Abstract

This paper addresses vector space models of prepositions, a notoriously ambiguous word class. We propose a rank-based distance measure to explore the vector-spatial properties of the ambiguous objects, focusing on two research tasks: (i) to distinguish polysemous from monosemous prepositions in vector space; and (ii) to determine salient vector-space features for a classification of preposition senses. The rank-based measure predicts the polysemy vs. monosemy of prepositions with a precision of up to 88%, and suggests preposition-subcategorised nouns as more salient preposition features than preposition-subcategorising verbs.

Keywords: prepositions, polysemy, vector-space model, German

1. Introduction

Vector space models have become a steadily increasing integral part of data-intensive lexical semantics over the past 20 years (cf. Turney and Pantel (2010) and Erk (2012) for two recent surveys). They have been exploited in psycholinguistic (Lund and Burgess, 1996) and computational linguistic research (Schütze, 1992), to explore distributional properties of target objects and the notion of “similarity” within a geometric setting.

A respective number of individual vector space approaches have been concerned with sense discrimination (cf. Section 2). Nevertheless, it is still largely unknown how to identify polysemous objects within a vector space model, and which geometric properties characterise the polysemous objects. For example, are polysemous objects

(a) outliers in space, i.e., are the vectors far away from all vectors whose objects are similar in meaning to one of the senses, or

(b) close in space to other polysemous objects, or

(c) close in space to semantically similar objects?

Insights on these spatial properties could foster research on sense discrimination that is interested in the selection and effect of the features underlying the vector space: A priori, distributional vectors subsume features across word meanings, but the features are clearly more or less salient with regard to specific object senses.

Our current research on spatial vector properties represents a first step to determine the semantic relevance of sense features. (i) by informing us about the effect of features on the spatial location with regard to other vectors, (ii) by informing us about the potential of similarity measures and clustering algorithms to model polysemy, and (iii) by informing us about the effect of the feature types (frequencies and proportions vs. binary values; information at the syntax-semantics interface; etc.).

More specifically, the current paper is part of a larger framework that systematically explores the vector spatial properties of German prepositions. In a data-intensive distributional framework, we rely on high-dimensional vector spaces to determine the degree of polysemy of the prepositions, and to explore salient features to model their actual meanings.

As in many other languages, German prepositions are notoriously ambiguous, cf. the various senses of the German preposition “nach” in the following examples, where “nach” refers to a temporal (i), directional (ii), or accordance meaning (iii):

(i) nach drei Stunden (after three hours)
(ii) nach Berlin (to Berlin)
(iii) nach Meinung (according to the opinion)

In the following, we address the polysemy of German prepositions with regard to two tasks, (i) to decide whether or not a preposition is polysemous, and (ii) to determine which features provide salient information for the semantic classes of a set of prepositions, including polysemous as well as monosemous prepositions. We systematically explore the vector spatial properties of German prepositions, in mutual dependence with the types of vector features. The core instrument in our explorations is a rank-based distance measure.

Section 2 describes related work on the automatic identification of preposition senses, and with regard to sense discrimination in more general terms. Section 3 introduces our rank-based distance measure, and Section 4 introduces our preposition data and the vector features, before Section 5 describes our actual experiments to distinguish polysemous from monosemous prepositions, and to determine salient preposition features.

2. Related Work

Previous approaches to sense discrimination have primarily aimed to identify regions in vector space that correspond to word senses. For example, Schütze (1998) performed
sense discrimination of ambiguous word tokens, based on their second-order co-occurrence distributions. Erk (2009) presented two variants of defining regions of word meaning in vector spaces, a *prototype model* that introduced a region surrounding the target’s type vector as the representation for a target word, and an *exemplar model* that introduced a k-nearest neighbour classification with weighted average features. Erk and Padó (2010) defined a model where polysemous words activated several word vectors. Reisinger and Mooney (2010) introduced a clustering to produce multiple sense-specific vectors for each word type. Boleda et al. (2012b) compared two models of representing regular polysemy, one with multiple class assignments for multiple senses, and one incorporating classes with polysemy properties. Boleda et al. (2012a) built vector representations of semantic classes from monosemous nouns and then modeled sense alternations using the pairs of these sense representations.

The above approaches are all different to this work, as we do not attempt to distinguish the various spaces of a word (vector) yet, but rather aim to identify the spatial positions of polysemous objects in vector space. In previous work (Springorum et al., 2013), we already presented a methodology to identify polysemous German prepositions by exploring their vector spatial properties. We applied two cluster evaluation metrics (the Silhouette Value (Kaufman and Rousseeuw, 1990) and a fuzzy version of the V-Measure (Rosenberg and Hirschberg, 2007)) as well as various correlations, to exploit hard vs. soft cluster analyses based on Self-Organising Maps. In contrast, the current paper defines and applies a *rank-based distance measure* to explore the preposition vector spaces.

Regarding previous work in computational semantics towards preposition senses, the research on prepositions has in general been enforced by the ACL Special Interest Group on Semantics (ACL-SIGSEM). The SIG has organised a series of workshops on prepositions (Saint-Dizier, 2003; Saint-Dizier, 2006b; Kordoni and Villavicencio, 2005; Arsenjevic et al., 2006; Costello et al., 2007), and a special issue in *Computational Linguistics* (Baldwin et al., 2009).

Large-scale projects that were interested in the definition and annotation of preposition senses exist for several languages, most prominently English (*The Preposition Project* (TPP) (Litkowski and Hargraves, 2005)), French (*PrepNet* (Saint-Dizier, 2005; Saint-Dizier, 2006a)) and German (*PrepCat* (Müller et al., 2010; Müller et al., 2011; Müller et al., 2012; Müller, 2013)). *The Preposition Project* has also led to the formulation of a *SemEval* task on word sense disambiguation for prepositions (Litkowski and Hargraves, 2007).

Distributional approaches towards preposition meaning and sense distinction have recently started to explore salient preposition features. For example, Baldwin (2006) was one of the first to explicitly use distributional information to determine preposition similarity. Relying on nine English prepositions and a standard vector space (target–content word matrix, based on a window of 5 words) reduced to 100 dimensions by Singular Value Decomposition, he compared the distributional similarity predictions to the preposition lexicon by Dorr (1997) and Roget’s thesaurus classes. Tratz and Hovy (2009) compared several supervised classifiers to assign preposition tokens to their senses. They relied on parse-based features, including the preposition-subcategorising word and the preposition-subcategorised word, and other sentence-relevant functions such as subject, object, other prepositional phrases. They did not only use the lemmas but also WordNet synonyms and hypernyms. Their best results relied on a maximum entropy classifier, outperforming previous approaches on the SemEval 2007 preposition data. Hovy et al. (2010) relied on the best classifier from Tratz and Hovy (2009) and explored context types (fixed windows size vs. selective), the influence of the words in that context (word-based vs. WordNet-based), and the preprocessing method (heuristics vs. parsing) on coarse and fine-grained preposition disambiguation. They found that selective context is better than fixed window size; the governor and the object of the preposition as well as the word directly to the left of the preposition have the highest influence; and that combining different extraction methods works better than either one in isolation. In contrast to these approaches, we focus on two standard sets of features for prepositions, the preposition-subcategorising verbs and the preposition-subcategorised nouns, to demonstrate how the rank-based distance measure determines salient features.

### 3. Rank-based Distance Measure

The core instrument in this paper to explore the geometrical properties of our high-dimensional vector spaces is a *Rank-based Distance Measure*. More specifically, for a set of 49 German prepositions (cf. Section 4), we computed the pair-wise distances for each pair of prepositions, as illustrated by Figure 1. The prepositions are represented by high-dimensional vectors, and as measure for calculating the vector similarities/distances we used the standard measure cosine.

In a second step, we abstracted the distances to “ranks”, i.e., we determined for each preposition the most similar preposition, the second most similar preposition, etc. The resulting rank information can be visualised by a 49×49 matrix as in Table 1, where “ab” is the 27th closest preposition to “an”, while “an” is only the 42nd closest preposition to “ab”. The smaller the rank, the closer are two prepositions and the more similar are their vector representations.

![Figure 1: Computing the rank of a preposition requires comparison with all prepositions.](http://www.clres.com/prepositions.html)

http://www.linguistics.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/prepositions/
The preposition classification is identical to that in Springorum et al. (2013) but more fine-grained: We split the three large classes ‘local’, ‘modal’ and ‘temporal’ into 23 sub-classes.

In the final step, an overall rank was calculated for each preposition. This rank corresponds to the mean position of a specific preposition in the distance-based sorted lists across all prepositions. Note that the main diagonal in the matrix is always zero and is not considered for the average rank calculation since it corresponds to a comparison of a preposition with itself.

We decided to use the rank information instead of plain distances, because a change in the feature set (vector representation) might increase or decrease individual distances. But to compare distances and average distances across models (feature sets), we convert the distances into ranks.

In the distributional vector spaces in the experiments to follow (cf. Section 5), each preposition will be associated with a feature vector containing either the subcategorised nouns, or the subcategorising verbs, or the concatenation of those vectors.

4. Data
Prepositions and Preposition Senses Our gold standard in terms of preposition senses is the German grammar book by Helbig and Buscha (1998) starting with their class hierarchy, we selected the semantic classes of prepositions that contained more than one preposition. We deleted those prepositions from the classes that appeared less often than 10,000 times in our web corpus containing 880 million words (see below). This selection process resulted in 32 semantic classes covering between 2 and 12 prepositions each (cf. Table 2). The included prepositions exhibit ambiguity rates of 1 (monosemous) up to 6 (cf. Table 3). Each preposition that occurred in more than one class is regarded as polysemous according to the gold standard. In total, 23 out of the 49 preposition types are polysemous (46%).

Corpus and Distributional Features The distributional features for the German prepositions were induced from the SdeWaC corpus (Faaß and Eckart, 2013), a cleaned version of the German web corpus deWaC created by the WaCky group (Baroni et al., 2009). The SdeWaC contains approx. 880 million words and can be downloaded from http://wacky.sslmit.unibo.it/

We focus on two specific feature sets that are expected to provide salient properties towards preposition meaning, (1) the nouns that are subcategorised by the prepositions, and (2) the verbs that subcategorise the prepositions. In examples (i)–(iii), the subcategorised nouns of the preposition nach would be Stunen, Berlin, Meinung, and the subcategorising verbs would be gingen, flogen, fragten.

(i) Wir gingen nach drei Stunden. – We left after three hours.
(ii) Wir flogen nach Berlin. – We flew to Berlin.
(iii) Wir fragten nach seiner Meinung. – We asked for his opinion.

The two types of subcategorisation information were extracted from a parsed version of the SdeWaC corpus using Bohnet’s MATE dependency parser (Bohnet, 2010). In the distributional vector spaces in the experiments to follow (cf. Section 5), each preposition will be associated with a feature vector containing either the subcategorised nouns, or the subcategorising verbs, or the concatenation of the two sets. We restricted the features to the 10,000 most frequent nouns/verbs, that co-occurred with prepositions in the corpus, and compared frequencies and binary values.

The binary values are a function $f(x)$ that maps a frequency $x$ to 1 or 0:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \end{cases}$$

5. Experiments

In the following experiments, we apply the rank-based distance measure and address the polysemy of German prepositions with regard to our two tasks, (i) to decide whether or not a preposition is polysemous (Section 5.1), and (ii) to determine which features provide salient information for the semantic classes of a set of prepositions (Section 5.2).

---

### Table 1: Preposition rank matrix.

| Preposition | ab | an | auf | ...
|-------------|----|----|-----|-----
| ab          | 0  | 27 | 13  | ...
| an          | 42 | 0  | 23  | ...
| auf         | 3  | 17 | 0   | ...
|             |... |... |...  |...
| Overall rank| 22 | 17 | 45  | 45

### Table 2: Preposition classes.

| Class        | Size | Subclasses |
|--------------|------|------------|
| lokal        | 27   | 6          |
| modal        | 24   | 10         |
| temporal     | 21   | 7          |
| kausal       | 5    | 0          |
| distributiv  | 6    | 0          |
| final        | 4    | 0          |
| urheber      | 3    | 0          |
| konditional  | 3    | 0          |
| ersatz       | 2    | 0          |
| restrikтив   | 2    | 0          |
| partitiv     | 2    | 0          |
| kopulativ    | 2    | 0          |

### Table 3: Degrees of preposition ambiguity.

| #Senses | #Prepositions |
|---------|---------------|
| 6       | 1             |
| 5       | 3             |
| 4       | 3             |
| 3       | 11            |
| 2       | 6             |
| 1       | 23            |

---

*Helbig and Buscha (1998) was selected as our semantic resource in accordance with closely related work on German preposition senses (Müller et al., 2012; Müller, 2013). The preposition classification is identical to that in Springorum et al. (2013) but more fine-grained: We split the three large classes ‘local’, ‘modal’ and ‘temporal’ into 23 sub-classes.*

*We also used local mutual information (LMI) values as alternative to frequencies (Evert, 2005), but the results were very similar to the frequency-based results, so we will disregard them.*
5.1. Detecting Polysemous Prepositions in Space

The first question we ask is whether we can distinguish polysemous prepositions from monosemous prepositions in vector space. We apply and compare two approaches to this task: (1) our rank-based distance measure, as defined in Section 3.; and (2) a standard k-Means clustering. Before Sections 5.1.2. and 5.1.3. present the classification experiments, Section 5.1.1. motivates the distinction into polysemous vs. monosemous prepositions from a visual point of view.

5.1.1. Visualisation of Prepositions and Polysemy

In order to explore the different contributions of frequency vs. binary feature values, we decided to visualise the preposition positions in two-dimensional feature spaces. We used t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008), which aims to preserve both the local and the global distances between all data points while reducing the dimensionality at the same time.

Figures 2 to 4 show how the prepositions are located in different feature spaces. We compare the noun features, the verb features and the concatenation of the noun and verb features, relying on frequencies (left-hand side (a)) vs. binary values (right-hand side (b)). Each dot corresponds to a preposition, and its size corresponds to the degree of polysemy, creating large blue dots for highly polysemous prepositions. Monosemous prepositions are marked red and have a constant size.

The plots suggest that the binary values provide a better basis for the polysemy-monosemy distinction: In the (b) spaces, most of the polysemous prepositions are in one corner of the plot, while most of the monosemous prepositions are in another corner of the plot. This distinction is intuitively stronger for noun features than for verb features, and stronger for verb features than for concatenated features. In the (a) spaces, the polysemous prepositions are also visually located in different areas than the monosemous prepositions, but rather in the central vs. marginal positions of the plot. In sum, we can identify different areas for polysemous vs. monosemous prepositions in space, but the absolute and relative locations of these areas differ with regard to the feature types and with regard to frequency vs. binary values.

5.1.2. Applying the Rank-based Distance Measure

The rank-based distance measure allows us to assign a mean rank score to each preposition, with regard to a specific feature set. In this first experiment, we explore to what extent prepositions with a low mean rank (i.e., prepositions that are close to many other prepositions) are more polysemous than prepositions with a high mean rank (i.e., prepositions that are distant to many other prepositions). The underlying hypothesis is that polysemous prepositions are close to many other prepositions, because of their various senses. Therefore, the mean distance between a polysemous preposition and the other prepositions should be smaller in comparison to a monosemous preposition.

Figures 5 to 7 plot the mean rank values of all prepositions, with regard to our noun feature set (frequencies underlying Figure 5 and binary values underlying Figure 6) and with regard to our verb feature set (binary values underlying Figure 7). The preposition bars are sorted by the average rank values, and the plot shows polysemous prepositions in white, and monosemous prepositions in dark. The straight blue line represents the median rank (which is suitable to our dataset with an almost 50% split of monosemous vs. polysemous prepositions), and the degree of polysemy of the prepositions (i.e., the number of senses in the gold standard) is indicated by the yellow line.

The figures based on the subcategorised nouns illustrate that prepositions with an above-average rank are indeed likely to be monosemous, while a low average rank indeed seems to be a good indicator for polysemous prepositions. Using binary values seems to improve the separation between monosemous and polysemous prepositions. This
effect is not visible if the prepositions are represented by verb features, neither for plain frequency values (omitted for space reasons) or for binary values (see Figure[7]). In sum, the likelihood of a preposition being polysemous decreases with an increasing average rank, thus demonstrating the potential of our rank-based measure to distinguish polysemous from monosemous prepositions. We conclude that prepositions that are close to many other prepositions in vector space are likely to be polysemous.

Figure 5: Mean rank values of German prepositions, relying on noun frequency vector spaces.

Figure 6: Mean rank values of German prepositions, relying on noun binary vector spaces.

Figure 7: Mean rank values of German prepositions, relying on verb binary vector spaces.

Tables[4 to 6] accompany Figures[5 to 7] and present the precision, recall and f-score values for the two-way classification of the prepositions into polysemous vs. monosemous, when using the median rank as threshold. The results confirm our intuitions: The binary values are more useful to distinguish polysemous from monosemous prepositions, and noun features are more salient than verb features with regard to this task.

| Poly | Correct | Wrong | P    | R    | F    |
|------|---------|-------|------|------|------|
| 18   | 5       | 78.3% | 78.3%| 78.3%|
| Mono | 18      | 8     | 69.2%| 69.2%| 69.2%|
| all  | 36      | 13    | 73.5%|      |      |

Table 4: Classification by mean rank (noun frequencies).

| Poly | Correct | Wrong | P    | R    | F    |
|------|---------|-------|------|------|------|
| 21   | 2       | 91.3% | 91.3%| 91.3%|
| Mono | 21      | 5     | 80.8%| 80.8%| 80.8%|
| all  | 42      | 7     | 85.7%|      |      |

Table 5: Classification by mean rank (noun binary values).

| Poly | Correct | Wrong | P    | R    | F    |
|------|---------|-------|------|------|------|
| 15   | 8       | 65.2% | 65.2%| 65.2%|
| Mono | 12      | 14    | 46.2%| 46.2%| 46.2%|
| all  | 27      | 22    | 55.1%|      |      |

Table 6: Classification by mean rank (verb binary values).

5.1.3. Applying k-Means Clustering

The final approach to distinguish polysemous prepositions from monosemous prepositions applies a k-Means clustering with \( k = 2 \), to assign the prepositions to the two classes polysemous vs. monosemous. In order to decide which cluster represents the group of polysemous prepositions, we relied on the mean rank distance information: the cluster with the lower average of the mean rank values was regarded as the class of polysemous prepositions. We applied the k-Means algorithm provided by the R Project for Statistical Computing[6] and again compared cluster analyses based on the binary noun features, the binary verb features, and their concatenation. We included both the 2-dimensional features from the dimensionality reduction above (cf. Section 5.1.1.), and the original high-dimensional features (10,000/20,000 feature types).

In parallel to the plots, Tables[7 to 9] present the results of the clusterings: We reach a classification precision of up to 87.8%, and all but one setting have precision values \( > 80\% \) and significantly outperform the baseline (the majority class), relying on \( \chi^2 \) with \(*p \leq 0.05\). Again, the noun features outperform the verb features. The concatenation of the feature sets achieves the overall best results when using all 20,000 dimensions, but the worst when relying on 2 dimensions only. Across the experiments, the absolute differences are small, varying by a few correct vs. wrong decisions only.

5.1.4. Summary

In this first set of experiments we demonstrated that the rank-based distance measure as well as standard classification approaches are able to distinguish polysemous prepositions from monosemous prepositions. Noun features were more useful than verb features for this task, and binary values were more useful than frequency values. The concatenation of noun and verb features demonstrated an unclear behaviour with regard to the task, and strongly depended on the experiment setup.

[6] http://www.r-project.org/
Two-dimensional plots of the dimensionality-reduced feature sets already suggested that polysemous prepositions are in different spatial areas than monosemous prepositions: In frequency spaces, the polysemous vs. monosemous prepositions are visually located in the central vs. marginal positions of the plots. In binary spaces, most of the polysemous prepositions were in one corner of the plot, while most of the monosemous prepositions were in another corner of the plot.

The rank-based distance measure experiments demonstrated that (i) not only it can distinguish polysemous and monosemous prepositions but in addition that (ii) prepositions that are close to many other prepositions in vector space are likely to be polysemous. We interpret this as follows. Since polysemous prepositions subsume the features with regard to several senses, they overlap in many of their features, while monosemous prepositions represent one specific sense represented by a reduced feature set. The k-Means experiments confirmed that (i) the polysemous and monosemous prepositions can be distinguished according to binary noun and/or verb subcategorisation features, and further showed that (ii) the original 10k/20k dimensions are clearly more useful to classify the prepositions than the reduced two-dimensional spaces.

### 5.2. Exploring Salient Preposition Features

The second question we ask is whether the rank-based distance measure as defined in Section 3. can be used as a tool to explore the impact of varying the preposition features, and to identify the semantically most salient features.

#### Table 7: Classification by k-Means (noun binary values).

|        | Correct | Wrong | P  | R  | F1  |
|--------|---------|-------|----|----|-----|
| Poly (2) | 20      | 5     | 80.0% | 87.0% | 83.3% |
| Mono (2) | 21      | 3     | 87.5% | 80.8% | 84.0% |
| all    | 41      | 8     | 83.7% |       |      |
| Poly (10k) | 19     | 4     | 82.6% | 82.6% | 82.6% |
| Mono (10k) | 23     | 3     | 88.5% | 88.5% | 88.5% |
| all    | 42      | 7     | 85.7% |       |      |

#### Table 8: Classification by k-Means (verb binary values).

|        | Correct | Wrong | P  | R  | F1  |
|--------|---------|-------|----|----|-----|
| Poly (2) | 16      | 3     | 84.2% | 69.6% | 76.2% |
| Mono (2) | 24      | 6     | 80.0% | 92.3% | 85.7% |
| all    | 40      | 9     | 81.6% |       |      |
| Poly (10k) | 18     | 5     | 78.3% | 78.3% | 78.3% |
| Mono (10k) | 22     | 4     | 84.6% | 84.6% | 84.6% |
| all    | 40      | 9     | 81.6% |       |      |

#### Table 9: Classification by k-Means (noun+verb binaries).

|        | Correct | Wrong | P  | R  | F1  |
|--------|---------|-------|----|----|-----|
| Poly (20k) | 19     | 4     | 82.6% | 82.6% | 82.6% |
| Mono (20k) | 24     | 2     | 92.3% | 92.3% | 92.3% |
| all    | 43      | 6     | 87.8% |       |      |
class is one of the classes that possess a very high average rank ($\approx 25$). The class contains only three prepositions according to the gold standard. The feature representation enforces a high similarity between “unfern” (not far) and “unterhalb” (underneath), but the similarity does not hold for the preposition “unter” (under). We can however explain this distance by taking into account that “unter” is polysemous. In addition to the local meaning of “unter” as in the example sentence "unter dem Tisch – under the table", there is also a meaning of “unter” referring to conditions, as in "unter den gegebenen Umständen – considering the circumstances". Figure 9 illustrates the polysemy–monosemy difference very clearly: “unfern” and “unterhalb” are likely to be monosemous while “unter” has a low mean rank, showing its polysemous characteristic. Therefore another semantic class of “unter” is likely to be the reason of the large distance in this case. This could also be the reason why “unfern” $\rightarrow$ “unter” has rank 10 but “unter” $\rightarrow$ “unfern” has only rank 47.

6. Conclusion

This paper presented a rank-based distance measure as an effective way (i) to decide whether or not a preposition is polysemous, and (ii) to determine salient vector-space features for a classification of preposition senses. To this end, we have shown that (i) polysemous prepositions share more features than monosemous prepositions and therefore possess a lower average rank-based distance; we can automatically classify the prepositions into polysemous vs. monosemous, reaching a precision up to 88%; and (ii) preposition-subcategorised nouns are more salient preposition features than preposition-subcategorising verbs.
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