EMERGENT COMMUNICATION FOR UNDERSTANDING HUMAN LANGUAGE EVOLUTION: WHAT'S MISSING?

Anonymous authors
Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

Emergent communication protocols among humans and artificial neural network agents do not yet share the same properties and show some critical mismatches in results. We describe three important phenomena with respect to the emergence and benefits of compositionality: ease-of-learning, generalization, and group size effects (i.e., larger groups create more systematic languages). The latter two are not fully replicated with neural agents, which hinders the use of neural emergent communication for language evolution research. We argue that one possible reason for these mismatches is that key cognitive and communicative constraints of humans are not yet integrated. Specifically, in humans, memory constraints and alternating between the roles of speaker and listener underlie the emergence of linguistic structure, yet these constraints are typically absent in neural simulations. We suggest that introducing such communicative and cognitive constraints would promote more linguistically plausible behaviors with neural agents.

1 INTRODUCTION

Emergent communication has been widely studied in deep learning (Lazaridou & Baroni, 2020), and in language evolution (Selten & Warglien, 2007; Winters et al., 2015; Raviv et al., 2019). Both fields share communication games as a common experimental framework: a speaker describes an input, e. g., an object or a scene, and transmits a message to a listener, which has to guess or reconstruct the speaker's input. However, the languages of artificial neural network agents (neural agents) do not always exhibit the same linguistic properties as human languages. This presents a problem for using emergent communication as a model for language evolution of humans (or animals (Prat, 2019)).

Here, we emphasize three important phenomena in human language evolution (described in detail in Section 2) that relate to the emergence of compositional structure—all of which have been discussed theoretically and confirmed experimentally with humans. First, compositional languages are easier to learn (Kirby et al., 2014; Carr et al., 2017; Raviv et al., 2021). Second, more compositionality allows for better generalization and facilitates convergence between strangers (Wray & Grace, 2007; Raviv et al., 2021). Third, larger populations typically develop more structured languages (Lupyan & Dale, 2010; Raviv et al., 2019).

In emergent communication among neural agents, however, two of the three phenomena are not yet replicated (see Section 3). While the ease-of-learning effect for compositional structure has been confirmed in multiple experiments (Li & Bowling, 2019; Guo et al., 2019; Chaabouni et al., 2020), recent work has shown that compositional structure is not necessary for generalization (Lazaridou et al., 2018; Chaabouni et al., 2020). As for the group size effect, this could so far only be confirmed with continuous communication channels (Tieleman et al., 2019). With discrete communication, an increase in group size does not lead to the emergence of more compositional languages (Chaabouni et al., 2022). Only recently, Rita et al. (2022) have shown that the group size effect can be partially recovered by explicitly modeling population heterogeneity.

We propose two potential explanations for the striking mismatches between humans and neural agents. We argue that emergent communication simulations with neural networks typically lack two key communicative and cognitive factors that drive the emergence of compositionality in humans, and whose omission essentially eliminates the benefits of compositionality: memory constraints, and alternating roles. These are described in detail in Section 4, along with suggestions on how to tackle them, namely, limiting model capacity and sharing parameters within single agents.

2 IMPORTANT PROPERTIES OF HUMAN LANGUAGES

Two of the most fundamental properties of human languages are 1. a consistent form-to-meaning mapping and 2. a compositional structure (Hockett, 1960). Previous work suggests that compositional structure evolves as the trade-off between a compressability pressure (i.e., languages should be as simple and learnable as possible) and an expressivity pressure (i.e., languages should be able to successfully disambiguate between a variety of meanings) (Kirby et al., 2015). Without a compressibility pressure, languages would become completely holistic (that is, with a unique symbol for each meaning) - which is highly expressive but poorly compressed. Without an expressivity pressure, languages would become degenerate (that is, comprised of a single symbol) - which is highly compressed but not expressive. Yet with both pressures present, as in the case of natural languages, structured languages with compositionality would emerge -as these strike a balance between compressibility and expressivity. Notably, three phenomena related to compositionality have been demostrated and discussed with humans:

Compositional Languages are easier to learn. The driving force behind a compressibility pressure is that languages have to be transmitted to, learned by, and used by multiple individuals, often from limited input and under a limited exposure time (Smith et al., 2003). Numerous iterated learning studies have shown that artificial languages become easier to learn over time (Kirby et al., 2008; Winters et al., 2015; Beckner et al., 2017) - a finding that is attributed to a simultaneous increase in compositionality. Indeed, artificial language learning experiments directly confirm that more compositional languages are learned better and faster by adults (Raviv et al., 2021).

Compositionality aids Generalization. When a language exhibits a compositional structure, it is easier to generalize (describe new meanings) in a way that is transparent and understandable to other speakers (Kirby, 2002; Zuidema, 2002). For instance, the need to communicate over a growing number of different items in an open-ended meaning space promotes the emergence of more compositional systems Carr et al. (2017). Recently, Raviv et al. (2021) showed that compositional structure predicts generalization performance, with compositional languages allowing for better generalizations that are also shared across different individuals .The rationale is that humans cannot remember a holistic language (compressability pressure), and when they need to invent descriptions for new meanings, compositionality enables systematic and transparent composition of new label-meaning pairs from existing part-labels.

Larger groups create more compositional languages. It has long been assumed that sociodemographic factors such as population size are important determinants of language evolution (Wray & Grace, 2007; Nettle, 2012; Lupyan & Dale, 2010). Specifically, global cross-linguistic studies found that bigger communities tend to have languages with more systematic and transparent structures (Lupyan & Dale, 2010). This result has also been confirmed experimentally, where bigger groups of interacting participants created more compositional languages (Raviv et al., 2019). These findings are attributed to compressibility pressures arising during communication: remembering partner-specific variants becomes increasingly more challenging as group size increases, and so memory constraints force larger groups to converge on more transparent languages.

3 REPLICATION ATTEMPTS WITH NEURAL AGENTS

Computational modeling has long been used to study language evolution (Kirby, 2002; Smith et al., 2003; Kirby et al., 2004; Smith & Kirby, 2008; Gong et al., 2008; Dale & Lupyan, 2012; Perfors & Navarro, 2014; Kirby et al., 2015; Steels, 2016). More recently, emergent communication with neural networks and reinforcement learning techniques was introduced (Lazaridou et al., 2017; Havrylov & Titov, 2017; Kottur et al., 2017). Table 1 offers a (non-exhaustive) summary of recent emergent communication experiments with neural agents. Both symbolic and visual inputs have been used (Lazaridou et al., 2018), and the channel bandwidth (alphabet size to the power of message length) has been increasing with time. Most experiments use long short-term memory (LSTM) (Hochreiter & Schmidhuber, 1997) as the agents' architecture, and training is most often carried out by the REINFORCE algorithm (Williams, 1992). Crucially, most experiments have been limited to a pair of agents, although Li & Bowling (2019) experimented with a single speaker and multiple listeners. Only recently, Chaabouni et al. (2022) and Rita et al. (2022) scaled up the group

size. In all experiments except Graesser et al. (2019), agents do not alternate between the roles of speaker and listener, and instead employ distinct models for the speaker and listener. For comparison, experiments with humans by Raviv et al. (2019) have had 4×16 distinct visual meanings, a discrete communication channel with bandwidth 16^{16}, and group sizes of 4-8 participants, who alternated between being speaker and listener roles.

Table 1: Neural emergent communication experiments. Input type and size of meaning space, channel bandwidth (alphabet size to the power of message length), task objective (reconstruction and discrimination, the latter with number of distractors), group size, role alternation between speaker and listener (RA), and presence of iterated learning (IL). Placeholders like N, K, or comma-separated lists mean that settings were varied.

Experiment	**Inputs**	**Channel**	**Objective**	**Groups**	**RA**	**IL**
Havrylov & Titov (2017)	visual (MSCOCO)	128^N	Discr. (128)	2	No	No
Kottur et al. (2017)	symbolic (4^3)	N^1	Reconstr.	2	No	No
Lazaridou et al. (2017)	pretrained visual	$10^1/100^1$	Discr.	2	No	No
Lazaridou et al. (2018)	symbolic (463)	$10^2/17^5/40^{10}$	Discr. (5)	2	No	No
Lazaridou et al. (2018)	visual (124×124)	N/A	Discr. (2,20)	2	No	No
Tieleman et al. (2019)	visual	*continuous*	Reconstr.	$1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32$	No	No
Chaabouni et al. (2019)	symbolic(K)	40^{30}	Reconstr.	$50, 100$	No	No
Graesser et al. (2019)	visual	2^8	Discr.	N	Yes	No
Rita et al. (2020)	symbolic (1000)	40^{30}	Reconstr.	2	No	No
Li & Bowling (2019)	symbolic (8×4)	8^2	Discr. (5)	$1 : 1, 2, 10$	No	Yes
Kharitonov et al. (2020)	symbolic (2^8)	1	Partial Reconstr.	2	No	No
Kharitonov et al. (2020)	visual (10^2)	2^{10}	Discr. (100)	2	No	No
Chaabouni et al. (2020)	symbolic (2×100)	100^3	Reconstr.	2	No	Yes
Chaabouni et al. (2022)	visual (ImageNet, CelebA)	20^{10}	Discr. (20–1024)	$2, 20, 100$	No	Yes
Rita et al. (2022)	symbolic (4×4)	20^{10}	Reconstr.	2,10	No	No

With respect to the three linguistic phenomena described above for human participants, neural agents show a mixed pattern of results: First, ease-of-learning of compositional languages has been confirmed in emergent communication with neural agents (Guo et al., 2019; Chaabouni et al., 2020; 2022). For example, more compositionality emerges when agents are being constantly reset and need to learn the language over and over again (similar to the iterated learning paradigm) (Li & Bowling, 2019). Similarly, Guo et al. (2019) found that compositional languages emerges in iterated learning experiments with neural agents because they are easier to learn.

Second, in contrast to humans, neural agents can generalize well even without compositional communication protocols. Chaabouni et al. (2020) have found that compositionality is *not* necessary for generalization in neural agents (in-line with earlier findings from Lazaridou et al. (2018)). Although they argue that structure (however it emerges) prevails throughout evolution *because* of its implied learnability advantage (in line with Kirby et al. (2015)), the finding that compositionality aids generalization has nevertheless not been replicated with neural agents yet.

Third, in populations of autoencoders, where the encoder and decoders were decoupled and exchanged throughout training, larger communities produced representations with less idiosyncrasies (Tieleman et al., 2019). However, these experiments used a continuous, rather than discrete, channel, which has only recently been analyzed with an increasing population size (Chaabouni et al., 2022; Rita et al., 2022). Although Chaabouni et al. (2022) argue that it is necessary to scale up emergent communication experiments to better align neural emergent communication with human language evolution, they have not found a systematic advantage of population size in generalization and ease-of-learning (in contrast with (Tieleman et al., 2019)). Similarly, Rita et al. (2022) found that language properties are not enhanced by population size alone. However, when adding heterogeneity via different learning rates, increased population size led to an increase in structure.

4 Potential Reasons for the Mismatch in Results

Why does the population size not affect emergent neural communication? And why do neural agents do not need compositionality to generalize? Our key argument is that crucial communicative and cognitive factors in humans have not yet been appropriately introduced to neural agents in emergent communication experiments. We argue that omitting these factors effectively removes the compress-

ibility pressure that underlies the emergence and benefits of compositionality. In the following, we highlight two crucial factors: memory constraints and speaker/listener role alternation.

Memory Constraints Human memory limitation is one of the most important constraints of language learning, and underlies the compressibility pressure in language use and transmission. Indeed, sequence memory constraints induce structure emergence in iterated learning Cornish et al. (2017), and underlie group size effects in real-world settings (Meir et al., 2012; Wray & Grace, 2007) and in communication games with humans (Raviv et al., 2019), where more compositionality is promoted because individuals cannot memorize partner-specific variations as group size increases. In contrast, a key ingredient for the success of neural networks is their overparameterization (Nakkiran et al., 2021), which means that their capacity is in fact sufficient to completely "memorize" sender-specific idiosyncratic languages. We propose that this overparametrization significantly reduces the compressibility pressure, effectively eliminating the potential benefits of compositional structure for learning and generalization.

We therefore suggest that in communication games, the model capacity, i. e., how much information the model can store, (well quantifiable, e. g., see MacKay et al. (2003)) should be considered in relation to the number of different meanings and the space of all possible messages, i. e. alphabet size to the power of (maximum) message length $|\mathcal{A}|^L$. We hypothesize that for compositionality to emerge, the model capacity needs to be less than required to memorize a separate message for each meaning from every agent but also less than the theoretical channel bandwidth, such that it becomes necessary to reuse substructures within the messages. In agreement with our position, Resnick et al. (2020) and Gupta et al. (2020) verified that learning an underlying compositional structure requires less capacity than memorizing a dataset. Similar to us, the authors of both works assume a range in model capacity that facilitates compositionality, but so far only determine a lower bound, while we argue here about the upper bound(s).

Role Alternation In current neural emergent communication experiments, one agent generates the message, and the other only processes it. This in sharp contrast to human communication, where speakers can reproduce any linguistic message that they can understand (Hockett, 1960). Indeed, dyadic and group communication experiments with humans typically have people alternating between the roles of speaker and listener throughout the experiment (Kirby et al., 2015; Raviv et al., 2019; Motamedi et al., 2021). This is only rarely reflected in work with neural agents (Table 1).

A straight-forward implementation of role alternation is to have shared parameters within the (generative) speaker role and the (discriminative) listener role of the same neural agent. This would make neural agents' architecture more similar to the human brain, where shared neural mechanisms support both production and comprehension of natural speech (Silbert et al., 2014). One way to do this would be to tie the output layer's weights to input embedding, a well known concept in language modeling (Mikolov et al., 2013; Raffel et al., 2020). Some experiments already implement role alternation, e. g., in multi-agent communication with given language descriptions (Graesser et al., 2019), or in language acquisition from image captions where agents simultaneously learn by cognition and production (Nikolaus & Fourtassi, 2021). We suggest role alternation should also implemented in emergent communication experiments to ensure more linguistically plausible dynamics.

5 Conclusion

We have outlined important discrepancies in results between emergent communication with human vs. neural agents and suggested these can be explained by the absence of key cognitive and communicative factors that drive human language evolution: memory constraints and speaker-listener role alternation. We suggest that including these factors in future work would mimic the compressability pressure and compositionality benefits observed with human agents, and consequentially make emergent neural communication protocols more linguistically plausible. Notably, additional psycho- and socio-linguistic factors may affect language evolution, and might also play a role in explaining the discrepancy in results.

REFERENCES

Clay Beckner, Janet B Pierrehumbert, and Jennifer Hay. The emergence of linguistic structure in an online iterated learning task. *Journal of Language Evolution*, 2(2):160–176, 2017.

Jon W Carr, Kenny Smith, Hannah Cornish, and Simon Kirby. The cultural evolution of structured languages in an open-ended, continuous world. *Cognitive science*, 41(4):892–923, 2017.

Rahma Chaabouni, Eugene Kharitonov, Emmanuel Dupoux, and Marco Baroni. Anti-efficient encoding in emergent communication. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.

Rahma Chaabouni, Eugene Kharitonov, Diane Bouchacourt, Emmanuel Dupoux, and Marco Baroni. Compositionality and generalization in emergent languages. In *ACL*, pp. 4427–4442. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020.

Rahma Chaabouni, Florian Strub, Florent Altché, Eugene Tarassov, Corentin Tallec, Elnaz Davoodi, Kory Wallace Mathewson, Olivier Tieleman, Angeliki Lazaridou, and Bilal Piot. Emergent communication at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL `https://openreview.net/forum?id=AUGBfDIV9rL`.

Hannah Cornish, Rick Dale, Simon Kirby, and Morten H Christiansen. Sequence memory constraints give rise to language-like structure through iterated learning. *PloS one*, 12(1):e0168532, 2017.

Rick Dale and Gary Lupyan. Understanding the origins of morphological diversity: The linguistic niche hypothesis. *Advances in complex systems*, 15(03n04):1150017, 2012.

Tao Gong, James W Minett, and William S-Y Wang. Exploring social structure effect on language evolution based on a computational model. *Connection Science*, 20(2-3):135–153, 2008.

Laura Graesser, Kyunghyun Cho, and Douwe Kiela. Emergent linguistic phenomena in multi-agent communication games. In *EMNLP/IJCNLP (1)*, pp. 3698–3708. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.

Shangmin Guo, Yi Ren, Serhii Havrylov, Stella Frank, Ivan Titov, and Kenny Smith. The emergence of compositional languages for numeric concepts through iterated learning in neural agents. *CoRR*, abs/1910.05291, 2019.

Abhinav Gupta, Cinjon Resnick, Jakob Foerster, Andrew Dai, and Kyunghyun Cho. Compositionality and capacity in emergent languages. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP*, pp. 34–38, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.repl4nlp-1.5. URL `https://aclanthology.org/2020.repl4nlp-1.5`.

Serhii Havrylov and Ivan Titov. Emergence of language with multi-agent games: Learning to communicate with sequences of symbols. In *NIPS*, pp. 2149–2159, 2017.

Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural Computation*, 9(8): 1735–1780, 1997. doi: 10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735.

Charles F Hockett. The origin of speech. *Scientific American*, 203(3):88–97, 1960.

Eugene Kharitonov, Rahma Chaabouni, Diane Bouchacourt, and Marco Baroni. Entropy minimization in emergent languages, 2020.

Simon Kirby. Learning, bottlenecks and the evolution of recursive syntax. 2002.

Simon Kirby, Kenny Smith, and Henry Brighton. From ug to universals: Linguistic adaptation through iterated learning. *Studies in Language. International Journal sponsored by the Foundation "Foundations of Language"*, 28(3):587–607, 2004.

Simon Kirby, Hannah Cornish, and Kenny Smith. 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, 2008.

Simon Kirby, Tom Griffiths, and Kenny Smith. Iterated learning and the evolution of language. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, 28:108–114, 2014.

Simon Kirby, Monica Tamariz, Hannah Cornish, and Kenny Smith. Compression and communication in the cultural evolution of linguistic structure. *Cognition*, 141:87–102, 2015.

Satwik Kottur, José Moura, Stefan Lee, and Dhruv Batra. Natural language does not emerge 'naturally' in multi-agent dialog. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 2962–2967, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D17-1321. URL https://aclanthology.org/D17-1321.

Angeliki Lazaridou and Marco Baroni. Emergent multi-agent communication in the deep learning era. *CoRR*, abs/2006.02419, 2020.

Angeliki Lazaridou, Alexander Peysakhovich, and Marco Baroni. Multi-agent cooperation and the emergence of (natural) language. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2017.

Angeliki Lazaridou, Karl Moritz Hermann, Karl Tuyls, and Stephen Clark. Emergence of linguistic communication from referential games with symbolic and pixel input. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2018.

Fushan Li and Michael Bowling. Ease-of-teaching and language structure from emergent communication. In *NeurIPS*, pp. 15825–15835, 2019.

Gary Lupyan and Rick Dale. Language structure is partly determined by social structure. *PloS one*, 5(1):e8559, 2010.

David JC MacKay, David JC Mac Kay, et al. *Information theory, inference and learning algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2003.

Irit Meir, Assaf Israel, Wendy Sandler, Carol A Padden, and Mark Aronoff. The influence of community on language structure: evidence from two young sign languages. *Linguistic Variation*, 12 (2):247–291, 2012.

Tomás Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Gregory S. Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *NIPS*, pp. 3111–3119, 2013.

Yasamin Motamedi, Kenny Smith, Marieke Schouwstra, Jennifer Culbertson, and Simon Kirby. The emergence of systematic argument distinctions in artificial sign languages. *Journal of Language Evolution*, 6(2):77–98, 2021.

Preetum Nakkiran, Gal Kaplun, Yamini Bansal, Tristan Yang, Boaz Barak, and Ilya Sutskever. Deep double descent: Where bigger models and more data hurt. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2021(12):124003, 2021.

Daniel Nettle. Social scale and structural complexity in human languages. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 367(1597):1829–1836, 2012.

Mitja Nikolaus and Abdellah Fourtassi. Modeling the interaction between perception-based and production-based learning in children's early acquisition of semantic knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 25th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pp. 391–407, Online, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.conll-1.31. URL https://aclanthology.org/2021.conll-1.31.

Andrew Perfors and Daniel J Navarro. Language evolution can be shaped by the structure of the world. *Cognitive science*, 38(4):775–793, 2014.

Yosef Prat. Animals have no language, and humans are animals too. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(5):885–893, 2019.

Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:140:1–140:67, 2020.

Limor Raviv, Antje Meyer, and Shiri Lev-Ari. Larger communities create more systematic languages. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 286(1907):20191262, 2019.

Limor Raviv, Marianne de Heer Kloots, and Antje Meyer. What makes a language easy to learn? a preregistered study on how systematic structure and community size affect language learnability. *Cognition*, 210:104620, 2021.

Cinjon Resnick, Abhinav Gupta, Jakob N. Foerster, Andrew M. Dai, and Kyunghyun Cho. Capacity, bandwidth, and compositionality in emergent language learning. In *AAMAS*, pp. 1125–1133. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2020.

Mathieu Rita, Rahma Chaabouni, and Emmanuel Dupoux. "lazimpa": Lazy and impatient neural agents learn to communicate efficiently. In *CoNLL*, pp. 335–343. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020.

Mathieu Rita, Florian Strub, Jean-Bastien Grill, Olivier Pietquin, and Emmanuel Dupoux. On the role of population heterogeneity in emergent communication. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL `https://openreview.net/forum?id=5Qkd7-bZfI`.

Reinhard Selten and Massimo Warglien. The emergence of simple languages in an experimental coordination game. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(18):7361–7366, 2007.

Lauren J. Silbert, Christopher J. Honey, Erez Simony, David Poeppel, and Uri Hasson. Coupled neural systems underlie the production and comprehension of naturalistic narrative speech. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(43):E4687–E4696, 2014. ISSN 0027-8424. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1323812111. URL `https://www.pnas.org/content/111/43/E4687`.

Kenny Smith and Simon Kirby. Cultural evolution: implications for understanding the human language faculty and its evolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 363(1509):3591–3603, 2008.

Kenny Smith, Henry Brighton, and Simon Kirby. Complex systems in language evolution: the cultural emergence of compositional structure. *Advances in complex systems*, 6(04):537–558, 2003.

Luc Steels. Agent-based models for the emergence and evolution of grammar. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 371(1701):20150447, 2016.

Olivier Tieleman, Angeliki Lazaridou, Shibl Mourad, Charles Blundell, and Doina Precup. Shaping representations through communication: community size effect in artificial learning systems, 2019.

Ronald J Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3):229–256, 1992.

James Winters, Simon Kirby, and Kenny Smith. Languages adapt to their contextual niche. *Language and Cognition*, 7(3):415–449, 2015.

Alison Wray and George W Grace. The consequences of talking to strangers: Evolutionary corollaries of socio-cultural influences on linguistic form. *Lingua*, 117(3):543–578, 2007.

Willem Zuidema. How the poverty of the stimulus solves the poverty of the stimulus. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 15, 2002.