

Schrödinger’s Bat: Diffusion Models Sometimes Generate Polysemous Words in Superposition

Jennifer C. White[✉] Ryan Cotterell[✉]

[✉]University of Cambridge [✉]ETH Zürich

jw2088@cam.ac.uk ryan.cotterell@inf.ethz.ch

Abstract

Recent work has shown that despite their impressive capabilities, text-to-image diffusion models such as DALL·E 2 (Ramesh et al., 2022) can display strange behaviours when a prompt contains a word with multiple possible meanings, often generating images containing both senses of the word (Rassin et al., 2022). In this work we seek to put forward a possible explanation of this phenomenon. Using the similar Stable Diffusion model (Rombach et al., 2022), we first show that when given an input that is the sum of encodings of two distinct words, the model can produce an image containing both concepts represented in the sum. We then demonstrate that the CLIP encoder used to encode prompts (Radford et al., 2021) encodes polysemous words as a superposition of meanings, and that using linear algebraic techniques we can edit these representations to influence the senses represented in the generated images. Combining these two findings, we suggest that the homonym duplication phenomenon described by Rassin et al. (2022) is caused by diffusion models producing images representing both of the meanings that are present in superposition in the encoding of a polysemous word.



<https://github.com/rycolab/diffusion-polysemy>

1 Introduction

When humans encounter a word with more than one possible meaning, they can use information such as situational context and selectional restrictions to infer which meaning is the most likely. Models for language-based tasks such as translation struggle with this, often being biased towards the sense that is more commonly attested regardless of context and thus often producing a translation of the incorrect sense (Campolungo et al., 2022). Recent research by Rassin et al. (2022) showed




Figure 1: By editing prompt encodings by removing projections of vectors corresponding to each sense, we are able to reduce homonym duplication and produce the desired sense of the word “bat”.

that text-to-image diffusion models behave in a different and unexpected way when confronted with a prompt containing polysemous words. Specifically, they showed that when DALL·E 2 is prompted with a sentence containing a word with multiple possible meanings, such as “bat” or “bow”, the generated image often represents *more than one* of these meanings. For example, in the initial image in Fig. 1 “bat” is represented both as a baseball bat and an animal. They call this behaviour homonym duplication. Diffusion models have attracted much attention, even beyond the reaches of the research communities that spawned them.¹ Despite this, we are still lacking in our understanding of some of the unusual tendencies they exhibit, such as the phenomenon of homonym duplication.

In this work, we put forward one possible explanation of this phenomenon. We suggest that this occurs due to polysemous words in the prompt being encoded as a linear superposition of their possible meanings. In a text-based decoding task, such as translation, a representation of this form would not pose a problem, as the decoding model ultimately converts its representations into a prob-

¹For example, the Twitter account <https://twitter.com/weirdalle>, which posts images generated by diffusion models, has over 1 million followers at time of writing.

ability distribution over tokens which it uses to select an output word. Thus, although both possibilities will influence the distribution obtained, it is forced to select a word representing one meaning or the other. However, diffusion models use the representation as input to condition the denoising process which predicts noise to remove, and such a choice between meanings is never forced. This means that both meanings influence the denoising process, and both meanings can be represented in the final image. To draw an analogy with quantum mechanics, in a famous thought experiment, [Schrödinger \(1935\)](#) described a scenario in which a cat in a box with a radioactive material is poisoned once a particle decay occurs, and suggested that since a particle’s state exists in a superposition of decayed and undecayed states until an observation is made, that the cat must be considered to be both alive and dead until the box is opened. In the translation scenario, the meaning of a word such as “bat” exists as a superposition of possibilities until an “observation” is made by sampling an output word. Since this never happens in diffusion models, the metaphorical box is never opened and the bat continues to be *both* a baseball bat and an animal.

Unfortunately, the internal workings of DALL·E 2 are not openly accessible, so we test this hypothesis by performing experiments using the implementation of Stable Diffusion ([Rombach et al., 2022](#)) available on HuggingFace ([Wolf et al., 2020](#)). This is a smaller diffusion model which encodes prompts using a CLIP ([Radford et al., 2021](#)) encoder, the same type of encoder used by DALL·E 2. We begin by showing that diffusion models can represent multiple concepts that are in linear superposition, by demonstrating that when Stable Diffusion takes as input a sum of CLIP encodings for two words, both objects can be represented in the generated image (§3). We then demonstrate that CLIP encodes polysemous words as a sum over their possible meanings, and that linear-algebraic manipulation of these representations can be used to generate one sense over another (§4), as demonstrated in Fig. 1. Combined, these two facts offer a possible explanation for the homonym duplication described by [Rassin et al. \(2022\)](#).

2 Background: Diffusion Models

Text-to-image diffusion models such as DALL·E 2 ([Ramesh et al., 2022](#)) and Stable Diffusion ([Rombach et al., 2022](#)) take a text prompt as input and

generate an image corresponding to the prompt. During training, an image \mathbf{x}_0 is transformed into random noise through the progressive addition of noise sampled from a Gaussian distribution whose mean depends on the image’s current value, i.e. $\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$, $\epsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{\alpha_t}\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, (1 - \alpha_t)\mathbf{I})$ where α_t is a value controlling the magnitude of the noise added at each step. The model is then trained to gradually denoise these images, step by step, conditioned on a descriptive caption of the image. Once trained, the model will apply this process to random noise to produce an image consistent with a given prompt.

2.1 CLIP Encoding

Both DALL·E 2 and Stable Diffusion encode text prompts using CLIP ([Radford et al., 2021](#)). CLIP is trained by jointly training a transformer-based text encoder and a transformer-based image encoder on pairs of images and captions with a contrastive objective – given N pairs, it is trained to maximise the cosine similarity between the text and image encodings for these N pairs, but also to minimise cosine similarity between the $N^2 - N$ other pairings.

2.2 Conditioned Denoising Process

Given a prompt \mathbf{s} , diffusion models sample $\mathbf{x}_T \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ as their initial image. This image is progressively denoised by taking $\mathbf{x}_{t-1} = \mathbf{x}_t - A_t \hat{\epsilon}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t \mid \mathbf{s}) + B_t$, where A_t and B_t are coefficients calculated by a scheduler. To allow generation to be guided by the prompt, $\hat{\epsilon}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t \mid \mathbf{s}) = \epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t \mid \emptyset) + \gamma \cdot (\epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t \mid \mathbf{s}) - \epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t \mid \emptyset))$, where $\gamma \geq 1$ describes the strength of guidance and $\epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t \mid \mathbf{s})$ is the model that has been trained to predict the noise to remove at each step. $\epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t \mid \mathbf{s})$ is generally implemented with a version of U-Net ([Ronneberger et al., 2015](#)).

DALL·E 2. In DALL·E 2, the prompt \mathbf{s} is encoded using CLIP, a CLIP image encoding is predicted using a transformer-based diffusion prior model conditioned on \mathbf{s} and $\text{CLIP}(\mathbf{s})$. The main diffusion model is then conditioned on this image encoding by projecting it to the appropriate dimension and then concatenating it to the attention context at each layer.

Stable Diffusion. In Stable Diffusion, the denoising process takes place entirely in the latent space. The starting point \mathbf{z}_T is sampled and then de-noised conditioned on $\text{CLIP}(\mathbf{s})$. The conditioning is implemented through cross-attention

between U-Net representations and a projection of CLIP(s). The final output z_0 is decoded to an image using the decoder of a Variational Auto-encoder (Kingma and Welling, 2014).

2.3 Homonym Duplication in DALL·E 2

Rassin et al. (2022) demonstrate a number of strange behaviours exhibited by DALL·E 2. In this work, we are primarily concerned with the phenomenon of homonym duplication – when multiple senses of a polysemous word are realised in one image. They use a number of prompts to show that when a prompt contains a polysemous word such as “bat” or “bow”, rather than realising the sense that the model deems to be most likely, it often realises both senses in the final image. They also point out that this is observed less frequently in smaller models such as DALL·E Mini and Stable Diffusion.

2.3.1 Stable Diffusion and DALL·E 2

In this work we consider Stable Diffusion in lieu of DALL·E 2. We make this choice since our method directly manipulates the representations used in the generation process, which is not possible in publicly available releases of DALL·E 2. Both are similar in that they both text-to-image generation models based on diffusion and a CLIP encoder. They differ primarily in the fact that Stable Diffusion performs the denoising process entirely in the latent space. DALL·E 2 is also a much larger model in terms of the number of parameters. Our hypothesis, if true, would be more difficult to show in a smaller model with less representational capacity. Because of this, we consider it likely that positive conclusions drawn from this work would also apply to DALL·E 2, though we invite replication of our approach using DALL·E 2.

2.3.2 Homonym Duplication in Stable Diffusion

As Rassin et al. (2022) point out, the homonym duplication phenomenon that they observe in DALL·E 2 is seen less frequently in Stable Diffusion. Nonetheless, we were successful in replicating the behaviour for some prompts. Some of these images are shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. More are included in App. A.1.

3 Claim 1: Diffusion can realise multiple concepts in superposition

To construct an explanation for the phenomenon of homonym duplication, we first show that an en-



(a) Prompt: “tall cranes by the sea”



(b) Prompt: “a man holding glasses”



(c) Prompt: “a gentleman with a bow and arrow”



(d) Prompt: “a baseball bat inside a spooky cave”

Figure 2: Examples of homonym generation observed in images generated using Stable Diffusion

coding that is composed of a sum of encodings of multiple words can produce an image in which each word in the sum is represented. When using the model in the standard way, the prompt s is encoded using CLIP, and the result $\text{CLIP}(s)$ is then used to condition the denoising process. In these experiments, we instead take two prompts s_1 and s_2 , and the denoising process is conditioned on the weighted sum of their CLIP encodings $\alpha_1 \text{CLIP}(s_1) + \alpha_2 \text{CLIP}(s_2)$, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$.²

3.1 Experimental Results

For each pair of prompts, s_1 and s_2 , 30 images were generated from $\alpha_1 \text{CLIP}(s_1) + \alpha_2 \text{CLIP}(s_2)$, 30 images were generated from $\text{CLIP}(s_1)$ and 30 images were generated from $\text{CLIP}(s_2)$. Results presented here are for pairs that were observed to result in realisation of both prompts. Some of the images generated using this method are shown in Fig. 3, and table 1 shows the percentage of images generated that contained the object described by s_1 , that described by s_2 , both or neither. We can see that the model can, in fact, generate an image representing both of the words in the sum. In fact, we see that this occurs in over 40% of generated images. More generated images are included in App. A.2.1 and a detailed breakdown

²In practice, we achieved best results with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0.5$.



Figure 3: Images generated by summing representations of multiple prompts

of the contents of the images generated for each pair of prompts, along with details of statistical significance tests are given in App. B.1.

There is no particular reason to assume that summing the representations of two words would result in a representation that can be interpreted by the model. Adding the representations in this way could result in a representation that doesn’t correspond to anything at all, and leads to the generation of low quality images. It’s also plausible that it would produce an interpolation between the two concepts described. However, we can see that this is not the case. The model sometimes produced both of the objects described in the two prompts, and otherwise largely produced one or the other. This indicates that the representations are encoded in such a way that the important information corresponding to each prompt does not interfere when the two are summed, potentially because they are stored in directions that are close to orthogonal.

As an additional observation on this point,

Input	Percentage containing:			
	s_1	s_2	Both	Neither
$\text{CLIP}(s_1)$	100.0	0	0	0
$\text{CLIP}(s_2)$	0	100.0	0	0
$0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(s_1)) + 0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(s_2))$	35.2	20	41.5	3.3

Table 1: Table showing which prompts were represented in images generated from each prompt in a pair and from their weighted sum


we found that some pairs, such as $s_1 = \text{"cat"}$, $s_2 = \text{"dog"}$, did not behave in the same way, instead producing a cat-dog hybrid creature. We speculate that this may be because similar concepts such as “cat” and “dog” are likely to share similar representation space.

4 Claim 2: Polysemous words are represented as linear superpositions of meanings

Next, we seek to show that the CLIP encoder used by Stable Diffusion represents polysemous word as a linear superposition of their possible meanings. Other methods of encoding words have been previously shown to represent polysemy in this way (Arora et al., 2018). In this case, since the encoder is transformer-based, there is no static representation of each word, but instead a representation of each token of the word in the context of a sentence. Due to this, we instead approximate directions corresponding to each meaning across several sentences. For a particular word of interest, we take several sets of syntactically similar sentences where each sentence contains either an ambiguous use of the word, or a use where one sense is more likely than the other. A procedure similar to that used by Bolukbasi et al. (2016) is then used to obtain bases for the spaces corresponding to the difference between a representation of a particular meaning and the representation of the word in the corresponding ambiguous sentence. We then use projections into these spaces to obtain approximations of the representation of each meaning. We then demonstrate how these approximations can be used to intervene on a representation and change the sense that appears in generated images. This involves editing the representation in the subspace spanned by our approximate representations, and removing the contribution from the representation of the undesired meaning.



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour the animal sense



(c) Encoding edited to favour the sports-related sense

Figure 4: Prompt: “a bat laying on the grass”

4.1 Identifying a Meaning Subspace


In a procedure based on that described by Bolukbasi et al. (2016), we begin by identifying a subspace in which representations of different meanings differ. Given a polysemous word w_p with distinct possible meanings, m_1 and m_2 , we hand-write a set of N prompts containing w_p in which either of the two candidate meanings is possible. From each such prompt, s^{amb} , we manually create $s^{(1)}$ and $s^{(2)}$, which differ from s^{amb} by the addition of a disambiguating modifier and changes to the lexical content to more strongly imply meanings m_1 and m_2 respectively, but otherwise have the same syntactic structure. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} s^{\text{amb}} &= \text{“a bat in a box”} \\ s^{(1)} &= \text{“a vampire bat in a cave”} \\ s^{(2)} &= \text{“a baseball bat in a locker”} \end{aligned}$$

Each sentence is encoded using CLIP and the vector representing w_p is extracted from each to give $V_{w_p}^{s_n} = \{v_{w_p}^{s_n^{\text{amb}}}, v_{w_p}^{s_n^{(1)}}, v_{w_p}^{s_n^{(2)}}\}$, where $v_{w_p}^s = \text{CLIP}(s)_{w_p}$.³

Next we construct $D_n^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1} = \{v_{w_p}^{s_n^{\text{amb}}}, v_{w_p}^{s_n^{(1)}}\}$,

³In practice, all of the words we used in our experiments were tokenised to a single token, so our description assumes that we have one encoding per word. For a word consisting of multiple tokens, this process would be repeated for the encoding corresponding to each token.



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour the music-related sense



(c) Encoding edited to favour the fish sense

Figure 5: Prompt: “a man holding a bass”

and calculate the mean of each such set:

$$\mu_n^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1} = \frac{1}{|D_n^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1}|} \sum_{v \in D_n^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1}} v \quad (1)$$

A matrix is calculated by summing the outer products of each vector’s difference with the mean of its set:

$$C^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1} = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{v \in D_n^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1}} (v - \mu_n^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1})(v - \mu_n^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1})^\top \quad (2)$$

The singular value decomposition (SVD) gives $C^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1} = U_1 \Sigma_1 V_1^\top$. The first k columns of the matrix U_1 , $\{u_1^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1}, \dots, u_k^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1}\}$ give an orthonormal basis for the subspace of difference between $v_{w_p}^{s^{\text{amb}}}$ and $v_{w_p}^{s^{(1)}}$.⁴ To find $\{u_1^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 2}, \dots, u_k^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 2}\}$, this procedure is repeated starting with $D_n^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 2} = \{v_{w_p}^{s^{\text{amb}}}, v_{w_p}^{s^{(2)}}\}$.

4.2 Finding Meaning Directions

We then use the difference subspaces defined by these bases to approximate vectors corresponding to m_1 and m_2 , which we term v_1 and v_2 .

⁴We choose k based on a threshold on the corresponding singular values, specifically we take k to be the smallest integer greater than 2 such that $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i} > 0.95$, where σ_i is the i th diagonal entry of Σ_1 . In practice, for all of our examples this results in $k < 5$.

The procedure for approximating these vectors begins by finding the average projection of $\mathbf{v}_{w_p}^{s(1)}$ into the subspace defined by $\{\mathbf{u}_1^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1}\}$:

$$\mathbf{v}_1^{(0)} = \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{v}_{w_p}^{s_n(1)} \cdot \mathbf{u}_j^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1} \right) \mathbf{u}_j^{\text{amb} \rightarrow 1} \quad (3)$$

We then make this orthogonal to all $\mathbf{v}_{w_p}^{s(2)}$, by taking $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_1$ to be $\frac{\mathbf{v}_1^{(N)}}{\|\mathbf{v}_1^{(N)}\|}$, where

$$\mathbf{v}_1^{(n)} = \mathbf{v}_1^{(n-1)} - \text{proj}(\mathbf{v}_1^{(n-1)}, \mathbf{v}_{w_p}^{s(2)}) \quad (4)$$

where $\text{proj}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ denotes the projection of \mathbf{a} onto \mathbf{b} , i.e. $\text{proj}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \frac{\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}}{\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{b}} \mathbf{b}$. The vector $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_2$ is found analogously.

By examination, we find that representations from ambiguous sentences tend to have negative dot products with both $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_1$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_2$ (or occasionally positive dot products with both). Representations from sentences favouring m_1 tend to have a positive dot product with $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_1$ and a near-zero dot product with $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_2$ (by construction), and vice versa for sentences favouring m_2 . This suggests how we may edit representations to target a desired sense.

The normalised vectors $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_1$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_2$ are not used, instead we take $\mathbf{v}_1 = \max_n(\mathbf{v}_{w_p}^{s_n(1)} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_1) \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_1$ and $\mathbf{v}_2 = \max_n(\mathbf{v}_{w_p}^{s_n(2)} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_2) \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_2$. We do this so that the vector also represents the magnitude of projection in this direction that is sufficient to have this sense represented.

4.3 Sense Editing Procedure

If we have a sentence s containing w_p then its standard, unedited encoding is given by $\mathbf{v}_{w_p} = \text{CLIP}(s)_{w_p}$. To edit this representation to push its sense towards m_2 , we consider its projection onto the subspace spanned by \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 and aim to make its dot product with \mathbf{v}_1 in this subspace near-zero while aligning it with \mathbf{v}_2 , based on the observations described in the previous section.

Since \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 are, in general, not orthogonal, we first obtain an orthonormal basis of the subspace that they span: $U = \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{v}_1}{\|\mathbf{v}_1\|}, \frac{\mathbf{v}_2 - \text{proj}(\mathbf{v}_2, \frac{\mathbf{v}_1}{\|\mathbf{v}_1\|})}{\|\mathbf{v}_2 - \text{proj}(\mathbf{v}_2, \frac{\mathbf{v}_1}{\|\mathbf{v}_1\|})\|} \right\}$, and then compute

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_{w_p}^{m_2} &= \mathbf{v}_{w_p} - \text{proj}_U \mathbf{v}_{w_p} \\ &+ \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_2\|}{\|\mathbf{v}_2 - \text{proj}(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_1)\|} (\mathbf{v}_2 - \text{proj}(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_1)) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Prompts	
a bass	a crane
a man holds a bass	a crane by the ocean
a bass is displayed on a wall	a crane surrounded by nature
a bat	glasses on a table
a bat and a baseball fly through the air	a seal
a boy holds a black bat	a seal on an envelope
a bat laying on the grass	a trunk

Table 2: Prompts used to evaluate our editing procedure, with the word of interest in bold

where $\text{proj}_U \mathbf{v}$ is the projection onto the subspace defined by U , i.e. $\text{proj}_U \mathbf{v} = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in U} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{u}$.

Subtracting $\text{proj}_U \mathbf{v}_{w_p}$ removes the entire projection of the vector onto this subspace, including its component along \mathbf{v}_1 , making it orthogonal to \mathbf{v}_1 as desired. We then wish to add \mathbf{v}_2 , but since this is not orthogonal to \mathbf{v}_1 we remove its projection along \mathbf{v}_1 and rescale accordingly. This means that in the subspace defined by U , $\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_{w_p}^{m_2}$ is orthogonal to \mathbf{v}_1 and has high cosine similarity with \mathbf{v}_2 . This edited representation replaces \mathbf{v}_{w_p} in the sentence encoding, which is then passed to the model as input.

4.4 Experimental Results

The sense editing procedure was performed on a set of prompts (shown in table 2) that were selected either because they had been observed to exhibit homonym duplication or because the sense that was represented in generated images was not always the same. In Fig. 4 and Fig. 5, we show some example images generated using an unedited prompt and some using prompts edited to favour one sense over another. More images are provided in App. A.3. In Fig. 6, we display the proportion of images realising each sense before and after applying this procedure (with \rightarrow **Sense 1** and \rightarrow **Sense 2** denoting the encodings edited to favour Sense 1 and Sense 2 respectively). Detailed numbers and details of statistical significance testing can be found in App. B.2. We can see that this procedure is successful in shifting the represented sense towards the intended sense. This suggests that the representations produced by CLIP do indeed incorporate a linear sum over representations of possible meanings, because a representation can be rewritten in terms of its projection into the subspace spanned by \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 and a component in the nullspace of this projection. It also shows that manipulating this sum affects the content of the resulting images.




Figure 6: For each word, the proportion of images across all prompts realising each sense is compared across the **Unedited** encoding, the encoding shifted towards Sense 1 (\rightarrow **Sense 1**), and the encoding shifted towards Sense 2 (\rightarrow **Sense 2**)

We note that this is, of course, a simplified approach. The directions obtained are an approximation based on a small number of handwritten sentences, and we intervene only on the polysemous word of interest, not on any of the other encodings in the sentence, which may also contain relevant information. Nonetheless, that such a simple and approximate method is capable of achieving such

results is a signal in itself.

5 An Explanation for Homonym Duplication

Combining the two claims that we have demonstrated, we arrive at a possible explanation of homonym duplication: words with multiple meanings are represented by a sum over multiple meanings, and both of these are then represented in the generated image. The difficulty inherent to dealing with words with potentially ambiguous meanings is by no means unique to text-to-image diffusion models, and, indeed, previous work has shown that similarly structured representations can arise through other methods [Arora et al. \(2018\)](#). So, it is natural to ask why the phenomenon of duplication has not been observed in text-based models that use such representations. For example, consider a machine translation model translating the phrase “*a bat*” from English to French. The English word “*bat*” can correspond to one of multiple words in French, depending on which sense is intended. Although it is possible that the model’s representation may include contributions from both possible meanings, when the decoder comes to generate an output word corresponding to “*bat*”, this representation will be converted into a distribution over output tokens and only one is sampled, corresponding to one of the two senses. This functionally represents the model selecting that sense over the other. When the next output token is sampled, the model’s output distribution is affected by the previous output and accordingly is very unlikely to generate further tokens corresponding to the other sense as this would produce nonsensical sentences unlike anything seen in training. Such models may produce the incorrect sense in a translation, but they have not been observed to produce both in the way diffusion models do.

In contrast, diffusion models use prompt representations to condition the denoising process. This process produces probability distributions over noise to be removed from the image at each step. This means that, unlike the translation model, the diffusion model is effectively never forced to sample from the possible meanings to select one over the other, and both can be represented in the resultant image. We have seen this to be the case in §3. This difference is likely why we see this unique behaviour in diffusion models and not in text-based models using similarly-structured representations.

6 Stable Diffusion and DALL·E 2

Rassin et al. (2022) found that smaller models exhibit homonym duplication much less frequently than larger ones. The superposition explanation is consistent with this finding: larger models have a larger representational capacity, and, thus, are capable of representing more features without interference. As shown by Elhage et al. (2022), models with more limited representational capacity may not represent features that do not prove to be sufficiently important. This suggests that smaller models may cease to represent a meaning that is improbable, and, in effect, one meaning is selected, whereas larger models are capable of continuing to represent alternative possible meanings, even if they are modelled to be unlikely.

It is also possible that this difference is a result of the two different processes followed by the models in training and in generating a new image. For a training pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) , Stable Diffusion uses a variational autoencoder (Kingma and Welling, 2014) to obtain \mathbf{z}_0 , a representation of \mathbf{x} in latent space. The denoising process is then trained to recover \mathbf{z}_0 from a noised \mathbf{z}_T , conditioned on $\text{CLIP}(\mathbf{y})$. Since the latent space is learned through autoencoding, it is likely that it will prioritise encoding information necessary to reconstruct the image, and there is no reason why distinct concepts described by a polysemous word should be encoded similarly. Thus, the denoising process of Stable Diffusion may learn to discard this information.

7 Related Work

Previous work has investigated models' learned representations through the lens of superposition. Elhage et al. (2022) conducted a controlled investigation into superposition in learned representations in feedforward neural networks. They investigated the tendency for a learned feature in a network to correspond to multiple features in superposition, and demonstrated how this allows for efficient storage of important features, allowing a representation to encode more features than it has dimensions. Previous work by Arora et al. (2018) has also found that learned representations of words can represent polysemous words as a linear superposition of possible meanings.

Work modelling inference of the meaning of an ambiguous word also offers some insight. Erk and Herbelot (2021) model this process using a probabilistic graphical model, where meanings are latent

variables that are inferred using the information provided by other words, such as the topical context and semantic restrictions. From this perspective, beliefs about the meaning of an ambiguous word are always viewed as a distribution over possible meanings, even if it is skewed so that one is much more likely. If we view computational models as similarly inferring a probability distribution over meanings, text-based decoding models are ultimately forced to sample from the resulting distribution, whereas diffusion models maintain both possibilities throughout the process of generating an image and thus can produce an image containing both.

8 Conclusion

In this work, we set out a possible explanation for the phenomenon of homonym duplication in text-to-image diffusion models as described by Rassin et al. (2022). We showed that summing representations of two distinct prompts and using this as input to the denoising process often leads to images in which both prompts are realised. This suggests that prompts are encoded in such a way that representations of distinct concepts can be summed without substantially interfering with each other. It also demonstrates that the denoising process does not restrict diffusion models to representing only one meaning.

We further described a procedure for manipulating which sense of a polysemous word appears in a generated image, based on the assumption that a representation of such a word contains linear contributions from each possible meaning. We demonstrated this procedure on several prompts, including some that exhibit homonym duplication, finding that it substantially increases the number of generated images containing the targeted sense, even when this sense is only rarely produced using the unedited representation. The success of this manipulation method provides support for the hypothesised structure of the representations.

We suggest that these facts combine to offer a plausible explanation of homonym duplication.

References

- Sanjeev Arora, Yuanzhi Li, Yingyu Liang, Tengyu Ma, and Andrej Risteski. 2018. [Linear algebraic structure of word senses, with applications to polysemy](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:483–495.
- Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Y. Zou,

- Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam T. Kalai. 2016. [Man is to computer programmer as woman is to homemaker? Debiasing word embeddings](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 29.
- Niccolò Campolungo, Federico Martelli, Francesco Saina, and Roberto Navigli. 2022. [DiBiMT: A novel benchmark for measuring Word Sense Disambiguation biases in Machine Translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4331–4352, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nelson Elhage, Tristan Hume, Catherine Olsson, Nicholas Schiefer, Tom Henighan, Shauna Kravec, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Robert Lasenby, Dawn Drain, Carol Chen, Roger Grosse, Sam McCandlish, Jared Kaplan, Dario Amodei, Martin Wattenberg, and Christopher Olah. 2022. [Toy models of superposition](#). *Transformer Circuits Thread*.
- Katrin Erk and Aurélie Herbelot. 2021. [How to marry a star: Probabilistic constraints for meaning in context](#). In *Proceedings of the Society for Computation in Linguistics 2021*, pages 451–453, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling. 2014. [Auto-encoding variational Bayes](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. [Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8748–8763.
- Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. 2022. [Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with CLIP latents](#). arXiv.
- Royi Rassin, Shauli Ravfogel, and Yoav Goldberg. 2022. [DALLE-2 is seeing double: Flaws in word-to-concept mapping in Text2Image models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. 2022. [High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models](#). In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10684–10695.
- Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. 2015. [U-Net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation](#). In *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2015*, pages 234–241.
- Erwin Schrödinger. 1935. [Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik](#). *Naturwissenschaften*, 23(49):823–828. See Trimmer (1980) for an English translation.
- John D. Trimmer. 1980. [The present situation in quantum mechanics: A translation of Schrödinger's "cat paradox" paper](#). *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 124(5):323–338.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. [Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A More Generated Images

In this section we provide a selection of additional images generated during our experiments.

A.1 Homonym Duplication

Fig. 7 displays further examples of homonym duplication seen in Stable Diffusion.




Figure 7: Examples of homonym duplication

A.2 Summing Encodings

Here we include further examples of images generated from the weighted sum of two prompt encodings as described in §3.

A.2.1 Both Concepts Realised

In Fig. 8 we include examples of images where both concepts in the sum are realised in the final image.

A.2.2 Leakage

In Fig. 9 we include some images that do not fully realise both concepts, but instead allow some kind of concept “leakage” as a result of the sum. For example, the prompts “*a completely black cat*” and “*a completely white cat*”, both overwhelmingly generate images of cats of one colour, as described. The weighted sum of the two does not generate one completely white cat and one completely black cat. Instead it generates a cat that is both black and white.

Similarly, the sum of “*a wall painted red*” and “*a wall painted blue*” does not generate a red wall and a blue wall, or even (for the majority of the time) a wall that is both red and blue. Instead, it tends to generate a wall that is one of the two colours described, but where something else in the image (such as a door) is of the other colour.



(a) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"elephant"})) + (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"snow"}))$



(b) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"goat"})) + (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"crown"}))$



(c) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"tiger"})) + (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"glasses"}))$



(d) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"bear"})) + (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"hat"}))$



(e) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"dog"})) + (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"lake"}))$



(f) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"cat"})) + (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"tree"}))$



(g) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"giraffe"})) + (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"beach"}))$



(h) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"bear"})) + (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"waterfall"}))$



(i) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"snow"})) + (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"church"}))$

Figure 8: Images generated from sums of encodings demonstrating the realisation of both concepts in the sum



(a) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"a completely black cat"}))$
 $+ (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"a completely white cat"}))$


(b) $(0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"a wall painted red"}))$
 $+ (0.5 \cdot \text{CLIP}(\text{"a wall painted blue"}))$

Figure 9: Images generated from sums of encodings that demonstrate concept leakage


A.3 Sense Editing

In this section we provide more example images demonstrating the effects of our linear subspace procedure as described in §4.

For each prompt we display 15 images sampled from the image generated from the unedited prompt encoding, alongside 15 generated from the encoding after editing it to favour each sense.



(a) Unedited prompt encoding




(b) Encoding edited to favour music-related sense

(c) Encoding edited to favour fish sense


Figure 10: Prompt: “a bass”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding




(b) Encoding edited to favour music-related sense




(c) Encoding edited to favour fish sense


Figure 11: Prompt: “a man holding a bass”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour music-related sense



(c) Encoding edited to favour fish sense


Figure 12: Prompt: “a bass displayed on a wall”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour animal sense



(c) Encoding edited to favour sports-related sense

Figure 14: Prompt: “a bat and a baseball fly through the air”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding




(b) Encoding edited to favour animal sense

(c) Encoding edited to favour sports-related sense

Figure 15: Prompt: “a boy holds a black bat”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour animal sense




(c) Encoding edited to favour sports-related sense

Figure 16: Prompt: “a bat laying on the grass”




(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour bird sense

(c) Encoding edited to favour construction-related sense


Figure 17: Prompt: “a crane”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour bird sense




(c) Encoding edited to favour construction-related sense


Figure 18: Prompt: “a crane by the ocean”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour bird sense




(c) Encoding edited to favour construction-related sense

Figure 19: Prompt: “a crane surrounded by nature”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour drinking-related sense



(c) Encoding edited to favour eyeglasses sense

Figure 20: Prompt: “glasses on a table”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour sense of wax or official seal




(c) Encoding edited to favour animal sense

Figure 21: Prompt: “a seal”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour sense of wax or official seal

(c) Encoding edited to favour animal sense

Figure 22: Prompt: “a seal on an envelope”



(a) Unedited prompt encoding



(b) Encoding edited to favour luggage-related sense



(c) Encoding edited to favour tree-related sense

Figure 23: Prompt: “*a trunk*”

B Statistical Comparisons

In this section we provide detailed information about the content of the images generated in our experiments, and provide details on statistical significance testing.

B.1 Summing Encodings

The information in this section concerns the experiments described in §3.

For each pair of prompts, s_1 and s_2 , 30 images were generated from each prompt, and 30 were generated from their weighted sum.

We were interested in the frequency with which both s_1 and s_2 were realised in an image generated by the weighted sum of their encodings. To ensure that this was not a coincidence, statistical significance was established using an unpaired permutation test where the statistic concerned was the difference between the number of images in which both prompts were realised in the images generated from the weighted sum and the images generated from each prompt alone. Some prompt pairs that we initially tried were discarded because they co-occurred too frequently in images generated by one of the prompts (for example, $s_1 = \text{"a dog in a public square"}$ and $s_2 = \text{"a tree in a public square"}$ were discarded because trees appear frequently in images generated by s_1 alone, and thus a large number of samples would have been required to establish a statistically significant difference).

All weighted sums in this section were found to realise both s_1 and s_2 more frequently than either prompt alone to a statistically significant extent ($p < 0.05$).

Input	Number containing:			
	Dog	Lake	Both	Neither
CLIP("dog")	30	0	0	0
CLIP("lake")	0	30	0	0
$0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"dog"}) + 0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"lake"})))$	3	11	16	0

Table 3: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s_1 = \text{"dog"}$, $s_2 = \text{"lake"}$

Input	Number containing:			
	Cat	Tree	Both	Neither
CLIP("cat")	30	0	0	0
CLIP("tree")	0	30	0	0
$0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"cat"}) + 0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"tree"})))$	6	2	22	0

Table 4: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s_1 = \text{"cat"}$, $s_2 = \text{"tree"}$

Input	Number containing:			
	Bear	Hat	Both	Neither
CLIP("bear")	30	0	0	0
CLIP("hat")	0	30	0	0
$0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"bear"}) + 0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"hat"})))$	20	3	5	2

Table 5: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s_1 = \text{"bear"}$, $s_2 = \text{"hat"}$

Input	Number containing:			
	Bear	Waterfall	Both	Neither
CLIP("bear")	30	0	0	0
CLIP("waterfall")	0	30	0	0
$0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"bear"}) + 0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"waterfall"})))$	10	12	6	2

Table 6: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s_1 = \text{"bear"}$, $s_2 = \text{"waterfall"}$

Input	Number containing:			
	Elephant	Snow	Both	Neither
CLIP("elephant")	30	0	0	0
CLIP("snow")	0	30	0	0
$0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"elephant"}) + 0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"snow"})))$	7	3	20	0

Table 7: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s_1 = \text{"elephant"}$, $s_2 = \text{"snow"}$

Input	Number containing:			
	Giraffe	Beach	Both	Neither
CLIP("giraffe")	30	0	0	0
CLIP("beach")	0	30	0	0
$0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"giraffe"}) + 0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"beach"})))$	3	17	9	1

Table 8: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s_1 = \text{"giraffe"}$, $s_2 = \text{"beach"}$

Input	Number containing:			
	Goat	Crown	Both	Neither
CLIP("goat")	30	0	0	0
CLIP("crown")	0	30	0	0
$0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"goat"}) + 0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"crown"})))$	11	4	11	4

Table 9: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s_1 = \text{"goat"}$, $s_2 = \text{"crown"}$

Input	Number containing:			
	Snow	Church	Both	Neither
CLIP("snow")	30	0	0	0
CLIP("church")	0	30	0	0
$0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"snow"}) + 0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\text{"church"})))$	14	1	15	0

Table 10: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s_1 = \text{"snow"}$, $s_2 = \text{"church"}$

Input	Number containing:			
	Tiger	Glasses	Both	Neither
CLIP(<i>“tiger”</i>)	30	0	0	0
CLIP(<i>“glasses”</i>)	0	30	0	0
$0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\textit{“tiger”})) + 0.5 \cdot (\text{CLIP}(\textit{“glasses”}))$	21	1	8	0

Table 11: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s_1 = \textit{“tiger”}$, $s_2 = \textit{“glasses”}$

B.2 Sense Editing

The information in this section concerns the experiments described in §4.

For each prompt, s , 30 images were generated from the unedited prompt encoding and 30 each were generated from the version edited to favour each sense.

We were interested in the frequency with which the intended sense was the only sense realised in an image generated by the one of the edited encodings. The value for the targeted sense of an edited encoding is bolded if it was found to be a statistically significant increase of realisation of that sense when compared to the unedited encoding. Statistical significance was established using an unpaired permutation test where the statistic concerned was the difference between the number of images in which the intended sense was realised, between images generated by the edited encoding and the unedited encoding. The significance level used in these experiments was $p < 0.05$.

Table 12, table 13 and table 14 concern prompts including the word *“bass”*, where **Sense 1** is a type of musical instrument (for counting purposes we included all kinds of instruments that can be described as a *“bass”*) and **Sense 2** is a type of fish.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	16	14	0	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	29	1	0	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	3	27	0	0

Table 12: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s = \textit{“a bass”}$ from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	10	19	1	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	24	2	0	4
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	0	30	0	0

Table 13: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s = \textit{“a man holds a bass”}$ from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	23	5	0	2
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	30	0	0	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	4	25	0	1

Table 14: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s = \textit{“a bass is displayed on a wall”}$ from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

Table 15, table 16, table 17 and table 18 concern prompts that include the ambiguous word *“bat”*, for

which **Sense 1** is a winged nocturnal mammal, and **Sense 2** is a piece of equipment used to play sports such as baseball.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	30	0	0	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	30	0	0	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	2	16	8	4

Table 15: Frequency of realisation of each concept for s = “a bat” from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	22	4	2	2
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	27	0	1	2
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	1	24	3	2

Table 16: Frequency of realisation of each concept for s = “a bat and a baseball fly through the air” from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	4	17	4	5
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	18	3	5	4
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	0	27	0	3

Table 17: Frequency of realisation of each concept for s = “a boy holds a black bat” from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	30	0	0	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	30	0	0	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	2	18	3	7

Table 18: Frequency of realisation of each concept for s = “a bat laying on the grass” from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

Table 19, table 20 and table 21 all include the ambiguous word “crane”, for which **Sense 1** is a long-legged bird, and **Sense 2** is a piece of machinery often used in construction.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	24	4	2	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	29	0	0	1
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	10	18	2	0

Table 19: Frequency of realisation of each concept for s = “a crane” from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	19	9	1	1
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	27	1	0	2
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	1	28	1	0

Table 20: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s = \text{“a crane by the ocean”}$ from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	9	16	5	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	24	4	1	1
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	1	29	0	0

Table 21: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s = \text{“a crane surrounded by nature”}$ from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

Table 22 gives results for the prompt “*glasses on a table*”, where **Sense 1** of “*glasses*” refers to glasses used for drinking, and **Sense 2** refers to eyeglasses.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	8	21	1	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	24	3	0	3
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	0	29	0	1

Table 22: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s = \text{“glasses on a table”}$ from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

Table 23 and table 24 give results for prompts containing the word “*seal*”, where **Sense 1** refers to a wax seal or an official seal on a letter or document, and **Sense 2** refers to a marine mammal.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	2	22	6	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	26	0	4	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	0	30	0	0

Table 23: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s = \text{“a seal”}$ from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	0	25	2	3
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	21	1	7	1
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	0	30	0	0

Table 24: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s = \text{“a seal on an envelope”}$ from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

Table 25 provides results for the prompt “*a trunk*” where **Sense 1** of “*trunk*” refers to a box used as luggage (for counting purposes, the trunk of a car was also included in this sense) and **Sense 2** refers to the trunk of a tree.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Both	Neither
Unedited	15	13	2	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 1)	30	0	0	0
Edited (\rightarrow Sense 2)	0	28	2	0

Table 25: Frequency of realisation of each concept for $s = \text{“}a\text{ trunk”}$ from the unedited prompt encoding, and encodings edited to favour each sense.

C Sentences Used to Find Meaning Directions

Here we provide the sentences s^{amb} , $s^{(1)}$ and $s^{(2)}$ that were used to calculate difference subspaces and meaning directions for each of the words we used.

s^{amb}	$s^{(1)}$	$s^{(2)}$
a bass	a double bass	a sea bass
there is a bass	there is a double bass	there is a sea bass
the person saw a bass	the musician played a double bass	the fisherman caught a sea bass
a person mentions a bass	a musician plays a double bass	an angler holds a sea bass
a nearby location has a bass	a jazz band has a double bass	a local aquarium has a sea bass

Table 26: Sentences used to find meaning directions for “*bass*”

s^{amb}	$s^{(1)}$	$s^{(2)}$
a bat	a fruit bat	a baseball bat
there is a bat	there is a fruit bat	there is a baseball bat
i do things with the bat	i feed insects to the fruit bat	i play baseball with the baseball bat
the person saw a bat	the boy saw a fruit bat	the boy bought a baseball bat
a person mentions a bat	a wildlife expert feeds a fruit bat	a baseball player swings a baseball bat
a bat is laying on the floor	a fruit bat is hanging from the tree	a baseball bat is laying on the base
a bat in a box	a fruit bat in a cave	a baseball bat in a store
a nearby location has a bat	a local zoo keeps an fruit bat	a sports store sells a baseball bat

Table 27: Sentences used to find meaning directions for “*bat*”

s^{amb}	$s^{(1)}$	$s^{(2)}$
a crane	a sandhill crane	a tower crane
there is a crane	there is a sandhill crane	there is a tower crane
there is a crane on the other side	there is a sandhill crane on the nature reserve	there is a tower crane on the building site
a crane is tall	a sandhill crane hunts fish	a tower crane lifts loads
a boy sees a crane	a boy feeds a sandhill crane	a man operates a tower crane
a crane beside a tree	a sandhill crane beside a nest	a tower crane beside a bulldozer
a crane is casting a shadow	a sandhill crane is eating some fish	a tower crane is lifting a container
a crane by the ocean	a sandhill crane in a nest	a tower crane in a quarry

Table 28: Sentences used to find meaning directions for “*crane*”

s^{amb}	$s^{(1)}$	$s^{(2)}$
glasses	wine glasses	reading glasses
there are glasses	there are wine glasses	there are reading glasses
the person saw glasses	the waiter filled wine glasses	the scientist wore reading glasses
a person holds glasses	a waiter fills wine glasses	a scientist wears reading glasses
glasses are being used	wine glasses are being cleaned	reading glasses are being cleaned

Table 29: Sentences used to find meaning directions for “*glasses*”

s^{amb}	$s^{(1)}$	$s^{(2)}$
a seal	a wax seal	a harp seal
there is a seal	there is a wax seal	there is a harp seal
the person saw a seal	the postmaster stamped a wax seal	the zookeeper fed a harp seal
a person mentions a seal	a butler opens a wax seal	a boy pets a harp seal
a seal in a frame	a wax seal on an envelope	a harp seal in the ocean
a nearby location has a seal	a fancy letter has a wax seal	a large zoo has a harp seal

Table 30: Sentences used to find meaning directions for “*seal*”

s^{amb}	$s^{(1)}$	$s^{(2)}$
a trunk	a storage trunk	a tree trunk
there is a trunk	there is a storage trunk	there is a tree trunk
the person saw a trunk	the traveller carried a storage trunk	the lumberjack sawed a tree trunk
a person mentions a trunk	a passenger carries a storage trunk	a carpenter uses a tree trunk
a trunk is being used	a storage trunk is being packed	a tree trunk is being felled

Table 31: Sentences used to find meaning directions for “*trunk*”