

Random vector generation of a semantic space

Jean-François Delpéch Sabine Ploux

Institut des Sciences Cognitives
UMR5304 CNRS - Université de Lyon
67, boulevard Pinel
69675 BRON cedex, France

jfdelpéch@gmail.com sploux@isc.cnrs.fr

We show how random vectors and random projection can be implemented in the usual vector space model to construct a Euclidean semantic space from a French synonym dictionary. We evaluate theoretically the resulting noise and show the experimental distribution of the similarities of terms in a neighborhood according to the choice of parameters. We also show that the Schmidt orthogonalization process is applicable and can be used to separate homonyms with distinct semantic meanings. Neighboring terms are easily arranged into semantically significant clusters which are well suited to the generation of realistic lists of synonyms and to such applications as word selection for automatic text generation. This process, applicable to any language, can easily be extended to collocations, is extremely fast and can be updated in real time, whenever new synonyms are proposed.

1. Introduction

In their seminal work, Ploux and Victorri ¹ have used synonymy relations deduced from French electronic dictionaries to create semantic spaces around French words and their neighbors. Their definition of “synonymy” is fairly broad and includes hyponymy (*moineau* and *oiseau*), hyperonymy (*arme* and *pistolet*) or even non-synonymous, but related terms (*autocar* and *automobile*); however, in their work, true synonyms (i.e. terms which are more or less interchangeable) form cliques of the graph of synonyms, i.e. maximally complete subgraphs. While this is very interesting from a theoretical standpoint, as it then becomes straightforward to evaluate an interclique distance (or degree of separation) between any two terms in the graph (as long as neither belongs to an island, such as *lapereau* and *lapinot*), it is not very useful in practice. For example, an author in search of the right term may well not be interested in strict synonyms; terms with related or even opposed meanings can often be preferable in rhetorical figures. Also, in many applications such as automatic text generation, a well-defined and mathematically well behaved semantic distance between terms is often a prerequisite.

In this report, we show how an Euclidean semantic distance can quickly and easily be constructed from Ploux and Victorri's database (which contains 54,685 terms and 116,694 cliques).

2. Construction of a semantic space

2.1. The vector space model

Since the pioneering work of Salton ^{2, 3}, it is well understood that any combination of terms, such as a clique, can be seen as a vector in a space where each dimension represents a distinct term (or lemma).

$$\mathcal{C}_j = (t_{1,j}, t_{2,j}, \dots, t_{t,j}) \tag{1}$$

This representation is extremely fruitful and forms the basis of numerous information retrieval systems; it suffers however from a severe limitation in that each term is orthogonal to each other. Of course, the dual equation from Equation ¹,

$$\mathcal{T}_k = (c_{1,k}, c_{2,k}, \dots, c_{s,k}) \tag{2}$$

may be used to compute term distances (or similarities) but the very high dimensionality of the subtending space makes such distances difficult to compute and to interpret: this is the “curse of dimensionality”.

2.2. Overlap similarity between terms

If D_i with cardinality d_i is the set of distinct terms occurring in all the cliques containing term t_i , we define the overlap similarity between two terms as the cardinality $d_{i,k}$ of the intersection $D_i \cap D_k$ (each word being counted only once.) Obviously, $d_{i,k} = 0$ for most (i, k) pairs, since for any i the total number of distinct terms in the database is much larger than d_i , which ranges from 2 to 243 in Ploux and Victorri's [3](#) database with an average value of 8.5.

2.3. Contexonyms

“Contexonyms” are words which co-occur in a given context (as for example in the same sentence of a corpus); while they are not synonyms, they are obviously closely related. Ji, Ploux and Wehrli [4](#) have proposed an automatic contexonym organizing model (ACOM) which relies on counting of co-occurrences and evaluating their probabilities to automatically produce and organize contexonyms for a target word. The test results, after training on an English corpus maintained by Project Gutenberg, show that the model is able to classify contexonyms as well as to reflect words' minute usage and nuance.

2.4. Latent semantic indexing

Dimensionality reduction can be achieved by a low-rank approximation of the term-document matrix. This can be done by Latent Semantic Indexing [5](#), which reduces dimensionality through a singular value decomposition (SVD) of the term-document matrix, retaining only a comparatively small number of the largest singular values. This method has been very successfully used for document indexing and retrieval. It suffers nevertheless from limitations:

- SVD is computationally intensive, even though the large term-document matrix is very sparse;
- There is no really satisfactory way to increment the results as new terms/documents become available.

More importantly, it is not well suited to generating a semantic space from cliques. The resulting, lower dimensional space is the best approximation, in the least squares sense, of the position of any term belonging to the whole set of cliques: the distance *between any pair of terms* will be optimal, while what is really of interest from the present perspective is the accurate determination of distances *between semantic neighbors*.

As a test, a SVD decomposition of the clique-term matrix (of which eq. [2](#) is a row) was performed. It reduced the matrix size from 54,685 x 116,694 to 54,685 x 250, meaning that each term was associated with a vector having 250 orthogonal components. The decomposition, which took 134 sec. on a desktop computer, was clearly unsatisfactory as the singular values decayed very slowly, from 63.31 for the first coordinate to 37.4 for the 250th one. According to this computation, the first few neighbors of *rapsode* would be *rimailleur*, *rimeur*, *versificateur*, *métromane*, *fil d'Apollon*, *favori des Muses*, *favori du Parnasse*, *nourrisson des Muses*, *héros du Pinde*, *mâche-laurier*, all with similarities extremely close to 1.0. While clearly in the right neighborhood, this seems to be of limited usefulness; note however that in practice a restriction to the first two or three largest singular values may often yield useful information [6](#).

2.5. Neural networks

Word order is not considered in this publication, but it should be mentioned for completeness that neural networks are often used in natural language processing to encode word sequences (see [7](#) for an extended review and bibliography). In a recent publication, Mikolov *et al.* [8](#) have introduced two novel model architectures for computing continuous vector representations of words from very large data sets. They report large improvements in accuracy at a computational cost which is still substantial, but that they claim is much lower than previous architectures. An interesting consideration is that, according to Mikolov *et al.* [9](#), the learned vectors explicitly encode many linguistic regularities and patterns.

2.6. Random vectors and random projection

2.6.1. Remarks on high-dimensionality spaces

Dasgupta [10](#) points out that intuitions valid in a low-dimensionality space may be totally misleading in a high-dimensionality space. For example, a set of points picked at random from the unit ball

$$\{x \in V : \|x\| < 1\} \quad (3)$$

will have some significant fraction near the origin, say within distance $1/2$ if $d = 3$, but this fraction becomes rapidly vanishingly small as the dimension d becomes large; for example for $d = 250$, $d^{250} = 0.5^{250} \approx 5.5 \times 10^{-76}$.

Another useful remark is that while obviously one cannot create more than d orthogonal vectors in a space of dimension d , one can create an exponentially large number of vectors quasi-orthogonal to each other; in other words [10](#), a set of $\exp(\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2 d))$ vectors picked at random will with high probability be quasi-orthogonal, i.e. have angles of $90 \pm \epsilon$ with each others. The seed vectors referred to below will be selected from such a set \mathbb{S}_d .

While an orthogonal projection will in general reduce the average distance between points, it is also known, as shown by Johnson and Lindenstrauss in an often cited paper [11](#), that distances may be almost perfectly preserved for any n points in an arbitrary number d of dimensions when projected to a random subspace of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ dimension.

2.6.2. Building random vectors

The comparatively recent method of random projection [12](#), [13](#), [14](#) is based on these three preceding remarks and proceeds as follows:

1. Uniquely associate with each term t_i a random seed vector $s_i \in \mathbb{S}_d$ having d independent coordinates;
2. Associate with each clique c_k the vector $\mathcal{C}_k = \sum_{i \in c_k} \rho_i^k s_i$ where $i \in c_k$ refers to the set of terms found in clique c_k and ρ_i^k is a function of the number of occurrences in c_k of term t_i and of the weights associated with t_i ;
3. Finally, associate with each term t_i the (suitably weighted) sum of the vectors of the cliques in which t_i appears, $\mathcal{T}_i = \sum_{k \ni t_i} \mathcal{C}_k$ where $k \ni t_i$ refers to the cliques containing t_i . In what follows, we shall assume without loss of generality that the term vectors \mathcal{T}_i are normalized to unity.

Obviously, each term vector \mathcal{T}_i is now embedded in a d -dimensional Euclidean semantic space and the similarity σ_{ij} between terms t_i and t_j is the scalar product of the associated term vectors:

$$\sigma_{ij} = \langle \mathcal{T}_i | \mathcal{T}_j \rangle \quad (4)$$

It is easy to see that σ_{ij} ranges from -1 to 1. It is sometimes more convenient to consider the distance \mathcal{D}_{ij} which is related to the similarity by $\mathcal{D}_{ij} = \sqrt{2(1 - \sigma_{ij})}$ and ranges from 0 (same t_i and t_k) to 2 (exactly opposite terms; note however that owing to the extreme sparsity of a high-dimensional space, the neighborhood exactly opposite a term is in practice always empty.)

2.6.3. Locality property

Building a term vector \mathcal{T}_i by the process described above involves only the terms pertaining to the set D_i defined in section [2.2](#). It is thus a purely local process: updating the semantic space requires only a few ten or a few hundred operations, orders of magnitude less than its initial generation (provided small changes to the weights are neglected, which is usually acceptable as they are logarithmic in term frequency and inverse document frequency.)

This does not imply that the similarity of term t_i with term $t_k \notin D_i$ is zero, even though $t_k \notin D_i \implies t_i \notin D_k$, since t_i and t_k may well have neighbors in common. For example *carotte* and *fraude* have a degree of separation of 2 but a similarity of 0.364.

The seed vectors s_i are not quite orthogonal and the scalar product $\langle s_i | s_j \rangle$ will usually be small, but not zero. Thus, even for uncorrelated term vectors \mathcal{T}_i and \mathcal{T}_j , their similarity σ_{ij} will usually be small but non-zero. This induce an unavoidable noise which is studied below in some detail.

2.7. Practical implementation

A normalized seed vector embedded in a d -dimensional space has d coordinates of which $d - 2m$ are 0, m are $+1/\sqrt{2m}$ and m are $-1/\sqrt{2m}$. Having the same number of positive and negative coordinates ensures that the scalar product of two seed vectors is 0 on the average. As seed vectors need to be very close to orthogonal with each others, the number $2m$ of non-zero coefficients must be substantially smaller than the dimension d .

The number of available, distinct seed vectors is the product of the number of combinations $\binom{d}{2m}$ of $2m$ non-zero coordinates amongst d coordinates, times the number of ways $\binom{2m}{m}$ of distributing m positive and m negative coordinates amongst these non-zero coordinates :

$$N_{seed}(d, m) = \binom{d}{2m} \times \binom{2m}{m} \quad (5)$$

In practice, N_{seed} should be much larger than the number of distinct terms to guarantee a negligible collision probability (i.e. two distinct terms having the same seed vector). This condition is already amply met with $m \geq 4$ as $N_{seed}(250, 4) \approx 2.4 \times 10^{16}$ when a dimension $d = 250$ is selected.

Given d and m and noting for simplicity $p = 2m/d$, the probability $P_{overlap}(v, d)$ of an overlap v between two randomly selected seed vectors is

$$P_{overlap}(v, d) = \binom{2m}{v} \times p^v \times (1 - p)^{(2m-v)} \quad (6)$$


When two randomly selected, normalized seed vectors have an overlap of v non-zero coordinates, their scalar products will be arranged symmetrically around zero and vary in discrete steps of $1/2m$. An overlap of 1 will generate the two scalars $1/2m$ and $-1/2m$ with probabilities $1/2$, an overlap of 2 will generate $2/2m$ with probability $1/4$, 0 with probability $1/2$, and $-2/2m$ with probability $1/4$; more generally, an overlap v will generate the scalar $s/2m$ with the probability

$$P_{scalar}(v, s) = \binom{v}{q_s} \times 2^{-v} \quad (7)$$

where the factors $q_s = (v + s)/2$ are restricted to integer values and by virtue of the identity $\sum_{k=-v}^v \binom{k}{q_k} \equiv 2^v$.

It can be seen from equations [6](#) and [7](#) that the noise decreases more or less linearly with d . Theoretical and experimental scalar products of two seed vectors, as computed from equations [6](#) and [7](#), are plotted in the next figure (next page) where:

- The light vertical lines are increments of 0.01σ , the heavier vertical lines are at 0 , -0.1σ and $+0.1\sigma$.
- The two horizontal lines are at 1.0 and 0.136 .
- The red dots are computed by taking the scalar products of 1,000,000 'term vectors' each synthesized by the addition of 5 random seed vectors. If instead we do the statistics directly on seed vectors, the result is unchanged except that the dots now occur only at multiples of 0.01 and the total is accordingly 5 times larger.
- The black dots are statistics over 40,000 points, starting with 10,000, taken from the tail of the neighbors of an arbitrary term (here *rapsode*.)
- The purple dots are a Gaussian with a standard deviation of 0.063 .



3. Results





Obviously, the size of the database of the term vectors \mathcal{T}_i is itself linearly dependent on the dimension; for $d = 2500$, each vector occupies 10 kB if a single coordinate is represented by a 4-byte floating point number. A database of 1,000,000 distinct terms would thus occupy 10 GB with this elementary data structure; however, for many applications, $d = 250$ will be sufficient and/or more sophisticated data structures may be implemented. Computation times will also increase more or less linearly with d , because they mostly involve stepping through all the dimensions.

3.1. Term neighbors

The following four figures have been constructed by compiling eight independent databases of 54,685 term vectors for each of the four indicated (m, d) couples; *tf-idf* statistical weights were used. Typically, on a small desktop computer, the compilation time is 3 to 4 seconds for $d = 250$ and 20 to 30 seconds for $d = 2500$.

Abscissas are proportional to the logarithm of the neighbor's rank (From 1 for *maison* in the upper right corner to 1000 in the lower left corner) and ordinates are the similarities to *maison*. For a given neighbor, the horizontally aligned red dots represent the eight scalars σ_i computed from the eight databases and the thicker, black dot is the average value σ_{avg} of the eight scalars. The neighbors are arranged in non-increasing order of their σ_{avg} with *maison*.

Even though the diameter d_{maison} of *maison* as defined in section 2.2 is only 98, there are several hundred significant neighbors: while most close neighbors belong to the set D_{maison} , many lie at more than one degree of separation from each others (their cliques are separated by more than one vertex). Also, it can be seen, as expected, that the noise is inversely proportional to \sqrt{d} but not very dependent on m (in fact, the only noticeable effect of a lower m is that there are more outliers) and that a standard deviation of about 0.063 is not unrealistic for $d = 2500$.



In what follows, unless otherwise noted, we'll use $d = 2500$ and $m = 50$. The size of the file containing the 54,685 term vectors is then 547,724,964 bytes, including some overhead. The number of available seed vectors being $\approx 2.0 \times 10^{255}$ the risk of collision is totally negligible.

The 100 first neighbors of *maison* are listed by decreasing similarity in table 1 next page. It is clear that the proximity decreases with σ , but that those neighboring words are all reasonably close to *maison* in its various meanings.

Table 1 - First 100 neighbors of *maison*

From 1 to 20		From 21 to 40		From 41 to 60		From 61 to 80		From 81 to 100						
1	1.000	maison	21	0.499	chez-soi	41	0.309	ménage	61	0.207	ermitage	81	0.163	domestique
2	0.843	demeure	22	0.498	cassine	42	0.307	bâtiment	62	0.204	appartement	82	0.162	plaque_de_blindage
3	0.820	habitation	23	0.491	cabane	43	0.306	case	63	0.198	cagna	83	0.159	mas
4	0.810	logis	24	0.486	gourbi	44	0.301	taudis	64	0.191	reposée	84	0.155	tanière
5	0.767	domicile	25	0.480	gîte	45	0.300	chalet	65	0.190	chartreuse	85	0.154	cache
6	0.762	pénates	26	0.477	bercail	46	0.292	pavillon	66	0.188	domesticité	86	0.152	niche
7	0.677	home	27	0.460	masure	47	0.292	villa	67	0.187	garde-meubles	87	0.151	rendez-vous_de_chasse
8	0.669	mesnil	28	0.436	asile	48	0.287	chaumière	68	0.186	gabionnade	88	0.151	repaire
9	0.661	chacunière	29	0.428	château	49	0.278	manse	69	0.182	lignée	89	0.149	clinique
10	0.659	foyer	30	0.404	immeuble	50	0.275	hôtel_particulier	70	0.180	caponnière	90	0.148	gloriette
11	0.653	train_de_maison	31	0.403	hutte	51	0.265	isba	71	0.172	fermette	91	0.147	havre
12	0.603	logement	32	0.385	maisonnette	52	0.254	bas-lieu	72	0.171	grand_ensemble	92	0.147	lapinière
13	0.596	maisonnée	33	0.382	ménil	53	0.249	manoir	73	0.171	lieu	93	0.146	kiosque
14	0.593	nid	34	0.374	abri	54	0.244	hôtel	74	0.171	famille	94	0.146	intérieur
15	0.576	résidence	35	0.369	galeas	55	0.241	standing	75	0.167	garde-meuble	95	0.144	bouverie
16	0.572	toit	36	0.368	lars	56	0.240	H.L.M.	76	0.167	deck-house	96	0.144	parents
17	0.545	bicoque	37	0.350	lare	57	0.233	habitable	77	0.166	habitat	97	0.143	tourelle
18	0.537	bâtisse	38	0.338	clapier	58	0.223	retraite	78	0.166	édifice	98	0.143	mantelet
19	0.532	cahute	39	0.331	palais	59	0.211	carbet	79	0.164	firme	99	0.142	hangar
20	0.502	baraque	40	0.314	train_de_vie	60	0.208	séjour	80	0.163	tranchée-abri	100	0.141	pigeonnier

Table 4 - First 100 neighbors of *barde*

From 1 to 20		From 21 to 40		From 41 to 60		From 61 to 80		From 81 to 100						
1	1.000	barde	21	0.298	versificateur	41	0.167	croque-notes	61	0.097	victimaire	81	0.080	injuré
2	0.839	aède	22	0.297	mâche-laurier	42	0.157	choriste	62	0.096	flamine	82	0.079	septemvir
3	0.717	tranche_de_lard	23	0.290	héros_du_Pinde	43	0.148	harnais	63	0.096	prestolet	83	0.079	lama
4	0.625	chantre	24	0.290	favori_des_Muses	44	0.147	prêtre	64	0.094	iman	84	0.078	salien
5	0.533	poète	25	0.289	amant_du_Parnasse	45	0.146	cigale	65	0.094	mufti	85	0.078	brachyne
6	0.521	chanteur	26	0.286	favori_du_Parnasse	46	0.124	coryphée	66	0.094	ratichon	86	0.077	ménéstrier
7	0.503	rhapsode	27	0.285	nourrisson_du_Parnasse	47	0.119	trouveur	67	0.093	ovate	87	0.076	curé
8	0.493	bardit	28	0.285	poèteureau	48	0.114	corybante	68	0.093	utopiste	88	0.076	talapoin
9	0.468	trouvère	29	0.284	métromane	49	0.110	luperque	69	0.091	ministre_du_culte	89	0.075	épulon
10	0.450	scalde	30	0.284	citharède	50	0.110	muezzin	70	0.090	pope	90	0.074	mettre_dans_le_même_sac
11	0.427	troubadour	31	0.282	crooner	51	0.109	druide	71	0.090	mystagogue	91	0.074	immodérément
12	0.421	minnesinger	32	0.276	félibre	52	0.105	eubage	72	0.090	cantatrice	92	0.074	sacrificateur
13	0.328	nourrisson_du_Pinde	33	0.274	duettiste	53	0.105	parolier	73	0.089	archiprêtre	93	0.074	bombardier
14	0.323	amant_des_Muses	34	0.267	rapsode	54	0.103	quindecemvir	74	0.086	sous-ventrière	94	0.073	lévite
15	0.315	lamelle	35	0.256	ménéstrel	55	0.103	mollah	75	0.085	abbé	95	0.073	englober
16	0.313	favori_d'Apollon	36	0.240	rimeur	56	0.103	padre	76	0.084	curète	96	0.072	chiennerie
17	0.313	fil_s_d'Apollon	37	0.233	rimailleur	57	0.102	hiérogammat	77	0.084	papas	97	0.072	rabbin
18	0.308	nourrisson_des_Muses	38	0.216	panne	58	0.100	saronide	78	0.082	avarice	98	0.072	passivité
19	0.302	enfant_d'Apollon	39	0.207	choreute	59	0.097	chansonnier	79	0.081	quindecemvir	99	0.072	capelan
20	0.300	maître_du_Pinde	40	0.176	vocaliste	60	0.097	chapelain	80	0.080	officiant	100	0.072	eschatologique

If we meant *barde* as *aède*, the third neighbor, *tranche_de_lard* is clearly not appropriate, and conversely.

However, in a Euclidean space, the Schmidt orthogonalization procedure does remove this kind of interference. Since term vectors are normalized to unity, one needs simply to subtract from the vector $|barde\rangle$ the collinear component of the vector $|tranche_de_lard\rangle$:

$$|barde\rangle_{\perp tranche_de_lard} = |barde\rangle - \langle barde|tranche_de_lard\rangle \times |tranche_de_lard\rangle \tag{8}$$

with the following result, where the perturbation due to *tranche_de_lard* is totally eliminated:

Table 5 - First 100 neighbors of *barde* orthogonalized w.r.t. *tranche_de_lard*

From 1 to 20		From 21 to 40		From 41 to 60		From 61 to 80		From 81 to 100						
1	0.744	aède	21	0.396	poèteureau	41	0.217	croque-notes	61	0.162	harnais	81	0.130	lama
2	0.697	barde	22	0.396	maître_du_Pinde	42	0.215	lamelle	62	0.161	prestolet	82	0.130	papas
3	0.634	chantre	23	0.394	mâche-laurier	43	0.205	coryphée	63	0.161	curète	83	0.126	soliste
4	0.634	scalde	24	0.393	favori_des_Muses	44	0.188	cantatrice	64	0.157	ministre_du_culte	84	0.124	talapoin
5	0.629	poète	25	0.389	nourrisson_du_Parnasse	45	0.185	quindecemvir	65	0.157	chapelain	85	0.121	directeur_de_conscience
6	0.622	chanteur	26	0.389	amant_du_Parnasse	46	0.183	mystagogue	66	0.157	eubage	86	0.120	utopiste
7	0.582	minnesinger	27	0.387	héros_du_Pinde	47	0.178	luperque	67	0.156	mufti	87	0.120	prêtraille
8	0.548	trouvère	28	0.380	félibre	48	0.177	padre	68	0.155	saronide	88	0.115	ceinture_de_sécurité
9	0.525	rhapsode	29	0.380	rapsode	49	0.177	mollah	69	0.153	trouveur	89	0.113	curé
10	0.523	troubadour	30	0.364	versificateur	50	0.175	muezzin	70	0.152	ovate	90	0.113	sacrificateur
11	0.429	nourrisson_du_Pinde	31	0.337	ménéstrel	51	0.173	hiérogammat	71	0.144	parolier	91	0.109	rabbin
12	0.415	crooner	32	0.333	métromane	52	0.172	ratichon	72	0.140	chansonnier	92	0.106	salien
13	0.414	amant_des_Muses	33	0.319	choreute	53	0.172	quindecemvir	73	0.139	hiérophante	93	0.105	aumônier
14	0.414	nourrisson_des_Muses	34	0.292	rimeur	54	0.171	corybante	74	0.139	pope	94	0.105	sous-ventrière
15	0.409	favori_d'Apollon	35	0.287	rimailleur	55	0.170	archiprêtre	75	0.137	diva	95	0.105	capelan
16	0.408	citharède	36	0.282	bardit	56	0.169	druide	76	0.137	épulon	96	0.105	affublement
17	0.405	duettiste	37	0.242	choriste	57	0.168	victimaire	77	0.135	abbé	97	0.104	virtuose
18	0.404	favori_du_Parnasse	38	0.231	vocaliste	58	0.168	cigale	78	0.134	septemvir	98	0.104	ménéstrier
19	0.400	fil_s_d'Apollon	39	0.224	panne	59	0.165	flamine	79	0.133	musicien	99	0.102	exécutant
20	0.397	enfant_d'Apollon	40	0.218	prêtre	60	0.165	iman	80	0.131	officiant	100	0.096	ténor

The number of terms which can be subtracted is only limited by the noise.

The corresponding clusters associated with |barde) *_tranche_de_lard* now are:

àède, barde, poète, chanteur, chantre					
0.71 chanteur	0.55 troubadour	0.44 fils_d'Apollon	0.43	0.42 favori_des_Muses	0.36 rapsode
0.71 àède	0.52 barde	0.44 maître_du_Pinde	amant_du_Parnasse	0.42 héros_du_Pinde	0.35 choriste
0.70 scalde	0.48 rhapsode	0.43	0.42	0.42 choreute	0.34 métromane
0.70 chantre	0.47 duettiste	nourrisson_du_Pinde	nourrisson_des_Muses	0.41 amant_des_Muses	0.31 rimailleur
0.66 poète	0.46 crooner	0.43 mâche-laurier	0.42 enfant_d'Apollon	0.40 félibre	0.30 rimeur
0.61 minnesinger	0.46 citharède	0.43	0.42 favori_d'Apollon	0.37 versificateur	0.28 vocaliste
0.55 trouvère	0.44 poèteureau	nourrisson_du_Parnasse	0.42 favori_du_Parnasse	0.36 ménestrel	0.27 coryphée
bardit, harnais, prêtre, lamelle, panne, rhapsode, troubadour, trouvère					
0.29 trouvère	0.28 minnesinger				
0.29 troubadour					

to be compared to the non-orthogonalized result:

àède, barde, chanteur, chantre, poète					
0.79 àède	0.54 trouvère	0.40 fils_d'Apollon	0.40	0.39 favori_d'Apollon	0.32 choriste
0.72 chantre	0.52 troubadour	0.40 maître_du_Pinde	nourrisson_du_Parnasse	0.39 choreute	0.32 tranche_de_lard
0.70 barde	0.50 rhapsode	0.40 mâche-laurier	0.40	0.38 favori_du_Parnasse	0.32 rapsode
0.69 chanteur	0.42 duettiste	0.40	nourrisson_des_Muses	0.38 amant_des_Muses	0.32 métromane
0.64 scalde	0.42 citharède	nourrisson_du_Pinde	0.39 héros_du_Pinde	0.38 félibre	0.28 rimailleur
0.63 poète	0.42 crooner	0.40	0.39 enfant_d'Apollon	0.34 versificateur	0.27 rimeur
0.56 minnesinger	0.41 poèteureau	amant_du_Parnasse	0.39 favori_des_Muses	0.33 ménestrel	0.25 vocaliste
bardit, tranche_de_lard, lamelle, rhapsode, troubadour, trouvère					
0.48 barde	0.41 àède	0.34 rhapsode	0.31 chanteur	0.28 bardit	
0.42 trouvère	0.37 minnesinger	0.33 tranche_de_lard	0.30 félibre	0.25 scalde	
0.41 troubadour	0.35 poète	0.32 ménestrel	0.29 chantre		
harnais, panne, prêtre					
0.35 panne	0.27 corybante	0.27 flamme	0.27 quindecemvir	0.26 mystagogue	ceinture_de_sécurité
0.34 harnais	0.27 mufti	0.27 curète	0.27 mollah	0.26 chapelain	0.26 affublement
0.34 prêtre	0.27 iman	0.27 hiéogrammate	0.27 padre	0.26 quindécemvir	0.25 harnois
0.28 muezzin	0.27 ovate	0.27 archiprêtre	0.27 luperque	0.26	

Conclusion and future work

We have shown how to construct a Euclidean semantic space from a French synonym dictionary by combining random vectors and random projection with the usual vector space model. The process is extremely fast and introduces an amount of noise acceptable in most situations. Updating the semantic space with new synonyms involves handling only a limited number of terms and is thus easily done in real time. As usual, the inner product between two normalized term vectors in the resulting semantic space is interpreted as the similarity between the terms. In additions, the Schmidt orthogonalization process is immediately applicable and can be used to separate semantically disjoint homonyms. The resulting semantic space is directly suited to the generation of practical lists of synonyms and to applications such as word selection for automatic text generation.

This process can be applied to any language, including English, where for example WordNet could be used as a basis. It can also be easily extended to collocations or to contexonyms [15](#), [16](#), [17](#). In future work, we plan on expanding this method by building a dynamic semantic space from Wikipedia and its "history" pages, whereby the evolution of the meaning of terms as a function of time can be viewed through the evolution of their semantic neighborhoods. This could also be done using time series from newspapers, from radio and television. We are also considering building a real-time semantic space from news and social networking services such as Twitter.

Bibliography

- [1] Ploux, S. and Victorri, B., Construction d'espaces sémantiques à l'aide de dictionnaires de synonymes, *Traitement Automatique des Langues, ATALA* (1998) Pages 161-182.
- [2] Salton, G., Automatic Information Extraction and Retrieval, 1968.
- [3] Salton, G., Automatic Text Processing, *Addison-Wesley Publishing Company*, ISBN 0-201-12227-8, 1989.
- [4] Ji, H., J., Ploux, S., Wehrli, E., Lexical Knowledge Representation with Contexonyms, *Proceedings of the 9th MT summit*, 2008, pp. 194-201.
- [5] Deerwester, S. *et al.*, Improving Information Retrieval with Latent Semantic Indexing, *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science (25)*, 1988.
- [6] Lebart, L. and Salem, A., *Statistique Textuelle*, p. 91, Dunod, 1994.
- [7] Goldberg, Y., A Primer on Neural Network Models for Natural Language Processing, Draft, 2015.
- [8] Mikolov, T., Chen, K., Corrado, G. and Dean, J., Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space, arXiv:1301.3781v3, 2013.
- [9] Mikolov, T., Sutskever, I., Chen, K., Corrado, G. and Dean, J., Distributed Representations of Words and Phrases and their Compositionality, arXiv:1310.4546v1, 2013.
- [10] Dasgupta S., Technical Perspective: Strange Effects in High Dimension, *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 53 (2010) No. 2, Page 96.
- [11] Johnson, W. and Lindenstrauss, J., Extensions of Lipschitz maps into a Hilbert space, *Contemporary Mathematics* 26, (1984), pp. 189-206.
- [12] Sahlgren, M., The Word-Space Model: Using Distributional Analysis to Represent Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Relations between Words in High-dimensional Vector Spaces, *PhD Dissertation*, Stockholm University, Sweden, 2006..
- [13] QasemiZadeh, B. and Handschuh, S., Random Indexing Explained with High Probability, *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Text, Speech and Dialog*, Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [14] Paradis, R., Guo, J.K., Moulton, J., Cameron, D. and Kanerva, P., Finding Semantic Equivalence of Text Using Random Index Vectors , *Procedia Computer Science* 20, 2013, pp. 454-459.
- [15] Boussidan, A., Dynamics of semantic change, *PhD Dissertation*, Université Lumière-Lyon2, France, 2013.
- [16] Ji, H., J., Ploux, S., Wehrli, E., *ibid.*.
- [17] Boussidan, A., Renon A.-L., Franco C., Lupone S. and Ploux, S., Repérage automatique de la néologie sémantique en corpus à travers des représentations cartographiques évolutives, To be published, 2010?.