



### A Top-down Graph-based Tool for Modeling Classical Semantic Maps: A Crosslinguistic Case Study of Supplementary Adverbs

**Zhu Liu**, Cunliang Kong, Ying Liu, Maosong Sun Tsinghua University liuzhu22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn 30 Mar, 2025

# Background



- What is a semantic map?
  - to visually represent the interrelationships between meanings
  - by capturing the form-meaning mappings shared across multiple languages.
  - form-meaning mappings: one-to-many relationships
    - Content words: polysemy, e.g., *head* can mean a *human body part* and a *leading role*
    - Function words or affixes: multifunctionality, e.g., to expresses purpose and direction
  - more straightforward than descriptions written by human languages

# Background



- How to construct a semantic map?
  - Nodes: meanings, concepts, senses or functions
  - Edges: the strenghth of association between nodes
  - Linguistic forms, e.g, content or function words, affixes, constructions
  - Form-Function Table: shows which meanings a given form can express
  - Structure Constraint: connectivity hypothesis (H1)
    - All meaning nodes associated with the same form must be connected.
    - (Bottom-up approach) to build a map that satisfies H1 case by case.
    - Less cyclic subgraphs: prevents overgeneralization and ensures predictive power

# Example

- Domain: External-possession construction
- Form-function pair
  - English: Goethe went <u>to</u> Vienna as a student. (direction) This seems outrageous <u>to</u> me. (experiencer) ...
  - French: dative case; Spanish, Basque, etc



Haspelmath M. External possession in a European areal perspective[J]. Typological studies in language, 1999, 39: 109-136.





## Motivation



- Bottom-up construction on semantic maps has several drawbacks
  - Time-consuming and difficult to scale on a larger dataset
    - Manual efforts to choose between equally plasusibe connections
    - Rollback issues, as adding new connections may require revisiting earlier ones
    - Expanding the dataset to include more languages, forms, and functions may offer new insights.
  - Fail to indicate the strength of associations between two functions
    - classical vs. next-generation maps
    - · classical one is more straightforward with less connections
    - Next-generation maps aim for richer representation by connecting nodes as much as
      possible and using numerical values to indicate the strength of associations.

## Contributions



- We propose a **top-down algorithm** to automatically generate classical semantic maps.
- We design a set of **metrics** to evaluate the quality of the resulting networks.
- A case study on supplementary adverbs demonstrates the efficiency and effectiveness of our proposed method.
- We develop a visualization tool based on this approach to assist typological linguists in studying multifunctionality across languages conveniently

## From Local to Global



- Local connectivity hypothesis H1
  - The meaning nodes associated with a single form must be connected.
- Global hypothesis H2
  - Start with a complete graph weighted by the number of bifunctional co-occurrences.
  - The final map is a maximum spanning tree of this graph
    - Overall connectivity
    - Acylicity
    - Maximum total edge weights









## Metrics



### • Intrinsic Metrics

- Size: Summed weights of edges
- Recall: The proportion of cases satisfying H1 out of all cases
- Precision: The proportion of cases satisfying H1 among all possible cases generated by the graph.
- Standard deviation of degrees: prefers a chain-like typology with less edges



## Metrics



### Intrinsic Metrics

- Size: Summed weights of edges
- Recall: The proportion of cases satisfying H1 out of all cases
- Precision: The proportion of cases satisfying H1 among all possible cases generated by the graph.
- Standard deviation of degrees: prefers a chain-like typology with less edges
- Extrinsic Metrics
  - Accuracy: The proportion of matches compared to the reference.

### Evaluation



- A Case study on: Supplementary Adverbs
- 9 languages, 28 grammatical forms and 18 functions
- The form-function table has been created by linguists in a bottom-up fashion.
- The golden map (GT) serves as a reference standard
- Two baselines
  - C: a complete graph
  - LT: a lower-bound one with a "bad" tree that does not overlap with GT



### Form-function table

L	G	AF	SU	RE	CO	GD	DE	IS	CD	DC	РТ	SC	WH	SE	SC	IC	UE	BL	DS
ZH	还又也在	0 0 1 0	1 1 1 1	1 1 0 1	1 0 0 1	1 0 0 1	1 0 0 0	1 1 0 1	1 0 1 0	1 0 1 0	1 0 1 0	0 0 1 0	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 1	0 0 1 0	0 1 0 0	1 0 0 0	1 0 1 0	0 1 0 0
во	ra	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	tarong	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
EN	also	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	too	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	again	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	still	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
DE	auch	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	noch	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
FR	aussi	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	encore	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RU	tbzhe	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	opyat	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
JA	も	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	また	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	なお	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
КО	도 더 또 다시 아직	1   0   0   0   0	1 0 1 0 0	0 0 1 1 0	0 0 0 1	0 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 1 0	1 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0
VI	cũng	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	nữa	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	còn	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	lại	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Abbr	Full
AF	Additive Focus
SU	Supplement
RE	Repetition
CO	Continuation
GD	Greater Degree
DE	Decrement
CD	Condition
DC	<b>Discretional Condition</b>
PT	Polarity Trigger
SC	Serious Condition
WH	Whatever
SE	Sequence
SD	Sequential Coordinator
IC	Inconsistency
UE	Unexpectedness
BL	Bottom Line
DS	<b>Discourse Continuation</b>

**NAACL 2025** 

5/25/2025

Index

C

Size<sup>↑</sup>

286

#### 13

Bảng 7: Evaluation of our generated graphs and baselines (denoted as complete graph C and ground truth GT). The index represents the first N maximum spanning trees, scaled by 10,000.

LT 79.0 GT 91 1 0.20 0.17 90 85.7 92.6 0 89 82.1 0.21 91.4 82.1 2 89 0.44 90.1 3 88 82.1 0.34 91.4 88 78.6 0.50 88.9 4

**Recall**↑

Precision<sup>↑</sup>

0

Accuracy<sup>↑</sup>

50.0

- The map generated by our method is highly accurate with a high recall.
- We can generate many candidate maps, which can be reviewed and refined by experts

Evaluation



5/25/2025

Index

Size<sup>↑</sup>

### Evaluation

- The map generated by our method is highly accurate with a high recall.
- We can generate many candidate maps, which can be reviewed and refined by experts

	1.000000000-000000000000000000000000000		and the set of the set	1000 (1000) (1000) (1000) (1000) <b>2</b> 00 <b>1</b> 0
С	286	1	0	50.0
LT	-	· —	-	79.0
GT	91	1	0.20	1
0	90	85.7	0.17	92.6
1	89	82.1	0.21	91.4
2	89	82.1	0.44	90.1
3	88	82.1	0.34	91.4
4	88	78.6	0.50	88.9

Precision<sup>↑</sup>

Accuracv<sup>↑</sup>

**Recall**↑

Bảng 7: Evaluation of our generated graphs and baselines (denoted as complete graph C and ground truth GT). The index represents the first N maximum spanning trees, scaled by 10,000.



5/25/2025

#### 15

#### Bång 7: Evaluation of our generated graphs and baselines (denoted as complete graph C and ground truth GT). The index represents the first N maximum spanning trees, scaled by 10,000.

The map gen is highly accu

- We can gene maps, which refined by exp
- Even with the lower bound of a tree • structure, the accuracy remains strong, highlighting the importance of the tree typology.

	much	SILC	
erated by our method	C	286	
urate with a high recall.	LT		
rate many candidate	GT	91	
can be reviewed and	0	90	
nerts	1	89	
	2	89	

Index	Size↑	Recall↑	Precision <sup>↑</sup>	Accuracy↑
С	286	1	0	50.0
LT	-8	-	. <b></b>	79.0
GT	91	1	0.20	1
0	90	85.7	0.17	92.6
1	89	82.1	0.21	91.4
2	89	82.1	0.44	90.1
3	88	82.1	0.34	91.4
4	88	78.6	0.50	88.9







### Evaluation

- The map generated by our method is highly accurate with a high recall.
- We can generate many candidate maps, which can be reviewed and refined by experts
- Even with the lower bound of a tree structure, the accuracy remains strong, highlighting the importance of the tree typology.
- Our proposed metric shows a moderate negative correlation, indicating its effectiveness in evaluating the map's structure.

Round	RG_1	RG_2
1	-17.8	-22.1
2	-21.9	-22.4
3	-20.5	-19.2
4	-23.8	-21.7
5	-23.1	-24.1
Mean	-21.4	-21.9
Std. Dev.	2.13	1.58

Table 8: Pearson correlation between Div\_D (diversity of degrees) and accuracy across five rounds. The mean and standard deviation for each round are also provided.



- We can generate comparable semantic maps to experts
- The failure cases mainly caused by the acyclic constraints
- Our edges effectively represent the degree of association between nodes.





- A top-down approach to build classical semantic model maps
- Metrics to evaluate the map automatically
- A visualization tool for linguistics





- (Ying Zhang. 2017) Semantic map approach to universals of conceptual correlations: a study on multifunctional repetitive grams. Lingua Sinica, 3(1):7.
- (William Croft. 2001). Radical Construction Grammar:Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- (Martin Haspelmath. 2003.) The geometry of grammatical meaning: Semantic maps and cross-linguistic comparison. In Michael Tomasello, editor, The new psychology of language, volume 2, pages 211–243. Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Cysouw, Michael(2007a). Building Semantic Maps: the Case of Person Marking. In: Matti Miestamo & Bernhard Wälchli (eds)., New Challenges in typology: Broadening the horizons and redefining the foundations. Berlin: Mouton, P225-248.



# Thank you for your attention!



Paper

Code

Personal Website

