

JAILBREAKING LLMs' SAFEGUARD WITH UNIVERSAL MAGIC WORDS FOR TEXT EMBEDDING MODELS

HAOYU LIANG^{1,*}, YOURAN SUN^{2,*}, YUNFENG CAI³, JUN ZHU^{1,†}, AND BO ZHANG¹

ABSTRACT. The security issue of large language models (LLMs) has gained significant attention recently, with various defense mechanisms developed to prevent harmful outputs, among which safeguards based on text embedding models serve as a fundamental defense. Through testing, we discover that the distribution of text embedding model outputs is significantly biased with a large mean. Inspired by this observation, we propose novel efficient methods to search for **universal magic words** that can attack text embedding models. The universal magic words as suffixes can move the embedding of any text towards the bias direction, therefore manipulate the similarity of any text pair and mislead safeguards. By appending magic words to user prompts and requiring LLMs to end answers with magic words, attackers can jailbreak the safeguard. To eradicate this security risk, we also propose defense mechanisms against such attacks, which can correct the biased distribution of text embeddings in a train-free manner.

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, large language models (LLMs) have been widely applied in the industry, such as chat systems [6] and search engines [31]. However, LLMs can be maliciously exploited to extract harmful output, making LLM security an important research topic.




FIGURE 1. (a) The distribution of cosine similarity between text embedding $e(s)$ of text s with normalized mean embedding e^* of all text, tested on various text embedding models. (b) The text embeddings lie in a spherical band on the embedding space S^{d-1} .

In this topic, it is of great significance to discover security vulnerabilities of text embedding models and propose the corresponding defense methods. Current LLMs security strategies include safety training [4] and input-output safeguard [35]. Lightweight text classifiers based on text embedding models [17] can be used as safeguards to classify whether LLM's inputs or outputs are harmful. This method can serve as a foundational line of defense because of its low cost and the ability to maintain the performance of LLMs. In addition, text embedding models are also used by modern search engines. Therefore, the robustness of text embedding models affects the security of both LLMs and search engines.

Attacking LLMs' safeguards is challenging because the output of LLMs is unknown, the safeguard is a black box, and the token space is vast and discrete. This results in the following limitations of existing attack methods on text embedding models: 1) Case-by-case attack methods require access to LLMs' output before the guard, which is unrealistic for online dialogue systems; 2) attack methods based on gradients of text embedding

¹DEPT. OF COMP. SCI. AND TECH., INST. FOR AI, TSINGHUA-BOSCH JOINT ML CENTER, THBI LAB, BNRIST CENTER, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, CHINA

²DEPT. OF MATH. SCI, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, CHINA

³BEIJING INST. OF MATH. SCI. AND APP. (BIMSA), BEIJING, CHINA

*EQUAL CONTRIBUTION.

†CORRESPONDENCE TO: JUN ZHU <DCSZJ@MAIL.TSINGHUA.EDU.CN>




FIGURE 2. Attack the safeguard of LLMs. The input guard is attacked directly, and the output guard is indirectly attacked by requiring LLMs to append universal magic words to its output.

models are white-box attacks, which are also unrealistic; 3) brute-force search for prompt perturbations requires traversing a massive token space, leading to high time costs.

To address these challenges, we propose an innovative approach to attack LLMs’ safeguard based on text embedding models: to find a universal “magic word” (i.e., adversarial suffix) that would increase or decrease the embedding similarity between any pair of texts to mislead the safeguard in classifying within the text embedding space.

This task is feasible based on the following observation: We tested several text embedding models and found that the cosine similarities between text embeddings and their mean (normalized) concentrate near a significant positive value, as shown in Figure 1(a). In other words, text embeddings do not distribute uniformly on a high-dimensional sphere S^{d-1} (since they are normalized); instead, they concentrate in a band on the sphere, as illustrated in Figure 1(b). The direction of distribution bias is similar to all text embeddings, while the opposite direction is dissimilar to all embeddings. This implies that if we can find suffixes that push any text towards this biased direction, we can increase the similarity of the text with other texts. Similarly, one could also try to find suffixes that reduce text similarity. These words would serve as universal magic words. We can mislead the safeguard by manipulating text similarity with universal magic words.

We use the mean of text embeddings and the principal singular vector to estimate the bias direction (see Sec 3.1). Actual tests and theoretical analysis show that the results of both methods are equivalent.

Based on the identified bias direction, we use three methods to find universal magic words (see Sec 3.2): Method 1: Brute-force search without utilizing the bias direction, used as a baseline. Method 2 (black box): Find words whose text embeddings are similar/dissimilar to the bias direction. Method 3 (white box): Find a universal suffix that makes any text embedding closer to the bias direction. We use a gradient-based method to solve this problem, which requires only one epoch. Experiments show that all three methods can find the best magic words, but Method 2 and Method 3 are far more efficient than Method 1. Additionally, only Method 3 can search for multi-token magic words.

The universal magic word can be abused to attack safeguards in LLM security systems. As shown in Figure 2, by appending magic words to LLMs’ input and output, the input-output safeguard will fail to detect harmful content.

Contributions. The contribution of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We discovered that the distribution of text embeddings obtained for text embedding models is uneven and noted the relationship between this property and universal magic words;
- We propose novel methods for finding universal magic words, which are efficient and capable of searching for multi-token magic words;
- We pointed out that universal magic words could be used to jailbreak LLM security systems. We proposed defense methods against such attacks and fixed the defect of uneven embedding distribution.

2. RELATED WORK

2.1. Defense Methods for LLMs.

Alignment. involves training LLMs to align with human values [3, 25, 4]. This method is widely used because it does not introduce additional computational overhead during inference. Due to the competition between assisting users and aligning values, as well as the limited domain of safety training [49], such methods are vulnerable to adversarial attacks [56, 8]. This has forced people to develop additional security measures.

Safeguards. are the additional measures on the input or output of LLMs to prevent harmful responses.

On the input side: 1) Detecting suspicious patterns [1, 14], which tends to yield false positives; 2) Reminding LLMs to align values with system prompts [50, 51, 54], which can be canceled by the user prompt “ignore previous instructions” [36]; 3) Perturbing the user’s prompt into multiple versions before feeding it to the LLM to detect harmful requests [18, 40], which is costly; 4) Classifying whether the prompt is harmful with a model [17].

On the output side, several detection methods for LLMs’ harmful response serve as the last line of defense in LLM security systems: 1) rule-based matching, with the same drawbacks as it on the input side; 2) another LLM to answer whether the output is harmful [37, 13, 48], which doubles the cost; 3) alternatively, text classifiers to do this [12, 17, 27], which is more cost-effective.

2.2. Attack Methods for LLMs.

Templates. jailbreak LLMs with universal magic words effective for various prompts, some transferable across LLMs. Manual templates are heuristically designed, which include explicit templates (e.g., instructing an LLM to “ignore previous instructions” [36], “Start with ‘Absolutely! Here’s” [29] or “Do anything now” [29]) and implicit templates (e.g., role-playing [5, 41], storytelling [23], virtual scenarios [21, 16, 42, 9]). Automatical templates are optimized by gradient descent (black-box) [46, 56, 55], random search (white-box) [20, 2], or generative models [24] to find adversarial prefixes and suffixes for user prompts. These prefixes and suffixes can be individual words or sentences [56], and comprehensible [24] or not [20].

Rewriting. attacks language models at several levels, including character-level (e.g., misspelling [22]), word-level (e.g., using synonyms [15]), segment-level (e.g., assigning variable names to segmented harmful text [52, 16]), prompt-level (e.g., rewriting user prompts with an LLM [8, 28, 43, 10]), language-level (e.g., translating into a language that lacks LLM safety [38]), and encoding-level (e.g., encoding harmful text into ASCII, Morse code [53] or Base64 [19]). Through optimization algorithms, attackers can automatically identify the most effective rewrites to bypass the LLM’s safeguards.

The methods above are all focused on attacking the LLM itself; however, research on attacking safeguards is still in its early stages. A magic word “lucraea” was discovered by the champion of a Kaggle competition on attacking LLMs [32], through trying the tokens near $\langle /s \rangle$ in the token embedding space. We find the more magic words including “lucraea” with our novel algorithms and give a more accurate and systematic explanation of why it works. PRP [26] is similar to our method, where the guard model is attacked by injecting adversarial prefixes (i.e., magic words) into LLMs’ response. The distinction between our work and PRP are: 1) we attack guards based on text embedding models, which are more lightweight and cost-effective than LLM-based guards in PRP; 2) we discovered the uneven distribution of text embeddings, enabling us to design algorithms to search for adversarial prefixes that are more efficient than PRP.

3. METHOD

Notation. Let s_1 and s_2 be two strings, and let r be a positive integer. The operation $s_1 + s_2$ denotes the concatenation of the strings s_1 and s_2 , while $r * s_2$ represents the string s_2 repeated r times. For example, if $s_1 = \text{“he”}$, $s_2 = \text{“llo”}$, then $s_1 + s_2 = \text{“hello”}$, $s_1 + 2 * s_2 = \text{“hellollo”}$. Denote the text embedding of s_1 by $e(s_1)$ and its dimension by d . We require $e(s_1)$ to be a unit vector. The cosine similarity between s_1 and s_2 is defined as

$$(1) \quad \cos \theta(s_1, s_2) := e(s_1)^\top e(s_2).$$

Concretely, text embedding $e(s)$ of text s is computed by $e(s) = \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{s})$, $\mathbf{s} = E\tau(s)$, where τ is a tokenizer that splits a piece of text s into l tokens, $\tau(s) \in \{0, 1\}^{T \times l}$ is one-hot per column, $E \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$ is a token embedding matrix (T is the token vocabulary size, d is the dimension of token embeddings), $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times l}$ is the representation of s in the token embedding space, and \mathbf{e} is the core of the text embedding model e .

Assumption 3.1. There exists a word w^+ satisfying that

$$(2) \quad \cos \theta(s_1 + w^+, s_2) \geq \cos \theta_*^+,$$

holds for any text s_1 and s_2 , where $\cos \theta_*^+$ is a number close to 1. We call w^+ as a **positive universal magic word** for the text embedding model e , which can force any pair of texts to be similar enough in the text embedding space.

Problem. Find all possible universal magic words w ’s such that Assumption 3.1 holds.

3.1. Description of the Uneven Direction. To describe the unevenness of the text embedding distribution, we represent the bias direction of the distribution by the normalized mean of text embeddings e^* or the principal singular vector v^* of the text embedding matrix. We prove that any text appended by a positive universal magic word w^+ will be close to e^* (or v^*). This serves as the guiding principle for our magic words in Sec 3.2.

The mean of text embeddings is denoted as

$$(3) \quad \bar{e} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_i e(s_i), \quad e^* = \frac{\bar{e}}{\|\bar{e}\|},$$




FIGURE 3. Positive magic words can force text embedding to move towards the normalized mean e^* . The same effect occurs for the principal singular vector v^* . Negative magic words can force text embedding to move away from its original position.

where $\mathcal{S} = \{s_i\}_i$ is the set of all possible text.

The following proposition tells that under Assumption 3.1, the embedding of any text appended by a magic word will be close to e^* .

Proposition 3.2. *Under Assumption 3.1, a positive universal magic word w^+ must satisfy*

$$\cos \theta(e(s+w^+), e^*) \geq \sqrt{1 - \tan^2 \theta_*^+}, \quad \forall s.$$

Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times d}$, where the i -th row of X is $e(s_i)^\top$, v^* be the *right singular vector* of X corresponding to the largest singular value.

The following proposition tells that under Assumption 3.1, the embedding of any text appended by a magic word will be close to v^* .

Proposition 3.3. *Under Assumption 3.1, a positive universal magic word w^+ must satisfy*

$$\cos \theta(e(s+w^+), v^*) \geq \sqrt{1 - \tan^2 \theta_*^+}, \quad \forall s.$$

See Appendix A for the proof of the two propositions.

In the experiments (Sec. 4.1), we found that e^* and v^* are almost identical, so in the subsequent description of our method, we will only refer to e^* .

3.2. Searching for Universal Magic Words. We want to find **universal magic words**, which as suffixes could make that text similar or dissimilar with other texts in the embedding space. We refer to the words that increase text similarity as **positive magic words** and those that decrease text similarity as **negative magic words**.

Brute-Force Method. The simplest method to find magic words is brute-force search, shown in Algorithm 1. This method directly calculate the similarity score defined below of all tokens in the vocabulary set, and find the top- k_0 magic words. This method does not rely on the bias direction.

For each token t_i in the vocabulary $\mathcal{T} = \{t_i\}_i$, we define its positive similarity score as

$$(4) \quad c_i^+ = \max_{1 \leq r \leq 16} \sum_{j,k} \cos \theta(s_j + r * t_i, s_k),$$

Tokens with higher positive scores are more effective as positive magic words. r represents the repetition count. Repeating the magic word appropriately can amplify its effect. However, we limit r to a maximum of 16 to avoid completely distorting the text.

Finding negative magic words requires more data. Specifically, in addition to the text s_i , we also need another set of text s'_i that is semantically similar to s_i but phrased differently. This is because the effect of a negative magic word is to make synonymous text no longer synonymous. Now the set of text pairs is in the form $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \{(s_i, s'_i)\}_i$ with $\cos \theta(s_i, s'_i)$ close to 1. We define the negative similarity score of t_i as

$$(5) \quad c_i^- = \min_{1 \leq r \leq 16} \sum_j \cos \theta(s_j + r * t_i, s'_j).$$

The lower negative similarity score indicates the more effectiveness of a magic words to make a text dissimilar with its original semantics.

Context-Free Method. We know that due to the uneven distribution of text embeddings in the embedding space, all text embeddings tend to be closer to e^* and farther from $-e^*$. Thus, tokens whose text embeddings are more parallel to e^* are likely to be magic words. Specifically, for a given $t_i \in \mathcal{T}$, we select the tokens with the maximum and minimum scores as magic word candidates based on the following score

$$(6) \quad c_i = e(r * t_i)^\top e^*,$$

where r is the repetition count, which we set between 3 and 5. This method is summarized in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 1 Brute-Force Method

Input: A set of text pairs $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \{(s_i, s'_i)\}_i$, and a vocabulary set $\mathcal{T} = \{t_i\}_i$, top- k_0 magic words
for t_i in \mathcal{T} **do**
 $c_i^+ \leftarrow \max_{1 \leq r \leq 16} \sum_{j,k} \cos \theta(s_j + r * t_i, s_k)$
 $c_i^- \leftarrow \min_{1 \leq r \leq 16} \sum_j \cos \theta(s_j + r * t_i, s'_j)$
end for
 $w^+ \leftarrow \text{getWord}(\text{topk}_i(c_i^+, k_0))$
 $w^- \leftarrow \text{getWord}(\text{topk}_i(-c_i^-, k_0))$
Output: w^\pm ▷ pos./neg. magic word

Algorithm 2 Context-Free Method

Input: text set $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$, vocabulary set $\mathcal{T} = \{t_i\}_i$, normalized mean e^* , repetition times r , candidate number k
for t_i in \mathcal{T} **do**
 $c_i \leftarrow e(r * t_i)^\top e^*$
end for
 $\mathcal{T}^\pm \leftarrow \text{getWord}(\text{topk}_i(\pm c_i, k))$ ▷ candidate list
 $w^\pm \leftarrow \text{Algorithm1}(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{T}^\pm)$
Output: w^\pm ▷ pos./neg. magic word

Gradient-Based Method. The above two methods cannot be used to compute multi-token magic words and do not utilize first-order information. What if we can access all the model parameters (white-box setting) and wish to leverage gradients? To address this, we need to formulate the problem more specifically. The magic words we aim to find consist of one or several tokens, denoted as w , that maximizes the following objective function:

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmax}_w \sum_{i,j} \cos \theta(s_i + w, s_j) \\ & = \operatorname{argmax}_w \sum_i \cos \theta(s_i + w, e^*) \end{aligned}$$

Unlike adversarial attacks in computer vision, the vocabulary's discreteness introduces significant optimization challenges. To address this, we split the optimization into two steps. In the first step, we search for the optimal token embeddings $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ (w is an m -token string) by solving:

$$(8) \quad \operatorname{argmax}_t \sum_i \mathbf{e}([s, \mathbf{t}])^\top e^*$$

In the second step, we identify the token(s) closest to these optimal token embeddings.

Eq. (8) can be further simplified. We assume that $\mathbf{e}([s, \mathbf{t}])$ is close to $\mathbf{e}([s, \mathbf{0}])$. Therefore, Eq. (8) can be approximated as

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmax}_t \sum_i (\mathbf{e}([s_i, \mathbf{0}]) + J(\mathbf{s}_i) \mathbf{t})^\top e^* \\ & = \operatorname{argmax}_t \mathbf{t}^\top \left(\sum_i J(\mathbf{s}_i) \right)^\top e^*, \end{aligned}$$

where $J(\mathbf{s}_i) := \frac{\partial \mathbf{e}([s_i, \mathbf{t}])}{\partial \mathbf{t}} \Big|_{\mathbf{t}=\mathbf{0}}$ denotes the Jacobian of the model \mathbf{e} at \mathbf{s}_i . The solution to the above problem is

$$(10) \quad \mathbf{t}^* \propto \left(\sum_i J(\mathbf{s}_i) \right)^\top e^*,$$

Interestingly, this \mathbf{t}^* is exactly the gradient of the following objective function with respect to \mathbf{t}

$$(11) \quad L = \sum_i \cos \theta(s_i + \mathbf{t}, e^*)$$

In other words, our method requires only one step of gradient descent in one epoch with respect to L . The similar conclusion also holds for negative magic words. This leads to the algorithm described in Algorithm 3.

Table 1 compares the three methods in terms of speed, scenario (black-box/white-box), and their ability to compute multi-token magic words.

3.3. Attacking LLMs' Safeguard. As shown in Figure 2, we can append magic words to the query so as to directly attack the input guard of LLMs, and require the LLM to end answers with magic words so as to indirectly attack the output guard.

This method works by moving text embedding out of data manifold. As shown in Figure 3, the data manifold in text embedding space is a band on the sphere. Positive magic words can push the text embedding towards e^* ,

Algorithm 3 Gradient-Based Method

Input: text set $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$, vocabulary set $\mathcal{T} = \{t_i\}_i$, normalized mean e^* , m -token magic word, candidate number k
 $t^{*\pm} \leftarrow \text{zeros}(d, m)$
for s_i in \mathcal{S} **do**
 $t \leftarrow \text{rand}(d, m)$
 $L^+ \leftarrow e(s_i + t)^\top e^*$
 $L^- \leftarrow e(s_i + t)^\top e(s'_i)$
 $t^{*\pm} \leftarrow t^{*\pm} + \partial L^\pm / \partial t$
end for $\triangleright t^{*\pm}$ is the optimal m -token embedding
 $[\mathcal{T}_1^\pm, \dots, \mathcal{T}_m^\pm] = \text{getWord}(\text{topk}(\pm E^\top t^*, k, \text{dim} = 0))$ $\triangleright \mathcal{T}_i^\pm$ contains k candidates for i -th token
 $\mathcal{T}^\pm = \mathcal{T}_1^\pm \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}_m^\pm$ \triangleright candidate list
 $w^\pm \leftarrow \text{Algorithm1}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}^\pm)$
Output: w^\pm \triangleright pos./neg. magic word

TABLE 1. Comparasion of Different Methods

Methods	Brute-Force	Context-Free	Gradient-Based
Speed	Slow	Fast	Fast
White/Black Box	Black	Black	White
Multi-token	No	No	Yes

i.e. along the normal direction of the manifold, and safeguards fail to work properly outside the manifold due to the lack of training data. Negative magic words can push the embedding of a harmful text far away from its original position with harmful semantics, leading to a harmless classification output.

Besides jailbreaking LLMs’, universal magic words may also be used to manipulate search rankings. Since most modern search engines are enhanced by text embedding models [31], abusers can increase the embedding similarity between their entries with any queries by inserting universal magic words into their entries.

4. EXPERIMENTS

We tested our method on several state-of-the-art models from the MTEB text embedding benchmark [30]. Specifically, we evaluated sentence-t5-base [33], nomic-embed-text-v1 [34], e5-base-v2 [47], and jina-embeddings-v2-base-en [11]. Additionally, considering that large language models (LLMs) are sometimes directly used as text embeddings, we also tested Qwen2.5-0.5B [39] with mean pooling. We used sentence-transformers/simple-wiki [44] as the text dataset $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \{(s_i, s'_i)\}_i$, where s_i is an English Wikipedia entry, and s'_i is its simplified variant.

4.1. Bias Direction. Since the full dataset is massive, we sampled 1/100 of all entries to estimate the mean of the text embeddings. This still leaves us with 1,000 entries, which is sufficient to accurately estimate the mean and the principal singular vector. In our experiments, we found that the normalized mean vector e^* is almost identical to the principal singular vector v^* as shown in Table 2. In appendix B, we will explain that this is a property of biased distributions.

TABLE 2. The overlap between the normalized mean vector e^* and the principal singular vector v^* .

Model	$ e^* \cdot v^* $
sentence-t5-base	$1 - 1.7 \times 10^{-6}$
Qwen2.5-0.5B	$1 - 1.4 \times 10^{-5}$
nomic-embed-text-v1	$1 - 2.9 \times 10^{-5}$
e5-base-v2	$1 - 0.7 \times 10^{-6}$
jina-embeddings-v2-base-en	$1 - 3.3 \times 10^{-6}$

4.2. One-token Magic Words. The universal magic words obtained for each model using our methods are shown in Table 3. Here, (Clean) represents the data distribution (mean \pm standard deviation) without magic word added. The data corresponding to each magic word indicates how much it can skew the embeddings’ cosine similarity and how many standard deviations it corresponds to. The effect of positive magic words is computed using Eq. (4), while the effect of negative magic words is computed using Eq. (5).

TABLE 3. The magic words for different text embedding models found by all the three methods, and their similarity scores.

Model	Positive		Negative	
	magic word	similarity c_i^+	magic word	similarity c_i^-
sentence-t5-base	(Clean)	0.71 ± 0.03	(Clean)	0.96 ± 0.04
	</s>	$0.79 = \mu + 2.5\sigma$	dumneavoastra	$0.89 = \mu - 1.7\sigma$
	lucrarea	$0.79 = \mu + 2.4\sigma$	impossible	$0.89 = \mu - 1.6\sigma$
Qwen2.5-0.5B (with mean pooling)	(Clean)	0.81 ± 0.08	(Clean)	0.97 ± 0.03
	Christopher	$0.84 = \mu + 0.4\sigma$	십시	$0.34 = \mu - 24\sigma$
	Boston	$0.84 = \mu + 0.4\sigma$	תוצאות	$0.42 = \mu - 21\sigma$
nomic-embed-text-v1	(Clean)	0.36 ± 0.05	(Clean)	0.90 ± 0.09
	[CLS]	$0.45 = \mu + 1.7\sigma$	sentence	$0.76 = \mu - 1.6\sigma$
	7	$0.42 = \mu + 1.1\sigma$	verb	$0.76 = \mu - 1.6\sigma$
e5-base-v2	(Clean)	0.69 ± 0.03	(Clean)	0.95 ± 0.04
	##abia	$0.71 = \mu + 0.6\sigma$	♣	$0.84 = \mu - 2.4\sigma$
	##($0.71 = \mu + 0.5\sigma$	bobbed	$0.85 = \mu - 2.2\sigma$
jina-embeddings-v2-base-en	(Clean)	0.62 ± 0.04	(Clean)	0.94 ± 0.05
	[SEP]	$0.73 = \mu + 2.7\sigma$	117	$0.84 = \mu - 2.0\sigma$
	##laze	$0.65 = \mu + 0.7\sigma$	geometridae	$0.87 = \mu - 1.5\sigma$

4.3. Multi-token Magic Words. Compared to the other two methods, the advantage of the gradient-based method is its ability to compute multi-token magic words. In Table 4, we list several multi-token magic words computed using Algorithm 3 for the sentence-t5-base model and their respective effects.

TABLE 4. Multi-token magic words of sentence-t5-base model found by Gradient-Based Method.

	magic words	similarity c_i^\pm
pos.	(Clean)	0.71 ± 0.03
	Variety roş	$0.75 = \mu + 1.1\sigma$
	Tel roş	$0.74 = \mu + 1.0\sigma$
neg.	(Clean)	0.96 ± 0.04
	Rocket autre prononce	$0.85 = \mu - 2.5\sigma$
	bourg In claimed	$0.85 = \mu - 2.5\sigma$

4.4. Efficiency. The baseline Algorithm 1 takes all the T tokens in the vocabulary as candidates in its brute-force search for the best one-token magic word w , taking $O(T)$ time. Algorithm 2, 3 obtain top- k candidates for the one-token magic word and then choose the best candidate by a brute-force search, taking $O(k)$ time, which is significantly more efficient than Algorithm 1 when $k \ll T$. If the rank of w in Algorithm 2, 3 is r , w can be found only if $k \geq r$, taking at least $O(r)$ time.

In Table 5, we demonstrate the least number of candidates (T for Algorithm 1 and r for Algorithm 2, 3) for different methods tested on the sentence-t5-base model. In addition, we reported the running time on A100 of the three algorithms in Table 5. Algorithm 2, 3 finish in 1 minute, which are approximately 1000 to 4000 times faster than Algorithm 1.

TABLE 5. The Efficiency of Different Methods, tested on sentence-t5-base model. The lower N_c (number of candidates) indicates the higher efficiency.

N_c	method	Brute-	Context-	Gradient
		Force	Free	Descent
pos.	</s>	32100	2	1
	lucrarea	32100	1	4
neg.	dumneavoastra	32100	23	279
	impossible	32100	1690	189
A100 time		16h	13s	72s

4.5. Attacking Safeguards. We use magic words to attack safeguards based on text embedding. We obtain text embeddings using sentence-t5-base and train various classifiers, including logistic regression, SVM, and a two-hidden-layer MLP, to detect harmful text in both the input and the output of LLMs. The training dataset is JailbreakBench [7]. Subsequently, we use a positive magic word and a negative magic word for sentence-t5-base from Table 3 to attack the safeguards.

The experimental results, as shown in Figure 4, indicate that the magic words significantly reduce the AUC of safeguards, making its classification performance approach random guessing, regardless of the classifier used. This validates the effectiveness of our universal magic words in attacking the safeguards.




FIGURE 4. The ROC (Receiver Operating Characteristic) of input and output guards. Our magic words significantly decrease their AUC (Area Under Curve). Renormalization in text embedding space can mitigate the decrease of AUC and defend this attack.

5. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

As discussed above, the distribution of text embeddings on S^{d-1} is biased towards the bias vector e^* , as shown in the left part of Figure 5. Algorithm 3 finds the inverse image of e^* in the token embedding space, denoted by t^{*+} . Since tokens are discrete, there isn't always a token near t^{*+} in the token embedding space. However, our experiments show that candidates can always be found near t^{*+} .




FIGURE 5. The mappings between text embedding space and token embedding space.

To explain this paradox, we propose the following picture. At the initialization of word embedding models, token embeddings are randomly initialized in the token embedding space. During training, they concentrate towards a certain subset of the token embedding space [45]. This subset must be away from t^{*+} to avoid degrading text embeddings' performance on high-frequency data. However, there are always some low-frequency tokens that are rarely updated by gradient descent and thus remain almost as they were randomly initialized. If they happen to be located near t^{*+} , they are the magic words we are looking for.

6. DEFENSE AGAINST OUR ATTACKS

To minimize the negative impact of our work, we propose the following recommendations to defend our attacks based on the above analysis.

Renormalization. Estimate the mean embedding \bar{e} from a large amount of text, subtract \bar{e} from text embeddings, and renormalize them

$$(12) \quad \tilde{e}(s) := \frac{e(s) - \bar{e}}{\|e(s) - \bar{e}\|}.$$

This can eradicate the security risk. Additionally, renormalization makes the distribution of text embeddings in the embedding space more uniform. Thus, we conjecture that this can improve the performance of text embedding models, representing **a train-free improvement to the text embeddings**.

We tested the defense effect of renormalization against our magic words on the sentence-t5-base model. The experimental setup is the same as Sec. 4.5. As shown in Figure 4, renormalization significantly alleviates the decrease in AUC caused by magic words, therefore improving the robustness of LLMs’ safeguards.

Besides, standardization and batch normalization can play a similar role because they also eliminate the mean. See Appendix C for the experiments on them.

Vocabulary Cleaning. A larger vocabulary is not always better; it should align with the training data, avoiding the inclusion of rare words such as markup and foreign words.

Reinitialization. After the model has been trained, low-frequency words can be reinitialized based on the average value of the token embeddings or the value of $\langle \text{unk} \rangle$ and then finetuned.

7. CONCLUSION

We have found that the output distribution of many current text embedding models is uneven, and based on this, we have designed a new algorithm to attack LLMs’ safeguards based on text embedding models. Our algorithms can efficiently search for magic words that significantly increase or decrease the text embedding similarity between any pair of texts in both black-box and white-box manner. We inject the magic words into LLMs’ response to attack its safeguards. Safeguards based on a variety of text embedding models are misled by this attack. We proposed and validated that renormalization in the text embedding space can defend against this attack.

IMPACT STATEMENT

This paper investigates the intrinsic structure of machine learning models and, through this exploration, identifies a novel attack method on text embedding systems. While our work highlights a potential vulnerability, we also suggest practical ways to address and reduce the risk of such attacks. By presenting both the attack and its defenses, we aim to strike a balance between raising awareness of security vulnerabilities and promoting the development of more robust models. We have made every effort to minimize our work’s potential negative societal impacts while emphasizing its contribution to advancing the understanding, safety, and reliability of machine learning systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] Gabriel Alon and Michael Kamfonas. Detecting language model attacks with perplexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14132*, 2023.
- [2] Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, and Nicolas Flammarion. Jailbreaking leading safety-aligned llms with simple adaptive attacks, 2024.
- [3] Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Andy Jones, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Nova DasSarma, et al. A general language assistant as a laboratory for alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00861*, 2021.
- [4] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022.
- [5] Rishabh Bhardwaj and Soujanya Poria. Red-teaming large language models using chain of utterances for safety-alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09662*, 2023.
- [6] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners, 2020.
- [7] Patrick Chao, Edoardo Debenedetti, Alexander Robey, Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, Vikash Sehwal, Edgar Dobriban, Nicolas Flammarion, George J. Pappas, Florian Tramèr, Hamed Hassani, and Eric Wong. Jailbreakbench: An open robustness benchmark for jailbreaking large language models, 2024.
- [8] Patrick Chao, Alexander Robey, Edgar Dobriban, Hamed Hassani, George J Pappas, and Eric Wong. Jailbreaking black box large language models in twenty queries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08419*, 2023.
- [9] Yanrui Du, Sendong Zhao, Ming Ma, Yuhan Chen, and Bing Qin. Analyzing the inherent response tendency of llms: Real-world instructions-driven jailbreak. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04127*, 2023.
- [10] Suyu Ge, Chunting Zhou, Rui Hou, Madian Khabsa, Yi-Chia Wang, Qifan Wang, Jiawei Han, and Yuning Mao. Mart: Improving llm safety with multi-round automatic red-teaming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07689*, 2023.
- [11] Michael Günther, Jackmin Ong, Isabelle Mohr, Alaeddine Abdesslem, Tanguy Abel, Mohammad Kalim Akram, Susana Guzman, Georgios Mastrapas, Saba Sturua, Bo Wang, Maximilian Werk, Nan Wang, and Han Xiao. Jina embeddings 2: 8192-token general-purpose text embeddings for long documents, 2024.
- [12] Pengcheng He, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. Debertav3: Improving deberta using electra-style pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09543*, 2021.
- [13] Hakan Inan, Kartikeya Upasani, Jianfeng Chi, Rashi Rungta, Krithika Iyer, Yuning Mao, Michael Tontchev, Qing Hu, Brian Fuller, Davide Testuggine, et al. Llama guard: Llm-based input-output safeguard for human-ai conversations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06674*, 2023.
- [14] Neel Jain, Avi Schwarzschild, Yuxin Wen, Gowthami Somepalli, John Kirchenbauer, Ping-yeh Chiang, Micah Goldblum, Aniruddha Saha, Jonas Geiping, and Tom Goldstein. Baseline defenses for adversarial attacks against aligned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00614*, 2023.
- [15] Di Jin, Zhijing Jin, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Peter Szolovits. Is bert really robust? a strong baseline for natural language attack on text classification and entailment, 2020.
- [16] Daniel Kang, Xuechen Li, Ion Stoica, Carlos Guestrin, Matei Zaharia, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Exploiting programmatic behavior of llms: Dual-use through standard security attacks, 2023.
- [17] Jinhwa Kim, Ali Derakhshan, and Ian G Harris. Robust safety classifier for large language models: Adversarial prompt shield. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00172*, 2023.
- [18] Aounon Kumar, Chirag Agarwal, Suraj Srinivas, Aaron Jiaxun Li, Soheil Feizi, and Himabindu Lakkaraju. Certifying llm safety against adversarial prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.02705*, 2023.
- [19] Hyeokjin Kwon and Woongil Pak. Text-based prompt injection attack using mathematical functions in modern large language models". *Electronics* 13, no. 24: 5008, 2024.
- [20] Raz Lapid, Ron Langberg, and Moshe Sipper. Open sesame! universal black-box jailbreaking of large language models. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Secure and Trustworthy Large Language Models*, 2024.
- [21] Haoran Li, Dadi Guo, Wei Fan, Mingshi Xu, Jie Huang, Fanpu Meng, and Yangqiu Song. Multi-step jailbreaking privacy attacks on chatgpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05197*, 2023.
- [22] Jinfeng Li, Shouling Ji, Tianyu Du, Bo Li, and Ting Wang. Textbugger: Generating adversarial text against real-world applications. In *Proceedings 2019 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*, NDSS 2019. Internet Society, 2019.
- [23] Xuan Li, Zhanke Zhou, Jianing Zhu, Jiangchao Yao, Tongliang Liu, and Bo Han. Deepinception: Hypnotize large language model to be jailbreaker. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03191*, 2023.
- [24] Zeyi Liao and Huan Sun. Amplegog: Learning a universal and transferable generative model of adversarial suffixes for jailbreaking both open and closed llms, 2024.
- [25] RuiBo Liu, Ge Zhang, Xinyu Feng, and Soroush Vosoughi. Aligning generative language models with human values. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 241–252, 2022.
- [26] Neal Mangaokar, Ashish Hooda, Jihye Choi, Shreyas Chandrashekar, Kassem Fawaz, Somesh Jha, and Atul Prakash. Prp: Propagating universal perturbations to attack large language model guard-rails, 2024.

- [27] Todor Markov, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Tyna Eloundou, Teddy Lee, Steven Adler, Angela Jiang, and Lilian Weng. A holistic approach to undesired content detection in the real world, 2023.
- [28] Anay Mehrotra, Manolis Zampetakis, Paul Kassianik, Blaine Nelson, Hyrum Anderson, Yaron Singer, and Amin Karbasi. Tree of attacks: Jailbreaking black-box llms automatically. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02119*, 2023.
- [29] Maximilian Mozes, Xuanli He, Bennett Kleinberg, and Lewis D. Griffin. Use of llms for illicit purposes: Threats, prevention measures, and vulnerabilities, 2023.
- [30] Niklas Muennighoff, Nouamane Tazi, Loïc Magne, and Nils Reimers. Mteb: Massive text embedding benchmark, 2023.
- [31] Pandu Nayak. Understanding searches better than ever before. Google Blog, Oct 2019.
- [32] Khoi Nguyen. Llm prompt recovery. Kaggle, 2024.
- [33] Jianmo Ni, Gustavo Hernández Ábrego, Noah Constant, Ji Ma, Keith B. Hall, Daniel Cer, and Yinfei Yang. Sentence-t5: Scalable sentence encoders from pre-trained text-to-text models, 2021.
- [34] nomic.ai. Nomic embed: Training a reproducible long context text embedder. https://static.nomic.ai/reports/2024_Nomic_Embed_Text_Technical_Report.pdf, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-13.
- [35] OpenAI. Openai platform: Moderation, January 2025. Accessed: 2025-01-14.
- [36] Fábio Perez and Ian Ribeiro. Ignore previous prompt: Attack techniques for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09527*, 2022.
- [37] Mansi Phute, Alec Helbling, Matthew Hull, ShengYun Peng, Sebastian Szyller, Cory Cornelius, and Duen Horng Chau. Llm self defense: By self examination, llms know they are being tricked. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07308*, 2023.
- [38] Huachuan Qiu, Shuai Zhang, Anqi Li, Hongliang He, and Zhenzhong Lan. Latent jailbreak: A benchmark for evaluating text safety and output robustness of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08487*, 2023.
- [39] Qwen. Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models, September 2024.
- [40] Alexander Robey, Eric Wong, Hamed Hassani, and George J Pappas. Smoothllm: Defending large language models against jailbreaking attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03684*, 2023.
- [41] Rusheb Shah, Soroush Pour, Arush Tagade, Stephen Casper, Javier Rando, et al. Scalable and transferable black-box jailbreaks for language models via persona modulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03348*, 2023.
- [42] Sonali Singh, Faranak Abri, and Akbar Siami Namin. Exploiting large language models (llms) through deception techniques and persuasion principles. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*, pages 2508–2517. IEEE, 2023.
- [43] Yu Tian, Xiao Yang, Jingyuan Zhang, Yinpeng Dong, and Hang Su. Evil geniuses: Delving into the safety of llm-based agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11855*, 2023.
- [44] tomaarsen. Dataset: sentence-transformers/simple-wiki. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/sentence-transformers/simple-wiki>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-13.
- [45] Eduard Tulchinskii, Kristian Kuznetsov, Laida Kushnareva, Daniil Cherniavskii, Serguei Barannikov, Irina Piontkovskaya, Sergey Nikolenko, and Evgeny Burnaev. Intrinsic dimension estimation for robust detection of ai-generated texts, 2023.
- [46] Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Nikhil Kandpal, Matt Gardner, and Sameer Singh. Universal adversarial triggers for attacking and analyzing nlp, 2021.
- [47] Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Binxing Jiao, Linjun Yang, Daxin Jiang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. Text embeddings by weakly-supervised contrastive pre-training, 2024.
- [48] Zezhong Wang, Fangkai Yang, Lu Wang, Pu Zhao, Hongru Wang, Liang Chen, Qingwei Lin, and Kam-Fai Wong. Self-guard: Empower the llm to safeguard itself. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15851*, 2023.
- [49] Alexander Wei, Nika Haghtalab, and Jacob Steinhardt. Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [50] Zeming Wei, Yifei Wang, Ang Li, Yichuan Mo, and Yisen Wang. Jailbreak and guard aligned language models with only few in-context demonstrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06387*, 2023.
- [51] Fangzhao Wu, Yueqi Xie, Jingwei Yi, Jiawei Shao, Justin Curl, Lingjuan Lyu, Qifeng Chen, and Xing Xie. Defending chatgpt against jailbreak attack via self-reminder. *Nat Mach Intell* 5, 1486–1496, 2023.
- [52] Fangzhou Wu, Ning Zhang, Somesh Jha, Patrick McDaniel, and Chaowei Xiao. A new era in llm security: Exploring security concerns in real-world llm-based systems, 2024.
- [53] Youliang Yuan, Wenxiang Jiao, Wenxuan Wang, Jen-tse Huang, Pinjia He, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. Gpt-4 is too smart to be safe: Stealthy chat with llms via cipher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06463*, 2023.
- [54] Yuqi Zhang, Liang Ding, Lefei Zhang, and Dacheng Tao. Intention analysis prompting makes large language models a good jailbreak defender. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06561*, 2024.
- [55] Sicheng Zhu, Ruiyi Zhang, Bang An, Gang Wu, Joe Barrow, Zichao Wang, Furong Huang, Ani Nenkova, and Tong Sun. Autodan: Interpretable gradient-based adversarial attacks on large language models, 2023.
- [56] Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, J Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043*, 2023.

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF PROPOSITIONS

A.1. Proof of Proposition 3.2.

Proof. Denote $P = I - e(s+w)e(s+w)^\top$. Then

$$\sin \theta(e(s+w), e) = \|Pe\|.$$

It follows immediately that

$$\begin{aligned} \sin \theta(e(s+w), e^*) &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left\| P \sum_i e(s_i) \right\| / \|\bar{e}\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_i \|Pe(s_i)\| / \|\bar{e}\| \leq \frac{\sin \theta_*}{\|\bar{e}\|}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it holds

$$\bar{e}^\top e(s+w) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_i e(s_i)^\top e(s+w) \geq \cos \theta_*,$$

from which we obtain $\|\bar{e}\| \geq \cos \theta_*$. The conclusion follows. \square

A.2. Proof of Proposition 3.3.

Proof. By Assumption 3.1, we have

$$\|Xe(s+w)\|^2 = \sum_i |e(s_i)^\top e(s+w)|^2 \geq |\mathcal{S}| \cos^2 \theta_*.$$

Therefore, $\|X\|^2 \geq |\mathcal{S}| \cos^2 \theta_*$.

Denote $P = I - e(s+w)e(s+w)^\top$. Direct calculations give rise to

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathcal{S}| \cos^2 \theta_* \sin^2 \theta(e(s+w), v^*) \\ &\leq \|X\|^2 \|Pv^*(v^*)^\top P\| \\ &\leq \|PX^\top XP\| = \|P \sum_i e(s_i)e(s_i)^\top P\| \\ &\leq \sum_i \|Pe(s_i)e(s_i)^\top P\| \leq |\mathcal{S}| \sin^2 \theta_*. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows immediately. \square

APPENDIX B. RESULTS FROM RANDOM MATRIX THEORY

Let A be an $n \times m$ matrix whose entries are i.i.d. standard normal random variables. Then, A has the following properties.

- (1) The distribution of AA^\top is called *Wishart distribution*.
- (2) In the regime where $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ with a fixed aspect ratio $\gamma = n/m$, the empirical distribution of the eigenvalues of $\frac{1}{m}AA^\top$ converges to the *Marchenko-Pastur distribution*

$$(13) \quad \rho(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{(\lambda^+ - \lambda)(\lambda - \lambda^-)}}{\lambda} + \max\left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}, 0\right) \delta_0,$$

where

$$(14) \quad \lambda^\pm = (1 \pm \sqrt{\gamma})^2.$$

- (3) The principal singular vector of A is approximately

$$(15) \quad \sqrt{m} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}\right).$$

Matrix B is obtained from A by normalizing each row of A . Concretely, if the i -th row of A is denoted by $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, then the i -th row of B is

$$(16) \quad \mathbf{b}_i = \frac{\mathbf{a}_i}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2}.$$

Hence, each row \mathbf{b}_i is a unit vector in \mathbb{R}^m . Then, B has the following properties.

- (1) Since each row \mathbf{a}_i is an i.i.d. Gaussian vector in \mathbb{R}^m , normalizing it means \mathbf{b}_i is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere S^{m-1} .




FIGURE 6. The overlap between the normalized mean vector e^* of C and its principal singular vector v^* as a function of the magnitude of $\|\mathbf{u}\| = u$.

(2) Let \mathbf{b}_i and \mathbf{b}_j be two distinct rows, their inner product follows Beta distribution

$$(17) \quad \mathbf{b}_i^\top \mathbf{b}_j \sim \text{Beta}\left(\frac{m-1}{2}, \frac{m-1}{2}\right).$$

When $m \gg 1$,

$$(18) \quad \mathbf{b}_i^\top \mathbf{b}_j \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{1}{m}\right).$$

(3) The largest eigenvalue of BB^\top approaches 1 when $m \rightarrow \infty$ and in this case $BB^\top \approx I_n$.

Matrix C is formed by taking each row of B , adding a fixed vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and then re-normalizing. Symbolically, if \mathbf{b}_i is the i -th row of B , then the i -th row of C is

$$(19) \quad \mathbf{c}_i = \frac{\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{u}\|_2}.$$

Then, the average of rows in C will be parallel to \mathbf{u} , and the principle singular vector would also be parallel to \mathbf{u} .

Specifically, we conducted the following numerical experiment: we first randomly generated an $N \times 768$ random matrix A and then produced C using the method described above. The overlap between the normalized mean vector e^* of C and its principal singular vector v^* as a function of the magnitude of $\|\mathbf{u}\| = u$ is shown in Figure 6.

APPENDIX C. DEFENSE BY STANDARDALIZATION

We tested the defense effect of standardizing text embeddings against our magic words. The experimental setup is the same as in Sec. 6, except that renormalization was replaced with standardization. As shown in Figure 7, the results indicate that standardization also provides some defense against magic words like renormalization. This is because standardization eliminates the mean of the text embedding, making the magic words ineffective.

APPENDIX D. ANOTHER DEFINITION OF NEGATIVE MAGIC WORDS

In the main text, we define universal negative magic words as words that make a text move away from semantically similar texts. However, there also exist words that push a text away from any other texts, which can be another definition of negative magic words. This can be expressed as an assumption similar to 3.1: There exists a word w^- satisfying that

$$(20) \quad \cos \theta(s_1 + w^-, s_2) \leq \cos \theta_*^-,$$

holds for any text s_1 and s_2 , where $\cos \theta_*^-$ is a number close to -1 . Such magic word w^- can force any pair of texts to be dissimilar enough in the text embedding space.

And similar to Sec. 3.1, any text appended by such magic word w^- will be close to $-e^*$ (or $-v^*$), as shown in Figure 8. The Propositions 3.2, 3.3 for negative magic words can be given and proved in the similar way.

This effectively moves text embeddings closer to the southern pole $-e^*$ of the sphere, so we refer to such magic words w^- as **southern magic words**. Concretely, a good southern magic word should make the following metric as small as possible,

$$(21) \quad c_i^- = \min_{1 \leq r \leq 16} \sum_{j,k} \cos \theta(s_j + r * t_i, s_k).$$




FIGURE 7. The ROC (Receiver Operating Characteristic) of input and output guards. Our magic words significantly decrease their AUC (Area Under Curve). Standardization in text embedding space can mitigate the decrease of AUC and defend against this attack.




FIGURE 8. Northern (i.e. positive) or southern magic words can force text embedding to move towards the normalized mean e^* (or $-e^*$). The same effect occurs for the principal singular vector v^* .

We can use methods similar to Algorithm 1, 2 and 3 to find southern magic words. Some of the best southern magic words we found for different text embedding models are demonstrated in Table 6. It is reasonable to find that the southern magic words “nobody” “None” “never” have negative semantics.

TABLE 6. Best southern magic words for different text embedding models.

Model	Southern magic word	
	magic word	similarity c_i^-
sentence-t5-base	(Clean)	0.71 ± 0.03
	nobody	$0.67 = \mu - 1.0\sigma$
	None	$0.67 = \mu - 0.9\sigma$
Qwen2.5-0.5B (with mean pooling)	(Clean)	0.81 ± 0.08
	십시	$0.14 = \mu - 8.7\sigma$
	וצרים	$0.28 = \mu - 7.0\sigma$
nomic-embed-text-v1	(Clean)	0.36 ± 0.05
	references	$0.30 = \mu - 1.1\sigma$
	writing	$0.33 = \mu - 0.6\sigma$
e5-base-v2	(Clean)	0.69 ± 0.03
	junctions	$0.67 = \mu - 0.8\sigma$
	coloring	$0.67 = \mu - 0.8\sigma$
jina-embeddings-v2-base-en	(Clean)	0.62 ± 0.04
	never	$0.61 = \mu - 0.3\sigma$
	for	$0.61 = \mu - 0.3\sigma$