

A History of Philosophy in Colombia through Topic Modelling

Juan R. Loaiza
Departamento de Filosofía
Universidad Alberto Hurtado
jloaiza@uahurtado.cl

Miguel González-Duque
Department of Biology
University of Copenhagen
miguelgondu@gmail.com

Abstract

Data-driven approaches to philosophy have emerged as a valuable tool for studying the history of the discipline. However, most studies in this area have focused on a limited number of journals from specific regions and subfields. We expand the scope of this research by applying dynamic topic modelling techniques to explore the history of philosophy in Colombia and Latin America. Our study examines the Colombian philosophy journal *Ideas y Valores*, founded in 1951 and currently one of the most influential academic philosophy journals in the region. By analyzing the evolution of topics across the journal's history, we identify various trends and specific dynamics in philosophical discourse within the Colombian and Latin American context. Our findings reveal that the most prominent topics are value theory (including ethics, political philosophy, and aesthetics), epistemology, and the philosophy of science. We also trace the evolution of articles focusing on the historical and interpretive aspects of philosophical texts, and we note a notable emphasis on German philosophers such as Kant, Husserl, and Hegel on various topics throughout the journal's lifetime. Additionally, we investigate whether articles with a historical focus have decreased over time due to editorial pressures. Our analysis suggests no significant decline in such articles. Finally, we propose ideas for extending this research to other Latin American journals and suggest improvements for natural language processing workflows in non-English languages.

1 Introduction

Digital analyses and tools have begun impacting philosophy in recent years, opening a number of questions and possibilities for researchers in philosophy and the digital humanities to explore. Some of these recent contributions include analyzing philosophical journals to reconstruct the history of certain debates in academic philosophy. One such study [Malaterre et al., 2019a] analyzed the journal *Philosophy of Science* and studied how the philosophy of science as a discipline has evolved from 1934 to 2015. Among its most interesting findings we can see how philosophy of science shifted from debates on nomological-deductive explanation to mechanistic explanations, how metaphysical and ontological problems became more present in recent decades, and how trends in philosophy of biology and philosophy of medicine have emerged in the last years. Later, Malaterre et al. [2019b] would also apply a similar method to the journal *Biology and Philosophy* as well as comparing across different journals in philosophy of science [Malaterre et al., 2021].

Given the potential of using digital techniques to analyze the history of philosophy, we set out to apply these strategies to another particular case. In this study, we aim at describing the development of academic philosophy in Colombia from 1951 to 2022 using text mining techniques on a well-known philosophy journal in Colombia: *Ideas y Valores*. Based at the Universidad Nacional de Colombia, the most important public institution in the country, *Ideas y Valores* was founded in 1951. The journal has been one of the main outlets for Colombian as well as Latin American philosophers more generally, publishing to date more than 1,000 documents including original articles, reviews and other document types. Given its impact in the country and in the region, we propose to take *Ideas y Valores* as a lens through which we can observe how philosophical ideas were developed and settled in Colombian (and to some extent Latin American) academic philosophy throughout the journal's lifetime.

The following study inquires which topics are more prominent throughout the history of *Ideas y Valores* and how have they evolved through time. Ad-

ditionally, we ask whether articles focusing on historical topics have decreased as years pass, given recent trends in academic publishing in philosophy, which we will make clear below. To answer these questions, we applied topic modelling techniques to the journal’s original articles using Dynamic Topic Modelling [Blei and Lafferty, 2006] to construct a timeline of the evolution of specific topics from 1951 to January 2022.

Our findings show that *Ideas y Valores* has focused largely on topics related to value theory (ethics, political philosophy and aesthetics) and epistemology and philosophy of science. We also see the impact of German philosophy in different areas of academic philosophy in the journal’s publication, with various topics relating directly to the works of Kant, Husserl, Heidegger, Hegel, among other German thinkers. Lastly, we evaluate whether historical topics have decreased in focus throughout the years in favor of more contemporary and argumentative (in contrast to interpretative) literature. These results suggest that no such change has occurred, and that topics with a historical focus remain as present as they have been since the journal’s foundation. Overall, these findings indicate a snapshot of the history of academic philosophy in Colombia and Latin America, and they invite further research into the trends and distribution of topics in philosophy in the region.

2 Background

2.1 History of philosophy in *Ideas y Valores*

Ideas y Valores was founded in 1951 by Cayetano Betancur, director of the *Instituto de Filosofía* at the Universidad Nacional de Colombia. The project was to found a journal that would offer a space of discussion for all sorts of ideas, including literary texts. The journal published eight issues between 1951 and 1954, before entering a hiatus that lasted until 1962. From then on, the journal has published at least one issue almost every year, with a couple of minor exceptions. From 1983 onwards, the journal has been published continuously until today. As of the time of writing, *Ideas y Valores* is a well-known journal in Colombia and Latin America, being indexed by Scopus, Web of Science, and with all of its publications available on Gold Open Access through a Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. According to the SCImago Journal Rankings in 2024 (i.e., ranking 2023), it has a h-index of 7, which, while being low for philosophy internationally, is still among the

highest in philosophy in Latin America (which have an average h-index of 4).


Ideas y Valores has undergone several changes in publication policy throughout its years. In its beginnings, the journal was founded to be a “universalist” journal for philosophical reflection in a broad sense [Betancur Gómez, 2021]. Such reflections included not only original philosophical articles (as we would find them in most journals nowadays), but also literary works, translations of foreign texts to Spanish (including works by Hegel, Heidegger, and others), political commentary, and the communication of philosophical ideas to the general public. As such, the first years of the corpus are very heterogeneous, as will be clear below. After the 1980s, the journal’s policy shifted towards publishing more “original” work. As a result, *Ideas y Valores* no longer published literary pieces or general interest articles, although it maintained a special section for translations. This also motivated a shift from publications focusing on interpreting other historical figures such as Hegel or Heidegger towards proposing unique ideas and arguments.

The Colombian philosophical landscape has been influenced by different traditions and schools. Before the 1990s, the most prominent tradition was arguably the phenomenological tradition of Husserl and Heidegger. Yet, during the 1990s other traditions flourished, including the postmodern tradition inspired by French thinkers such as Deleuze and Foucault [Soto, 2017] and the analytic tradition focused on logic and language (especially in the philosophy of Wittgenstein) and later on in problems related to the philosophy of mind [Pérez and Echeverri, 2023]. Even though there is an appreciation of these shifts among historians of philosophy and academic philosophers in Colombia and Latin America, it is relatively unclear how these authors, traditions, topics, and ideas have shifted. This motivates a more data-driven approach to model how these ideas have changed through time.

2.2 Dynamic Topic Models

In this analysis, we studied the corpus of *Ideas y Valores*’ articles using Dynamic Topic Models (DTM; see Blei and Lafferty [2006]), which is an extension of the Latent Dirichlet Allocation model (LDA) proposed by Blei et al. [2003]. These two models are examples of **topic modelling**, in which “topics” (broadly defined as collections of words that tend to co-occur) are automatically segmented. This section explains both LDAs and DTMs in lay terms, aiming at an audience of scholars in the digital humanities; we post-

Figure 1: Words, topics and documents in a dynamic topic model. Original articles (a) from *Ideas y Valores* are processed into bag-of-words by extracting and fixing the text from either PDF or HTML sources, followed by a normalization process in which stop-words are removed and words are lemmatized (b). Using our amassed collection of articles processed into bag-of-words, we use Dynamic Topic modelling to model each document as having a proportion of 90 different topics, 8 of which are shown in (c). By topic, we refer to a distribution over words that evolves over time. In the topic *Wittgenstein*, the words *Wittgenstein*, *lenguaje* (language), *regla* (rule) and *juego* (game) were the most probable from 2010 onwards, with slight variations on their likelihood in previous years (d). Dynamic Topic modelling accounts for how the discussion of a certain subject evolves over time.



pone the rigorous mathematical explanation to the supplementary material (see Sec. A).

Both LDAs and DTMs are examples of **generative models**. Generative models describe, in probabilistic terms, the process by which text, images, or other modalities are created. In our setting, LDAs imagine a document from *Ideas y Valores* as being made of a collection of *topics* in certain proportions: an author might choose to write a paper that is 42% about Wittgenstein, 25% about relativism, and 20% about phenomenology, and so on. Each of these topics (say, Wittgenstein) is made of words in different proportions (10% “Wittgenstein”, 8% “language”, 5% “rule”, etc.).¹ Fig. 1 illustrates this relationship between words, documents and topics using a specific article from our corpus.

LDAs then imagine the generative process as follows: once an author has settled for a group of topics and their proportions, the author writes each word of the document by (1) choosing a topic according to their proportions (e.g. choosing Wittgenstein with a probability of 42% in our running example), and (2) selecting a word from said topic according to their probability (“rule” with 5% probability, and so on).

Fitting an LDA consists of determining these proportions from the corpus itself, using the tools of statistical inference. Once a number of topics K is provided, LDA software determines which words belong to which topics, and in what proportion. The underlying mathematical process is can be thought of as a form of “clustering”: words that tend to happen together are clustered into the same topic, and how frequently they co-occur determines the propor-

tion.

DTMs, the statistical model we use to uncover these latent topics, is an extension of LDAs which keeps track of the temporal evolution of topics. Intuitively, DTMs learn how a topic transitions from one time period to the next. This transition takes the current topics and the proportions of the words therein, and slightly adjusts them to the topics discussed in the next time slice’s documents. More formally, DTMs fit an LDAs per time slice in the manner described above, sharing the topics across time slices using slight perturbations subsequently. That way, a topic is allowed to evolve over time: the words used for describing Wittgenstein might vary from decade to decade, but the underlying topic is still the same (see Fig. 1d).

LDAs and DTMs are by no means the only forms of topic modelling. Other methods include Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI), Non-negative matrix factorization (NMF, recently used in the digital humanities context [e.g. Greene et al., 2024]), and more contemporary methods like BERTopic based on artificial neural networks and transformers [Grootendorst, 2022].

3 Methods

For the present study, we retrieved all original articles in *Ideas y Valores* and available online published between 1951 and January 2022. These articles are published in three languages: Spanish, English, and Portuguese. We analyze only those languages pub-

lished in Spanish since they are the majority of the articles in the corpus, and because natural language processing pipelines in topic modelling are not well-suited to analyze topics across different languages. Table 1 summarizes the resulting corpus. The corpus consisted of 875 full-text articles with an average word count of 3,439 words (fig. 2). We used articles in HTML format whenever possible, otherwise using articles in PDF format. This amounted to 275 articles in HTML format (particularly those between 2009 and 2017) and 600 articles in PDF format. For each of these formats, we used slightly different preprocessing procedures to account for various kinds of format-dependent artifacts as described in section 3.1. In addition to acquiring the articles’ full-text, we also acquired each article’s metadata to aid in further analyses.

3.1 Data acquisition and preprocessing

To begin our study, we downloaded articles from *Ideas y Valores*’s website. These articles are published under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, and are available either in PDF or HTML format. As explained above, we used articles in HTML format whenever possible, since they are easier to parse and analyze. Additionally, we obtained each article’s metadata, which is available in each article’s HTML headers, and saved in JSON format to use for reference.

Data preprocessing proceeded in four steps: (1) text extraction, (2) punctuation and artifact removal, (3) stopword removal, and (4) lemmatization. The software implementation of these steps can be found in our GitHub repository: <https://github.com/juanrloaiza/latinamerican-philosophy-mining>.

For articles in HTML format, text extraction was straightforward, as the text is already in a format that is easy to process. We extracted the text from HTML files using the BeautifulSoup4 [Richardson, 2020] package version 4.9.3. For articles in PDF format, text extraction was slightly more difficult. Most PDF files had optical character recognition (OCR) data embedded, but such data often includes various artifacts (e.g., the letter “M” is often interpreted by OCR processes as the sequence “1V1”). Hence, we first extracted all text data from each PDF file using a Python interface for Ghostscript [Goebel, 2018]. Then we passed the text through an orthographic correction process using PySpellChecker [Barrus, 2020]. This process used a list of word frequencies in Spanish collected by the Real Academia Española [2022] in order to attempt to correct each

Table 1: Counts of various elements in the *Ideas y Valores* entire corpus from 1951 to January 2022.


	Count
Number of documents	875
Number of words	3,001,085
Number of unique words	138,192
Number of corrected words	43,834
Average document length	3,429
Number of stopwords	1,608
Protected words	50

Note: Words are any token remaining after removing punctuation and tokens less than 3 characters long. Corrected words are token types that have been changed at least once during orthographical correction. Average document length is counted as the number of words remaining after removing stopwords and correcting the texts’ orthography.

unknown word in a given text. Additionally, we implemented a custom dictionary using the HTML articles we had processed to obtain a more technical (i.e., philosophical) dictionary that could aid in correcting some terms. In total, we corrected 438,834 tokens (see Table 1), improving how much of the text was recognizable by the dictionary on average from 94.97% to 98.66%. For the total corpus, word recognition improved from 95.3% to 98.7%. Figure 3 shows distribution of ratios of recognized words per article before and after correcting these tokens.

Punctuation and artifact removal in both cases was implemented using Python’s native re package. For further preprocessing steps for topic modelling, it is common practice to use libraries like the Natural Language Toolkit [NLTK; Bird et al., 2009] or SpaCy [Honnibal et al., 2020] for identifying stopwords, lemmatizing, and stemming [Iguar and Seguí, 2024]. For stopword removal we used three stopword lists (Spanish, English, and Portuguese) from the Natural Language Toolkit (NLTK) by Bird et al. [2009]. Due to the limited number of words in the Spanish list, we added the list compiled by Diaz [2016] and filtered it to protect philosophically important words such as “verdad” (truth), “bien” (good), and “deber” (duty). We then implemented both stopword removal and lemmatization using SpaCy [Honnibal et al., 2020]. We used SpaCy instead of NTLK’s own lemmatizer capabilities since NTLK’s lemmatizer is much more limited for Spanish than SpaCy’s. For SpaCy we used their own `es-core-md` model, a

Figure 2: Number of articles and average length of documents per period of 5 years. Document length is computed after stopwords have been removed.



model constructed from newspaper articles in Spanish. After stopwords removal and lemmatization we obtained a corpus of 816 documents with an average usable word count of 3327.5 words. All lists and dictionaries can be downloaded from the study’s GitHub repository (see Supplementary Data).

3.2 Data modelling

As explained above, we used DTMs, which are an extension of LDA models (see Sec. 2.2), to extract topics from the corpus and study their evolution through time. Various implementations for LDA models can be found in the Python open-source community. In particular, the Python package `Gensim` [Řehůřek and Sojka, 2010] provides a simple interface for computing topic models using not only LDA, but also other methods like LSI or NMF. `Gensim` also provides an interface for computing dynamic topic models, which is implemented in pure Python. Yet, we found `Gensim`’s implementation of DTMs to be slow in practice, and decided to use a C++ implementation provided by Blei’s laboratory [Blei and Gerrish, 2011].

Using the DTM tooling provided by Blei and Gerrish [2011], we modelled the topics in our corpus using the following steps. First, recall that to be able to train a DTM, one needs to specify the number of topics K beforehand. To decide on the number of topics, we inspected models in a grid $K \in \{50, 60, \dots, 150\}$, training each model using 3 different random seeds

to account for the inherent stochasticity during training.

To decide which of these models to use, metrics like the average topic coherence, perplexity, number of topics without any articles assigned to them, and number of articles without topic were computed, following standard practice for topic models [see e.g., Malaterre et al., 2021, Greene et al., 2024]. These metrics, combined with manual inspection of the models, led us to choose $K = 90$ as the number of topics.²

3.3 Topic interpretation

Interpreting LDA models requires making the perspective of the researcher explicit. While we opted for a more data-driven approach to selecting the number of topics for our model (using coherence, log perplexity, and number of articles without a topic), topic interpretation requires a human (ideally expert) standpoint from which to judge the semantic content of each distribution.

Topic interpretation was done in two phases. First, we manually inspected every topic, examining the most probable words and the most probable articles to appear according to the model. With LDA modelling techniques, each topic is a probability distribution over words, but it is the researcher who must give meaning to such distributions. This introduces a possible bias when it comes to analyzing such overarching corpora as the one we analyzed. Researchers




Figure 3: Ratio of words recognized by PySpellChecker before and after orthographical correction. A word is recognized if it is contained in PySpellChecker’s default Spanish, English or German dictionaries, RAE’s 2020 frequency list, or if it is contained in articles that were available in HTML format. Each point represents a single document, and its location represents how many words are recognized before and after correction against the whole document’s word length.

are seldom equally knowledgeable in all areas of a given discipline. Rather, each researcher has a set of areas of expertise in which they are more knowledgeable, but as a result, researchers tend to be more sensitive to how their areas of expertise are subdivided than with other areas. For example, some observers might be more sensible to differences in subdivisions within philosophy of mind or philosophy of science, but they might omit nuances when it comes to political philosophy or ethics. Similarly, readers in these areas may be sensible to the various subareas within the latter, but they might be less sensible to the heterogeneity within other areas of philosophy.

To reduce such biases, given our areas of expertise, we opted to use an external categorization of academic philosophy as a reference to label each topic. Specifically, we decided to use the category taxonomy used in the popular PhilPapers [Bourget and Chalmers] archive to guide labeling decisions. This helped reduce possible biases concerning the granularity of our classification given our areas of expertise. Having a predefined, relatively standardized taxonomy to aid in tagging reduced such biases since it is easier to inspect which of the PhilPapers’ categories would be a better fit for a given topic. This tax-

onomy includes divisions and subdivisions in all areas of philosophy, thus providing enough guidance to identify topics at various degrees of granularity. Although this taxonomy may also involve their editors’ biases, we believe it at least provides an explicit and publicly available taxonomy that can be openly discussed in future research.

To label each topic, first we assigned a “main area” label to each topic, corresponding to one of five main areas in the PhilPapers taxonomy. These are “Metaphysics and Epistemology”, “Value Theory”, “Science, Logic, and Mathematics”, “History of Western Philosophy”, and “Philosophical Traditions”. We omit “Philosophy, Misc” and “Other Academic Areas” in the PhilPapers taxonomy because they are not meaningful for our analysis, but we do include an “Other” main area label for documents left in the corpus that are not academic articles (e.g., literary pieces published in the 1970s). After we assign a main area to each topic, we assign tags of different subareas inside that main area. These are often areas in the second level in the PhilPapers area (e.g., “Epistemology” is contained directly inside “Metaphysics and Epistemology”), although in some cases we opt for more specific tags that could be informative.

Lastly, whenever a topic appeared to have a dominant historical emphasis (e.g., relates to discussions on the interpretation of a particular piece of work or philosopher), we added a special tag “#historical” to evaluate the presence of predominantly historical topics throughout the years. This enabled us to examine the hypothesis that changes in the editorial policy of *Ideas y Valores* during the 1980s shifted publications away from focusing on historical figures and towards more contemporary discussions in academic philosophy.

3.4 Assigning documents to topics

As we mentioned above, the goal of topic modelling techniques is to compute a probability distribution over topics for each document. A topic, then, *belongs* to a document in a given proportion. Our analysis relies on the probability computed the other way around: documents *belonging* to a given topic.

To assign a document as belonging to a given topic we rely on the probabilistic notion of document likelihood. Once we choose a topic, a document is defined to be likely to belong to said topic if (1) the document itself is probable, i.e. the exact combination of words is likely to occur, and (2) if the document contains said topic in large proportion.

Assuming that all documents are equally likely

simplifies the computation of the likelihood to only topic proportions.³ For each topic, we sort all articles according to the proportion said topic has in it. This process re-organizes the corpus such that the ones on the top of the list discuss the chosen topic in great proportion. From this list, we consider the documents that cover 50% of the total sum (that is, adding all proportions, and selecting the top documents in the list until we reach half of this sum).

Documents are thus assigned to each topic until we account for 50% of the total likelihood sum, ordered from most likely to least likely relative to other documents in the corpus. Through this process of assigning documents to topics, a given document might be assigned to more than one topic.

There are two ad-hoc choices in this process: we could have chosen another arbitrary percentage (besides 50%), as well as another prior over documents (i.e. not assuming that all documents are equally likely). Different choices might lend better assignments by lowering the likelihood of documents that are rare in this context (e.g., literary pieces). Determining neutral criteria for such decisions is left for future research.

4 Results

4.1 Main areas

As explained above, we first assigned each topic to one of five main areas following the taxonomy used in the PhilPapers archive, plus one category for various articles which do not fall under any of the first five areas. Table 2 summarizes the words with the most probability in each main area after averaging across time slices. These word lists are obtained after assigning topics to main areas based on each topic's word distribution. Therefore, obtaining a sensible word list for the main area validates the assignment of topics to specific main areas.

We noticed several specific interests already emerging in these word lists. For "History of Western philosophy", we observe an emphasis on several specific authors in the traditions of German idealism (Kant, Fichte, and Hegel) as well as interest in pragmatism (Rorty), phenomenology (Husserl), and early modern philosophy (Spinoza). For "Philosophical traditions", there are several words related to philosophy of education ("educación", "pedagógico", "aprendizaje", "formación", and "educativo"), as well as an interest in the work of Mexican philosopher Mauricio Beuchot. Lastly, in "Metaphysics and Epistemology", there is a notable interest in religion ("dios", "religioso") besides the

expected distribution on words relating to general epistemology.

Figure 4 shows the distribution of articles per main area, both in absolute terms and in proportional the number of documents per year. The main area with the most documents overall is "Value theory", with 571 documents assigned, followed by "Metaphysics and epistemology" with 240 documents, "History of Western philosophy" with 222 documents, "Science, logic, and mathematics" with 160 documents, and "Philosophical traditions" with 84 documents.⁴ There were 231 documents classified as "Other", which included letters and literary pieces that were part of the journal's scope during the 1970s.

We see an increase in publications starting from the 1990s and exploding in the 2010s. This also allows certain topic areas to appear more forcefully. This is most salient is the case of "Metaphysics and epistemology". Before 1990, only 23 out of 216 documents contained topics assigned to this main area, covering only 10.6% of publications. After 1990 we find 226 out of 659 documents, covering 34.3% of publications. The main area "Value theory" also saw a similar increase, with 118 out of 216 documents containing topics in this main area before 1990 (54.6% of publications), and 453 out of 659 documents after 1990 (68.7% of publications). Similarly, "History of Western philosophy" covered 13.4% of documents (29 of 216) before 1990 and 29.3% (193 of 659) after 1990. Both "Philosophical traditions" and "Science, logic, and mathematics" decreased in proportional size, however. "Philosophical traditions" covered 12.9% (28 of 216) of documents before 1990, but only 8.5% (56 of 659) afterward, while "Science, logic, and mathematics" covered 22.2% (48 of 216) documents before 1990, and 17.0% thereafter.⁵

4.2 Subareas

For each of the main areas, we can also obtain the subareas with the most publications in that main area to get a better picture of which specific areas are more representative. Table 3 shows the number of documents for the five areas with the most documents in each main area. For each of these subareas, we compute the ten most probable words, aggregating across all topics assigned to the corresponding subarea. Figure 5 shows the volume of the largest subarea within each main area through time.

Starting with the largest main area, "Value Theory", we see a clear interest in topics related to ethics and political philosophy. This is notable because under the PhilPapers taxonomy, "Value theory" also covers topics related to aesthetics. Hence, it appears

Table 2: Ten most probable words across all topics assigned to each main area.

Main area	Most probable words
Value theory	moral, principio, experiencia, vida, hombre, libertad, juicio, humano, acción, razón
History of Western philosophy	Rorty, Fichte, infinito, Hegel, Spinoza, pensar, Kant, Husserl, objeto, pensamiento
Science, logic, and mathematics	priori, ciencia, proposición, lógico, conocimiento, Cassirer, teoría, sistema, científico, geometría
Philosophical traditions	educación, analogía, analítico, sujeto, analógico, pedagógico, Beuchot, aprendizaje, formación, educativo
Metaphysics and epistemology	cuerpo, mundo, oración, dios, argumento, significado, justificación, escepticismo, escéptico, religioso
Other	filosofía, Mill, Socrates, Mundo, forma, Plato, Singer, self, relación, palabra

that publications in ethics and political philosophy outweigh publications in aesthetics. Another interesting finding is that there is special interest in Kantian practical philosophy, given that “Kant” appears as one of the largest subareas within “Value Theory”. Other specific subareas within “Value Theory” include Nussbaum and Sen’s capability approach and theories of justice. Lastly, interest in “Ethics”, the largest subarea within “Value Theory”, has remained proportionally constant relative to publications in its main area. As shown in figure 5, “Ethics” scales at a similar rate to its corresponding main area.

Regarding “History of Western Philosophy”, we see a clear interest in German philosophy: German idealism, Hegel, Kant (both general Kantian scholarship and Kantian epistemology), and Phenomenology (specifically Husserl and Heidegger). Its largest subarea, “German idealism”, has constant publications through time, but these do not grow proportionally as the corresponding main area grows. This suggests that as publications in “History of Western Philosophy” increase, different subareas appear within this topic beyond publications on German idealism. We also find noteworthy that the four largest subareas within “History of Western Philosophy” (those presented in Table 3 excluding “Epistemology”) have relatively similar publication numbers, ranging from 50 to 46 items in each subarea. This means that interest in “History of Western philosophy”, while focused on German philosophy, remains somewhat balanced between German Idealism, Hegel, Kant and German Phenomenology.

On the side of “Science, logic, and mathematics”, we observe a focus on philosophy of science (especially in topics related to physics) and philoso-

phy of language and logic. In contrast to the previous main area, here we note a distinct interest in “Philosophy of science”, which almost doubles the number of items assigned to the second-largest subarea, “Philosophy of language.” When considering its evolution through time, we observe constant interest throughout the years, but we also see an increase in publications beyond “Philosophy of science” in the last decade. We take this to imply a growing diversity of topics as the number of publications grows, similar to what we observe in other areas.

Fourth, concerning “Metaphysics and epistemology”, we observe two clear areas of interest: epistemology (including relativism and realism) and philosophy of religion. The first subarea, epistemology, substantially outweighs philosophy of religion, including almost 100 items more than the latter. Nevertheless, interest in philosophy of religion and theology is not negligible, accounting for more items than subareas in other main areas such as “Philosophy of language.” We also note that in both “Philosophy of religion” and “Theology”, one author that stands out is Levinas, whose work has influenced other fields such as ethics and political philosophy. This suggests that part of the interest in these latter topics stems from a strong focus on these latter subareas, as discussed previously. In terms of time dynamics, “Epistemology” sees a proportional growth relative to the whole main area, similar to “Ethics” in “Value Theory” and contrasting with the largest subareas within “History of Western Philosophy” and “Science, Logic, and Mathematics.”


In “Philosophical traditions” we see two broad areas of interest: Colombian and Latin American

Table 3: Number of articles and most probable words for each subarea within each main area.

Main area	Subarea	Most probable words	Num. of docs
Value theory	Ethics	principio; vida; capacidad; enfoque; razón; discurso; idea; teoría; ética; desarrollo	221
	Political theory	principio; capacidad; enfoque; idea; desarrollo; teoría; humano; Sen; Nussbaum; noción	110
History of Western philosophy	Social and political philosophy	político; política; modelo; social; resultado; sujeto; Arendt; factor; Marx; condición	72
	Kant	libertad; juicio; voluntad; libre; Hume; bello; gusto; derecho; estético; natural	68
	Theories of justice	principio; idea; teoría; noción; bien; original; primario; racional; Rawls; plan	59
	German idealism	Fichte; Hegel; pensar; pensamiento; lógica; conciencia; espíritu; absoluto; negación; posición	50
Hegel	Hegel	Hegel; pensar; pensamiento; lógica; conciencia; espíritu; absoluto; contenido; Hegeliano; negación	48
	Kant	Kant; razón; kantiano; crítica; conocimiento; ilustración; naturaleza; práctico; concepto; puro	47
	Phenomenology	Husserl; objeto; Heidegger; ente; mundo; propiedad; acto; referencia; conciencia; percepción	46
Epistemology	Epistemology	Kant; concepto; objeto; trascendental; intuición; conocimiento; unidad; representación; puro; espacio	33
	Philosophy of science	priori; ciencia; conocimiento; Cassirer; científico; geometría; teoría; constitutivo; problema; grupo	62
Science, logic, and mathematics	Philosophy of language	proposición; lógico; lenguaje; sujeto; predicado; lengua; semántico; lógica; lingüístico; formal	33
	Logic	proposición; lógico; sujeto; lógico; predicado; necesario; formal; falso; enunciado; modal	32
Philosophy of physical science	Philosophy of physical science	física; ley; físico; espacio; teoría; sistema; movimiento; cuerpo; natural; Newton	22
	Truth	proposición; lógico; sujeto; predicado; lógica; necesario; formal; falso; modal; contingente	22
Metaphysics and epistemology	Epistemology	argumento; justificación; justificar; razón; normativo; posición; justificado; sostener; objeción; contenido	126
	Relativism	creencia; problema; caso; tipo; teoría; término; mente; criterio; concepto; considerar	102
Philosophy of religion	Philosophy of religion	dios; religioso; religión; teología; cristiano; divino; razón; Levinás; cristianismo; palabra	37
	Realism	mundo; realidad; real; realismo; conceptual; metafísico; contenido; realista; representación; ficción	27
Philosophical traditions	Theology	dios; teología; divino; cristiano; Levinás; palabra; razón; rostro; paz; teológico	23
	Colombian philosophy	filosofía; siglo; obra; historia; año; cultura; nacional; estudio; autor; revista	53
Derrida / Ricoeur / Philosophy of Language*	Derrida / Ricoeur / Philosophy of Language*	signo; texto; escritura; lenguaje; Derrida; palabra; Ricoeur; discurso; literatura; parís	24
	Latin american philosophy	educación; analogía; analítico; analógico; sujeto; pedagógico; Beuchot; aprendizaje; formación; educativo	7
Other	Metaphilosophy / Phenomenology*	filosofía; concepto; relación; historia; forma; objeto; mundo; filosófico; realidad; pensamiento	170
	Literary pieces English	palabra; amor; mundo; hombre; obra; mito; forma; dejar; vida; poesía mill; Socrates; Plato; singer; self; political; philosophy; like; world; education	57
			4

Note: Subareas marked with "*" aggregate different subareas which we detected contained exactly the same number of items and most probable words. This is likely due to there being one single topic tagged with these subareas.

Figure 4: Number of articles for each main area in the PhilPapers taxonomy in absolute quantity (left) and ratio of papers (right) in each area per year between 1951 and January 2022. Since an article may belong to more than one topic, they can also belong to more than one main area. Here we ignore overlaps between main areas, which means that the sum of documents in the graph is greater than the total number of documents in our corpus. We also include a line for 1983, the year in which the journal started publishing continuously after a period of hiatus.



Philosophy and post-structuralist philosophy of language (especially Derrida and Ricoeur). We note that concerns with Colombian philosophy have been constant throughout the journal’s history and particularly salient in the first decades. This is consistent with the journal’s policies and early discussions towards a unique and localized style of philosophy and publication.

Lastly, in the “Other” category, we see a large concentration of articles under the “Metaphilosophy / Phenomenology” aggregated subarea. This topic covers a very heterogeneous set of publications which to some extent contain metaphilosophical reflections. These including discussions on phenomenological methods or Wittgenstein’s metaphilosophy, for example. As such, we do not find these topics more informative than the other areas previously reported, since it covers almost every topic in the corpus. We also see some articles which correspond to “Literary pieces” published during the journal’s first decades, before they shifted their publication policy towards academic articles. Finally, our model identified some English words as a single topic, mainly due to specific terms that were kept after eliminating general tokens in English as stop-words.

4.3 Historical topics

As explained before, during the 1980s and 1990s, academics close to *Ideas y Valores*, and especially Rubén Sierra Mejía (who was an editor of several issues

during this time period), thought that philosophy in Colombia focused too much on the history of ideas rather than in pursuing its own problems and agendas [Betancur Gómez, 2021, López, 2021]. This justifies the expectation that the journal’s editorial policy may have shifted towards topics engaging in less historical discussions, a hypothesis that we can partially test using our model.

To do this, we assigned special tags to specific topics that engaged specifically with historical ideas (e.g., dealing with the interpretation of a specific philosopher or work). Table 4 shows the five topics with the most documents per main area along with their assigned subareas, most probable words and number of documents assigned. Taking the whole corpus into consideration, 27.78% of documents were assigned to at least one of these topics.

As shown in Table 4, the topics with most assigned documents among historical topics are those engaging with German philosophers (Kant, Hegel, Husserl, Heidegger). This is consistent with the emphasis on German idealism and phenomenology reported earlier. Other important figures that can be noticed in our analysis include Aristotle, Deleuze, Quine and Davidson (both authors within one topic), and Derrida and Ricoeur (also both authors within one topic). Furthermore, we found other topics that were specific to discussions of specific philosophers but only contained a handful of assigned documents. These include topics specialized in Nietzsche (13 documents), Wittgenstein (12 documents), Gadamer (11 documents), Spinoza (9 doc-

Figure 5: Proportion of articles per year for each main area and largest subarea within each main area.



uments), Descartes (6 documents), Rorty (5 documents).

To account for change through time in the journal’s editorial policy, we hypothesized that topics engaging specifically with historical ideas would decrease in size throughout the years. Concretely, we considered the ratio of documents assigned to historical topics against the total documents published per year, and hypothesized that there would be a negative correlation between this ratio and time. By considering this ratio, rather than the total number of documents per topic, we account for differences in the number of articles published across time, especially given that there is a considerable increase in publication after 2010. Also worth noting is that we compute this model for publications after 1983, since we do not have continuous data before this year due to various interruptions in the journal’s publication (see Sec. 2.1).

Figure 6 shows a simple linear regression model fitted to the ratio of articles assigned to historical topics versus the total number of published articles across time. Computing Pearson’s correlation coefficient with a one-sided test ($H_1 : r < 0$) shows that the linear relationship between the ratio and time is statistically non-significant ($r(38) = 0.20, p = 0.8885$). Therefore, there is no evidence that the ratio of articles assigned to historical topics and the total number of articles per year has decreased through

time. Moreover, visual inspection of the data suggests that there is effectively no change in this ratio through time, and we note that plotting confidence intervals at 95% shows that there are models which explain the data both with a positive and a negative slope. Yet, we observe a slight tendency towards a positive slope, which suggests that there are more models which account for the data and have a positive slope. This is consistent with the calculated slope of 0.0020 in our model.

We conclude that while the editorial policy of the journal may have shifted away from publishing historical articles, we find no reason to think that these changes significantly affected the ratio of articles in historical topics against those in non-historical topics. On the contrary, it appears more likely that the ratio is constant throughout the years.

5 Discussion

In this study, we modeled the evolution of topics in an established philosophy journal in Colombia and Latin America, *Ideas y Valores*. We used a Dynamic Topic Model, a model which expands on Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) models to also include temporal dynamics in the behavior of different topics. This allowed us to reconstruct a history of philosophy in Colombia (and perhaps part of the

Table 4: Summary of topics labelled as historical topics and to which more than five documents were assigned.

Main area	Subareas	Most probable words	Num. of docs
History of Western philosophy	Kant; Epistemology	Kant; concepto; objeto; trascendental; intuición; conocimiento; unidad; representación; puro; espacio	33
	German Idealism; Hegel	pensar; pensamiento; lógica; negación; movimiento; contenido; Hegel; lógico; puro; singular	32
	Phenomenology; Husserl	objeto; propiedad; referencia; relación; percepción; descripción; nombre; acto; intencional; causal	18
	Greek Philosophy; Aristotle	Aristóteles; movimiento; naturaleza; aristotélico; alma; forma; Platón; natural; esclavo; pasaje	17
	Phenomenology; Heidegger	Heidegger; ente; mundo; cosa; ontológico; Heideggeriano; relación; interpretación; dasein; existir	17
	German Idealism; Hegel	Hegel; conciencia; espíritu; absoluto; Hegeliano; autoconciencia; fenomenología; reconocimiento; sujeto; concepto	16
	Modern Philosophy; Kant; Political Theory	Kant; razón; kantiano; ilustración; crítica; práctico; naturaleza; prejuicio; biblia; hombre	14
	Nietzsche	nietzsche; voluntad; fuerza; mundo; vida; forma; devenir; nihilismo; ideal; bataille	13
	Analytic Philosophy; Wittgenstein	lenguaje; Wittgenstein; juego; regla; palabra; lógico; expresión; pensamiento; proposición; práctica	12
	Hermeneutics; Gadamer	Gadamer; hermenéutico; hermenéutica; comprensión; interpretación; comprender; tradición; horizonte; lenguaje; diálogo	11
	Phenomenology; Husserl	Husserl; conciencia; fenomenología; objeto; trascendental; fenomenológico; acto; intencional; Husserliano; vivencia	11
	Modern Philosophy; Spinoza; Metaphysics	infinito; Spinoza; naturaleza; actividad; infinitud; acción; concepción; aspecto; implicar; determinado	9
	Modern Philosophy; Descartes	Descartes; cartesiano; certeza; alma; pasión; meditación; vii; existencia; cogito; cuerpo	6
Metaphysics and epistemology	Deleuze; síntesis; deleuze; estética; sensación; lakoff; pasivo; placer; deleuziano; displacer; contracción	9	
Philosophical traditions	Analytic Philosophy; Quine; Davidson	oración; significado; quine; davidson; evidencia; teoría; observacional; empirismo; sujeto; distal	6
	Philosophy Of Language; Derrida; Ricoeur	signo; texto; escritura; lenguaje; Derrida; palabra; Ricoeur; discurso; literatura; París	24
	Latin American Philosophy; Hermeneutics; Beuchot	educación; analogía; analítico; analógico; sujeto; pedagógico; Beuchot; aprendizaje; formación; educativo	7
	Philosophy Of Law; Kant	derecho; jurídico; ley; natural; naturaleza; político; deber; Kant; hombre; voluntad	29
Value theory	Social And Political Philosophy; Marx	Marx; social; relación; clase; capital; forma; materialismo; ideología; producción; sociedad	20
	Aesthetics; Kant; Modern Philosophy	juicio; bello; gusto; estético; juzgar; belleza; común; objeto; resultar; obra	17

history of philosophy in Latin America) using digital methods.


Our findings show that throughout the journal’s history, most articles have engaged with topics related to “Value Theory”, particularly to ethics and political philosophy. We interpret this finding as a sign that philosophy in Colombia is deeply intertwined with reflecting on the country’s history, violence, forgiveness and justice. In this regard, we note that prominent philosophers mentioned in these articles include Kant, Hegel, Benjamin, Levinas, among other prominent thinkers in these areas.

Besides topics relating to “Value Theory”, we observed interest in topics related to the “History of Western Philosophy” and “Science, Logic and Mathematics”. Concerning the first main area, we see a special interest in Phenomenology and German Idealism. Concerning the second, we see discussions in philosophy of science and philosophy of language, areas which we interpret as a signal of the emergence of analytic philosophy within the journal. This interpretation is further supported by the fact that topics in these latter areas emphasize traditionally analytic discussions on logic, physics, and empiricism.

Besides analyzing areas and subareas throughout the corpus, we also investigated whether the journal has changed its historical focus throughout the years. We noticed that while some academics proposed steering away from historical discussions and promoting some form of originality, the journal has always included both historical and non-historical topics within its articles. However, these findings must be explored in more detail with different techniques, since our analysis relies on us tagging certain topics as historical or non-historical, tags which may be open to discussion. Future studies may approach these problems by using independent raters or odd-one-out techniques which may make classification more precise [Chang et al., 2009].

Another result worth noting is the emphasis on German philosophers, particularly Kant, Hegel, Heidegger, Husserl, Nietzsche, Gadamer, among others. We note that German thinkers appear more prominently throughout the corpus than, for instance, French or US American philosophers. The visibility of German thinkers could be explained by the fact that many Colombian philosophers (e.g., Jorge Aurelio Díaz, Guillermo Hoyos, Rubén Sierra Mejía) studied in Germany between 1960 and 1990 (and many continue to do so).

Figure 6: Simple linear regression on the ratio of documents in historical topics to documents in non-historical topics against time by year, using a 95% confidence interval.



5.1 Limitations

Topic modelling techniques have become much more accessible in recent years with the advent of more accessible packages and technologies to implement models such as LDA. However, there are still a number of different workflows and decisions which have not been standardized in either the literature in digital humanities and philosophy, as well as in general discussions on the use of topic models in computer science.

One limitation we encountered concerns selecting the appropriate number of topics for our model. While we opted for a relatively data-driven approach using coherence, log perplexity, and number of articles without a topic as relevant metrics, much more can be done regarding making the human decisions involved much more explicit and reproducible. It is common to use coherence alone as a metric to select the number of topics for the model [see e.g., Greene et al., 2024] or to rely on expert judgment to determine how interpretable the resulting topics are [see e.g., Malaterre et al., 2021]. Instead of limiting ourselves to one metric, we decided on two additional metrics which, after manual inspection, offered a plausible model for our data. This combined both approaches and while it improved on previous methods to make these decisions, we also think this step should be refined further in the literature. For example, some alternatives to this workflow could add word intrusion or topic intrusion tasks as suggested by Chang et al. [2009] to verify empirically that the selected model is the most interpretable.

Another limitation of our study was due to differences in the resources available for topic mod-

elling in Spanish. Even though NLP and topic modelling tools are widely available in English, the repertoire of tools for Spanish is much more restricted. These include stopword lists and workflows for orthographical correction, which are much smaller than their English-language counterparts. For the present study, we implemented several strategies to overcome these limitations, such as extending word lists available in NLTK and SpaCy with other lists available online, as well as using a subset of our corpus to correct artifacts in OCR in Spanish. We expect that future developments of these tools in other languages enable more diversity in the types of studies carried out in the fields of digital humanities, data-driven approaches to philosophy and its history, and more general applications of text mining tools.

Lastly, there was information that we did not analyze and that could offer further insights into the history and present of philosophy in Colombia and Latin America. This includes information present in the metadata about authors' gender (assumed by their name) and institutional affiliation. We think examining such metadata may lead to interesting findings about the demographic distribution within certain topics. Future studies could also exploit citation and reference information to study reference networks within and between topics and areas. While we did not carry out these analyses, we expect to explore these data in the future.

Overall, we see a promising area of study to apply models such as DTMs and LDAs to answer questions about the history of philosophy, both globally and locally. Despite the limitations of the present study, we take this as an opportunity to promote the use of digital technologies to shed light on how philosophical texts have evolved to engage with new ideas, styles, currents and developments. We expect future studies to include other journals, both in Colombia and internationally, as well as develop new tools for the analysis of such corpora.

Supplementary data

The complete set analyses, as well as the code base and metadata, are available on GitHub: (<https://github.com/juanrloaiza/latinamerican-philosophy-mining>).

Notes

¹In mathematical terms, we would say that a document is a probability distribution over topics, and each topic is a probability distribution over words.

²The exact metrics and their values can be found in our GitHub repository, alongside the code necessary to replicate this grid search. In particular, see Supplementary Data.

³Mathematically speaking, we are using Bayes rule to compute the probability of documents conditioned on topics. We are computing the *maximum a posteriori* using a uniform prior over documents.

⁴Notice that a document may belong to more than one main area (thus explaining why these numbers sum to more than the amount of documents in our corpus, 875). This is due to our criteria for determining whether a document *belongs* to a given topic. See Sec. 3.4.

⁵Notice again that there may be overlap between main areas due to how documents are assigned to topics. This explains why the ratio of documents containing topics in each main area for each main area does not sum 100%.

References

- T. Barrus. Pyspellchecker: Pure python spell checker based on work by Peter Norvig, 2020. <https://github.com/barrust/pyspellchecker>.
- J. C. Betancur Gómez. Silenciamientos, enfoques y escrituras de la filosofía en Colombia. para una relectura de ideas... y valores (1951-1954). *Ideas y Valores*, 70:53–78, 2021. doi: 10.15446/ideasyvalores.v70n7Supl.95397.
- S. Bird, E. Loper, and E. Klein. Natural Language Processing with Python, 2009.
- D. M. Blei and S. M. Gerrish. Dynamic topic models and the document influence model, 2011. Available at: <https://github.com/blei-lab/dtm>, (Accessed: 10 June 2022).
- D. M. Blei and J. D. Lafferty. Dynamic topic models. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning - ICML '06*, pages 113–120. ACM Press, 2006. ISBN 978-1-59593-383-6. doi: 10.1145/1143844.1143859. URL <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=1143844.1143859>.
- D. M. Blei, A. Y. Ng, and M. I. Jordan. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research*, 3 (Jan):993–1022, 2003.
- D. M. Blei, A. Kucukelbir, and J. D. McAuliffe. Variational inference: A review for statisticians. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 112(518):859–877, 2017.
- D. Bourget and D. Chalmers. PhilPapers: Online Research in Philosophy. Available at : <https://philpapers.org/> (Accessed: 6 August 2024).
- J. Chang, S. Gerrish, C. Wang, J. Boyd-Graber, and D. Blei. Reading Tea Leaves: How Humans

- Interpret Topic Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 22. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2009/hash/f92586a25bb3145facd64ab20fd554ff-Abstract.html>.
- G. Diaz. Stopwords Spanish (ES), 2016. Available at: <https://github.com/stopwords-iso/stopwords-es> (Accessed: 28 July 2022).
- H. Goebel. Ghostscript: Interface to the Ghostscript C-API, both high- and low-level, based on ctypes, 2018. URL <https://gitlab.com/pdftools/python-ghostscript>.
- D. Greene, J. O’Sullivan, and D. O’Reilly. Topic modelling literary interviews from The Paris Review. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 2024. doi: 10.1093/lhc/fqad098.
- M. Grootendorst. Bertopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based tf-idf procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05794*, 2022.
- M. Honnibal, I. Montani, S. Van Landeghem, and A. Boyd. spaCy: Industrial-strength Natural Language Processing in Python, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1212303>.
- L. Igual and S. Seguí. Basics of natural language processing. In *Introduction to Data Science*, pages 195–210. Springer International Publishing, 2024. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-48956-3_10.
- C. A. López. Cultura y tecnificación en los primeros filósofos colombianos de la normalización. *Ideas y Valores*, 70:79–109, 2021. doi: 10.15446/ideasyvalores.v70n7Supl.95336.
- C. Malaterre, J.-F. Chartier, and D. Pulizzotto. What is this thing called philosophy of science? A computational topic-modeling perspective, 1934–2015. *HOPOS: The Journal of the International Society for the History of Philosophy of Science*, 9(2):215–249, 2019a. doi: 10.1086/704372.
- C. Malaterre, D. Pulizzotto, and F. Lareau. Revisiting three decades of Biology and Philosophy: a computational topic-modeling perspective. *Biology & Philosophy*, 35(1):5, 2019b. doi: 10.1007/s10539-019-9729-4.
- C. Malaterre, F. Lareau, D. Pulizzotto, and J. St-Onge. Eight journals over eight decades: a computational topic-modeling approach to contemporary philosophy of science. *Synthese*, 199(1):2883–2923, 2021. ISSN 1573-0964. doi: 10.1007/s11229-020-02915-6.
- D. I. Pérez and S. Echeverri. Analytic Philosophy in Latin America. In E. N. Zalta and U. Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2023. Available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2023/entries/latin-american-analytic/> (Accessed: 18 June 2024).
- Real Academia Española. CORDE: Corpus Diacrónico del Español, 2022. Available at: <https://www.rae.es/banco-de-datos/corde> (Accessed: 18 May 2022).
- R. Řehůřek and P. Sojka. Software Framework for Topic Modelling with Large Corpora. In *Proceedings of the LREC 2010 Workshop on New Challenges for NLP Frameworks*, pages 45–50, Valletta, Malta, May 2010. ELRA. <http://is.muni.cz/publication/884893/en>.
- L. Richardson. BeautifulSoup4: Screen-scraping library, 2020. URL <http://www.crummy.com/software/BeautifulSoup/bs4/>.
- SCImago. SJR - SCImago journal & country rank. Available at: <http://www.scimagojr.com> (Accessed: 3 December 2024).
- D. P. Soto. Cien años de filosofía en Colombia (1910–2010). en torno a la lectura de Juan José Botero. *Ideas y Valores*, 66(164):413–421, 2017.

A A mathematical explanation of Dynamic Topic Modelling

As we discuss in the main text (see Sec. 2.2), we use *Dynamic Topic Models* (DTMs) to detect the relevant topics in the corpus of Ideas y Valores [Blei et al., 2003, Blei and Lafferty, 2006]. This section dives deeper into the mathematics behind this model; a less mathematical explanation (which should be more than enough for the purposes of this paper) can be found in the aforementioned section.

This appendix assumes familiarity with probability theory and statistical inference. In particular, we expect the reader to know about distributions like the Categorical (or Multinomial) and Dirichlet, and about how to infer the parameters of a probability distribution from data using variational inference.

A.1 Latent Dirichlet Allocation

Understanding DTMs requires understanding Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) models first. LDA

is a type of probabilistic generative model, meaning that it describes a way in which the data could be generated according to probability distributions.

LDA formalizes the process by which documents are generated as follows: A corpus $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{d}_1, \dots, \mathbf{d}_M\}$ is made of a collection of documents $\mathbf{d}_m = (w_1, \dots, w_N)$, which are in turn made of words w_j . Broadly speaking, LDA assumes that authors generate documents by

1. Deciding the document's length, or number of words N .
2. Deciding the proportions of each topic to use. Say we have K topics in total, then this would correspond to specifying a vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K)$ such that all entries add up to 1.0. In other words, θ_k corresponds to the proportion (or percentage) of topic k in the document. Each topic β_1, \dots, β_K is a vector of percentages over all words.
3. For each of the N words, the author first decides which topic it belongs to according to the proportions in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Say topic k was selected. The author then decides on which word to choose next according to the vector of proportions $\beta_k = (\beta_{k1}, \dots, \beta_{kV})$, where V is the total number of unique words in all documents.

As a minimal example, say we have two topics $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2) = (0.7, 0.3)$, and a small vocabulary of three words "a", "b", and "c". The topic vectors could for example be $\beta_1 = (0.1, 0.0, 0.9)$ and $\beta_2 = (0.0, 1.0, 0.0)$. According to an LDA, each word an author wants to write is chosen by first looking at the proportions on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ (thus selecting the first topic 70% of the time, and the second topic 30% of the time), and then looking at the distributions inside β_k where k is either 1 or 2 depending on the aforementioned choice.

The following is a simple script that uses Python and numpy to simulate this generative process for a 5-word document.

Using a simple script to simulate this generative process (see Code 1), a 5-word document looks like this: "c-b-a-c-c". Notice how most of the times the letter "c" was selected, since it is the most likely word of the most likely topic for this specific configuration. The letter "b" (which is only possible in topic 2) is only selected once, as is the letter "a".

How do we choose the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and β_k to faithfully represent a corpus that is given to us? This question is answered through statistical inference, which is a field of statistics in which distribu-

```
import numpy as np

words = ["a", "b", "c"]

# theta
topic_proportions = [0.7, 0.3]

# beta_1
topic_1_proportions = [0.2, 0.0, 0.8]

# beta_2
topic_2_proportions = [0.0, 1.0, 0.0]

for _ in range(5):
    topic_id = np.random.choice(
        [1, 2],
        p=topic_proportions
    )
    if topic_id == 1:
        word = np.random.choice(
            words,
            p=topic_1_proportions
        )
    else:
        word = np.random.choice(
            words,
            p=topic_2_proportions
        )
    print(word)
```

Code example 1: Generating a document given a set of topic proportions. An LDA materializes the `topic_proportions` using samples from a Dirichlet distribution, learning its parameters, `topic_1_proportions` and `topic_2_proportions` from a corpus of documents.

tion parameters are identified automatically through data.

One way to model the selection of topic proportions is to use the Dirichlet distribution, since its outputs are precisely vectors of proportions. Recall that the Dirichlet distribution is parameterized by a collection of positive real values $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$, such that samples from the distribution $\theta \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha)$ are **probability vectors**, defined as list of elements that are between 0 and 1, and which all add up to 1. Each element θ_i of a sample from a Dirichlet contains, then, a proportion of the entire probability, which is determined by how its respective α_i stands in proportion to $\sum_i \alpha_i$. As an example, a minimal Python script in which samples from a Dirichlet are taken can be found in Code 2.

```
import numpy as np

alpha = [2.0, 2.0, 1.0]
samples = np.random.dirichlet(alpha, 5)
print(samples)
```

Code example 2: Sampling from a Dirichlet distribution using NumPy.

These five samples are shown as barplots in Fig. 7. α governs the distribution by telling what the average value of each θ_i should be, as well as its variance. If we sample from this distribution with $\alpha = (2.0, 2.0, 1.0)$ several times, then the average of the first element will tend towards $2/5$ (i.e. α_1 divided by the sum of all values in α).

With this, we can re-write the generative process using the language of distributions: An author writes an article by

1. Deciding on the document's length N .
2. Sampling topic proportions $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K)$ from a $\text{Dirichlet}(\alpha)$ where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K)$.
3. For word w_n , the author decides on a topic by choosing on an index k according to the probabilities in θ , and then choosing on a word from the vocabulary according to the probabilities in β_k .⁶

In LDA, the Dirichlet parameter α and the topic proportions β_1, \dots, β_K are estimated from all documents using **statistical inference**. These parameters determine the structure of topics in a corpus, and they can be inferred from the documents alone. In a nutshell, statistical inference determine the parameters of a given probability distribution or generative

model in an optimization process: we start with an initial guess for what α and the topic proportions could be, and we tweak them iteratively to make the documents in the dataset more likely.

Circling back to the original example in Code 1, if we start with a collection of documents, the goal of this optimization process is akin to recreating said documents by modifying the parameters in `topic_proportions`, `topic_1_proportions` and `topic_2_proportions`.

The specifics of the actual optimization procedure used by [Blei et al., 2003] are beyond the scope of this explanation. An interested reader could explore the article where LDAs were proposed, or recent surveys on the subjects (namely variational inference) [Blei et al., 2017].

To summarize, LDA is a method for identifying topics in a corpus of documents without previous annotation. It assumes that documents are made by (i) selecting topic proportions (e.g. 70% Kantian ethics, 20% philosophy of mind...) by sampling from a Dirichlet distribution with parameters $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K)$, (ii) selecting a topic β_k for each word, and then sampling from the vocabulary with the probabilities specified by said topic i.e. $\beta_k = (\beta_{k1}, \dots, \beta_{kV})$. The topic proportions and the distributions of words for each topic are learned by maximizing the likelihood of the data.

A.2 Dynamic Topic Modelling

The previous section introduced Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA), a method for unsupervised learning of topic distributions inside documents. In this algorithm, the topic proportions θ and the probabilities of words in a given topic β_k are learned for the entire corpus, without regard to the year a given document was published. It would be more natural to assume that the structure of topics in a given corpus evolves over time, and that the words used to describe a topic in one decade may not match another.

To incorporate time into LDAs, Blei and Lafferty [Blei and Lafferty, 2006] consider a variation of their original model in which the variables that encode topic proportions and word probabilities *evolve over time*. The variables that encode the topic proportions and distributions α_t and $\beta_{k,t}$ are only slight variations of the previous time slice α_{t-1} and β_{t-1} .

Such a model of evolution can be represented by sampling from a Gaussian distribution. Fig. 8 shows this idea for two topics. Sampling α_t from $\mathcal{N}(\alpha_{t-1}, \sigma^2 I)$ corresponds to taking a random step around the previous topic proportions, and the same can be said for sampling $\beta_{k,t}$ from $\mathcal{N}(\beta_{k,t-1}, \sigma^2 I)$.⁷




Figure 7: Samples from a Dirichlet distribution with $\alpha = (2.0, 2.0, 1.0)$. Notice how the third class is, in proportion, generally smaller than the first two. Expected values for the categories can be computed easily from the vector α : the average value of a category is given by its respective α_i divided by the sum of all $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K$. In this particular example, if we were to keep sampling, the average value of e.g. the first category would be $2.0/(2.0 + 2.0 + 1.0) = 2/5$. The variance between these samples is also encoded in our choice for α .

To transform these real numbers α_t into probability vectors, LDA relied on considering them as parameters of a Dirichlet distribution. In DTMs, the authors propose to use the Softmax transformation (which takes as input vectors of real numbers, and outputs a probability vector):

$$\alpha_t = (\alpha_{1,t}, \dots, \alpha_{K,t}) \mapsto \text{Softmax}(\alpha_t) = \left(\frac{\exp(\alpha_{k,t})}{\sum_{k'=1}^K \exp(\alpha_{k',t})} \right)$$

Let's describe DTMs as a generative model, following our notation of LDAs and the algorithm presented in the original article [Blei and Lafferty, 2006]: At a given time slice t , the author

1. Evolves all topics from the previous time slice: $\beta_{k,t} | \beta_{k,t-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\beta_{k,t-1}, \sigma^2 I)$.
2. Evolves the topic proportions from the previous time slice: $\alpha_t | \alpha_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\alpha_{t-1}, \delta^2 I)$.
3. For each document:
 - (a) Chooses the topic proportions for the document by drawing $\eta \sim \mathcal{N}(\alpha_t, a^2 I)$ and mapping it to a probability vector using Softmax.
 - (b) For each word:
 - i. Decides on a topic k according to the proportions on $\text{Softmax}(\eta)$.
 - ii. Chooses a word w from topic k by sampling from $\text{Softmax}(\beta_{t,k})$.




Figure 8: How topic proportions evolve over time slices. At each time step, the new topic proportions are slight modifications of the previous ones, defined by sampling from a Gaussian distribution in a high-dimensional space. This can be expressed mathematically with the relationship $\alpha_t | \alpha_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\alpha_{t-1}, \delta^2 I)$.

The parameters $\alpha_t, \beta_{t,k}$ are also learned using statistical inference. The fact that we are evolving the topic proportions from one time slice to another using the Gaussian distribution allows us to compute the mean and variance of α_t given the past and β_t in closed form.