Language Change – Our Big Picture

Vivi Nastase
University of Heidelberg
What we read

[Inna] Constructions, construal and cooperation in the evolution of language. Pleyer and Lindner, 2014


[Georgi] Neural selection in the modern English lexicon. Grieve, 2018

[Michael S. & MDL-based Models for Agreement of Etymological Data. Westig et al., 2011

[Rebecca] Identifying cognates by phonetic and semantic similarity.

[Artur] Paleo-Latin historical sound change. Westig et al., 2012


[Verena] Language Modeling for Code-Mixing: The Role of Linguistic Theory based Synthetic Data. Pratapa et al., 2018


[Stefano] The Closeness of “Tetch” Happen: The influence of social and linguistic context on the success of lexical innovations. Stewart and Eisenstein, 2018

[Miriam] The Role of Historical Emergence of Word Senses in Evolution of Word Meaning: Evidence from 500,000 Years of English. Raniero et al., 2018

[Maks] Studying the History of Ideas using Topic Models. Hall et al., 2018


[Don't Get Fooled by Word Embeddings – Better Watch their Neighborhood. Hellrich and Hahn, 2017

[Sebastian]
What we learned

- development of the **language faculty** in humans
- the **forces** that drive language change
- **changes in the lexicon** (phonological / semantic / grammatical)
  - the evolution of the lexicon from an ancestor language
  - borrowings
  - expansion of word senses
- **tracking changes** over time
Language evolution – the prequel

Requirements:

- storage capacity
- pattern-recognition and analogy
- knowledge organization
- socio-cognitive capacities:
  - joint attention
  - shared intentionality
  - common ground

(Pleyer and Lindner, 2014)
The forces that model language change

**Internal**

- simplicity (economy of cognitive resources)
- informativeness/expressiveness

(Kemp et al, 2018)

**External**

- cultural shifts (e.g. technological advancements)
- linguistic drift (e.g. semantic changes)
- natural selection (the result of competing linguistic forms)

(Ahern et al., 2016) (Karjus et al., 2018) (Grieve, 2018) (Hamilton et al., 2016)
Changes in the lexicon: language families

- **reconstructing the lexicon of Proto Indo-European** by working backwards using laws of sound change in Indo-European languages (Pyysalo, 2017)
  - automatic alignment of etymologically related forms (MDL / using context and phonetic features) (Wettig et al., 2011) (Wettig et al., 2012)
- **compare languages** using word form (cognates) distances
  - Levenstein distance (Serva and Petroni, 2007)
Borrowings and sense expansions:

- concepts without (or weak) connections to previously lexicalized concepts → **borrowings**
  
  *algebra, algorithm, shampoo, ketchup, ...*

- concepts that can be explained through connections to previously lexicalized concepts → **sense expansions / blends (portmanteau words)**
  
  *run* (as a physical activity / run for office / run a program)
  
  *frenemy, webinar, podcast, ...*
The dynamics of word senses:

- clustering
- neighbours and neighbourhood comparisons in a vector space
- analysis in terms of specific features (concreteness, externality, ...)
- changes in affect

(Xu et al., 2016/2017) (Eger and Mehler, 2016) (Ramiro et al., 2018) (Mitra et al., 2014) (Brill et al., 2001)
The dynamics of topics:

- use topic analysis to track the dynamic of themes over time
- use topic analysis to track the vocabulary changes with respect to specific topics

(Hall et al., 2008) (Gupta et al., 2018)
Changes in the lexicon: language change in social media

Social media is a special environment:

- reach
- demographics
- communication constraints

The survival of new word forms:

- linguistic context
- social context
- phonological factors
- the form itself

(Eisenstein, 2013/2018)
Switching between two or more languages within a single utterance – linguistic change in the era of globalization

*conscious* and deliberate – seeks to produce a specific effect (e.g. advertisement) or achieve a specific function (e.g. request/command)

*subconscious* driven by language proficiency issues: the switching points are determined by the similarity between the grammars of the languages involved

(Pratapa et al., 2018) (Boztepe, 2002) (Zhiganova, 2016) (Koban, 2013)
Conclusions

What can we conclude?