

# How Can BERT Help Lexical Semantics Tasks?

Yile Wang, Leyang Cui, Yue Zhang

Westlake University

{wangyile, cuileyang}@westlake.edu.cn

yue.zhang@wias.org.cn

## Abstract

Contextualized embeddings such as BERT can serve as strong input representations to NLP tasks, outperforming their static embeddings counterparts such as skip-gram, CBOW and GloVe. However, such embeddings are dynamic, calculated according to a sentence-level context, which limits their use in lexical semantics tasks. We address this issue by making use of dynamic embeddings as word representations in training static embeddings, thereby leveraging their strong representation power for disambiguating context information. Results show that this method leads to improvements over traditional static embeddings on a range of lexical semantics tasks, obtaining the best reported results on seven datasets.

## 1 Introduction

Word embedding (Bengio et al., 2003) is a fundamental task in natural language processing, which investigates the representation of words in dense low-dimensional vector spaces. Seminal methods (Mikolov et al., 2013a; Pennington et al., 2014; Bojanowski et al., 2017) are built based on the distributional hypothesis (Harris, 1954). In particular, the skip-gram model (Mikolov et al., 2013a) trains a word embedding lookup table from large raw sentences by using a center word to predict its context words in a window size. Data likelihood is modeled based on cosine similarities between embeddings.

Word embeddings are useful in two broad aspects. First, they can be used directly to solve lexical semantics tasks, such as word similarity and analogy. For example, Mikolov et al. (2013a) shows that the analogy between  $\langle king, queen \rangle$  and  $\langle man, woman \rangle$  can be reflected by algebraic operations between the relevant word vectors. This characteristic of word embeddings is of large interest to computational linguistic research (Faruqui et al.,

2015; Kiela et al., 2015a; Artetxe et al., 2018). Second, word embeddings can be used as input representations to downstream tasks, addressing sparsity issues of one-hot or indicator feature functions.

Recently, contextualized word representation such as ELMo (Peters et al., 2018), GPT (Radford et al., 2018, 2019), BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), XLNet (Yang et al., 2019) and RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) has been shown a more effective input representation method compared to traditional word representation such as skip-gram (Mikolov et al., 2013a) and GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014), giving significantly improved results in a wide range of NLP tasks, including question answering (Choi et al., 2018), reading comprehension (Xu et al., 2019) and commonsense reasoning (Lin et al., 2019). Such embeddings differ from traditional embeddings mainly in their parameterization. In addition to a lookup table, a sequence encoding network such as RNN and SAN is also used for calculating word vectors given a sentence. As a result, the vector for the same word varies under different contexts. We thus call them *dynamic embeddings*. In contrast, traditional methods are referred to as *static embeddings*.

One limitation of dynamic embeddings, as compared to static embeddings, is that they cannot be used directly for the aforementioned lexical semantics tasks due to the need for sentential contextualization. We investigate how to address this issue. Intuitively, there are several cheap methods to obtain static embeddings from dynamic embedding models. For example, the contextualized vectors of a word can be averaged over a large corpus. Alternatively, the word vector parameters from the token embedding layer in a contextualized model can be used as static embeddings. Our experiments show that these simple methods do not necessarily outperform traditional static embedding methods.

We consider integrating dynamic embeddings

into the training process of static word embeddings, thereby fully exploiting their strength for obtaining improved static embeddings, and consequently for improving lexical semantics tasks. In particular, we integrate BERT and skip-gram by using BERT to provide dynamic embeddings for center words during the training of a skip-gram model. Compared with the skip-gram, the advantage is at least two-fold. First, polysemous words are represented using BERT embeddings, thereby resolving word sense ambiguities (Coenen et al., 2019). Second, syntactic and semantic information over the entire sentence is integrated into the center word representation (Jawahar et al., 2019; Clark et al., 2019), thereby providing richer features compared to a word window.

Experiments over a range of lexical semantics datasets show that our method outperforms the existing state-of-the-art methods for training static embeddings, demonstrating the advantage of leveraging dynamic embeddings to improve lexical semantics tasks. To our knowledge, we are the first to systematically integrate contextualized embeddings for improving word similarity and analogy results.

## 2 Related Work

**Static Word Embeddings.** Skip-gram (SG) and continuous-bag-of-words (CBOW) are two models based on distributed word-context pair information (Mikolov et al., 2013a). The former predicts the context words for a center word, while the latter predicts a center word using its context words. Ling et al. (2015) claims that not all the context are equal and considered word order in the skip-gram model. Hall et al. (2014) and Levy and Goldberg (2014a) further inject syntactic information by building word embeddings from the dependency parse trees over texts. GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) learns word embeddings by factorizing global word co-occurrence statistics. Our model follows the skip-gram framework. The main difference between our work and the above methods is that center words are represented dynamically, rather than statically.

Our work is related to a line of work on sense embedding (Chen et al., 2014; Li and Jurafsky, 2015; Jauhar et al., 2015). However, they require a pre-defined set of senses, and rely on external word sense disambiguation for training static sense embeddings. In contrast, we use dynamic embeddings

to automatically and implicitly represent senses.

**Dynamic Word Embeddings.** Contextualized word representations have been shown useful for NLP tasks (Choi et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2019). ELMo (Peters et al., 2018) provides deep word representations generated from LSTM based language modeling, GPT (Radford et al., 2018, 2019) improves language model pre-training based on Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017), BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) investigates self-attention-network for deep bidirectional representations, XLNet (Yang et al., 2019) takes a generalized autoregressive pretraining model based on Transformer-XL (Dai et al., 2019).

The above models are based on a language modeling objective. However, they do not model word co-occurrences directly, which has been shown important for distributed word embeddings. By integrating dynamic embeddings into the training of static embeddings, we make use of both contextualized representation and co-occurrence information for improving lexical semantics tasks.

**Dynamically Calculating Context Vectors for Word Embeddings.** SynGCN (Vashishth et al., 2019) use graph convolution network (GCN) to integrate syntactic context for learning context embeddings. Our work is similar in dynamically calculating word representations. The main difference is that, while their model uses dependency parse trees and graph convolution network for better incorporating syntactic and semantic information, we directly model the sequential context by using BERT contextualized representation trained over large data.

## 3 Background

We take skip-gram (Mikolov et al., 2013a) as our base model for static word embeddings. BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) is used as the dynamic embeddings to replace the center word embeddings in our model.

**Skip-Gram.** Given a sentence  $s$  with words  $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n (w_i \in D)$ , we model each word  $w_i$  by using its context words  $w_{i-ws}, \dots, w_{i-1}, w_{i+1}, \dots, w_{i+ws}$ . The center word and context words are projected into two types of embeddings  $v_i$  and  $v'_{i+j} (1 \leq |j| \leq ws)$ , respectively, as shown in Figure 1(a). Given a training corpus with  $N$  sentences  $C = \{s_c = w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{n_c}\}_{c=1}^N$ , the training ob-




Figure 1: Skip-gram, BERT and our proposed model. The blue blocks denote the representation of words.

jective is to minimize:

$$L_{SG} = - \sum_{c=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \sum_{1 \leq |j| \leq w_s} \log f(v'_{i+j}, v_i) \quad (1)$$

herein  $f(v'_{i+j}, v_i) = p(w_{i+j}|w_i)$  represents the concurrence probability of word  $w_{i+j}$  given the word  $w_i$ , which is estimated by:

$$p(w_{i+j}|w_i) = \frac{\exp(v'_{i+j}^\top v_i)}{\sum_{w_k \in D} \exp(v'_k{}^\top v_i)} \quad (2)$$

During training, each word in the vocabulary uses the same embedding tables  $V$  and  $V'$  across sentences.

**BERT.** BERT consists of a multi-layer bidirectional Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) encoder. The masked language model (MLM) objective is to predict certain masked words through its contextualized representation, as shown in Figure 1(b).

Formally, given a sentence  $s = w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n$ , each  $w_i$  is transformed into input vector  $h_i$  by summing up the static WordPiece (Wu et al., 2016) token embeddings  $E_{w_i}$ , the segment embeddings  $SE_{w_i}$  and the position embeddings  $PE_{w_i}$ :

$$h_i = E_{w_i} + SE_{w_i} + PE_{w_i} \quad (3)$$

The input vectors  $H = \{h_1, \dots, h_n\}$ ,  $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  are then transformed into queries  $Q^m$ , keys  $K^m$ ,

and values  $V^m$ ,  $\{Q^m, K^m, V^m\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_k}$ :

$$Q^m, K^m, V^m = HW_Q^m, HW_K^m, HW_V^m \quad (4)$$

where  $\{W_Q^m, W_K^m, W_V^m\} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_k}$  are trainable parameters,  $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  represent the  $m$ -th attention head.  $M$  parallel attention functions are applied to produce  $M$  output states  $\{O^1, \dots, O^M\}$ :

$$A^m = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{Q^m{}^\top K^m}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right) \quad (5)$$

$$O^m = A^m V^m$$

$A^m$  is the attention distribution for the  $m$ -th head and  $\sqrt{d_k}$  is a scaling factor. Finally, each head for  $O_i$  are concatenated to obtain the final output of word  $w_i$ :

$$o_i = [O_i^1, \dots, O_i^M] \quad (6)$$

Given a corpus  $\{s_c = w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{n_c}\}_{c=1}^N$ , the objective is to minimize the loss of predicting the randomly chosen masked word  $w_{mask_i}$  by its output representation  $o_{mask_i}$  in Eq. 6:

$$L_{MLM} = - \sum_{c=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \log p(E_{w_{mask_i}} | o_{mask_i}) \quad (7)$$

where  $E$  is the token embedding table in Eq. 3,  $p(E_{w_{mask_i}} | o_{mask_i})$  is calculated as with Eq. 2:

$$p(E_{w_{mask_i}} | o_{mask_i}) = \frac{\exp(E_{w_{mask_i}}^\top o_{mask_i})}{\sum_{w_k \in D} \exp(E_{w_k}^\top o_{mask_i})} \quad (8)$$

## 4 The Proposed Approach

Given a sentence  $s = w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n$ , we model a center word  $w_i$  and its context words  $w_{i-w_s}, \dots, w_{i-1}, w_{i+1}, \dots, w_{i+w_s}$  as in the skip-gram model. To integrate dynamic embeddings, we use BERT to replace the center word embeddings  $v_i$ , so that each center word  $w_i$  is represented in a sentential context. To this end, a center word  $w_i$  is first transformed into  $h_i$ , which is the sum of the token embedding  $E_{w_i}$  and the position embedding  $PE_{w_i}$ :

$$h_i = E_{w_i} + PE_{w_i} \quad (9)$$

Then  $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n$  are fed into a  $L$ -layer bidirectional Transformer block, as described in Eq. 4 and Eq. 5. In particular, we use a pretrained BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) model to generate the output representations  $o_i$ , where numbers of layers  $L = 12$ , attention heads  $M = 12$  and model size  $d = 768$ .

A linear projection layer is used for transforming the output  $o_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  to  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{emb}}$ :

$$u_i = U o_i \quad (10)$$

where  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{emb} \times d}$  are model parameters.

To model co-occurrence between the center word  $w_i$  and its context words  $w_{i-w_s}, \dots, w_{i-1}, w_{i+1}, \dots, w_{i+w_s}$ , we maximize the probability of the context words  $w_{i+j}$  ( $1 \leq |j| \leq w_s$ ) given the contextualized representation  $u_i$  of the center word:

$$p(w_{i+j}|w_i) = \frac{\exp(v'_{i+j} \top u_i)}{\sum_{w_k \in D} \exp(v'_k \top u_i)} \quad (11)$$

similar to Eq. 2,  $v'_k$  is the context word embeddings for  $w_k$  by using a static embedding table.

Note that our model is not a direct adaptation of the skip-gram model by replacing one embedding table. The original skip-gram algorithm uses the center word embedding table as the final output embeddings. However, to make the context words predictable and enable negative sampling from the vocabulary, we thus use BERT representation for the center word, and the context word embedding table as the final output static embeddings.

**Attention Aggregation.** Not all context words contribute equally to deciding the word representation. For example, predicting the stop words (e.g., “the”, “a”) is less informative than more meaningful words. One method to solve this problem is sub-sampling (Mikolov et al., 2013). A word  $w_i$  is

discarded with a probability by:

$$P(w_i) = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{t}{f(w_i)}} \quad (12)$$

where  $f(w_i)$  is the frequency of word  $w_i$  in the training corpus and  $t$  is a chosen threshold, typically around  $10^{-5}$ .

Sub-sampling is used in the skip-gram model. However, it cannot be directly used in our method because contextualized representation can be undermined with words being removed from a sentence. We choose instead to select more indicative context words automatically while keeping the training sentence complete. Formally, we apply the attention mechanism to aggregate context words for each center word  $w_j$  by using  $u_i$  as the query vector and  $v'_j$  as the key vectors:

$$a_j = \text{ATT}(u_i, v'_j) \quad (13)$$

where  $\text{ATT}(\cdot)$  denotes the dot-product attention operation (Luong et al., 2015).

The context embeddings are then combined using the corresponding attention coefficient:

$$v'_{i\_context} = \sum_{1 \leq |j| \leq w_s} a_{i+j} v'_{i+j} \quad (14)$$

**Training.** Given  $\{s_c = w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{n_c}\}_{c=1}^N$ , the objective is to minimize a noise contrastive estimation loss function with negative sampling:

$$L = - \sum_{c=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \left( \log \sigma(v'_{i\_context} \top u_i) + \sum_{m=1}^k \mathbb{E}_{w_{negm} \sim P(w)} [\log \sigma(-v'_{negm} \top u_i)] \right) \quad (15)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the sigmoid function,  $w_{negm}$  denotes a negative sample,  $k$  is the number of negative samples and  $P(w)$  is the noise distribution set as the unigram distribution  $U(w)$  raised to the 3/4 power (i.e.,  $P(w) = U(w)^{3/4}/Z$ ).

The final embeddings  $v'$  are optimized through stochastic gradient descent.

**Testing.** The trained embeddings are tested for lexical semantics tasks in the following way. First, the similarity score between two words are calculated based on the cosine similarity between their embeddings:

$$\text{score}_{word} = \cos(x, y) = \frac{x \top y}{\|x\| \cdot \|y\|} \quad (16)$$

Second, the word analogy task investigates relations of the form “ $x$  is to  $y$  as  $x^*$  is to  $y^*$ ”, where






Figure 2: Development experiments: (a) embedding dimension, (b) window size and (c) attention aggregation.

$y^*$  can be predicted given the word vectors of  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $x^*$  by 3CosAdd (Levy and Goldberg, 2014b):

$$y^* = \arg \max_{y' \in V, y' \neq x^*, y, x} \cos((x^* + y - x), y') \quad (17)$$

The relation similarity score between  $x$  to  $y$  and  $x^*$  to  $y^*$  is computed as:

$$\text{score}_{\text{relation}} = \cos((y - x), (y^* - x^*)) \quad (18)$$

## 5 Experiments

We compare the effectiveness of our method with both the skip-gram baselines and naive BERT methods for lexical semantics tasks. In addition, our methods are also compared with the state-of-the-art methods on standard benchmarks.

### 5.1 Experimental Settings

**Datasets.** The Wikipedia dump<sup>1</sup> corpus is used for training static embeddings, which consist of 57 million sentences with 1.1 billion tokens. Sentences with a length between 10 to 40 are selected, the final average length of sentences is 20.2.

We perform word similarity tasks on the WordSim-353 (Finkelstein et al., 2001), SimLex-999 (Kiehl et al., 2015b), Rare Word (RW) (Luo et al., 2013) and MEN-3K (Bruni et al., 2012) datasets, computing the Spearman’s rank correlation between the word similarity score $_{\text{word}}$  and human judgments.

For word analogy, we compare the analogy prediction accuracy on the Google (Mikolov et al., 2013a) datasets. We also compare the Spearman’s rank correlation between relation similarity score $_{\text{relation}}$  and human judgments on the SemEval-2012 (Jurgens et al., 2012) dataset.

**Hyper-Parameters Settings.** The dimension of word embedding vectors  $d_{\text{emb}}$  is 300; the window

size for context words  $ws$  is set as 5; the number of negative samples  $k$  is 5; the initial learning rate for SGD is 0.08 and gradients are clipped at norm 5.

### 5.2 Development Experiments

We select one million sentences from corpus for development experiments, investigating the effect of embedding dimension, context window size and attention aggregation.

**Embedding Dimension.** Figure 2(a) shows the results for different word embedding dimension  $d_{\text{emb}}$ . The model with 100 dimensional embeddings gives a lower result, which is likely because the model will underfit with too few dimensions. The model with 500 dimensions gives similar final result compared with 300 dimensions, while having more parameters and taking more training and testing time. We thus select the dimension as 300, which is the same as most traditional models.

**Window Size.** The window size  $ws$  decides how much context information we directly model. The results are shown on Figure 2(b). When  $ws$  is 1, we only model the relationship between the center word and its two neighbor words. The performance is 54.8. As the window size increases, the model gives better results, showing the effectiveness of modeling more context information. However, when the window size is 8, the model costs twice as much training time but does not give further improvements. Therefore we set the window size to 5, which is the same as skip-gram.

**Attention Aggregation.** Figure 2(c) shows the results of skip-gram and our model with or w/o attention aggregation. Our model stably outperforms skip-gram. Without attention aggregation, our model treats all context words equally. It gives slower convergence with a best development result of 65.5, lower than 66.3 with attention aggregation. This shows the effectiveness of differentiating context words (Mikolov et al., 2013).

<sup>1</sup><https://dumps.wikimedia.org/>

Types	Models	Word Similarity						Analogy	
		WS353	WS353S	WS353R	SimLex-999	RW	MEN	Google	SemEval
Traditional	SG	61.0	68.9	53.7	34.9	34.5	67.0	43.5	19.1
	CBOW	62.7	70.7	53.9	38.0	30.0	68.6	58.4	18.9
	GloVe	54.2	64.3	50.2	31.6	29.9	68.3	45.3	18.7
	FASTTEXT	68.3	74.6	61.6	38.2	37.3	74.8	72.7	19.5
	Deps	60.6	73.1	46.8	39.6	33.0	60.5	36.0	22.9
Dynamic Models	ELMo <sub>token</sub>	54.1	69.1	39.2	41.7	42.1	57.7	39.8	19.3
	GPT2 <sub>token</sub>	65.5	71.5	55.7	48.4	31.6	69.8	33.1	21.3
	BERT <sub>token</sub>	57.8	67.3	42.5	48.9	29.5	54.8	31.7	22.0
	XLNet <sub>token</sub>	62.4	74.4	53.2	48.1	34.0	66.3	32.6	22.2
	ELMo <sub>avg</sub>	58.3	71.3	47.4	43.6	38.4	65.5	49.1	21.2
	GPT2 <sub>avg</sub>	64.5	72.1	59.7	46.9	29.1	68.6	37.2	21.9
	BERT <sub>avg</sub>	59.4	67.0	49.9	46.8	30.8	66.3	59.4	20.8
	XLNet <sub>avg</sub>	64.9	72.3	58.0	47.3	27.7	64.1	30.8	23.2
	GCN + Static	SynGCN	60.9	73.2	45.7	45.5	33.7	71.0	50.7
BERT + Static	Ours	<b>72.8</b>	<b>75.3</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>49.4</b>	<b>42.3</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>75.8</b>	<b>20.2</b>

Table 1: Main results on word similarity and analogy tasks. The ELMo, GPT2, BERT and XLNet models use 512, 768, 768 and 768 dimensional embeddings, respectively, while others use 300 dimensional vectors.

### 5.3 Baselines

- **SG**, **CBOW** are the skip-gram and continuous-bag-of-words models by Mikolov et al. (2013a).
- **GloVe** is a log-bilinear regression model which leverages global co-occurrence statistics of corpus (Pennington et al., 2014).
- **FASTTEXT** takes into account subword information that incorporates character n-grams into the skip-gram model (Bojanowski et al., 2017).
- **Deps** modifies the skip-gram model using the dependency parse tree to replace the sequential context (Levy and Goldberg, 2014a).
- **BERT**. We investigate two simple ways to use BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) for lexical semantics tasks. The first method, called BERT<sub>token</sub>, ignores the contextualized parameters and uses the mean pooled subword token embeddings from  $E$  in Eq. 3 as a set of static embeddings. The second method, called BERT<sub>avg</sub>, takes the average of output  $o_i$  in Eq. 6 over training corpus.
- **ELMo**, **GPT2** and **XLNet**. Similar to BERT, we also investigate the token embeddings and the average of output representation from ELMo (Peters et al., 2018), GPT2 (Radford et al., 2019) and XLNet (Yang et al., 2019) models. The baselines are ELMo<sub>token</sub>, ELMo<sub>avg</sub>, GPT2<sub>token</sub>, GPT2<sub>avg</sub>, XLNet<sub>token</sub> and XLNet<sub>avg</sub>, respectively.
- **SynGCN**. Given a training sentence, Vashishta et al. (2019) propose a GCN to dynamically calculate context word embeddings based on the syntax structure, using this dynamically calculated embeddings in training static embeddings.

The above baselines can be categorized into three classes, as shown in the first column in Table 1. In particular, the first category of methods are

traditional static embeddings, where word vectors come from a lookup table. In the second category, static embeddings from dynamic word embedding models are used. In the last category, dynamic and static embeddings are integrated in the sense that context or center words representation are dynamically calculated via GCN or a BERT model for each sentence, but the target embeddings are static.

### 5.4 Results

Table 1 shows the main results on word similarity and analogy tasks. Our model gives the best performance on 7 out of 8 datasets, achieving the best results on all the word similarity datasets ( $p$ -value  $< 0.01$  using t-test). In particular, it outperforms the best performing baselines by a large margin on WS353, WS353R and Google datasets, obtaining 6.5%, 8.3%, and 4.2% improvement, respectively.

Among the traditional word embedding baselines, the skip-gram and CBOW models give relatively similar results. The FASTTEXT model gives the best result for word similarity tasks by leveraging subword information. The syntax-based embeddings Deps outperforms other traditional embeddings on the SemEval-2012 dataset. The reason can be that the syntax-based embedding encodes functional similarity rather than topical similarity (Kominos and Manandhar, 2016), which is more suitable for the relation similarity tasks, including relation classes such as “part-whole” (e.g.,  $\langle car, engine \rangle$  is more similar to  $\langle hand, finger \rangle$  than  $\langle bottle, water \rangle$ ) and “cause-purpose” (e.g.,  $\langle anesthetic, numbness \rangle$  is more similar to  $\langle joke, laughter \rangle$  than  $\langle smile, friendship \rangle$ ).

With regard to dynamic embedding models, the

Word Pairs	Human	SG ( $\Delta$ )	BERT <sub>token</sub> ( $\Delta$ )	BERT <sub>avg</sub> ( $\Delta$ )	SynGCN ( $\Delta$ )	Ours ( $\Delta$ )
<i>dividend, payment</i>	0.763	0.464 (-0.299)	0.347 (-0.416)	0.503 (-0.260)	0.431 (-0.332)	<b>0.566 (-0.197)</b>
<i>murder, manslaughter</i>	0.853	0.600 (-0.253)	0.369 (-0.484)	0.672 (-0.181)	0.516 (-0.337)	<b>0.712 (-0.141)</b>
<i>shower, thunderstorm</i>	0.631	0.401 (-0.230)	0.344 (-0.287)	0.483 (-0.148)	0.398 (-0.233)	<b>0.496 (-0.135)</b>
<i>board, recommendation</i>	0.447	0.259 (-0.188)	0.299 (-0.148)	0.583 (+0.136)	0.092 (-0.355)	<b>0.342 (-0.105)</b>
<i>benchmark, index</i>	0.425	0.305 (-0.120)	0.247 (-0.178)	0.569 (+0.144)	0.255 (-0.170)	<b>0.435 (-0.010)</b>

Table 2: Word similarity comparison between human and models. The scores of human are normalized to (0,1).

Types	Example	SG	BERT <sub>token</sub>	BERT <sub>avg</sub>	SynGCN	Ours
capital-country	<i>Berlin to Germany is Ottawa to Canada</i>	59.7	17.2	45.3	51.3	<b>86.7</b>
city-state	<i>Phoenix to Arizona is Dallas to Texas</i>	39.2	16.2	36.2	38.4	<b>70.8</b>
nationality-adjective	<i>Austria to Austrian is Spain to Spanish</i>	67.3	69.3	87.9	40.1	<b>90.3</b>
family	<i>son to daughter is uncle to aunt</i>	63.6	41.5	76.6	69.5	<b>86.7</b>
comparative	<i>good to better is easy to easier</i>	53.4	55.2	80.4	78.6	<b>91.7</b>
superlative	<i>fast to fastest is bad to worst</i>	23.8	41.6	58.0	45.5	<b>85.9</b>
plural	<i>dog to dogs is mouse to mice</i>	38.5	28.3	90.6	74.7	<b>92.2</b>

Table 3: Word analogy prediction accuracy on Google datasets according to different types of word pairs.

static token embeddings (e.g., BERT<sub>token</sub>) and the average of output representations (e.g., BERT<sub>avg</sub>) perform relatively close on word similarity tasks, giving comparable results on some datasets such as WS353S and RW, and better than traditional models on the SimLex-999 and SemEval-2012 datasets. This shows the effectiveness of dynamic and sentential information. However, these methods do not fully exploit the word co-occurrence information, and thus still underperform static baselines on datasets such as WS353, WS353R and MEN. Our method outperforms these methods for using dynamic embeddings, showing the usefulness of integrating dynamic embeddings into static embedding training based on the distributional hypothesis.

## 6 Analysis

Below we investigate the main reason behind the effectiveness of our method.

**Fine-grained Result.** Table 2 shows the word similarity results of some representative word pairs. BERT<sub>token</sub> does not capture the relatedness of  $\langle \textit{dividend, payment} \rangle$  and  $\langle \textit{murder, manslaughter} \rangle$  due to lack of consideration of context information, showing the discrepancy between human judgement and model scoring. BERT<sub>avg</sub> further improves the performance. Almost all the models give better results for word pairs that have higher co-occurrence probability. For example, the phrase “*benchmark index*” and “*board recommendation*” appear 8 and 29 times in corpus, respectively. In addition, the same neighboring words appearing in more sentences may have more similar averaged contextualized representations, thus leading BERT<sub>avg</sub> to give higher similarity scores compared

Model	Nearest Neighbors for Word “while”
SG	<i>whilst, recuperating, pursuing, preparing, attempting, fending</i>
CBOW	<i>whilst, when, still, although, and, but</i>
GloVe	<i>both, taking, ‘, up, but, after</i>
FASTTEXT	<i>whilst, still, and, meanwhile, instead, though</i>
SynGCN	<i>whilst, time, when, years, months, tenures</i>
Ours	<i>whilst, whereas, although, conversely, though, meanwhile</i>

Table 4: Nearest neighbors for word “while”.

with human judgement. SynGCN tends to underestimate the relationship between word pairs compared with other models, which shows negative influence of differentiating syntactic contexts. Overall, the results of our model are closer to human judgement.

For word analogy, we compare the performances of models according to different types of word pairs. Table 3 shows the results. BERT<sub>token</sub> performs relatively lower on “*capital-country*” and “*city-state*” compared to skip-gram because it does not model context information. BERT<sub>avg</sub> improves the results by a large margin, giving comparable results on grammatical related word analogy such as “*plural*” due to the use of sentential information. SynGCN performs relatively well on grammatical related word pairs by using syntax structures. However, it does not perform well on “*capital-country*” and “*nationality-adjective*” word pairs compared with the sequential context based skip-gram model. In contrast, our model takes the advantages of these methods and gives the best overall performance.

**Nearest Neighbors.** Table 4 shows the nearest neighbors to the word “*while*” according to cosine similarity. In particular, traditional methods yield





## References

- Mikel Artetxe, Gorka Labaka, Iñigo Lopez-Gazpio, and Eneko Agirre. 2018. [Uncovering divergent linguistic information in word embeddings with lessons for intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation](#). In *CoNLL*, pages 282–291, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, Pascal Vincent, and Christian Janvin. 2003. [A neural probabilistic language model](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 3:1137–1155.
- Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. 2017. [Enriching word vectors with subword information](#). *TACL*, 5:135–146.
- Elia Bruni, Gemma Boleda, Marco Baroni, and Nam-Khanh Tran. 2012. [Distributional semantics in technicolor](#). In *ACL*, pages 136–145, Jeju Island, Korea. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xinxiong Chen, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2014. [A unified model for word sense representation and disambiguation](#). In *EMNLP*, pages 1025–1035, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eunsol Choi, He He, Mohit Iyyer, Mark Yatskar, Wentaoh Yih, Yejin Choi, Percy Liang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. [QuAC: Question answering in context](#). In *EMNLP*, pages 2174–2184, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kevin Clark, Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. [What does BERT look at? an analysis of BERT’s attention](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 276–286, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andy Coenen, Emily Reif, Ann Yuan, Been Kim, Adam Todd Pearce, Fernanda Viégas, and Martin Wattenberg. 2019. [Visualizing and measuring the geometry of bert](#). *ArXiv*, abs/1906.02715.
- Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Quoc Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. [Transformer-XL: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context](#). In *ACL*, pages 2978–2988, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *NAACL*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Manaal Faruqui, Jesse Dodge, Sujay Kumar Jauhar, Chris Dyer, Eduard Hovy, and Noah A. Smith. 2015. [Retrofitting word vectors to semantic lexicons](#). In *NAACL*, pages 1606–1615, Denver, Colorado. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lev Finkelstein, Evgeniy Gabrilovich, Yossi Matias, Ehud Rivlin, Zach Solan, Gadi Wolfman, and Eytan Ruppin. 2001. [Placing search in context: The concept revisited](#). *TOIS*, 20:406–414.
- David Hall, Greg Durrett, and Dan Klein. 2014. [Less grammar, more features](#). In *ACL*, pages 228–237, Baltimore, Maryland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zellig S Harris. 1954. [Distributional structure](#). *Word*, 10(2-3):146–162.
- Sujay Kumar Jauhar, Chris Dyer, and Eduard Hovy. 2015. [Ontologically grounded multi-sense representation learning for semantic vector space models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 683–693, Denver, Colorado. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ganesh Jawahar, Benoît Sagot, and Djamel Seddah. 2019. [What does BERT learn about the structure of language?](#) In *ACL*, pages 3651–3657, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David Jurgens, Saif Mohammad, Peter Turney, and Keith Holyoak. 2012. [SemEval-2012 task 2: Measuring degrees of relational similarity](#). In *SEMEVAL*, pages 356–364, Montréal, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Douwe Kiela, Felix Hill, and Stephen Clark. 2015a. [Specializing word embeddings for similarity or relatedness](#). In *EMNLP*, pages 2044–2048, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Douwe Kiela, Felix Hill, and Stephen Clark. 2015b. [Specializing word embeddings for similarity or relatedness](#). In *EMNLP*, pages 2044–2048, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexandros Komninos and Suresh Manandhar. 2016. [Dependency based embeddings for sentence classification tasks](#). In *NAACL*, pages 1490–1500, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Omer Levy and Yoav Goldberg. 2014a. [Dependency-based word embeddings](#). In *ACL*, pages 302–308, Baltimore, Maryland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Omer Levy and Yoav Goldberg. 2014b. [Linguistic regularities in sparse and explicit word representations](#). In *CoNLL*, pages 171–180, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiwei Li and Dan Jurafsky. 2015. [Do multi-sense embeddings improve natural language understanding?](#) In *EMNLP*, pages 1722–1732, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Bill Yuchen Lin, Xinyue Chen, Jamin Chen, and Xiang Ren. 2019. [KagNet: Knowledge-aware graph networks for commonsense reasoning](#). In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*, pages 2822–2832, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wang Ling, Chris Dyer, Alan W. Black, and Isabel Trancoso. 2015. [Two/too simple adaptations of Word2Vec for syntax problems](#). In *NAACL*, pages 1299–1304, Denver, Colorado. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. [Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Thang Luong, Hieu Pham, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. [Effective approaches to attention-based neural machine translation](#). In *EMNLP*, pages 1412–1421, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thang Luong, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. 2013. [Better word representations with recursive neural networks for morphology](#). In *CoNLL*, pages 104–113, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Laurens van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. [Visualizing data using t-SNE](#). *JMLR*, 9:2579–2605.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013a. [Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space](#). *CoRR*, abs/1301.3781.
- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. 2013. [Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality](#). In C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *NeurIPS*, pages 3111–3119. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D. Manning. 2014. [Glove: Global vectors for word representation](#). In *EMNLP*, pages 1532–1543.
- Matthew Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. [Deep contextualized word representations](#). In *NAACL*, pages 2227–2237, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. [Improving language understanding by generative pre-training](#).
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#).
- Shikhar Vashishth, Manik Bhandari, Prateek Yadav, Piyush Rai, Chiranjib Bhattacharyya, and Partha Talukdar. 2019. [Incorporating syntactic and semantic information in word embeddings using graph convolutional networks](#). In *ACL*, pages 3308–3318, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *NeurIPS*, pages 5998–6008. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, et al. 2016. [Google’s neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08144*.
- Hu Xu, Bing Liu, Lei Shu, and Philip Yu. 2019. [BERT post-training for review reading comprehension and aspect-based sentiment analysis](#). In *NAACL*, pages 2324–2335. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V. Le. 2019. [Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding](#).