



CrossMark  
click for updates

## Research

**Cite this article:** Steels L. 2016 Agent-based models for the emergence and evolution of grammar. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**: 20150447. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0447>

Accepted: 11 May 2016

One contribution of 13 to a theme issue  
'The major synthetic evolutionary transitions'.

### Subject Areas:

computational biology, evolution

### Keywords:

language evolution, grammaticalization,  
emergence of grammar, fluid construction  
grammar, agent-based models, major  
transitions in evolution

### Author for correspondence:

Luc Steels

e-mail: [steels@arti.vub.ac.be](mailto:steels@arti.vub.ac.be)

# Agent-based models for the emergence and evolution of grammar

Luc Steels

ICREA, IBE-Universitat Pompeu Fabra and CSIC, 08003 Barcelona, Spain

LS, 0000-0001-9134-3663


Human languages are extraordinarily complex adaptive systems. They feature intricate hierarchical sound structures, are able to express elaborate meanings and use sophisticated syntactic and semantic structures to relate sound to meaning. What are the cognitive mechanisms that speakers and listeners need to create and sustain such a remarkable system? What is the collective evolutionary dynamics that allows a language to self-organize, become more complex and adapt to changing challenges in expressive power? This paper focuses on grammar. It presents a basic cycle observed in the historical language record, whereby meanings move from lexical to syntactic and then to a morphological mode of expression before returning to a lexical mode, and discusses how we can discover and validate mechanisms that can cause these shifts using agent-based models.

This article is part of the themed issue 'The major synthetic evolutionary transitions'.

## 1. Stages in language evolution

A human language is a remarkable, highly complex communication system. The capacity for language, the so-called language-ready brain [1], uniquely emerged in the hominin species, perhaps being in place as far back as half a million years ago [2]. Since then, languages have been born, and existing languages have kept changing, diversifying and dying. How can we develop a scientific understanding of the emergence and continuous cultural evolution of such a highly complex system? Analogous to a successful strategy in evolutionary biology [3], we could postulate different stages for the emergence of language in a population with language-ready brains, based on criteria related to the complexity of the meanings that can be conveyed and the complexity of the structures and linguistic forms available to express them.

To study how complexity at each stage arises and what is required to see transitions between stages, we could adopt the synthetic method, which is being used increasingly in many scientific fields, particularly biology [4], but also fields studying culturally evolving systems, such as sociology [5] or archaeology [6]. This method suggests that we should build operational models that generate analogous behaviours to those observed in the natural system we want to understand, similar to the way an aeroplane can be said to exhibit a similar capacity to fly as birds and hence informs us about what it takes to fly. In the case of language, the operational models take the form of a population of artificial agents which are initialized with a set of cognitive mechanisms and interaction patterns—but no language system—and after a significant series of interactions, usually called language games, we expect to see a communication system emerge that has similar properties as found in human languages, such as recursive syntax or rich conceptual structure [7–9]. The synthetic methodology is not only being applied using computer simulations [10], but also using physical robots (see figure 1 from [11]), so that the behaviour of the agents is embedded in reality and issues related to the perceptual grounding of language, and the relation of language to physical action can be addressed. In such cases, agent-based models resemble the artificial systems considered in synthetic biology [12], because they are embedded in the 'real' physical world.



**Figure 1.** Example of an agent-based study for the origins of words. (a) Physical robotic agents are put in an open-ended environment with various geometric objects. To draw attention to an object, one robot identifies and then names the object, and the other robot then points to it. This language game is a success if the object pointed to by the listener is the one intended by the speaker. (b) A population of 10 agents starts without a vocabulary or any knowledge of the characteristics of each individual object. Speakers invent words for unexpressed meanings, listeners adopt the words they have not heard, and both align their lexicons based on success and failure in the game. The x-axis plots a series of 2000 games naming a set of 10 objects in different positions and seen from different angles. The y-axis shows both the average size of the lexicon (right y-axis, blue line), which shows a burst to 20 words and then a decrease to an optimal vocabulary of 10, and communicative success (left y-axis, red line), which rises to more than 95% after a mere 800 games.

The main advantages of the synthetic methodology are that (i) all internal states of the operational model can be tracked, for example, in contrast to humans, we can monitor the complete brain states of a robot as it is learning and processing language; (ii) experimental conditions can be varied in a controlled way, so that we can isolate the causal effect of a particular factor, e.g. increased population size, a new concept formation mechanism, increased communicative pressure; and (iii) a space of possible evolutionary linguistic pathways can be explored that have not necessarily occurred in nature, giving a theoretical tool for studying the space of possible languages.

This paper illustrates this methodology, focusing on the emergence of grammar. It is the final one of the three stages commonly recognized in language evolution research.


- (i) *From action to gesture.* The first stage goes from purposeful actions, for example grasping, to symbolic communicative gestural signs, for example pointing, possibly accompanied by sounds to draw the attention of the listener. The gestures are not innate, but created and implicitly negotiated. This stage is reached by most children around the first year of life [13]. Many researchers have argued that gestural signs must have been the first stage in the origins of symbolic communication in our species as well [14], partly because closely related species, in particular chimpanzees and bonobos, also develop gestural signs among close kin [15]. Various agent-based models have tried to emulate this stage, mostly based on operationalizing ontogenetic ritualization [16–18].
- (ii) *From sounds to words.* In the second stage, the sounds accompanying gestures, which were initially purely intended for grabbing the attention of the listener, become words, i.e. complex vocalizations associated with meanings [19]. This stage is reached by children in the first year of life with at first a slow acquisition rate, which then steadily increases so that around the age of 2, we typically observe a vocabulary spurt. Such a stage has also been postulated as the earliest stage in the origins of human languages [20], possibly

already reached in earlier hominin species, such as *Homo heidelbergensis* [2]. Although some non-human primates can acquire a system of signs [21], these signs were always supplied by human experimenters as opposed to being self-generated, and systems do not propagate beyond close kin. Several agent-based models for stage II have been developed (see the sample in [22]). They typically take the form of language games in which agents from a population take turns being speaker and listener in order to refer to objects or actions in the shared reality, as illustrated in figure 1 discussed in Steels [11].

- (iii) *From single words to grammar.* In the third stage, utterances use various syntactic devices, such as affixes, word stem changes, sequential ordering, intonation, stress patterns and hierarchical structure, in order to express additional meaning and extra information to avoid combinatorial complexity in parsing and semantic interpretation. This stage is reached in children by the end of the second year [23] and both lexicon and grammar grow rapidly until, at year five, the main grammatical systems of the language are in place, although many subtleties still need to be learned in subsequent years while the lexicon also expands further. Indeed, language learning goes on throughout life as languages are continuously changing. There is a wide consensus that humans are unique in their capacity to build up, learn and align grammatical language, even though many animal species exhibit some of the cognitive prerequisites such as recognizing and producing recursive syntax [24]. The rest of this paper discusses agent-based models for this third stage, which so far have been much less explored.

## 2. How grammar evolves in human languages

Historical linguists, like Wilhelm von Humboldt, already observed in the nineteenth century that the expression of meaning in a particular language is not static but cycles through different modes [25] (figure 2).



**Figure 2.** The expression of meaning goes through a linguistic cycle, switching between four modes: an inferential mode, in which meaning needs to be inferred; a lexical mode, where meanings are expressed with words; a syntactic mode, where they are expressed with several words organized in hierarchical structures; and a morphological mode, where phrases are compacted into single words with affixes and word form variations expressing grammatical features.

- *Mode 1. Inferred.* Human communication is inferential [26]. Speaker and listener try to come to a shared understanding of a situation, but not all meaning involved is explicitly expressed. In fact, most of it has to be inferred from the context, common sense knowledge and background information. For example, the sentence ‘I want to come’ does not explicitly express that the action of coming may take place in the future, but we can infer this, because the speaker expresses a desire to carry out the action, which implies that if it happens, it will be in the future.
- *Mode 2. Lexical.* A meaning fragment becomes associated with a word, and as soon as speakers and listeners master an initial inventory of word–meaning pairs, the words can be put together in multiword utterances without concern for grammar but already enabling the compositional expression of larger meanings. This mode does not require complex linguistic processing. The speaker needs to retrieve from his lexicon a set of words that together cover the overall meaning he wants to convey, and the listener needs to look up the words in his own lexicon and then infer the semantic relations between the individual meaning fragments to reconstruct the overall meaning. A lexical mode with free-floating words is the norm in the ‘telegraphic speech’ that characterizes the very first phases of language learning in 2 year old children beyond single words. We find it in newspaper headlines, noun complexes, queries typed into search engines, Twitter-like messages in social media, utterances by non-native speakers without knowledge of the grammar, etc.
- *Mode 3. Syntactic.* In this mode, meaning is expressed using hierarchical patterns of words. For example, the article ‘the’, the adjective ‘Roman’ and the noun ‘poet’ form part of the noun phrase ‘the Roman poet’. The phrase as a whole can act as a unit and be combined again with other words or phrasal units, leading to hierarchical phrase structures, as in, ‘the Roman poet wrote pretty boring sonnets’. A phrasal pattern often expresses meaning beyond the meanings of its constituents [27]. For example, the phrase ‘ran into’ in ‘I ran into an old

friend’ means ‘to encounter’ rather than means a simple composition of the original literal meaning of ‘run’ (a physical movement towards a target) and ‘into’ (a spatial preposition meaning inside).

- *Mode 4. Morphological.* In this mode, meaning is expressed using complex word forms that have a purely lexical core ‘decorated’ with various markers (either clearly separable affixes or variations in the form of a word). The markers express grammatical features, such as gender, number, case, tense, aspect, definiteness, etc., and form an inflectional system. An example from English is ‘opened’, which has ‘open’ as lexical core and ‘-ed’ as an affix expressing past tense. Hierarchical structure and semantic relations between words are now expressed through grammatical agreement instead of word ordering. Grammatical agreement means that certain grammatical features, such as gender or number, are shared between words that are semantically related. Because the structure is expressed through feature marking, words or phrases can be free-floating again, like in a lexical mode.

When looking at a particular language, we find that all four modes are used, although usually one of them is dominant. For example, English is predominantly an *analytic* language, i.e. primarily relying on syntax (mode 3), even though there are some meaning domains using a morphological approach, for example, past tense expression in irregular verbs (came/come, do/did) or expression of semantic roles (cases) in pronouns (he/him/his). Quechuan, a native American language, is predominantly a *synthetic* language, i.e. primarily relying on morphology (mode 4). Nouns have no less than 19 possible case suffixes, and seven possessive suffixes. Verbs have a variety of suffixes to indicate tense, aspect, mood and modality, and various markers to convey subtle aspects of meaning. For example, an action verb may have additional markers to express the nature of the action, how the action was executed, which type of instrument was used, which evidence was available, etc. [28]. All this information is expressed in English, using separate words organized in syntactic patterns.

The historical record shows that the language inventory tends to expand for each mode. We see growth in the lexicon, increase in morphological complexity [29], increase in the sophistication of syntactic patterns [30]. However, we also see weakening and erosion within a given mode that may lead to a shift between modes, a process that is commonly called grammaticalization [31–33].

A typical example comes from the domain of time, such as the expression of future [34]. We see languages where future is not expressed explicitly or very ambiguously, and it therefore has to be inferred (as is currently the case in Chinese). Then, a stage may develop where future is expressed syntactically with a verb phrase and an auxiliary (as in English ‘I will come’). Typically, a verb such as ‘want’ or ‘go to’, which indirectly suggests future, is recruited and then becomes grammaticalized to take on the role of a future auxiliary. Next, we may see the compaction of a phrasal pattern into a single word, as in French ‘Je partirai’ (I will leave), which comes from an earlier syntactic expression of future with the verb ‘habere’ (have) as in ‘partire habeo’ (literally, ‘to leave I have’). The words in this pattern were increasingly glued together and compacted to ‘parti-abeo’, then ‘partir-ayo’,

which finally ended up through further phonetic optimization as ‘partirai’ (French first person singular future of ‘partire’) [35].

Although mode shifts typically take place over long time periods (thousands of years), there can be sudden accelerations, often owing to catastrophic events causing punctuated equilibria [36]. For example, in the formation of creole languages, the grammatical structures of the source language (e.g. French) get stripped away almost entirely to yield a lexical language (mode 2 dominating) from which the grammaticalization processes start off again and quite rapidly (in one or two generations) lead to a novel fully functioning grammatical system [37].

Language evolution usually moves in the direction from lexical to syntactic and then morphological, but there are occasionally movements in the other direction [38]. For example, the form of a word may erode so strongly that the meaning is no longer clearly expressed at which point a re-invention takes place. For example, the Latin word for speaking ‘loqui’ went out of use in late colloquial Latin to be replaced by ‘fabulare’, which evolved into Spanish ‘hablar’, or ‘parabolare’, which evolved into French ‘parler’ [35]. The negation particle ‘ne’ in French, itself already a reduction from ‘non’, was felt as too weak and was reinforced syntactically with the particle ‘pas’ (literally step) as in ‘je ne veux pas’ (I do not want). Today, ‘ne’ has become optional and ‘pas’ has effectively become the negation particle, as in ‘je veux pas’ (colloquial contemporary French).

These uncontested facts suggest that we should not conceptualize the origins and evolution of language as an all-or-none phenomenon, perhaps owing to a single genetic mutation that gave rise to a single new operator (such as merge). Instead, it makes more sense to inquire about the many cognitive mechanisms, the invention, learning and alignment strategies, and the cultural evolutionary dynamics that have to be in place so that a population of individuals can sustain these linguistic cycles in the expression of meaning domains. The mechanisms include analogical inference, routinization of behaviour, optimization, analogical inference, hierarchical planning and plan recognition, concept formation, imitation, associative memory and no doubt many more. Whether these cognitive mechanisms are specific to a language, and therefore would have required neurobiological change, or not can only be discussed seriously if we have adequate operational models of what these mechanisms are.

### 3. Agent-based models of language evolution

Agent-based models are a good way to tease apart and investigate the many mechanisms and factors involved in explaining linguistic cycling, because we can explicate a certain factor or mechanism (e.g. a particular concept formation strategy or a particular mechanism for analogical inference) and study its effect on the emergence or change how a particular meaning domain (e.g. colour, space or time) gets expressed. Moreover, there are not only cognitive factors, but also external factors influencing the evolutionary dynamics; for example, strong language contact may lead to intensive borrowing and the subsequent collapse of phrasal or morphological patterns, significant population turnover may compromise cultural transmission, differences in frequency for meanings and forms may accelerate shifts to another mode or reorganization of the grammar [39]. All these factors can be incorporated in an agent-based model and their impact studied by systematically changing them, for example, by allowing slower or faster population turnover.

Much remains to be done, as this methodology is only now beginning to be applied on a sufficiently large scale, but there is already a body of significant case studies. Most importantly, research is converging on a core set of mechanisms and processes, so that the hugely complicated effort to set up an agent-based model becomes more doable. Our group has made concrete proposals for such a core and translated them into a computational workbench for doing evolutionary linguistics experiments that is freely downloadable from <https://www.fcg-net.org/>.

The common core in all our experiments includes the following components:

- (i) *A script-based interaction engine.* It governs the turn-taking interaction between speakers and listeners.
- (ii) *A semantic representation formalism.* Agents in all modes use the same system for representing and manipulating meaning, based on a variant of second-order intentional logic. The representation includes objects in the domain of discourse denoted as symbols, e.g.  $o_2$ ,  $o_3$ , etc., and  $n$ -ary predicates for the properties, relations or actions involving these objects, e.g.  $red(o_2)$ ,  $next-to(o_1, o_2)$ , etc. The semantic representations are second order, because a property or relation can itself be an object and the intension (the predicate itself) can also be an object. The details of this representation formalism are not important for the main points of this paper.
- (iii) *Representation of situation models.* Situation models are couched in terms of this semantic representation formalism. A situation model contains all the objects and relations known about the shared context. It is private to each agent and not necessarily shared. In robotic experiments, the situation model is obtained from sensors and complex sensory processes that anchor objects in experienced reality and compute which predicates are true in the current context [40]. For example, a scene with a red ball that is inside a green box (which might occur in the experiments shown in figure 1) is represented with the following set of predications:

$$red(o_1), green(o_2), ball(o_1), block(o_2) \text{ and } inside(o_1, o_2). \quad (3.1)$$

- (iv) *Representation of utterance meaning.* The meaning of utterances is obtained by the listener through parsing an utterance, and by the speaker through conceptualizing ‘what to say’ in order to achieve a particular communicative goal. The utterance meaning uses the same semantic representation formalism as situation models. However, expressions now have variables instead of constants. These variables are written as symbols with a question mark in front, such as  $?x_1$ ,  $?x_2$ , etc. Semantic interpretation consists of matching utterance meaning against the situation model in order to find bindings for all the variables. For example, the utterance ‘ball red next-to block’ (assuming no grammar) gets translated by a lexical parsing process that looks up the word meanings and combines them into a set

$$ball(?x_1), red(?x_2), box(?x_3) \text{ and } inside(?x_4, ?x_5). \quad (3.2)$$



A possible binding for these variables, given the situation model in (3.1) is

$$?x1 = o1, \quad ?x2 = o1, \quad ?x3 = o2, \quad ?x4 = o1 \quad \text{and} \\ ?x5 = o2.$$

Grammar primarily signals some of the co-reference relations between variables. For example, if we take the English utterance '(the) red ball inside (the) box', then the listener knows, even before consulting the situation model, that  $?x1 = ?x2$ , because the words 'red' and 'ball', which introduce the predicates 'red' and 'ball', are part of the same noun phrase. Moreover, he knows from the semantics of the prepositional noun phrase construction that

$$?x4 = ?x1 = ?x2 \quad \text{and} \quad ?x3 = ?x5.$$

- (v) *A construction grammar engine.* Construction schemas are relevant for all modes, whether they capture lexical, morphological or syntactic ways of expressing meaning. A construction schema defines an association between meaning and form, for example the predicate 'red(?x)' and the word 'red'. Or article, adjective and noun units are combined in a noun phrase that also establishes semantic relations between the meaning of these units. A construction schema has slots for the different units (words or phrases), and specifies the syntactic and semantic constraints on the units and their morphosyntactic properties. It specifies how to build a new unit for the parent, and associates grammatical and semantic categories with that unit. In contrast to purely syntactic formalisms (such as minimalism), construction schemas always contribute meaning beyond the meaning of their constituents, such as co-reference relations between the meanings of constituents or additional predicates. Construction grammar typically organizes schemas into networks to support priming and inheritance from more abstract to more concrete constructions.

We have developed an operational version of construction grammar, called fluid construction grammar (FCG) [41]. Details of FCG are complex, but not crucial for the present discussion. The most important point is that FCG uses the same schema representation and the same processing mechanisms for lexical, syntactic and morphological constructions, so that agents can smoothly move between the three different modes of meaning expression described earlier. Another important characteristic of FCG is that the same construction schema can be used in parsing as well as production, so that the speaker can monitor his own speech by simulating how the listener might interpret the utterance he is producing, and the listener can simulate how he would express the meaning he was able to derive from the speaker's utterance.

- (vi) *Learning architecture.* Finally, all agents are equipped with a general architecture that supports insight learning [42,43]. There are two layers of processing: a routine layer where agents apply the constructions available at that point in their individual inventory, and a metalayer where agents apply diagnostics and repair strategies. A *diagnostic strategy* triggers when routine application of constructions is not possible, when the outcome after applying available constructions is incomplete or not interpretable with the

current situation model, or when an opportunity for possible optimization is detected. A *repair strategy* attempts to deal with issues diagnosed by these diagnostics. For example, if a word is missing for expressing a fragment of utterance meaning, then the speaker may invent or recruit a new word; if a phrase or part of a phrase is recurring often, it may be compacted in a single word by changing the intonation structure and pauses between words; if a co-referential relation between two variables is not expressed, a grammatical construction might be introduced to convey this information to avoid semantic ambiguity in the future, etc. After an interaction, *consolidation strategies* come into action. They translate repairs into new constructions or variations on existing constructions, perform credit assignment and restructure the grammar.

- (vii) *Cultural evolutionary dynamics.* All models we developed are based on an instantiation of evolutionary dynamics at the cultural, more precisely linguistic, level. Evolutionary dynamics requires that there is a population of units that multiply with inheritance, exhibit variation and undergo selection, effecting the distribution of traits. Here, the traits are strategies and constructions built with them, stored in the individual memories of the agents. They multiply through social learning as a part of language games. Variation is unavoidable owing to performance deviations, creative language use and imperfect learning. Selection takes place, because the agents prefer constructions that lead to higher communicative success, adequate expressive power and minimized cognitive effort, causing some strategies and constructions to propagate and become dominant in the language community. Language evolution never stops, because there is no optimal solution and no central authority, so that the population keeps navigating in the space of possible language variants to have a communication system adapted to their needs.

## 4. Case studies

From §3, it follows that setting up a specific agent-based model requires: a definition of a game script, an environment that will be the source of meanings, a population with possibly internal structure and dynamics and most importantly operational diagnostic, repair and consolidation strategies, so that we can see what their effect is on the emerging language. An experiment will typically focus on one aspect of language. These can be quite specific, for example, how can an inventory of colour terms and colour categories arise, how can a system expressing tense and aspect emerge, how does phonetic erosion lead to the collapse of a case system. It can also be more general, for example, how can a recursive phrase structure grammar emerge, what is the impact of analogy on streamlining an inflection system, what is the impact of population structure and renewal on the emergence and preservation of a lexicon. The remainder of this paper can only give a few concrete examples with details contained in the cited papers.

### (a) Word formation

Agent-based models for word formation have to explain how implicit, inferred meanings can turn into explicit lexical expression. This happens in the experiment shown in figure 1 in which agents play naming games about visually

**Table 1.** Word formation strategy.

role	diagnostic	repair	consolidation
speaker	word is missing for	invent new	build new construction
	a meaning	word	associating meaning with
	fragment	form	newly invented word
listener	unknown word	guess	new construction associating
		possible	guessed meaning with
		meaning	unknown word

**Table 3.** Coercion.

role	diagnostic	repair	consolidation
speaker	disconnected unit	find best matching	store the expanded
	(co-referential	construction and	combination
	relations not	coerce unit so	potential of the
listener	disconnected unit	infer additional	store the expanded
	(co-referential	co-referential	combination
	relations not	relations from	potential of the
	expressed)	situation model	coerced unit

perceived objects in a shared situation using the diagnostic, repair and consolidation strategy shown in table 1.

Consolidation also needs to include credit assignment using the following strategy:

- (i) In the case of a *successful* interaction, all new or modified constructions are stored and the scores of the constructions that were involved are increased, whereas competing constructions, i.e. constructions that could also potentially apply but lead to a dead end or to some other anomaly, are decreased, thus implementing the kind of lateral inhibition dynamics familiar from many neural network models, such as the Kohonen network.
- (ii) In the case of a *failed* interaction, the scores of the implicated constructions are decreased, and new or modified constructions are not stored.

We see in figure 1 that these strategies indeed allow a population of agents to expand and share a lexicon. Words propagate but there is variation, because different agents may invent a new word when they do not have one. Progressively, some words win the competition based on the lateral inhibition dynamics and a shared lexicon with a minimal set of words for the meaning domain results. These strategies have already been applied for a variety of meaning domains, including experiments where both the categories and the lexicon evolve and get coordinated [44]. Experiments have also been conducted on word formation with multiword utterances (without grammar) using slightly more sophisticated diagnostic, repair and consolidation strategies [45].

## (b) Syntax formation

Agent-based models for syntax formation have to explain how a set of words can get organized into hierarchical

**Table 2.** Phrase building strategy.

role	diagnostic	repair	consolidation
speaker	disconnected unit	build variant of best	store this
	(co-referential	matching	constructional
	relations not	construction by	variant
listener	disconnected unit	adding the unit	build constructional
	(unexpressed	relations deduced	variant adding unit
	co-referential	through speaker	to best matching
	relations)	feedback and	construction
		situation model	

**Table 4.** Phonetic reduction.


role	diagnostic	repair	consolidation
speaker	is optimization	leave out final	store the new form as a
	possible?	consonant or	constructional
		vowel	variant
listener	form matches only	use best matching	store new word form as
	partially with	construction	a construction
	existing one		variant

phrasal patterns. This happens in the experiment shown in figure 3 (from [43]) where agents play the syntax game [46], which is a variant of the naming game that requires the expression of n-ary relations, such as ‘inside-of’ or ‘moves-towards’, and hence ambiguity about the role of the arguments in the relation. Figure 3 is based on two strategies: one for building phrasal patterns by incorporating units, and another one for fitting existing words or phrases into an existing phrasal pattern through coercion [43].


The phrase-building strategy creates an extended phrasal pattern, which initially contains just a single word, by incorporating an additional constituent. For example, the pattern ‘blue block’ is extended, so that an extra property is expressed, as in ‘big blue block’. The new variant inherits most of its properties from the partially applicable construction (table 2).

The coercion strategy extends the lexical or phrasal categories of a unit, so that it fits a schema. For example, in the phrase ‘she WhatsApped me’, the noun ‘WhatsApp’ is coerced to behave as a verb, so that the clausal construction combining subject, verb and object, can apply (table 3).

Figure 3 shows the effect of these strategies when a population of five agents plays 800 syntax games. The experimental results show not only that agents converge on a shared phrase structure grammar (seen because alignment reaches almost 100%), but also that semantic and syntactic ambiguity decreases significantly to close to zero, implying that a ‘better’ communication system arises, meaning one with less cognitive effort and less risk for misunderstanding. Different agents may select different word orders to express the same co-reference relations, and so there is unavoidably competition. Agents may also differ on the grammatical categories of words. However, the lateral inhibition credit assignment strategy, the same as used for word formation, causes convergence of word ordering and categorical usage.



**Figure 3.** Grammar emergence experiment shows 500 consecutive language games in a population of five agents. The running average of four different measures is shown: (i) *semantic ambiguity* measures the number of times the situation model had to be used to generate or block hypotheses, divided by the number of variables in the utterance meaning; (ii) *syntactic ambiguity* measures the percentage of failed paths in the search space; (iii) *communicative success* measures whether the hearer was able to identify the topic without speaker feedback; (iv) *alignment* measures whether the hearer would express the same meaning using the same utterance as the speaker; and (v) *grammatical constructions* measures the learning rate, i.e. how fast the grammar is acquired, by tracking the percentage of constructions of the final grammar already learned at each time step.



**Figure 4.** Changes to an agreement marker during a single experiment in a population of 10 agents which are using the phonetic reduction strategy. The probability that the speaker reduces a marker is  $e = 0.1$  per game. The marker *-uinbui* erodes progressively to *-u*. A truncated variant is typically present for a while in the population until it becomes dominant. If the *-u* marker is cut further, its function gets lost and must be regenerated.

### (c) Reduction

Agent-based models for the phonetic erosion of meaning have to explain how words or morphological markers of words can progressively simplify without compromising initially their use, until of course the form has completely disappeared. This is illustrated in the experiment shown in figure 4 taken from larger-scale experiments in the emergence of marker systems and agreement [47]. Simplifying, the speaker attempts to diminish the articulatory complexity of a form (with a certain probability) and the listener accepts this form-variant if it is close enough to an existing form and if its acceptance leads to a successful game, after which the listener consolidates the form-variant in a new

construction as part of his own inventory. Results in figure 4 show this strategy at work with new variants popping up, and spreading in the population, without compromising communicative success, until they become dominant, after which a new variant comes up (table 4).

## 5. Conclusion

Agent-based modelling can play an important role in deconstructing the many factors that play a role in the emergence and evolution of language. It helps to tease these factors apart and study their causal impact on an evolving language

in repeatable objective experiments. Data from historical linguistics have abundantly demonstrated that there are different modes in which a particular meaning domain can get expressed (inferred, lexical, syntactic and morphological) and that we regularly see mode shifts creating linguistic cycles. For example, temporal information, such as future, may go from being unexpressed, to being expressed using words, auxiliaries in verbal patterns, and compact morphological expression in an inflectional system. A theory of language evolution needs to show by what cognitive mechanisms, external factors and evolutionary dynamics meanings get expressed in each of these modes and how shifts may occur.

This paper puts forward a common core with a script-based interaction engine, semantic representations for situation models and utterance meaning, an operational model of construction grammar processing, and a meta-level

learning architecture enabling insight learning. It also puts forward a model of the cultural evolutionary dynamics and then points to a number of case studies that are using this core for achieving word formation, syntax formation and phonetic reduction. Clearly, language is an extraordinarily complex adaptive system. We therefore should not expect a single simple explanation how such a system can emerge and keep evolving, and many more experiments are needed on all aspects of the linguistic cycle.

**Competing interests.** I declare I have no competing interests.

**Funding.** The writing of this paper was partly supported by the European FP7 project Insight and by the Wissenschaftskolleg in Berlin.

**Acknowledgements.** The author is a fellow at the Institute for Advanced Studies (ICREA) and associated with the Institute for Evolutionary Biology (IBE) of the UPF and CSIC in Barcelona.

## References

- Arbib M (ed.). 2012 *How the brain got language: the mirror system hypothesis*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dediu D, Levinson S. 2013 On the antiquity of language: the reinterpretation of Neandertal linguistic capacities and its consequences. *Front. Psychol.* **4**, 397. (doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00397)
- Maynard Smith J, Szatmáry E. 1995 *The major transitions in evolution*. Oxford, UK: Freeman.
- Benner S, Sismour M. 2005 Synthetic biology. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **6**, 533–543. (doi:10.1038/nrg1637)
- Bianchi F, Squazzoni F. 2015 Agent-based models in sociology. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Comput. Stat.* **7**, 284–306. (doi:10.1002/wics.1356)
- Wurzer G, Kowarik K, Reschreiter H (eds). 2015 *Agent-based modeling and simulation in archaeology*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Cangelosi A, Parisi D (eds). 2002 *Simulating the evolution of language*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Lyon C, Nehaniv CL, Cangelosi A (eds). 2007 *Emergence of language and communication*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Steels L. 2011 Modeling the cultural evolution of language. *Phys. Life Rev.* **8**, 330–356. (doi:10.1016/j.plrev.2011.10.014)
- Steels L. 1998 The origins of ontologies and communication conventions in multi-agent systems. *J. Agents Multi-Agent Syst.* **1**, 169–194. (doi:10.1023/A:1010002801935)
- Steels L. 2003 Evolving grounded communication for robots. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **7**, 308–312. (doi:10.1016/S1364-6613(03)00129-3)
- Solé R, Munteanu A, Rodríguez-Caso C, Macía J. 2013 Synthetic protocell biology: from reproduction to computation. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **362**, 1727–1739. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2007.2065)
- Capirci O, Volterra V. 2014 Gesture and speech: the emergence and development of a strong and changing partnership. *Gesture* **8**, 22–44. (doi:10.1075/gest.8.1.04cap)
- Corballis M. 2009 The evolution of language. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* **1156**, 19–43. (doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04423.x)
- Halina M, Rossano F, Tomasello M. 2013 The ontogenetic ritualization of bonobo gestures. *Anim. Cogn.* **16**, 653–666. (doi:10.1007/s10071-013-0601-7)
- Arbib M, Ganesh V, Gasser B. 2014 Dyadic brain modelling, mirror systems and the ontogenetic ritualization of ape gesture. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **369**, 4–14. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0414)
- Hafner V, Kaplan F. 2005 Learning to interpret pointing gestures: experiments with four-legged autonomous robots. In *Biomimetic neural learning for intelligent robots* (LNCS vol. 3575), pp. 225–234. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Spranger M, Steels L. 2014 Discovering communication through ontogenetic ritualisation. In *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Development and Learning in Epigenetic Robotics (ICDL-Epirob)*, pp. 14–19. Cambridge, MA: IEEE.
- Bloom P. 1973 *One word at a time: the use of single-word utterances before syntax*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton.
- Bickerton D. 1998 Catastrophic evolution: the case for a single step from proto-language to full human language. In *Approaches to the evolution of language: social and cognitive bases* (eds JR Hurford, M Studdert-Kennedy, C Knight), pp. 341–358. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Savage-Rumbaugh S, Lewin R (eds). 1994 *The ape at the brink of the human mind*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Steels L (ed.). 2012 *Experiments in cultural language evolution*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Tomasello M (ed.). 1992 *First verbs: a case study of early grammatical development*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gentner T, Fenn K, Margoliash D, Nusbaum H. 2006 Recursive syntactic pattern learning by songbirds. *Nature* **440**, 1204–1207. (doi:10.1038/nature04675)
- Givón T. 2009 *The genesis of syntactic complexity*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Sperber D, Wilson D. 1986 *Relevance: communication and cognition*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Goldberg A. 1995 *Constructions: a construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Talmy L (ed.). 2000 *Cognitive semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Givón T (ed.). 2009 *The genesis of syntactic complexity. Diachrony, ontogeny, neuro-cognition, evolution*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Van de Velde F. 2011 Left-peripheral expansion of the English NP1. *English Lang. Linguist.* **15**, 387–415. (doi:10.1017/S1360674311000086)
- Lehmann C (ed.). 2015 *Thoughts on grammaticalization (Classics in Linguistics 1)*. Berlin, Germany: Language Science Press.
- Traugott E, Heine B (eds). 1991 *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Heine B, Kuteva T. 2007 *The genesis of grammar: a reconstruction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bybee J, Perkins R, Pagliuca W (eds). 1996 *The evolution of grammar. Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Perret M (ed.). 2014 *Introduction à l'histoire de la langue française*. Paris, France: Arman Colin.
- Dixon R (ed.). 1997 *The rise and fall of languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.



37. Mufwene S. 2001 *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
38. Haspelmath M. 2004 On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In *Up and down the cline - the nature of grammaticalization*, vol. 59 (eds O Fischer, M Norde, H Perridon), pp. 17–44. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
39. Bybee JE. 2007 *Frequency of use and the organization of language*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
40. Steels L, Hild M (eds). 2012 *Language grounding in robots*. New York, NY: Springer.
41. Steels L, Szathmáry E. 2015 Fluid construction grammar as a biological system. *Linguist. Vanguard* **1**, 1–350. (doi:10.1515/lingvan-2015-0022)
42. van Trijp R. 2012 A reflective architecture for robust language processing and learning. In *Computational issues in fluid construction grammar* (ed. L Steels), pp. 51–74. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
43. Garcia-Casademont E, Steels L. 2016 Grammar learning as insight problem solving. *J. Cogn. Sci.* **17**, 27–62. (doi:10.17791/jcs.2016.17.1.27)
44. Baronchelli A, Gong T, Puglisi A, Loreto V. 2010 Modeling the emergence of universality in color naming patterns. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **107**, 2403–2407. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0908533107)
45. de Beule J. 2016 The multiple word guessing game. *Belgian J. Linguist.* **30**.
46. Steels L, Garcia-Casademont E. 2015 How to play the syntax game. In *Proc. Eur. Conf. on Artificial Life* (eds P Andrews *et al.*), pp. 479–486. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
47. Beuls K, Steels L. 2013 Agent-based models of strategies for the emergence and evolution of grammatical agreement. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e58960. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0058960)