the dataset each new dimension accounts for


S: diagonal $m \times m$ matrix of **singular values** expressing the importance of each dimension.

C: columns corresponding to original but m rows corresponding to ⁵⁴**singular values**



Singular Value Decomposition

Contexts






SVD applied to term-document matrix: Latent Semantic Analysis

Deerwester et al (1988)

- If instead of keeping all m dimensions, we just keep the top k singular values. Let's say 300.
- The result is a least-squares approximation to the original X
- But instead of multiplying, we'll just make use of W .
- Each row of W :
 - A k -dimensional vector
 - Representing word W





LSA more details

- 300 dimensions are commonly used
- The cells are commonly weighted by a product of two weights
 - Local weight: Log term frequency
 - Global weight: either idf or an entropy measure



Let's return to PPMI word-word matrices

- Can we apply to SVD to them?



SVD applied to term-term matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ |V| \times |V| \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} W \\ |V| \times |V| \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_3 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \sigma_V \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ |V| \times |V| \end{bmatrix}$$




Truncated SVD on term-term matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ |V| \times |V| \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} W \\ |V| \times k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_3 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \sigma_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ k \times |V| \end{bmatrix}$$




Truncated SVD produces embeddings

- Each row of W matrix is a k -dimensional representation of each word w
- K might range from 50 to 1000
- Generally we keep the top k dimensions, but some experiments suggest that getting rid of the top 1 dimension or even the top 50 dimensions is helpful (Laposa and Evert 2014).




Semantic Patterns Emerge

An Improved Model of Semantic Similarity based on Lexical Co-Occurrence (Rohde et al. 2005)



Semantic Relations Emerge


An Improved Model of Semantic Similarity based on Lexical Co-Occurrence (Rohde et al. 2005)





Embeddings versus sparse vectors

- Dense SVD embeddings sometimes work better than sparse PPMI matrices at tasks like word similarity
 - Denoising: low-order dimensions may represent unimportant information
 - Truncation may help the models generalize better to unseen data.
 - Having a smaller number of dimensions may make it easier for classifiers to properly weight the dimensions for the task.
 - Dense models may do better at capturing higher order co-occurrence.



Vector Semantics

Embeddings inspired by neural language models: skip-grams and CBOW



Prediction-based models: An alternative way to get dense vectors

- **Skip-gram** (Mikolov et al. 2013a) **CBOW** (Mikolov et al. 2013b)
- Learn embeddings as part of the process of word prediction.
- Train a neural network to predict neighboring words
 - Inspired by **neural net language models**.
 - In so doing, learn dense embeddings for the words in the training corpus.
- Advantages:
 - Fast, easy to train (much faster than SVD)
 - Available online in the `word2vec` package
 - Including sets of pretrained embeddings!



Skip-grams

- Predict each neighboring word
 - in a context window of $2C$ words
 - from the current word.
- So for $C=2$, we're given word w_t and predict 4 surrounding words:


the cat **sat** on the
 w_{t-2} w_{t-1} w_t w_{t+1} w_{t+2}



Skip-grams learn 2 embeddings for each w


input embedding v , in the input matrix W

- Column i of the input matrix W is the $1 \times d$ embedding v_i for word i in the vocabulary.




output embedding v' , in output matrix W'

- Row i of the output matrix W' is a $d \times 1$ vector embedding v'_i for word i in the vocabulary.





Intuition: similarity as dot-product between a target vector and context vector





Similarity is computed from dot product

- Remember: two vectors are similar if they have a high dot product
 - Cosine is just a normalized dot product
- So:
 - $\text{Similarity}(j,k) \propto c_k \cdot v_j$
 - We'll need to normalize to get a probability



Turning dot products into probabilities

- Similarity(j,k) = $c_k \cdot v_j$
- We use softmax to turn into probabilities

$$p(w_k | w_j) = \frac{\exp(c_k \cdot v_j)}{\sum_{i \in |V|} \exp(c_i \cdot v_j)}$$




Learning

- Start with some initial embeddings (e.g., random)
- iteratively make the embeddings for a word
 - more like the embeddings of its neighbors
 - less like the embeddings of other words.



Visualizing W and C as a network for doing error backprop





One-hot vectors

- A vector of length $|V|$
- 1 for the target word and 0 for other words
- So if “popsicle” is vocabulary word 5
- The **one-hot vector** is
- $[0,0,0,0,1,0,0,0,\dots,0]$

$$\begin{matrix} w_0 & w_1 & & w_j & & w_{|V|} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{matrix}$$



Problem with the softmax

- The denominator: have to compute over every word in vocab

$$p(w_k | w_j) = \frac{\exp(c_k \cdot v_j)}{\sum_{i \in |V|} \exp(c_i \cdot v_j)}$$

- Instead: just sample a few of those negative words



Goal in learning

- Make the word like the context words

lemon, a [tablespoon of apricot preserves or] jam
 c1 c2 w c3 c4

$$\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}}$$

- We want this to be high:

$$\sigma(c_1 \cdot w) + \sigma(c_2 \cdot w) + \sigma(c_3 \cdot w) + \sigma(c_4 \cdot w)$$

- And not like k randomly selected “noise words”

[cement metaphysical dear coaxial apricot attendant whence forever puddle]
 n1 n2 n3 n4 n5 n6 n7 n8

- We want this to be low:

$$\sigma(n_1 \cdot w) + \sigma(n_2 \cdot w) + \dots + \sigma(n_8 \cdot w)$$



Skipgram with negative sampling: Loss function

$$\log \sigma(c \cdot w) + \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \mathbb{E}_{w_i \sim p(w)} [\log \sigma(-w_i \cdot w)]$$



Relation between skipgrams and PMI!

- If we multiply WW^T
- We get a $|V| \times |V|$ matrix M , each entry m_{ij} corresponding to some association between input word i and output word j
- Levy and Goldberg (2014b) show that skip-gram reaches its optimum just when this matrix is a shifted version of PMI:

$$WW^T = M^{\text{PMI}} - \log k$$

- So skip-gram is implicitly factoring a shifted version of the PMI matrix into the two embedding matrices.



Properties of embeddings

- Nearest words to some embeddings (Mikolov et al. 2013)



target:	Redmond	Havel	ninjutsu	graffiti	capitulate
	Redmond Wash.	Vaclav Havel	ninja	spray paint	capitulation
	Redmond Washington	president Vaclav Havel	martial arts	grafitti	capitulated
	Microsoft	Velvet Revolution	swordsmanship	taggers	capitulating




Embeddings capture relational meaning!

$\text{vector}(\text{'king'}) - \text{vector}(\text{'man'}) + \text{vector}(\text{'woman'}) \approx \text{vector}(\text{'queen'})$

$\text{vector}(\text{'Paris'}) - \text{vector}(\text{'France'}) + \text{vector}(\text{'Italy'}) \approx \text{vector}(\text{'Rome'})$





Vector Semantics

Brown clustering



Brown clustering

- An agglomerative clustering algorithm that clusters words based on which words precede or follow them
- These word clusters can be turned into a kind of vector
- We'll give a very brief sketch here.




Brown clustering algorithm

- Each word is initially assigned to its own cluster.
- We now consider merging each pair of clusters. Highest quality merge is chosen.
 - Quality = merges two words that have similar probabilities of preceding and following words
 - (More technically quality = smallest decrease in the likelihood of the corpus according to a class-based language model)
- Clustering proceeds until all words are in one big cluster.



Brown Clusters as vectors

- By tracing the order in which clusters are merged, the model builds a binary tree from bottom to top.
- Each word represented by binary string = path from root to leaf
- Each intermediate node is a cluster
- Chairman is 0010, “months” = 01, and verbs = 1





Brown cluster examples

Friday Monday Thursday Wednesday Tuesday Saturday Sunday weekends Sundays Saturdays
June March July April January December October November September August
pressure temperature permeability density porosity stress velocity viscosity gravity tension
anyone someone anybody somebody
had hadn't hath would've could've should've must've might've
asking telling wondering instructing informing kidding reminding bothering thanking depositing
mother wife father son husband brother daughter sister boss uncle
great big vast sudden mere sheer gigantic lifelong scant colossal
down backwards ashore sideways southward northward overboard aloft downwards adrift



Summary

- Distributional (vector) models of meaning
 - **Sparse** (PPMI-weighted word-word co-occurrence matrices)
 - **Dense:**
 - Word-word SVD 50-2000 dimensions
 - Skip-grams and CBOW
 - Brown clusters 5-20 binary dimensions.