

CHAPTER

C

WordNet: Word Relations, Senses, and Disambiguation

In this chapter we introduce computation with a thesaurus: a structured list of words organized by meaning. The most popular thesaurus for computational purposes is **WordNet**, a large online resource with versions in many languages. One use of WordNet is to represent **word senses**, the many different meanings that a single lemma can have (Chapter 6) Thus the lemma *bank* can refer to a financial institution or to the sloping side of a river. WordNet also represents relations between senses, like the **IS-A** relation between *dog* and *mammal* or the part-whole relationship between *car* and *engine*. Finally, WordNet includes **glosses**, a definition for senses in the form of a text string.

glosses

We'll see how to use each of these aspects of WordNet to address the task of computing **word similarity**; the similarity in meaning of two different words, an alternative to the embedding-based methods we introduced in Chapter 6. And we'll introduce **word sense disambiguation**, the task of determining which sense of a word is being used in a particular context, a task with a long history in computational linguistics and applications from machine translation to question answering. We give a number of algorithms for using features from the context for deciding which sense was intended in a particular context.

word sense disambiguation

C.1 Word Senses

Consider the two uses of the lemma *bank* mentioned above, meaning something like “financial institution” and “sloping mound”, respectively:

(C.1) Instead, a *bank* can hold the investments in a custodial account in the client's name.

(C.2) But as agriculture burgeons on the east *bank*, the river will shrink even more.

We represent this variation in usage by saying that the lemma *bank* has two **senses**.¹ A **sense** (or **word sense**) is a discrete representation of one aspect of the meaning of a word. Loosely following lexicographic tradition, we represent each sense by placing a superscript on the lemma as in **bank¹** and **bank²**.

word sense

The senses of a word might not have any particular relation between them; it may be almost coincidental that they share an orthographic form. For example, the *financial institution* and *sloping mound* senses of *bank* seem relatively unrelated.

Homonym

Homonymy

In such cases we say that the two senses are **homonyms**, and the relation between the senses is one of **homonymy**. Thus **bank¹** (“financial institution”) and **bank²** (“sloping mound”) are homonyms, as are the sense of *bat* meaning ‘club for hitting a ball’ and the one meaning ‘nocturnal flying animal’. We say that these two uses of *bank* are **homographs**, as are the two uses of *bat*, because they are written the

homographs

¹ Confusingly, the word “lemma” is itself ambiguous; it is also sometimes used to mean these separate senses, rather than the citation form of the word. You should be prepared to see both uses in the literature.

same. Two words can be homonyms in a different way if they are spelled differently but pronounced the same, like *write* and *right*, or *piece* and *peace*. We call these **homophones**; they are one cause of real-word spelling errors.

Homonymy causes problems in other areas of language processing as well. In question answering or information retrieval, we better help a user who typed “bat care” if we know whether they are vampires or just want to play baseball. And they will also have different translations; in Spanish the animal bat is a *murciélago* while the baseball bat is a *bate*. **Homographs** that are pronounced differently cause problems for speech synthesis (Chapter 28) such as these homographs of the word *bass*, the fish pronounced *b ae s* and the instrument pronounced *b ey s*.

(C.3) The expert angler from Dora, Mo., was fly-casting for **bass** rather than the traditional trout.

(C.4) The curtain rises to the sound of angry dogs baying and ominous **bass** chords sounding.

Sometimes there is also some semantic connection between the senses of a word. Consider the following example:

(C.5) While some banks furnish blood only to hospitals, others are less restrictive.

Although this is clearly not a use of the “sloping mound” meaning of *bank*, it just as clearly is not a reference to a charitable giveaway by a financial institution. Rather, *bank* has a whole range of uses related to repositories for various biological entities, as in *blood bank*, *egg bank*, and *sperm bank*. So we could call this “biological repository” sense **bank**³. Now this new sense **bank**³ has some sort of relation to **bank**¹; both **bank**¹ and **bank**³ are repositories for entities that can be deposited and taken out; in **bank**¹ the entity is monetary, whereas in **bank**³ the entity is biological.

When two senses are related semantically, we call the relationship between them **polysemy** rather than homonymy. In many cases of polysemy, the semantic relation between the senses is systematic and structured. For example, consider yet another sense of *bank*, exemplified in the following sentence:

(C.6) The bank is on the corner of Nassau and Witherspoon.

This sense, which we can call **bank**⁴, means something like “the building belonging to a financial institution”. It turns out that these two kinds of senses (an organization and the building associated with an organization) occur together for many other words as well (*school*, *university*, *hospital*, etc.). Thus, there is a systematic relationship between senses that we might represent as

BUILDING ↔ ORGANIZATION

This particular subtype of polysemy relation is often called **metonymy**. Metonymy is the use of one aspect of a concept or entity to refer to other aspects of the entity or to the entity itself. Thus, we are performing metonymy when we use the phrase *the White House* to refer to the administration whose office is in the White House. Other common examples of metonymy include the relation between the following pairings of senses:

Author (*Jane Austen wrote Emma*) ↔ Works of Author (*I really love Jane Austen*)
Tree (*Plums have beautiful blossoms*) ↔ Fruit (*I ate a preserved plum yesterday*)

While it can be useful to distinguish polysemy from unrelated homonymy, there is no hard threshold for how related two senses must be to be considered polysemous. Thus, the difference is really one of degree. This fact can make it very difficult to decide how many senses a word has, that is, whether to make separate senses for

closely related usages. There are various criteria for deciding that the differing uses of a word should be represented with discrete senses. We might consider two senses discrete if they have independent truth conditions, different syntactic behavior, and independent sense relations, or if they exhibit antagonistic meanings.

Consider the following uses of the verb *serve* from the WSJ corpus:

(C.7) They rarely *serve* red meat, preferring to prepare seafood.

(C.8) He *served* as U.S. ambassador to Norway in 1976 and 1977.

(C.9) He might have *served* his time, come out and led an upstanding life.

The *serve* of *serving red meat* and that of *serving time* clearly have different truth conditions and presuppositions; the *serve* of *serve as ambassador* has the distinct subcategorization structure *serve as NP*. These heuristics suggest that these are probably three distinct senses of *serve*. One practical technique for determining if two senses are distinct is to conjoin two uses of a word in a single sentence; this kind of conjunction of antagonistic readings is called **zeugma**. Consider the following ATIS examples:

zeugma

(C.10) Which of those flights serve breakfast?

(C.11) Does Midwest Express serve Philadelphia?

(C.12) ?Does Midwest Express serve breakfast and Philadelphia?

We use (?) to mark those examples that are semantically ill-formed. The oddness of the invented third example (a case of zeugma) indicates there is no sensible way to make a single sense of *serve* work for both breakfast and Philadelphia. We can use this as evidence that *serve* has two different senses in this case.

Dictionaries tend to use many fine-grained senses so as to capture subtle meaning differences, a reasonable approach given that the traditional role of dictionaries is aiding word learners. For computational purposes, we often don't need these fine distinctions, so we may want to group or cluster the senses; we have already done this for some of the examples in this chapter.

How can we define the meaning of a word sense? We introduced in Chapter 6 the standard computational approach of representing a word as an **embedding**, a point in semantic space. The intuition was that words were defined by their co-occurrences, the counts of words that often occur nearby.

Thesauri offer an alternative way of defining words. But we can't just look at the definition itself. Consider the following fragments from the definitions of *right*, *left*, *red*, and *blood* from the *American Heritage Dictionary* (Morris, 1985).

right *adj.* located nearer the right hand esp. being on the right when facing the same direction as the observer.
left *adj.* located nearer to this side of the body than the right.
red *n.* the color of blood or a ruby.
blood *n.* the red liquid that circulates in the heart, arteries and veins of animals.

Note the circularity in these definitions. The definition of *right* makes two direct references to itself, and the entry for *left* contains an implicit self-reference in the phrase *this side of the body*, which presumably means the *left* side. The entries for *red* and *blood* reference each other in their definitions. Such circularity is inherent in all dictionary definitions. For humans, such entries are still useful since the user of the dictionary has sufficient grasp of these other terms.

For computational purposes, one approach to defining a sense is—like the dictionary definitions—defining a sense through its relationship with other senses. For

example, the above definitions make it clear that *right* and *left* are similar kinds of lemmas that stand in some kind of alternation, or opposition, to one another. Similarly, we can glean that *red* is a color, that it can be applied to both *blood* and *rubies*, and that *blood* is a *liquid*. **Sense relations** of this sort are embodied in on-line databases like **WordNet**. Given a sufficiently large database of such relations, many applications are quite capable of performing sophisticated semantic tasks (even if they do not *really* know their right from their left).

C.1.1 Relations Between Senses

This section explores some of the relations that hold among word senses, focusing on a few that have received significant computational investigation: **synonymy**, **antonymy**, and **hyponymy**, as well as a brief mention of other relations like **meronymy**.

Synonymy We introduced in Chapter 6 the idea that when two senses of two different words (lemmas) are identical, or nearly identical, we say the two senses are **synonyms**. Synonyms include such pairs as

synonym

couch/sofa vomit/throw up filbert/hazelnut car/automobile

And we mentioned that in practice, the word *synonym* is commonly used to describe a relationship of approximate or rough synonymy. But furthermore, synonymy is actually a relationship between senses rather than words. Considering the words *big* and *large*. These may seem to be synonyms in the following ATIS sentences, since we could swap *big* and *large* in either sentence and retain the same meaning:

(C.13) How big is that plane?

(C.14) Would I be flying on a large or small plane?

But note the following WSJ sentence in which we cannot substitute *large* for *big*:

(C.15) Miss Nelson, for instance, became a kind of big sister to Benjamin.

(C.16) ?Miss Nelson, for instance, became a kind of large sister to Benjamin.

This is because the word *big* has a sense that means being older or grown up, while *large* lacks this sense. Thus, we say that some senses of *big* and *large* are (nearly) synonymous while other ones are not.

hyponym **Hyponymy** One sense is a **hyponym** of another sense if the first sense is more specific, a subclass. For example, *car* is a hyponym of *vehicle*; *dog* is a hyponym of *animal*, and *mango* is a hyponym of *fruit*. Conversely, *vehicle* is a **hypernym** of *car*, and *animal* is a hypernym of *dog*. It is unfortunate that the two words hypernym and hyponym are very similar and hence easily confused; for this reason, the word

hypernym

superordinate

superordinate is often used instead of **hypernym**.

Superordinate	vehicle	fruit	furniture	mammal
Hyponym	car	mango	chair	dog

meronymy **Meronymy** Another common relation is **meronymy**, the **part-whole** relation. A *leg* is part of a *chair*; a *wheel* is part of a *car*. We say that *wheel* is a **meronym** of *car*, and *car* is a **holonym** of *wheel*.

part-whole

meronym

holonym

C.2 WordNet: A Database of Lexical Relations

WordNet The most commonly used resource for English sense relations is the **WordNet** lexical database (Fellbaum, 1998). WordNet consists of three separate databases, one each for nouns and verbs and a third for adjectives and adverbs; closed class words are not included. Each database contains a set of lemmas, each one annotated with a set of senses. The WordNet 3.0 release has 117,798 nouns, 11,529 verbs, 22,479 adjectives, and 4,481 adverbs. The average noun has 1.23 senses, and the average verb has 2.16 senses. WordNet can be accessed on the Web or downloaded and accessed locally. Figure C.1 shows the lemma entry for the noun and adjective *bass*.

The noun “bass” has 8 senses in WordNet.

1. bass¹ - (the lowest part of the musical range)
2. bass², bass part¹ - (the lowest part in polyphonic music)
3. bass³, basso¹ - (an adult male singer with the lowest voice)
4. sea bass¹, bass⁴ - (the lean flesh of a saltwater fish of the family Serranidae)
5. freshwater bass¹, bass⁵ - (any of various North American freshwater fish with lean flesh (especially of the genus *Micropterus*))
6. bass⁶, bass voice¹, basso² - (the lowest adult male singing voice)
7. bass⁷ - (the member with the lowest range of a family of musical instruments)
8. bass⁸ - (nontechnical name for any of numerous edible marine and freshwater spiny-finned fishes)

The adjective “bass” has 1 sense in WordNet.

1. bass¹, deep⁶ - (having or denoting a low vocal or instrumental range)
“a deep voice”; *“a bass voice is lower than a baritone voice”*;
“a bass clarinet”

Figure C.1 A portion of the WordNet 3.0 entry for the noun *bass*.

Note that there are eight senses for the noun and one for the adjective, each of which has a **gloss** (a dictionary-style definition), a list of synonyms for the sense, and sometimes also usage examples (shown for the adjective sense). Unlike dictionaries, WordNet doesn't represent pronunciation, so doesn't distinguish the pronunciation [b ae s] in **bass**⁴, **bass**⁵, and **bass**⁸ from the other senses pronounced [b ey s].

The set of near-synonyms for a WordNet sense is called a **synset** (for **synonym set**); synsets are an important primitive in WordNet. The entry for *bass* includes synsets like {*bass*¹, *deep*⁶}, or {*bass*⁶, *bass voice*¹, *basso*²}. We can think of a synset as representing a concept of the type we discussed in Chapter 14. Thus, instead of representing concepts in logical terms, WordNet represents them as lists of the word senses that can be used to express the concept. Here's another synset example:

{*chump*¹, *fool*², *gull*¹, *mark*⁹, *patsy*¹, *fall guy*¹,
*sucker*¹, *soft touch*¹, *mug*²}

The gloss of this synset describes it as *a person who is gullible and easy to take advantage of*. Each of the lexical entries included in the synset can, therefore, be used to express this concept. Synsets like this one actually constitute the senses associated with WordNet entries, and hence it is synsets, not wordforms, lemmas, or individual senses, that participate in most of the lexical sense relations in WordNet.

WordNet represents all the kinds of sense relations discussed in the previous section, as illustrated in Fig. C.2 and Fig. C.3. WordNet hyponymy relations correspond

Relation	Also Called	Definition	Example
Hypernym	Superordinate	From concepts to superordinates	<i>breakfast</i> ¹ → <i>meal</i> ¹
Hyponym	Subordinate	From concepts to subtypes	<i>meal</i> ¹ → <i>lunch</i> ¹
Instance Hypernym	Instance	From instances to their concepts	<i>Austen</i> ¹ → <i>author</i> ¹
Instance Hyponym	Has-Instance	From concepts to concept instances	<i>composer</i> ¹ → <i>Bach</i> ¹
Member Meronym	Has-Member	From groups to their members	<i>faculty</i> ² → <i>professor</i> ¹
Member Holonym	Member-Of	From members to their groups	<i>copilot</i> ¹ → <i>crew</i> ¹
Part Meronym	Has-Part	From wholes to parts	<i>table</i> ² → <i>leg</i> ³
Part Holonym	Part-Of	From parts to wholes	<i>course</i> ⁷ → <i>meal</i> ¹
Substance Meronym		From substances to their subparts	<i>water</i> ¹ → <i>oxygen</i> ¹
Substance Holonym		From parts of substances to wholes	<i>gin</i> ¹ → <i>martini</i> ¹
Antonym		Semantic opposition between lemmas	<i>leader</i> ¹ ↔ <i>follower</i> ¹
Derivationally Related Form		Lemmas w/same morphological root	<i>destruction</i> ¹ ↔ <i>destroy</i> ¹

Figure C.2 Noun relations in WordNet.

Relation	Definition	Example
Hypernym	From events to superordinate events	<i>fly</i> ⁹ → <i>travel</i> ⁵
Troponym	From events to subordinate event (often via specific manner)	<i>walk</i> ¹ → <i>stroll</i> ¹
Entails	From verbs (events) to the verbs (events) they entail	<i>snore</i> ¹ → <i>sleep</i> ¹
Antonym	Semantic opposition between lemmas	<i>increase</i> ¹ ↔ <i>decrease</i> ¹
Derivationally Related Form	Lemmas with same morphological root	<i>destroy</i> ¹ ↔ <i>destruction</i> ¹

Figure C.3 Verb relations in WordNet.

to the notion of immediate hyponymy discussed on page 4. Each synset is related to its immediately more general and more specific synsets through direct hypernym and hyponym relations. These relations can be followed to produce longer chains of more general or more specific synsets. Figure C.4 shows hypernym chains for **bass**³ and **bass**⁷.

In this depiction of hyponymy, successively more general synsets are shown on successive indented lines. The first chain starts from the concept of a human bass singer. Its immediate superordinate is a synset corresponding to the generic concept of a singer. Following this chain leads eventually to concepts such as *entertainer* and *person*. The second chain, which starts from musical instrument, has a completely different path leading eventually to such concepts as musical instrument, device, and physical object. Both paths do eventually join at the very abstract synset *whole, unit*, and then proceed together to *entity* which is the top (root) of the noun hierarchy (in WordNet this root is generally called the **unique beginner**).

unique
beginner

C.3 Word Similarity: Thesaurus Methods

In Chapter 6 we introduced the embedding and cosine architecture for computing the similarity between two words. A thesaurus offers a different family of algorithms that can be complementary.

Although we have described them as relations between words, similar is actually a relationship between word *senses*. For example, of the two senses of *bank*, we

```

Sense 3
bass, basso --
(an adult male singer with the lowest voice)
=> singer, vocalist, vocalizer, vocaliser
    => musician, instrumentalist, player
        => performer, performing artist
            => entertainer
                => person, individual, someone...
                    => organism, being
                        => living thing, animate thing,
                            => whole, unit
                                => object, physical object
                                    => physical entity
                                        => entity
                                            => causal agent, cause, causal agency
                                                => physical entity
                                                    => entity

Sense 7
bass --
(the member with the lowest range of a family of
musical instruments)
=> musical instrument, instrument
    => device
        => instrumentality, instrumentation
            => artifact, artefact
                => whole, unit
                    => object, physical object
                        => physical entity
                            => entity

```

Figure C.4 Hyponymy chains for two separate senses of the lemma *bass*. Note that the chains are completely distinct, only converging at the very abstract level *whole, unit*.

might say that the financial sense is similar to one of the senses of *fund* and the riparian sense is more similar to one of the senses of *slope*. In the next few sections of this chapter, we will compute these relations over both words and senses.

The thesaurus-based algorithms use the structure of the thesaurus to define word similarity. In principle, we could measure similarity by using any information available in a thesaurus (meronymy, glosses, etc.). In practice, however, thesaurus-based word similarity algorithms generally use only the hypernym/hyponym (*is-a* or subsumption) hierarchy. In WordNet, verbs and nouns are in separate hypernym hierarchies, so a thesaurus-based algorithm for WordNet can thus compute only noun-noun similarity, or verb-verb similarity; we can't compare nouns to verbs or do anything with adjectives or other parts of speech.

The simplest thesaurus-based algorithms are based on the intuition that words or senses are more similar if there is a shorter **path** between them in the thesaurus graph, an intuition dating back to Quillian (1969). A word/sense is most similar to itself, then to its parents or siblings, and least similar to words that are far away. We make this notion operational by measuring the number of edges between the two concept nodes in the thesaurus graph and adding one. Figure C.5 shows an intuition; the concept *dime* is most similar to *nickel* and *coin*, less similar to *money*, and even less similar to *Richter scale*. A formal definition:

$$\text{pathlen}(c_1, c_2) = 1 + \text{the number of edges in the shortest path in the}$$




Figure C.5 A fragment of the WordNet hypernym hierarchy, showing path lengths (number of edges plus 1) from *nickel* to *coin* (2), *dime* (3), *money* (6), and *Richter scale* (8).

thesaurus graph between the sense nodes c_1 and c_2

Path-based similarity can be defined as just the path length, transformed either by log (Leacock and Chodorow, 1998) or, more often, by an inverse, resulting in the following common definition of **path-length based similarity**:

path-length
based similarity

$$\text{sim}_{\text{path}}(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{\text{pathlen}(c_1, c_2)} \quad (\text{C.17})$$

For most applications, we don't have sense-tagged data, and thus we need our algorithm to give us the similarity between words rather than between senses or concepts. For any of the thesaurus-based algorithms, following Resnik (1995), we can approximate the correct similarity (which would require sense disambiguation) by just using the pair of senses for the two words that results in maximum sense similarity. Thus, based on sense similarity, we can define **word similarity** as follows:

word similarity

$$\text{wordsim}(w_1, w_2) = \max_{\substack{c_1 \in \text{senses}(w_1) \\ c_2 \in \text{senses}(w_2)}} \text{sim}(c_1, c_2) \quad (\text{C.18})$$

The basic path-length algorithm makes the implicit assumption that each link in the network represents a uniform distance. In practice, this assumption is not appropriate. Some links (e.g., those that are deep in the WordNet hierarchy) often seem to represent an intuitively narrow distance, while other links (e.g., higher up in the WordNet hierarchy) represent an intuitively wider distance. For example, in Fig. C.5, the distance from *nickel* to *money* (5) seems intuitively much shorter than the distance from *nickel* to an abstract word *standard*; the link between *medium of exchange* and *standard* seems wider than that between, say, *coin* and *coinage*.

It is possible to refine path-based algorithms with normalizations based on depth in the hierarchy (Wu and Palmer, 1994), but in general we'd like an approach that lets us independently represent the distance associated with each edge.

information-
content

A second class of thesaurus-based similarity algorithms attempts to offer just such a fine-grained metric. These **information-content word-similarity** algorithms still rely on the structure of the thesaurus but also add probabilistic information derived from a corpus.

Following Resnik (1995) we'll define $P(c)$ as the probability that a randomly selected word in a corpus is an instance of concept c (i.e., a separate random variable, ranging over words, associated with each concept). This implies that $P(\text{root}) = 1$ since any word is subsumed by the root concept. Intuitively, the lower a concept

in the hierarchy, the lower its probability. We train these probabilities by counting in a corpus; each word in the corpus counts as an occurrence of each concept that contains it. For example, in Fig. C.5 above, an occurrence of the word *dime* would count toward the frequency of *coin*, *currency*, *standard*, etc. More formally, Resnik computes $P(c)$ as follows:

$$P(c) = \frac{\sum_{w \in \text{words}(c)} \text{count}(w)}{N} \quad (\text{C.19})$$

where $\text{words}(c)$ is the set of words subsumed by concept c , and N is the total number of words in the corpus that are also present in the thesaurus.

Figure C.6, from Lin (1998), shows a fragment of the WordNet concept hierarchy augmented with the probabilities $P(c)$.




Figure C.6 A fragment of the WordNet hierarchy, showing the probability $P(c)$ attached to each content, adapted from a figure from Lin (1998).

We now need two additional definitions. First, following basic information theory, we define the information content (IC) of a concept c as

$$\text{IC}(c) = -\log P(c) \quad (\text{C.20})$$

Second, we define the **lowest common subsumer** or **LCS** of two concepts:

$\text{LCS}(c_1, c_2)$ = the lowest common subsumer, that is, the lowest node in the hierarchy that subsumes (is a hypernym of) both c_1 and c_2

There are now a number of ways to use the information content of a node in a word similarity metric. The simplest way was first proposed by Resnik (1995). We think of the similarity between two words as related to their common information; the more two words have in common, the more similar they are. Resnik proposes to estimate the common amount of information by the **information content of the lowest common subsumer of the two nodes**. More formally, the **Resnik similarity** measure is

$$\text{sim}_{\text{resnik}}(c_1, c_2) = -\log P(\text{LCS}(c_1, c_2)) \quad (\text{C.21})$$

Lin (1998) extended the Resnik intuition by pointing out that a similarity metric between objects A and B needs to do more than measure the amount of information in common between A and B. For example, he additionally pointed out that the more **differences** between A and B, the less similar they are. In summary:

Lowest
common
subsumer
LCS

Resnik
similarity

- **Commonality:** the more information A and B have in common, the more similar they are.
- **Difference:** the more differences between the information in A and B, the less similar they are.

Lin measures the commonality between A and B as the information content of the proposition that states the commonality between A and B:

$$\text{IC}(\text{common}(A,B)) \quad (\text{C.22})$$

He measures the difference between A and B as

$$\text{IC}(\text{description}(A,B)) - \text{IC}(\text{common}(A,B)) \quad (\text{C.23})$$

where $\text{description}(A,B)$ describes A and B. Given a few additional assumptions about similarity, Lin proves the following theorem:

Similarity Theorem: The similarity between A and B is measured by the ratio between the amount of information needed to state the commonality of A and B and the information needed to fully describe what A and B are.

$$\text{sim}_{\text{Lin}}(A,B) = \frac{\text{common}(A,B)}{\text{description}(A,B)} \quad (\text{C.24})$$

Applying this idea to the thesaurus domain, Lin shows (in a slight modification of Resnik's assumption) that the information in common between two concepts is twice the information in the lowest common subsumer $\text{LCS}(c_1, c_2)$. Adding in the above definitions of the information content of thesaurus concepts, the final **Lin similarity** function is

Lin similarity

$$\text{sim}_{\text{Lin}}(c_1, c_2) = \frac{2 \times \log P(\text{LCS}(c_1, c_2))}{\log P(c_1) + \log P(c_2)} \quad (\text{C.25})$$

For example, using sim_{Lin} , Lin (1998) shows that the similarity between the concepts of *hill* and *coast* from Fig. C.6 is

$$\text{sim}_{\text{Lin}}(\text{hill}, \text{coast}) = \frac{2 \times \log P(\text{geological-formation})}{\log P(\text{hill}) + \log P(\text{coast})} = 0.59 \quad (\text{C.26})$$

Jiang-Conrath distance

A similar formula, **Jiang-Conrath distance** (Jiang and Conrath, 1997), although derived in a completely different way from Lin and expressed as a distance rather than similarity function, has been shown to work as well as or better than all the other thesaurus-based methods:

$$\text{dist}_{\text{JC}}(c_1, c_2) = 2 \times \log P(\text{LCS}(c_1, c_2)) - (\log P(c_1) + \log P(c_2)) \quad (\text{C.27})$$

We can transform dist_{JC} into a similarity by taking the reciprocal.

Finally, we describe a **dictionary-based** method that is related to the Lesk algorithm for word sense disambiguation we will introduce in Section C.6.1. The intuition of **extended gloss overlap**, or **extended Lesk** measure (Banerjee and Pedersen, 2003) is that two concepts/senses in a thesaurus are similar if their glosses contain overlapping words. We'll begin by sketching an overlap function for two glosses. Consider these two concepts, with their glosses:

Extended gloss overlap
extended Lesk

- *drawing paper*: paper that is specially prepared for use in drafting
- *decal*: the art of transferring designs from specially prepared paper to a wood or glass or metal surface.

For each n -word phrase that occurs in both glosses, Extended Lesk adds in a score of n^2 (the relation is non-linear because of the Zipfian relationship between lengths of phrases and their corpus frequencies; longer overlaps are rare, so they should be weighted more heavily). Here, the overlapping phrases are *paper* and *specially prepared*, for a total similarity score of $1^2 + 2^2 = 5$.

Given such an overlap function, when comparing two concepts (synsets), Extended Lesk not only looks for overlap between their glosses but also between the glosses of the senses that are hypernyms, hyponyms, meronyms, and other relations of the two concepts. For example, if we just considered hyponyms and defined $\text{gloss}(\text{hypo}(A))$ as the concatenation of all the glosses of all the hyponym senses of A , the total relatedness between two concepts A and B might be

$$\begin{aligned} \text{similarity}(A,B) = & \text{overlap}(\text{gloss}(A), \text{gloss}(B)) \\ & + \text{overlap}(\text{gloss}(\text{hypo}(A)), \text{gloss}(\text{hypo}(B))) \\ & + \text{overlap}(\text{gloss}(A), \text{gloss}(\text{hypo}(B))) \\ & + \text{overlap}(\text{gloss}(\text{hypo}(A)), \text{gloss}(B)) \end{aligned}$$

Let RELS be the set of possible WordNet relations whose glosses we compare; assuming a basic overlap measure as sketched above, we can then define the **Extended Lesk** overlap measure as

$$\text{sim}_{\text{eLesk}}(c_1, c_2) = \sum_{r,q \in \text{RELS}} \text{overlap}(\text{gloss}(r(c_1)), \text{gloss}(q(c_2))) \quad (\text{C.28})$$

$\text{sim}_{\text{path}}(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{\text{pathlen}(c_1, c_2)}$ $\text{sim}_{\text{Resnik}}(c_1, c_2) = -\log P(\text{LCS}(c_1, c_2))$ $\text{sim}_{\text{Lin}}(c_1, c_2) = \frac{2 \times \log P(\text{LCS}(c_1, c_2))}{\log P(c_1) + \log P(c_2)}$ $\text{sim}_{\text{JC}}(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{2 \times \log P(\text{LCS}(c_1, c_2)) - (\log P(c_1) + \log P(c_2))}$ $\text{sim}_{\text{eLesk}}(c_1, c_2) = \sum_{r,q \in \text{RELS}} \text{overlap}(\text{gloss}(r(c_1)), \text{gloss}(q(c_2)))$

Figure C.7 Five thesaurus-based (and dictionary-based) similarity measures.

Figure C.7 summarizes the five similarity measures we have described in this section.

Evaluating Thesaurus-Based Similarity

Which of these similarity measures is best? Word similarity measures have been evaluated in two ways, introduced in Chapter 6. The most common intrinsic evaluation metric computes the correlation coefficient between an algorithm's word similarity scores and word similarity ratings assigned by humans. There are a variety

of such human-labeled datasets: the RG-65 dataset of human similarity ratings on 65 word pairs (Rubenstein and Goodenough, 1965), the MC-30 dataset of 30 word pairs (Miller and Charles, 1991). The WordSim-353 (Finkelstein et al., 2002) is a commonly used set of ratings from 0 to 10 for 353 noun pairs; for example (*plane*, *car*) had an average score of 5.77. SimLex-999 (Hill et al., 2015) is a more difficult dataset that quantifies similarity (*cup*, *mug*) rather than relatedness (*cup*, *coffee*), and including both concrete and abstract adjective, noun and verb pairs. Another common intrinsic similarity measure is the TOEFL dataset, a set of 80 questions, each consisting of a target word with 4 additional word choices; the task is to choose which is the correct synonym, as in the example: *Levied is closest in meaning to: imposed, believed, requested, correlated* (Landauer and Dumais, 1997). All of these datasets present words without context.

Slightly more realistic are intrinsic similarity tasks that include context. The Stanford Contextual Word Similarity (SCWS) dataset (Huang et al., 2012) offers a richer evaluation scenario, giving human judgments on 2,003 pairs of words in their sentential context, including nouns, verbs, and adjectives. This dataset enables the evaluation of word similarity algorithms that can make use of context words. The *semantic textual similarity* task (Agirre et al. 2012, Agirre et al. 2015) evaluates the performance of sentence-level similarity algorithms, consisting of a set of pairs of sentences, each pair with human-labeled similarity scores.

Alternatively, the similarity measure can be embedded in some end-application, such as question answering or spell-checking, and different measures can be evaluated by how much they improve the end application.

C.4 Word Sense Disambiguation: Overview

word sense
disambiguation
WSD

The task of selecting the correct sense for a word is called **word sense disambiguation**, or **WSD**. WSD algorithms take as input a word in context and a fixed inventory of potential word senses and outputs the correct word sense in context. The input and the senses depends on the task. For machine translation from English to Spanish, the sense tag inventory for an English word might be the set of different Spanish translations. For automatic indexing of medical articles, the sense-tag inventory might be the set of MeSH (Medical Subject Headings) thesaurus entries.

When we are evaluating WSD in isolation, we can use the set of senses from a dictionary/thesaurus resource like WordNet. Figure C.4 shows an example for the word *bass*, which can refer to a musical instrument or a kind of fish.²

WordNet Sense	Spanish Translation	Roget Category	Target Word in Context
bass ⁴	lubina	FISH/INSECT	... fish as Pacific salmon and striped bass and...
bass ⁴	lubina	FISH/INSECT	... produce filets of smoked bass or sturgeon...
bass ⁷	bajo	MUSIC	... exciting jazz bass player since Ray Brown...
bass ⁷	bajo	MUSIC	... play bass because he doesn't have to solo...

Figure C.8 Possible definitions for the inventory of sense tags for *bass*.

lexical sample

It is useful to distinguish two WSD tasks. In the **lexical sample** task, a small

² The WordNet database includes eight senses; we have arbitrarily selected two for this example; we have also arbitrarily selected one of the many Spanish fishes that could translate English *sea bass*.

pre-selected set of target words is chosen, along with an inventory of senses for each word from some lexicon. Since the set of words and the set of senses are small, simple supervised classification approaches are used.

all-words

In the **all-words** task, systems are given entire texts and a lexicon with an inventory of senses for each entry and are required to disambiguate every content word in the text. The all-words task is similar to part-of-speech tagging, except with a much larger set of tags since each lemma has its own set. A consequence of this larger set of tags is data sparseness; it is unlikely that adequate training data for every word in the test set will be available. Moreover, given the number of polysemous words in reasonably sized lexicons, approaches based on training one classifier per term are unlikely to be practical.

C.5 Supervised Word Sense Disambiguation

Supervised WSD is commonly used whenever we have sufficient data that has been hand-labeled with correct word senses.

Datasets: There are various **lexical sample** datasets with context sentences labeled with the correct sense for the target word, such as the *line-hard-serve* corpus with 4,000 sense-tagged examples of *line* as a noun, *hard* as an adjective and *serve* as a verb (Leacock et al., 1993), and the *interest* corpus with 2,369 sense-tagged examples of *interest* as a noun (Bruce and Wiebe, 1994). The SENSEVAL project has also produced a number of such sense-labeled lexical sample corpora (SENSEVAL-1 with 34 words from the HECTOR lexicon and corpus (Kilgarriff and Rosenzweig 2000, Atkins 1993), SENSEVAL-2 and -3 with 73 and 57 target words, respectively (Palmer et al. 2001, Kilgarriff 2001)). **All-word** disambiguation tasks are trained from a **semantic concordance**, a corpus in which each open-class word in each sentence is labeled with its word sense from a specific dictionary or thesaurus. One commonly used corpus is SemCor, a subset of the Brown Corpus consisting of over 234,000 words that were manually tagged with WordNet senses (Miller et al. 1993, Landes et al. 1998). In addition, sense-tagged corpora have been built for the SENSEVAL all-word tasks. The SENSEVAL-3 English all-words test data consisted of 2081 tagged content word tokens, from 5,000 total running words of English from the WSJ and Brown corpora (Palmer et al., 2001).

semantic
concordance

Features Supervised WSD algorithms can use any standard classification algorithm. Features generally include the word identity, part-of-speech tags, and embeddings of surrounding words, usually computed in two ways: **collocation** features are words or n-grams at a particular location, (i.e., exactly one word to the right, or the two words starting 3 words to the left, and so on). **bag of word** features are represented as a vector with the dimensionality of the vocabulary (minus stop words), with a 1 if that word occurs in the neighborhood of the target word.

collocation

bag of word

Consider the ambiguous word *bass* in the following WSJ sentence:

(C.29) An electric guitar and **bass** player stand off to one side,

If we used a small 2-word window, a standard feature vector might include a bag of words, parts-of-speech, unigram and bigram collocation features, and embeddings, that is:

$$[w_{i-2}, \text{POS}_{i-2}, w_{i-1}, \text{POS}_{i-1}, w_{i+1}, \text{POS}_{i+1}, w_{i+2}, \text{POS}_{i+2}, w_{i-2}^{i-1}, w_{i+1}^{i+2}, E(w_{i-2}, w_{i-1}, w_{i+1}, w_{i+2}), \text{bag}()] \quad (\text{C.30})$$

would yield the following vector:

```
[guitar, NN, and, CC, player, NN, stand, VB, and guitar, player stand,
E(guitar, and, player, stand), bag(guitar, player, stand)]
```

High performing systems generally use POS tags and word collocations of length 1, 2, and 3 from a window of words 3 to the left and 3 to the right (Zhong and Ng, 2010). The embedding function could just take the average of the embeddings of the words in the window, or a more complicated embedding function can be used (Iacobacci et al., 2016).

C.5.1 Wikipedia as a source of training data

One way to increase the amount of training data is to use Wikipedia as a source of sense-labeled data. When a concept is mentioned in a Wikipedia article, the article text may contain an explicit link to the concept’s Wikipedia page, which is named by a unique identifier. This link can be used as a sense annotation. For example, the ambiguous word *bar* is linked to a different Wikipedia article depending on its meaning in context, including the page BAR (LAW), the page BAR (MUSIC), and so on, as in the following Wikipedia examples (Mihalcea, 2007).

In 1834, Sumner was admitted to the **[[bar (law)|bar]]** at the age of twenty-three, and entered private practice in Boston.

It is danced in 3/4 time (like most waltzes), with the couple turning approx. 180 degrees every **[[bar (music)|bar]]**.

Jenga is a popular beer in the **[[bar (establishment)|bar]]**s of Thailand.

These sentences can then be added to the training data for a supervised system. In order to use Wikipedia in this way, however, it is necessary to map from Wikipedia concepts to whatever inventory of senses is relevant for the WSD application. Automatic algorithms that map from Wikipedia to WordNet, for example, involve finding the WordNet sense that has the greatest lexical overlap with the Wikipedia sense, by comparing the vector of words in the WordNet synset, gloss, and related senses with the vector of words in the Wikipedia page title, outgoing links, and page category (Ponzetto and Navigli, 2010).

C.5.2 Evaluation

extrinsic
evaluation

To evaluate WSD algorithms, it’s better to consider **extrinsic, task-based**, or **end-to-end** evaluation, in which we see whether some new WSD idea actually improves performance in some end-to-end application like question answering or machine translation. Nonetheless, because extrinsic evaluations are difficult and slow, WSD systems are typically evaluated with **intrinsic** evaluation, in which a WSD component is treated as an independent system. Common intrinsic evaluations are either exact-match **sense accuracy**—the percentage of words that are tagged identically with the hand-labeled sense tags in a test set—or with precision and recall if systems are permitted to pass on the labeling of some instances. In general, we evaluate by using held-out data from the same sense-tagged corpora that we used for training, such as the SemCor corpus discussed above or the various corpora produced by the SENSEVAL effort.

intrinsic

sense accuracy

Many aspects of sense evaluation have been standardized by the SENSEVAL and SEMEVAL efforts (Palmer et al. 2006, Kilgarriff and Palmer 2000). This framework provides a shared task with training and testing materials along with sense inventories for all-words and lexical sample tasks in a variety of languages.

most frequent
sense

The normal baseline is to choose the **most frequent sense** for each word from the senses in a labeled corpus (Gale et al., 1992a). For WordNet, this corresponds to the first sense, since senses in WordNet are generally ordered from most frequent to least frequent. WordNet sense frequencies come from the SemCor sense-tagged corpus described above— WordNet senses that don't occur in SemCor are ordered arbitrarily after those that do. The most frequent sense baseline can be quite accurate, and is therefore often used as a default, to supply a word sense when a supervised algorithm has insufficient training data.

C.6 WSD: Dictionary and Thesaurus Methods

Supervised algorithms based on sense-labeled corpora are the best-performing algorithms for sense disambiguation. However, such labeled training data is expensive and limited. One alternative is to get indirect supervision from dictionaries and thesauruses, and so this method is also called **knowledge-based WSD**. Methods like this that do not use texts that have been hand-labeled with senses are also called weakly supervised.

C.6.1 The Lesk Algorithm

Lesk algorithm

The most well-studied dictionary-based algorithm for sense disambiguation is the **Lesk algorithm**, really a family of algorithms that choose the sense whose dictionary gloss or definition shares the most words with the target word's neighborhood. Figure C.9 shows the simplest version of the algorithm, often called the **Simplified Lesk algorithm** (Kilgarriff and Rosenzweig, 2000).

Simplified Lesk

```

function SIMPLIFIED LESK(word, sentence) returns best sense of word

  best-sense ← most frequent sense for word
  max-overlap ← 0
  context ← set of words in sentence
  for each sense in senses of word do
    signature ← set of words in the gloss and examples of sense
    overlap ← COMPUTE OVERLAP(signature, context)
    if overlap > max-overlap then
      max-overlap ← overlap
      best-sense ← sense
  end
  return(best-sense)

```

Figure C.9 The Simplified Lesk algorithm. The COMPUTE OVERLAP function returns the number of words in common between two sets, ignoring function words or other words on a stop list. The original Lesk algorithm defines the *context* in a more complex way. The *Corpus Lesk* algorithm weights each overlapping word w by its $-\log P(w)$ and includes labeled training corpus data in the *signature*.

As an example of the Lesk algorithm at work, consider disambiguating the word *bank* in the following context:

(C.31) The **bank** can guarantee deposits will eventually cover future tuition costs because it invests in adjustable-rate mortgage securities.

given the following two WordNet senses:

bank ¹	Gloss:	a financial institution that accepts deposits and channels the money into lending activities
	Examples:	“he cashed a check at the bank”, “that bank holds the mortgage on my home”
bank ²	Gloss:	sloping land (especially the slope beside a body of water)
	Examples:	“they pulled the canoe up on the bank”, “he sat on the bank of the river and watched the currents”

Sense **bank**¹ has two non-stopwords overlapping with the context in (C.31): *deposits* and *mortgage*, while sense **bank**² has zero words, so sense **bank**¹ is chosen.

There are many obvious extensions to Simplified Lesk. The original Lesk algorithm (Lesk, 1986) is slightly more indirect. Instead of comparing a target word’s signature with the context words, the target signature is compared with the signatures of each of the context words. For example, consider Lesk’s example of selecting the appropriate sense of *cone* in the phrase *pine cone* given the following definitions for *pine* and *cone*.

- pine 1 kinds of evergreen tree with needle-shaped leaves
- 2 waste away through sorrow or illness
- cone 1 solid body which narrows to a point
- 2 something of this shape whether solid or hollow
- 3 fruit of certain evergreen trees

In this example, Lesk’s method would select **cone**³ as the correct sense since two of the words in its entry, *evergreen* and *tree*, overlap with words in the entry for *pine*, whereas neither of the other entries has any overlap with words in the definition of *pine*. In general Simplified Lesk seems to work better than original Lesk.

The primary problem with either the original or simplified approaches, however, is that the dictionary entries for the target words are short and may not provide enough chance of overlap with the context.³ One remedy is to expand the list of words used in the classifier to include words related to, but not contained in, their individual sense definitions. But the best solution, if any sense-tagged corpus data like SemCor is available, is to add all the words in the labeled corpus sentences for a word sense into the signature for that sense. This version of the algorithm, the **Corpus Lesk** algorithm, is the best-performing of all the Lesk variants (Kilgarriff and Rosenzweig 2000, Vasilescu et al. 2004) and is used as a baseline in the SENSEVAL competitions. Instead of just counting up the overlapping words, the **Corpus Lesk** algorithm also applies a weight to each overlapping word. The weight is the **inverse document frequency** or **IDF**, a standard information-retrieval measure introduced in Chapter 6. IDF measures how many different “documents” (in this case, glosses and examples) a word occurs in and is thus a way of discounting function words. Since function words like *the*, *of*, etc., occur in many documents, their IDF is very low, while the IDF of content words is high. Corpus Lesk thus uses IDF instead of a stop list.

Formally, the IDF for a word *i* can be defined as

$$\text{idf}_i = \log \left(\frac{N_{\text{doc}}}{n_{d_i}} \right) \quad (\text{C.32})$$

³ Indeed, Lesk (1986) notes that the performance of his system seems to roughly correlate with the length of the dictionary entries.

Corpus Lesk

inverse
document
frequency
IDF

where $Ndoc$ is the total number of “documents” (glosses and examples) and nd_i is the number of these documents containing word i .

Finally, we can combine the Lesk and supervised approaches by adding new Lesk-like bag-of-words features. For example, the glosses and example sentences for the target sense in WordNet could be used to compute the supervised bag-of-words features in addition to the words in the SemCor context sentence for the sense (Yuret, 2004).

C.6.2 Graph-based Methods

Another way to use a thesaurus like WordNet is to make use of the fact that WordNet can be construed as a graph, with senses as nodes and relations between senses as edges. In addition to the hypernymy and other relations, it’s possible to create links between senses and those words in the gloss that are unambiguous (have only one sense). Often the relations are treated as undirected edges, creating a large undirected WordNet graph. Fig. C.10 shows a portion of the graph around the word $drink_v^1$.




Figure C.10 Part of the WordNet graph around $drink_v^1$, after Navigli and Lapata (2010).

There are various ways to use the graph for disambiguation, some using the whole graph, some using only a subpart. For example the target word and the words in its sentential context can all be inserted as nodes in the graph via a directed edge to each of its senses. If we consider the sentence *She drank some milk*, Fig. C.11 shows a portion of the WordNet graph between the senses $drink_v^1$ and $milk_n^1$.




Figure C.11 Part of the WordNet graph between $drink_v^1$ and $milk_n^1$, for disambiguating a sentence like *She drank some milk*, adapted from Navigli and Lapata (2010).

The correct sense is then the one which is the most important or *central* in some way in this graph. There are many different methods for deciding centrality. The

degree simplest is **degree**, the number of edges into the node, which tends to correlate with the most frequent sense. Another algorithm for assigning probabilities across nodes is **personalized page rank**, a version of the well-known pagerank algorithm which uses some seed nodes. By inserting a uniform probability across the word nodes (*drink* and *milk* in the example) and computing the personalized page rank of the graph, the result will be a pagerank value for each node in the graph, and the sense with the maximum pagerank can then be chosen. See [Agirre et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Navigli and Lapata \(2010\)](#) for details.

C.7 Semi-Supervised WSD: Bootstrapping

bootstrapping Both the supervised approach and the dictionary-based approaches to WSD require large hand-built resources: supervised training sets in one case, large dictionaries in the other. We can instead use **bootstrapping** or **semi-supervised learning**, which needs only a very small hand-labeled training set.

Yarowsky algorithm A classic bootstrapping algorithm for WSD is the **Yarowsky algorithm** for learning a classifier for a target word (in a lexical-sample task) ([Yarowsky, 1995](#)). The algorithm is given a small seedset Λ_0 of labeled instances of each sense and a much larger unlabeled corpus V_0 . The algorithm first trains an initial classifier on the seedset Λ_0 . It then uses this classifier to label the unlabeled corpus V_0 . The algorithm then selects the examples in V_0 that it is most confident about, removes them, and adds them to the training set (call it now Λ_1). The algorithm then trains a new classifier (a new set of rules) on Λ_1 , and iterates by applying the classifier to the now-smaller unlabeled set V_1 , extracting a new training set Λ_2 , and so on. With each iteration of this process, the training corpus grows and the untagged corpus shrinks. The process is repeated until some sufficiently low error-rate on the training set is reached or until no further examples from the untagged corpus are above threshold.




Figure C.12 The Yarowsky algorithm disambiguating “plant” at two stages; “?” indicates an unlabeled observation, A and B are observations labeled as SENSE-A or SENSE-B. The initial stage (a) shows only seed sentences Λ_0 labeled by collocates (“life” and “manufacturing”). An intermediate stage is shown in (b) where more collocates have been discovered (“equipment”, “microscopic”, etc.) and more instances in V_0 have been moved into Λ_1 , leaving a smaller unlabeled set V_1 . Figure adapted from [Yarowsky \(1995\)](#).

We need more good teachers – right now, there are only a half a dozen who can play the free bass with ease.
An electric guitar and bass player stand off to one side, not really part of the scene,
The researchers said the worms spend part of their life cycle in such fish as Pacific salmon and striped bass and Pacific rockfish or snapper.
And it all started when fishermen decided the striped bass in Lake Mead were...

Figure C.13 Samples of *bass* sentences extracted from the WSJ by using the simple correlates *play* and *fish*.

one sense per
collocation

Initial seeds can be selected by hand-labeling a small set of examples (Hearst, 1991), or by using the help of a heuristic. Yarowsky (1995) used the **one sense per collocation** heuristic, which relies on the intuition that certain words or phrases strongly associated with the target senses tend not to occur with the other sense. Yarowsky defines his seedset by choosing a single collocation for each sense.

For example, to generate seed sentences for the fish and musical senses of *bass*, we might come up with *fish* as a reasonable indicator of **bass**¹ and *play* as a reasonable indicator of **bass**². Figure C.13 shows a partial result of such a search for the strings “fish” and “play” in a corpus of *bass* examples drawn from the WSJ.

one sense per
discourse

The original Yarowsky algorithm also makes use of a second heuristic, called **one sense per discourse**, based on the work of Gale et al. (1992b), who noticed that a particular word appearing multiple times in a text or discourse often appeared with the same sense. This heuristic seems to hold better for coarse-grained senses and particularly for cases of homonymy rather than polysemy (Krovetz, 1998).

Nonetheless, it is still useful in a number of sense disambiguation situations. In fact, the *one sense per discourse* heuristic is an important one throughout language processing as it seems that many disambiguation tasks may be improved by a bias toward resolving an ambiguity the same way inside a discourse segment.

C.8 Unsupervised Word Sense Induction

word sense
induction

It is expensive and difficult to build large corpora in which each word is labeled for its word sense. For this reason, an unsupervised approach to sense disambiguation, often called **word sense induction** or **WSI**, is an important direction. In unsupervised approaches, we don’t use human-defined word senses. Instead, the set of “senses” of each word is created automatically from the instances of each word in the training set.

Most algorithms for word sense induction use some sort of clustering over word embeddings. (The earliest algorithms, due to Schütze (Schütze 1992, Schütze 1998), represented each word as a context vector of bag-of-words features \vec{c} .) Then in training, we use three steps.

1. For each token w_i of word w in a corpus, compute a context vector \vec{c} .
2. Use a **clustering algorithm** to **cluster** these word-token context vectors \vec{c} into a predefined number of groups or clusters. Each cluster defines a sense of w .
3. Compute the **vector centroid** of each cluster. Each vector centroid \vec{s}_j is a **sense vector** representing that sense of w .

Since this is an unsupervised algorithm, we don’t have names for each of these “senses” of w ; we just refer to the j th sense of w .

To disambiguate a particular token t of w we again have three steps:

1. Compute a context vector \vec{c} for t .
2. Retrieve all sense vectors s_j for w .
3. Assign t to the sense represented by the sense vector s_j that is closest to t .

All we need is a clustering algorithm and a distance metric between vectors. Clustering is a well-studied problem with a wide number of standard algorithms that can be applied to inputs structured as vectors of numerical values (Duda and Hart, 1973). A frequently used technique in language applications is known as **agglomerative clustering**. In this technique, each of the N training instances is initially assigned to its own cluster. New clusters are then formed in a bottom-up fashion by the successive merging of the two clusters that are most similar. This process continues until either a specified number of clusters is reached, or some global goodness measure among the clusters is achieved. In cases in which the number of training instances makes this method too expensive, random sampling can be used on the original training set to achieve similar results.

agglomerative
clustering

How can we evaluate unsupervised sense disambiguation approaches? As usual, the best way is to do extrinsic evaluation embedded in some end-to-end system; one example used in a **SemEval** bakeoff is to improve search result clustering and diversification (Navigli and Vannella, 2013). Intrinsic evaluation requires a way to map the automatically derived sense classes into a hand-labeled gold-standard set so that we can compare a hand-labeled test set with a set labeled by our unsupervised classifier. Various such metrics have been tested, for example in the SemEval tasks (Manandhar et al. 2010, Navigli and Vannella 2013, Jurgens and Klapaftis 2013), including cluster overlap metrics, or methods that map each sense cluster to a pre-defined sense by choosing the sense that (in some training set) has the most overlap with the cluster. However it is fair to say that no evaluation metric for this task has yet become standard.

C.9 Summary

This chapter has covered a wide range of issues concerning the meanings associated with lexical items. The following are among the highlights:

- A **word sense** is the locus of word meaning; definitions and meaning relations are defined at the level of the word sense rather than wordforms.
- **Homonymy** is the relation between unrelated senses that share a form, and **polysemy** is the relation between related senses that share a form.
- **Hyponymy** and **hypernymy** relations hold between words that are in a class-inclusion relationship.
- **WordNet** is a large database of lexical relations for English.
- **Word-sense disambiguation (WSD)** is the task of determining the correct sense of a word in context. Supervised approaches make use of sentences in which individual words (**lexical sample task**) or all words (**all-words task**) are hand-labeled with senses from a resource like WordNet.
- Classifiers for supervised WSD are generally trained on features of the surrounding words.
- An important baseline for WSD is the **most frequent sense**, equivalent, in WordNet, to **take the first sense**.

- The **Lesk algorithm** chooses the sense whose dictionary definition shares the most words with the target word's neighborhood.
- Graph-based algorithms view the thesaurus as a graph and choose the sense that is most central in some way.
- **Word similarity** can be computed by measuring the **link distance** in a thesaurus or by various measures of the **information content** of the two nodes.

Bibliographical and Historical Notes

Word sense disambiguation traces its roots to some of the earliest applications of digital computers. The insight that underlies modern algorithms for word sense disambiguation was first articulated by [Weaver \(1955\)](#) in the context of machine translation:

If one examines the words in a book, one at a time as through an opaque mask with a hole in it one word wide, then it is obviously impossible to determine, one at a time, the meaning of the words. [...] But if one lengthens the slit in the opaque mask, until one can see not only the central word in question but also say N words on either side, then if N is large enough one can unambiguously decide the meaning of the central word. [...] The practical question is : “What minimum value of N will, at least in a tolerable fraction of cases, lead to the correct choice of meaning for the central word?”

Other notions first proposed in this early period include the use of a thesaurus for disambiguation ([Masterman, 1957](#)), supervised training of Bayesian models for disambiguation ([Madhu and Lytel, 1965](#)), and the use of clustering in word sense analysis ([Sparck Jones, 1986](#)).

An enormous amount of work on disambiguation was conducted within the context of early AI-oriented natural language processing systems. [Quillian \(1968\)](#) and [Quillian \(1969\)](#) proposed a graph-based approach to language understanding, in which the dictionary definition of words was represented by a network of word nodes connected by syntactic and semantic relations. He then proposed to do sense disambiguation by finding the shortest path between senses in the conceptual graph. [Simmons \(1973\)](#) is another influential early semantic network approach. Wilks proposed one of the earliest non-discrete models with his *Preference Semantics* ([Wilks 1975c](#), [Wilks 1975b](#), [Wilks 1975a](#)), and [Small and Rieger \(1982\)](#) and [Riesbeck \(1975\)](#) proposed understanding systems based on modeling rich procedural information for each word. Hirst's ABSITY system ([Hirst and Charniak 1982](#), [Hirst 1987](#), [Hirst 1988](#)), which used a technique called marker passing based on semantic networks, represents the most advanced system of this type. As with these largely symbolic approaches, early neural network (at the time called 'connectionist') approaches to word sense disambiguation relied on small lexicons with hand-coded representations ([Cottrell 1985](#), [Kawamoto 1988](#)). Considerable work on sense disambiguation has also been conducted in in psycholinguistics, under the name 'lexical ambiguity resolution'. [Small et al. \(1988\)](#) present a variety of papers from this perspective.

The earliest implementation of a robust empirical approach to sense disambiguation is due to [Kelly and Stone \(1975\)](#), who directed a team that hand-crafted a set of disambiguation rules for 1790 ambiguous English words. [Lesk \(1986\)](#) was the

first to use a machine-readable dictionary for word sense disambiguation. The problem of dictionary senses being too fine-grained has been addressed by clustering word senses into **coarse senses** (Dolan 1994, Chen and Chang 1998, Mihalcea and Moldovan 2001, Agirre and de Lacalle 2003, Chklovski and Mihalcea 2003, Palmer et al. 2004, Navigli 2006, Snow et al. 2007). Corpora with clustered word senses for training clustering algorithms include Palmer et al. (2006) and **OntoNotes** (Hovy et al., 2006).

Supervised approaches to disambiguation began with the use of decision trees by Black (1988). The need for large amounts of annotated text in these methods led to investigations into the use of bootstrapping methods (Hearst 1991, Yarowsky 1995).

Diab and Resnik (2002) give a semi-supervised algorithm for sense disambiguation based on aligned parallel corpora in two languages. For example, the fact that the French word *catastrophe* might be translated as English *disaster* in one instance and *tragedy* in another instance can be used to disambiguate the senses of the two English words (i.e., to choose senses of *disaster* and *tragedy* that are similar). Abney (2002) and Abney (2004) explore the mathematical foundations of the Yarowsky algorithm and its relation to co-training. The most-frequent-sense heuristic is an extremely powerful one but requires large amounts of supervised training data.

The earliest use of clustering in the study of word senses was by Sparck Jones (1986); Pedersen and Bruce (1997), Schütze (1997), and Schütze (1998) applied distributional methods. Recent work on word sense induction has applied Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) (Boyd-Graber et al. 2007, Brody and Lapata 2009, Lau et al. 2012), and large co-occurrence graphs (Di Marco and Navigli, 2013).

A collection of work concerning WordNet can be found in Fellbaum (1998). Early work using dictionaries as lexical resources include Amsler's (1981) use of the Merriam Webster dictionary and Longman's *Dictionary of Contemporary English* (Boguraev and Briscoe, 1989).

Early surveys of WSD include Agirre and Edmonds (2006) and Navigli (2009).

See Pustejovsky (1995), Pustejovsky and Boguraev (1996), Martin (1986), and Copestake and Briscoe (1995), inter alia, for computational approaches to the representation of polysemy. Pustejovsky's theory of the **generative lexicon**, and in particular his theory of the **qualia structure** of words, is another way of accounting for the dynamic systematic polysemy of words in context.

Another important recent direction is the addition of sentiment and connotation to knowledge bases (Wiebe et al. 2005, Qiu et al. 2009, Velikovich et al. 2010) including SentiWordNet (Baccianella et al., 2010) and ConnotationWordNet (Kang et al., 2014).

Exercises

- C.1 Collect a small corpus of example sentences of varying lengths from any newspaper or magazine. Using WordNet or any standard dictionary, determine how many senses there are for each of the open-class words in each sentence. How many distinct combinations of senses are there for each sentence? How does this number seem to vary with sentence length?
- C.2 Using WordNet or a standard reference dictionary, tag each open-class word in your corpus with its correct tag. Was choosing the correct sense always a straightforward task? Report on any difficulties you encountered.

- C.3** Using your favorite dictionary, simulate the original Lesk word overlap disambiguation algorithm described on page 16 on the phrase *Time flies like an arrow*. Assume that the words are to be disambiguated one at a time, from left to right, and that the results from earlier decisions are used later in the process.
- C.4** Build an implementation of your solution to the previous exercise. Using WordNet, implement the original Lesk word overlap disambiguation algorithm described on page 16 on the phrase *Time flies like an arrow*.

- Abney, S. P. (2002). Bootstrapping. In *ACL-02*, pp. 360–367.
- Abney, S. P. (2004). Understanding the Yarowsky algorithm. *Computational Linguistics*, 30(3), 365–395.
- Agirre, E. and de Lacalle, O. L. (2003). Clustering WordNet word senses. In *RANLP 2003*.
- Agirre, E., Banea, C., Cardie, C., Cer, D., Diab, M., Gonzalez-Agirre, A., Guo, W., Lopez-Gazpio, I., Maritxalar, M., Mihalcea, R., Rigau, G., Uria, L., and Wiebe, J. (2015). 2015 SemEval-2015 Task 2: Semantic Textual Similarity, English, Spanish and Pilot on Interpretability. In *SemEval-15*, pp. 252–263.
- Agirre, E., Diab, M., Cer, D., and Gonzalez-Agirre, A. (2012). Semeval-2012 task 6: A pilot on semantic textual similarity. In *SemEval-12*, pp. 385–393.
- Agirre, E. and Edmonds, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Word Sense Disambiguation: Algorithms and Applications*. Kluwer.
- Agirre, E., López de Lacalle, O., and Soroa, A. (2014). Random walks for knowledge-based word sense disambiguation. *Computational Linguistics*, 40(1), 57–84.
- Amsler, R. A. (1981). A taxonomy of English nouns and verbs. In *ACL-81*, Stanford, CA, pp. 133–138.
- Atkins, S. (1993). Tools for computer-aided corpus lexicography: The Hector project. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 41, 5–72.
- Baccianella, S., Esuli, A., and Sebastiani, F. (2010). Sentiwordnet 3.0: An enhanced lexical resource for sentiment analysis and opinion mining. In *LREC-10*, pp. 2200–2204.
- Banerjee, S. and Pedersen, T. (2003). Extended gloss overlaps as a measure of semantic relatedness. In *IJCAI 2003*, pp. 805–810.
- Black, E. (1988). An experiment in computational discrimination of English word senses. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 32(2), 185–194.
- Boguraev, B. and Briscoe, T. (Eds.). (1989). *Computational Lexicography for Natural Language Processing*. Longman.
- Boyd-Graber, J., Blei, D. M., and Zhu, X. (2007). A topic model for word sense disambiguation. In *EMNLP/CoNLL 2007*.
- Brody, S. and Lapata, M. (2009). Bayesian word sense induction. In *EACL-09*, pp. 103–111.
- Bruce, R. F. and Wiebe, J. (1994). Word-sense disambiguation using decomposable models. In *ACL-94*, Las Cruces, NM, pp. 139–145.
- Chen, J. N. and Chang, J. S. (1998). Topical clustering of MRD senses based on information retrieval techniques. *Computational Linguistics*, 24(1), 61–96.
- Chklovski, T. and Mihalcea, R. (2003). Exploiting agreement and disagreement of human annotators for word sense disambiguation. In *RANLP 2003*.
- Copestake, A. and Briscoe, T. (1995). Semi-productive polysemy and sense extension. *Journal of Semantics*, 12(1), 15–68.
- Cottrell, G. W. (1985). *A Connectionist Approach to Word Sense Disambiguation*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY. Revised version published by Pitman, 1989.
- Di Marco, A. and Navigli, R. (2013). Clustering and diversifying web search results with graph-based word sense induction. *Computational Linguistics*, 39(3), 709–754.
- Diab, M. and Resnik, P. (2002). An unsupervised method for word sense tagging using parallel corpora. In *ACL-02*, pp. 255–262.
- Dolan, W. B. (1994). Word sense ambiguity: Clustering related senses. In *COLING-94*, Kyoto, Japan, pp. 712–716.
- Duda, R. O. and Hart, P. E. (1973). *Pattern Classification and Scene Analysis*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Fellbaum, C. (Ed.). (1998). *WordNet: An Electronic Lexical Database*. MIT Press.
- Finkelstein, L., Gabrilovich, E., Matias, Y., Rivlin, E., Solan, Z., Wolfman, G., and Ruppin, E. (2002). Placing search in context: The concept revisited. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 20(1), 116–131.
- Gale, W. A., Church, K. W., and Yarowsky, D. (1992a). Estimating upper and lower bounds on the performance of word-sense disambiguation programs. In *ACL-92*, Newark, DE, pp. 249–256.
- Gale, W. A., Church, K. W., and Yarowsky, D. (1992b). One sense per discourse. In *Proceedings DARPA Speech and Natural Language Workshop*, pp. 233–237.
- Hearst, M. A. (1991). Noun homograph disambiguation. In *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the University of Waterloo Centre for the New OED and Text Research*, pp. 1–19.
- Hill, F., Reichart, R., and Korhonen, A. (2015). Simlex-999: Evaluating semantic models with (genuine) similarity estimation. *Computational Linguistics*, 41(4), 665–695.
- Hirst, G. (1987). *Semantic Interpretation and the Resolution of Ambiguity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hirst, G. (1988). Resolving lexical ambiguity computationally with spreading activation and polaroid words. In Small, S. L., Cottrell, G. W., and Tanenhaus, M. K. (Eds.), *Lexical Ambiguity Resolution*, pp. 73–108. Morgan Kaufmann.
- Hirst, G. and Charniak, E. (1982). Word sense and case slot disambiguation. In *AAAI-82*, pp. 95–98.
- Hovy, E. H., Marcus, M. P., Palmer, M., Ramshaw, L. A., and Weischedel, R. (2006). Ontonotes: The 90% solution. In *HLT-NAACL-06*.
- Huang, E. H., Socher, R., Manning, C. D., and Ng, A. Y. (2012). Improving word representations via global context and multiple word prototypes. In *ACL 2012*, pp. 873–882.
- Iacobacci, I., Pilehvar, M. T., and Navigli, R. (2016). Embeddings for word sense disambiguation: An evaluation study. In *ACL 2016*, pp. 897–907.
- Jiang, J. J. and Conrath, D. W. (1997). Semantic similarity based on corpus statistics and lexical taxonomy. In *ROCLING X*, Taiwan.
- Jurgens, D. and Klapaftis, I. P. (2013). Semeval-2013 task 13: Word sense induction for graded and non-graded senses. In **SEM*, pp. 290–299.
- Kang, J. S., Feng, S., Akoglu, L., and Choi, Y. (2014). Connotationwordnet: Learning connotation over the word+ sense network. In *ACL 2014*.
- Kawamoto, A. H. (1988). Distributed representations of ambiguous words and their resolution in connectionist networks. In Small, S. L., Cottrell, G. W., and Tanenhaus, M. (Eds.), *Lexical Ambiguity Resolution*, pp. 195–228. Morgan Kaufmann.

- Kelly, E. F. and Stone, P. J. (1975). *Computer Recognition of English Word Senses*. North-Holland.
- Kilgarriff, A. (2001). English lexical sample task description. In *Proceedings of Senseval-2: Second International Workshop on Evaluating Word Sense Disambiguation Systems*, Toulouse, France, pp. 17–20.
- Kilgarriff, A. and Palmer, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Computing and the Humanities: Special Issue on SENSEVAL*, Vol. 34. Kluwer.
- Kilgarriff, A. and Rosenzweig, J. (2000). Framework and results for English SENSEVAL. *Computers and the Humanities*, 34, 15–48.
- Krovetz, R. (1998). More than one sense per discourse. In *Proceedings of the ACL-SIGLEX SENSEVAL Workshop*.
- Landauer, T. K. and Dumais, S. T. (1997). A solution to Plato's problem: The Latent Semantic Analysis theory of acquisition, induction, and representation of knowledge. *Psychological Review*, 104, 211–240.
- Landes, S., Leacock, C., and Teng, R. I. (1998). Building semantic concordances. In Fellbaum, C. (Ed.), *WordNet: An Electronic Lexical Database*, pp. 199–216. MIT Press.
- Lau, J. H., Cook, P., McCarthy, D., Newman, D., and Baldwin, T. (2012). Word sense induction for novel sense detection. In *EACL-12*, pp. 591–601.
- Leacock, C. and Chodorow, M. S. (1998). Combining local context and WordNet similarity for word sense identification. In Fellbaum, C. (Ed.), *WordNet: An Electronic Lexical Database*, pp. 265–283. MIT Press.
- Leacock, C., Towell, G., and Voorhees, E. M. (1993). Corpus-based statistical sense resolution. In *HLT-93*, pp. 260–265.
- Lesk, M. E. (1986). Automatic sense disambiguation using machine readable dictionaries: How to tell a pine cone from an ice cream cone. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Systems Documentation*, Toronto, CA, pp. 24–26.
- Lin, D. (1998). An information-theoretic definition of similarity. In *ICML 1998*, San Francisco, pp. 296–304.
- Madhu, S. and Lytel, D. (1965). A figure of merit technique for the resolution of non-grammatical ambiguity. *Mechanical Translation*, 8(2), 9–13.
- Manandhar, S., Klapaftis, I. P., Dligach, D., and Pradhan, S. (2010). Semeval-2010 task 14: Word sense induction & disambiguation. In *SemEval-2010*, pp. 63–68.
- Martin, J. H. (1986). The acquisition of polysemy. In *ICML 1986*, Irvine, CA, pp. 198–204.
- Masterman, M. (1957). The thesaurus in syntax and semantics. *Mechanical Translation*, 4(1), 1–2.
- Mihalcea, R. (2007). Using wikipedia for automatic word sense disambiguation. In *NAACL-HLT 07*, pp. 196–203.
- Mihalcea, R. and Moldovan, D. (2001). Automatic generation of a coarse grained WordNet. In *NAACL Workshop on WordNet and Other Lexical Resources*.
- Miller, G. A. and Charles, W. G. (1991). Contextual correlates of semantics similarity. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 6(1), 1–28.
- Miller, G. A., Leacock, C., Teng, R. I., and Bunker, R. T. (1993). A semantic concordance. In *Proceedings ARPA Workshop on Human Language Technology*, pp. 303–308.
- Morris, W. (Ed.). (1985). *American Heritage Dictionary* (2nd College Edition Ed.). Houghton Mifflin.
- Navigli, R. (2006). Meaningful clustering of senses helps boost word sense disambiguation performance. In *COLING/ACL 2006*, pp. 105–112.
- Navigli, R. (2009). Word sense disambiguation: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 41(2).
- Navigli, R. and Lapata, M. (2010). An experimental study of graph connectivity for unsupervised word sense disambiguation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 32(4), 678–692.
- Navigli, R. and Vannella, D. (2013). Semeval-2013 task 11: Word sense induction & disambiguation within an end-user application. In **SEM*, pp. 193–201.
- Palmer, M., Babko-Malaya, O., and Dang, H. T. (2004). Different sense granularities for different applications. In *HLT-NAACL Workshop on Scalable Natural Language Understanding*, Boston, MA, pp. 49–56.
- Palmer, M., Dang, H. T., and Fellbaum, C. (2006). Making fine-grained and coarse-grained sense distinctions, both manually and automatically. *Natural Language Engineering*, 13(2), 137–163.
- Palmer, M., Fellbaum, C., Cotton, S., Delfs, L., and Dang, H. T. (2001). English tasks: All-words and verb lexical sample. In *Proceedings of Senseval-2: 2nd International Workshop on Evaluating Word Sense Disambiguation Systems*, Toulouse, France, pp. 21–24.
- Palmer, M., Ng, H. T., and Dang, H. T. (2006). Evaluation of wsd systems. In Agirre, E. and Edmonds, P. (Eds.), *Word Sense Disambiguation: Algorithms and Applications*. Kluwer.
- Pedersen, T. and Bruce, R. (1997). Distinguishing word senses in untagged text. In *EMNLP 1997*, Providence, RI.
- Ponzetto, S. P. and Navigli, R. (2010). Knowledge-rich word sense disambiguation rivaling supervised systems. In *ACL 2010*, pp. 1522–1531.
- Pustejovsky, J. (1995). *The Generative Lexicon*. MIT Press.
- Pustejovsky, J. and Boguraev, B. (Eds.). (1996). *Lexical Semantics: The Problem of Polysemy*. Oxford University Press.
- Qiu, G., Liu, B., Bu, J., and Chen, C. (2009). Expanding domain sentiment lexicon through double propagation. In *IJCAI-09*, pp. 1199–1204.
- Quillian, M. R. (1968). Semantic memory. In Minsky, M. (Ed.), *Semantic Information Processing*, pp. 227–270. MIT Press.
- Quillian, M. R. (1969). The teachable language comprehender: A simulation program and theory of language. *Communications of the ACM*, 12(8), 459–476.
- Resnik, P. (1995). Using information content to evaluate semantic similarity in a taxonomy. In *International Joint Conference for Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-95)*, pp. 448–453.
- Riesbeck, C. K. (1975). Conceptual analysis. In Schank, R. C. (Ed.), *Conceptual Information Processing*, pp. 83–156. American Elsevier, New York.
- Rubenstein, H. and Goodenough, J. B. (1965). Contextual correlates of synonymy. *Communications of the ACM*, 8(10), 627–633.

- Schütze, H. (1992). Dimensions of meaning. In *Proceedings of Supercomputing '92*, pp. 787–796. IEEE Press.
- Schütze, H. (1997). *Ambiguity Resolution in Language Learning: Computational and Cognitive Models*. CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA.
- Schütze, H. (1998). Automatic word sense discrimination. *Computational Linguistics*, 24(1), 97–124.
- Simmons, R. F. (1973). Semantic networks: Their computation and use for understanding English sentences. In Schank, R. C. and Colby, K. M. (Eds.), *Computer Models of Thought and Language*, pp. 61–113. W.H. Freeman and Co.
- Small, S. L., Cottrell, G. W., and Tanenhaus, M. (Eds.). (1988). *Lexical Ambiguity Resolution*. Morgan Kaufman.
- Small, S. L. and Rieger, C. (1982). Parsing and comprehending with Word Experts. In Lehnert, W. G. and Ringle, M. H. (Eds.), *Strategies for Natural Language Processing*, pp. 89–147. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Snow, R., Prakash, S., Jurafsky, D., and Ng, A. Y. (2007). Learning to merge word senses. In *EMNLP/CoNLL 2007*, pp. 1005–1014.
- Sparck Jones, K. (1986). *Synonymy and Semantic Classification*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh. Republication of 1964 PhD Thesis.
- Vasilescu, F., Langlais, P., and Lapalme, G. (2004). Evaluating variants of the lesk approach for disambiguating words. In *LREC-04*, Lisbon, Portugal, pp. 633–636. ELRA.
- Velikovich, L., Blair-Goldensohn, S., Hannan, K., and McDonald, R. (2010). The viability of web-derived polarity lexicons. In *NAACL HLT 2010*, pp. 777–785.
- Weaver, W. (1949/1955). Translation. In Locke, W. N. and Boothe, A. D. (Eds.), *Machine Translation of Languages*, pp. 15–23. MIT Press. Reprinted from a memorandum written by Weaver in 1949.
- Wiebe, J., Wilson, T., and Cardie, C. (2005). Annotating expressions of opinions and emotions in language. *Language resources and evaluation*, 39(2-3), 165–210.
- Wilks, Y. (1975a). An intelligent analyzer and understander of English. *Communications of the ACM*, 18(5), 264–274.
- Wilks, Y. (1975b). Preference semantics. In Keenan, E. L. (Ed.), *The Formal Semantics of Natural Language*, pp. 329–350. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Wilks, Y. (1975c). A preferential, pattern-seeking, semantics for natural language inference. *Artificial Intelligence*, 6(1), 53–74.
- Wu, Z. and Palmer, M. (1994). Verb semantics and lexical selection. In *ACL-94*, Las Cruces, NM, pp. 133–138.
- Yarowsky, D. (1995). Unsupervised word sense disambiguation rivaling supervised methods. In *ACL-95*, Cambridge, MA, pp. 189–196.
- Yuret, D. (2004). Some experiments with a Naive Bayes WSD system. In *Senseval-3: 3rd International Workshop on the Evaluation of Systems for the Semantic Analysis of Text*.
- Zhong, Z. and Ng, H. T. (2010). It makes sense: A wide-coverage word sense disambiguation system for free text. In *ACL 2010*, pp. 78–83.