

Simulating Language

Lecture 10: What about syntax?

Simon Kirby

simon@ling.ed.ac.uk



What have we looked at so far?


- Innate signalling
 - Animal communication as a pre-wired mapping between meanings and signals
- Learned signalling
 - Humans may be unique in *learning* the mapping between meanings and signals
 - Our model builds on the animal signalling model
 - Adds: learning bias, cultural evolution and meaning inference

What's missing?


- In all our models, both meanings and signals are *atomic*
- In reality (for all communicating species) both meanings and signals have internal structure
 - Aside: what does structure mean?
 - One answer: having internal parts that can be recombined
- Does this matter at all?

How we leverage structure...


- What's the missing word?




lapalu



kanepi




luneki




???

How we leverage structure...


- What's the missing word?




lapalu



kanepi




luneki




neluka

How we leverage structure...


- What's the missing word?




laneplo



replo




lanepilu




???

How we leverage structure...


- What's the missing word?




laneplo



replo



lanepilu



repilu

What's the difference?

- In the first example, the meanings and signals might as well have been unstructured/atomic
 - We were essentially seeing a vocabulary
- In the second example, we relied on the fact that:
 - the meanings had internal structure (e.g. color and shape),
 - and the signals had internal structure (e.g. subsequences of syllables)
 - and the mapping utilises the structure in a way that allows us to generalise

Compositionality

- The crucial structure of the mapping is *compositionality*

Compositionality: the meaning of the whole is a function of the meaning of the parts and how they are put together.

- Arguably the most important feature of the syntax of human language
- Enables open-ended communication (more fundamentally than recursion)
- Strangely, it is (almost) unique to humans, despite being a hugely beneficial trait!

Where does compositionality come from?

- Compositionally-structured meaning-signal mappings are adaptive, since they enable open-ended communication
- So... might suggest an explanation in terms of natural selection:


“Evolutionary theory offers clear criteria for when a trait should be attributed to natural selection: complex design for some function, and *the absence of alternative processes capable of explaining such complexity*. Human language meets these criteria.” Pinker & Bloom (1990)

- But are there *alternative process*?

And anyway, how exactly do properties of our innate endowment lead to observable properties of language (the adaptations they purport to explain)? This is **problem of linkage** again...


Iterated learning again

- To solve the problem of linkage, we need to turn again to the iterated learning model
- What happens if, instead of mappings between atomic meanings and signals, we allowed for meanings and signals with structure?
- Could we see a *cultural* rather than biological evolution of compositionality?




Holistic vs. Compositional


- It's not the structure in meanings/signals that matters, but whether that structure is utilised by the mapping




lapalu



luneki



kanepi




neluka


This mapping between meanings and signals does not preserve structure from one domain to the other. We call this a **holistic** language, and it's equivalent to what we've been looking at in the course so far. It's basically just a vocabulary.

Holistic vs. Compositional


- It's not the structure in meanings/signals that matters, but whether that structure is utilised by the mapping




laneplo



lanepilu



replo



repilu

This mapping between meanings and signals *does* preserve structure from one domain to the other. We call this a **compositional** language. On a rudimentary level, it exhibits morphosyntactic properties. It enables generalisation to new meanings.

Simulating the transition to syntax

- Starting in the late '90s, there were a series of simulations using different techniques to try and understand the cultural evolution of syntactic structure (see today's reading: Kirby & Hurford 2002)
- Tricky requirement:
 - we need a learning model that is capable of detecting, and using, syntactic structure when it is there in the data,
 - but we don't want to simply impose syntactic structure from the outset.
- We need a learner that is happy with either **holistic** or **compositional** languages

Example model (Kirby, 2002)

- Meanings are simple predicate logic expressions. e.g.:
loves(mary, john)
thinks(mary, likes(john, heather))
- There are 5 different individuals, 5 simple predicates, and 5 predicates of propositional attitude in the agents' world
- Signals are simply strings of random characters from the alphabet. e.g.:
agjds
gfhiyjilkq
marylovesjohn

Learning

- Agents attempt to induce a simple grammar that covers the meaning-signal pairs that they hear
- Fundamental principle: Learning is compression
 - Learners try and fit the data heard, but also generalise by compressing their grammar (cf. Occam's Razor)
 - Learning is a trade-off between fit to data and generalisation

Two steps to learning

- Incorporation (for each utterance heard)

S/loves(john, mary) → johnlovesmary

- Generalisation (whenever possible, within certain heuristic constraints)

S/loves(peter, mary) → peterlovesmary

S/loves(john, mary) → johnlovesmary



S/loves(x, mary) → C/x lovesmary

C/john → john

C/peter → peter

A diffusion chain

1. Start with one learner and one adult speaker neither of which have grammars.
2. Choose a meaning at random.
3. Get speaker to produce signal for that meaning (may need to “invent” random string).
4. Give meaning-signal pair to learner.
5. Repeat 2-4 one hundred and fifty times.
6. Delete speaker.
7. Make learner be the new speaker.
8. Introduce a new learner (with no initial grammar)
9. Repeat 2-8 thousands of times.

Results 1: initial stages

- Initially, speakers have no language, so “invent” random strings of characters
- A *protolanguage* emerges for some meanings, but no structure. These are *holistic* expressions:

ldg “Mary admires John”

xkq “Mary loves John”

gj “Mary admires Gavin”

axk “John admires Gavin”

gb “John knows that Mary knows that John admires Gavin”

Big complex grammar
but low expressivity

$S/\text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary}) \rightarrow \text{sdx}$
 $S/\text{admires}(\text{mary}, \text{gavin}) \rightarrow \text{gj}$
 $S/\text{admires}(\text{john}, \text{gavin}) \rightarrow \text{axk}$
 $S/\text{admires}(\text{gavin}, \text{heather}) \rightarrow \text{nui}$
 $S/\text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{heather}) \rightarrow \text{my}$
 $S/\text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{john}) \rightarrow \text{xkq}$
 $S/\text{admires}(\text{mary}, \text{john}) \rightarrow \text{ldg}$
 $S/\text{thinks}(\text{john}, \text{loves}(\text{mary}, \text{gavin})) \rightarrow \text{fi}$
 $S/\text{thinks}(\text{heather}, \text{loves}(\text{heather}, \text{gavin})) \rightarrow \text{ad}$
 $S/\text{thinks}(\text{john}, \text{admires}(\text{heather}, \text{gavin})) \rightarrow \text{xuy}$
 $S/\text{knows}(\text{gavin}, \text{loves}(\text{gavin}, \text{mary})) \rightarrow \text{k}$
 $S/\text{knows}(\text{gavin}, \text{loves}(\text{john}, \text{mary})) \rightarrow \text{ysw}$
 $S/\text{thinks}(\text{mary}, \text{knows}(\text{gavin}, \text{loves}(\text{heather}, \text{john}))) \rightarrow \text{pq}$
 $S/\text{thinks}(\text{mary}, \text{knows}(\text{heather}, \text{loves}(\text{heather}, \text{john}))) \rightarrow \text{rr}$
 $S/\text{knows}(\text{john}, \text{knows}(\text{mary}, \text{admires}(\text{mary}, \text{john}))) \rightarrow \text{lr}$
... (plus another 101 rules)

Results 2: many generations later...

gjhftejm “Mary admires John”

gjhftejwp “Mary loves John”

gjqpfej m “Mary admires Gavin”

gjqp fhm “John admires Gavin”

ihuitejugjqp fhm “John knows that Mary knows that John admires Gavin”

Results 2: many generations later...

g̃j h f tej m
John Mary admires
“Mary admires John”

g̃j h f tej wp
John Mary loves
“Mary loves John”

g̃j qp f tej m
Gavin Mary admires
“Mary admires Gavin”

g̃j qp fh m
Gavin John admires
“John admires Gavin”

i h u i tej u g̃j qp fh m
John knows Mary knows Gavin John admires
“John knows that Mary knows that John admires Gavin”

$S/p(x, y) \rightarrow g j A/y \bar{f} A/x B/p$

$S/p(x, q) \rightarrow i A/x D/p S/q$

$A/heather \rightarrow d l$

$A/mary \rightarrow t e j$

$A/pete \rightarrow n$

$A/gavin \rightarrow q p$

$A/john \rightarrow h$

$B/detests \rightarrow b$

$B/loves \rightarrow w p$

$B/hates \rightarrow c$

$B/likes \rightarrow e$

$B/admires \rightarrow m$

$D/believes \rightarrow g$

$D/knows \rightarrow u$


$D/decides \rightarrow i p r$

$D/says \rightarrow p$

$D/thinks \rightarrow m$

Small, simple grammar
infinite expressivity

Quantitative results: languages evolve




What's going on?

- There's no biological evolution in this iterated learning model
- There isn't even any communication or notion of function in model at all.
- So, why are structured languages evolving?
- The “language-as-organism” hypothesis:

Languages themselves are evolving to the conditions of the iterated learning process in order that they are learnable.

- The agents never see all the meanings...
- Only languages that are *generalisable* from limited exposure are stable.

Language has to fit through a narrow *bottleneck*




- This has profound implications for the structure of language
- Language becomes generalisable from a limited subset of utterances:
 - When meanings are structured, signals become structured
 - *Generalisable* equates to *compositional* in this case
- Syntax is an adaptive response **by language** (arising from cultural evolution) to the problem of getting through this bottleneck


From simulations to experiments

- Since running these simulations (and many more like them) there have been criticisms that this process is implausible
- Is it really likely that random mistakes could lead us from a holistic protolanguage to a compositional syntax? Do these learning algorithms really reflect the human language learning biases?
- Kirby, Cornish & Smith (2008) replicate the simulations using real human subjects to test this.
- Participants learn an initially random artificial “alien” language by seeing part of that language and then are tested on meanings from the whole language.
- Each participant’s output at testing is used to train the next participant


Generation: 0




Generation: 1



Generation: 9

	nereki	lereki	renana	□
	neheki	lahoki	reneki	○
	nekeki	lakeki	raheki	△
	neroplo	laneplo	replo	□
	nehoplo	lahoplo	rehoplo	○
	nekiplo	lkiplo	rahoplo	△
	nepilu	lanepilu	repilu	□
	nehopilu	lahopilu	rehopilu	○
	nekipilu	lkipilu	rahopilu	△

Generation: 9



Readings for this lecture

- Kirby, S. & Hurford, J. (2002) The emergence of linguistic structure: An overview of the iterated learning model. In Cangelosi, A. and Parisi, D., editors, *Simulating the Evolution of Language*, chapter 6, pages 121-148. Springer Verlag, London.
- Kirby, S., Cornish, H., and Smith, K. (2008). Cumulative Cultural Evolution in the Laboratory: an experimental approach to the origins of structure in human language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(31): 10681-10686.