

Linguistic Structure from a Bottleneck on Sequential Information Processing

Richard Futrell¹ and Michael Hahn²
¹ University of California, Irvine
² Saarland University


October 10, 2024

Abstract

Human language is a unique form of communication in the natural world, distinguished by its structured nature. Most fundamentally, it is systematic, meaning that signals can be broken down into component parts that are individually meaningful—roughly, words—which are combined in a regular way to form sentences [1, 2]. Furthermore, the way in which these parts are combined maintains a kind of locality: words are usually concatenated together, and they form contiguous phrases, keeping related parts of sentences close to each other [3–5]. We address the challenge of understanding how these basic properties of language arise from broader principles of efficient communication under information processing constraints. Here we show that natural-language-like systematicity arises in codes that are constrained by predictive information, a measure of the amount of information that must be extracted from the past of a sequence in order to predict its future [6, 7]. In simulations, we show that such codes approximately factorize their source distributions, and then express the resulting factors systematically and locally. Next, in a series of cross-linguistic corpus studies, we show that human languages are structured to have low predictive information at the levels of phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. Our result suggests that human language performs a sequential, discrete form of Independent Components Analysis on the statistical distribution over meanings that need to be expressed. It establishes a link between the statistical and algebraic structure of human language, and reinforces the idea that the structure of human language is shaped by communication under cognitive constraints [8–12].


Human language is characterized by a certain systematic correspondence between the structure of utterances and the structure of the meanings that they express [1, 2]. For example, an English speaker will describe an image such as Figure 1A with a phrase such as *a cat with a dog*, in which the parts of the string such as *cat* correspond regularly with parts of the image. These ways of decomposing form and meaning into parts may seem natural, but they are not logically necessary. For example, Figure 1B shows an utterance in a hypothetical counterfactual language where meaning is decomposed in a way which most people would find unnatural: here we have a word *gol* which refers to a cat head and a dog head together, and another word *nar* which refers to a cat body and a dog body together. Similarly, Figure 1C presents a hypothetical language which is systematic but according to an unnatural way of decomposing the utterance: here the utterance form contains individually meaningful subsequences *a cat*, *with*, and *a dog*, but these are not combined together by concatenation as they are in English. We can even conceive of languages such as in Figure 1D, where each meaning is expressed as a single unanalyzable unit of form—in fact, codes without systematic structure are what is expected generically from optimal coding procedures such as Huffman coding [12, 13]. Why does human language have the structure that it does?

A. Natural Language




a cat with a dog

B. Unnatural Systematic




a gol with a nar

C. Nonlocal Systematic



waitacdahogt

D. Holistic



vek

Figure 1: Example utterances describing an image in English and various hypothetical languages. **A.** An English utterance exhibiting systematicity and locality. **B.** An unnatural systematic language in which *gol* means a cat head paired with a dog head and *nar* means a cat body paired with a dog body. **C.** A nonlocal but systematic language in which an utterance is formed by interleaving the words for ‘cat’ and ‘dog’. **D.** A holistic nonsystematic language in which the form *vek* means ‘a cat with a dog’ with no correspondence between parts of form and parts of meaning.

We argue that the particular structure of human language arises from constraints on sequential information processing. Before the invention of writing, all language had to be produced and comprehended in real time, subject to the computational exigencies of the human brain, whose primary function is to select rapidly which actions to take next given sensory, memory, and motivational states [14]. The resulting cognitive constraints on language processing have plausibly shaped the structure of human language [11, 15, 16]. Concretely, our theory is based on three observations:

1. Natural language utterances consist, to a first approximation, of one-dimensional sequences of symbols (for example, phonemes).
2. The ease of production and comprehension of language is influenced by the sequential predictability of these symbols down to the smallest timescales [17–26].
3. Humans have limited cognitive resources for use in sequential prediction [15, 27–29].






Thus we posit that language is structured in a way that minimizes the complexity of sequential prediction, as measured using a quantity called predictive information: the amount of information that any predictor must store about the past of a sequence in order to predict its future [6, 7, 30–32]. Below, we show that codes which are constrained to have low predictive information within signals have systematic structure resembling natural language, and we provide massively cross-linguistic evidence based on large text corpora showing that natural language has lower predictive information than would be expected if it had different kinds of structure, at the levels of phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics.

Results

Explananda

First we will clarify the properties of language that we want to explain. Taking a maximally general stance, we think of a language L as a function from meanings to forms, where meanings are any set, and forms are strings drawn from a finite alphabet. A language is **systematic** when it has the structure of a homomorphism [2, 33]. This means that if we can consider a meaning m as a combination of parts (say $m = m_1 \times m_2$), then the string for that meaning decomposes in the same way:

$$L(m_1 \times m_2) = L(m_1) \cdot L(m_2), \tag{1}$$

for some function \cdot which combines two strings together. For example, an object  would be described in English as *blue square*. The meaning  is decomposed into features for color and shape as  =  \times , and the English language concatenates the words for those two features: $L(\text{blue square}) = L(\text{blue wavy shape} \times \text{square}) = L(\text{blue wavy shape}) \cdot L(\text{square}) = \text{blue square}$.

We wish to explain why human languages are systematic, and furthermore why they combine meanings in the way they do (the function \times), and why they combine strings in the way they do (the function \cdot). In particular, meanings are structured in a way that seems natural to humans (that is, like Figure 1A and not Figure 1B), and strings are usually combined by concatenation (that is, like Figure 1A and not like Figure 1C). Even when strings are not combined by concatenation, they are combined in a way such that parts of the string which relate to the same part of meaning remain fairly contiguous or close to each other. We call this latter property **locality**.

Influential accounts have held that human language is systematic because language learners need to generalize in order to produce forms for never-before-seen meanings [34–38]. Such accounts successfully motivate systematicity in the *abstract* sense, but on their own they do not explain the

particular ways that meanings and strings are structured in natural language. It is crucial for a theory of systematicity to have something to say about the specific way meanings and strings are combined, because if we are free to choose any combination functions \times and \cdot , then any function L can be made systematic in the sense of Eq. 1 [39, 40]. In existing work, these functions are explained via (implicit or explicit) inductive biases built into language learners [34, 41–47] or stipulations about mental representation of meanings and strings [48–53]. In contrast, we aim to explain linguistic systematicity from maximally general principles, without any assumptions about the mental representation of meanings, and with extremely minimal assumptions about the structure of strings—only that they are one-dimensional sequences of symbols.

Predictive Information

We measure the complexity of sequential prediction using **predictive information**, which is the amount of information that any predictor must store about the past of a stochastic process in order to predict its future. For a stationary stochastic process generating symbols X_1, X_2, \dots , the predictive information E [6], also called excess entropy [7], is the mutual information between all the symbols up to an arbitrary time index (say t) and all the symbols at or after that time index:¹

$$E = I[X_{<t} : X_{\geq t}]. \quad (2)$$

We calculate the predictive information of a language L as the predictive information of the stream of symbols generated by repeatedly sampling meanings $m \in \mathcal{M}$ from a source $p_{\mathcal{M}}$ and translating them to strings as $s = L(m)$ with a delimiter in between [29].

Calculation Predictive can be calculated in a simple way that gives intuition about its behavior. Let h_n represent the n -**gram entropy rate** of a process, that is, the average entropy of a symbol given a window of $n - 1$ previous symbols:

$$h_n = H[X_t | X_{t-n+1}, \dots, X_{t-1}]. \quad (3)$$

For a stationary process, as the window size increases, the n -gram entropy rate converges to an asymptotic value called the **entropy rate** h [54]. The predictive information is equivalent to the rate of this convergence [7]:

$$E = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (h_n - h), \quad (4)$$

as illustrated in Figure 2A. This calculation reveals that predictive information is low when symbols can be predicted accurately based on local contexts, and high when there are strong long-range correlations among symbols.

Simulation Results

The following simulations, in which we calculate predictive information exactly for simple sources and languages, show that languages that minimize predictive information have the following properties: (1) they factorize their source distribution into approximately independent components, and (2) they express these components systematically and locally in strings.

¹We assume familiarity with information-theoretic quantities. Briefly, the **entropy** $H[X] = -\sum p(x) \log p(x)$ of a random variable X is its average information content. The **conditional entropy** $H[X | Y] = -\sum p(x, y) \log p(x | y)$ of X given another random variable Y is its average informatino content given knowledge of Y . The **mutual information (MI)** between X and Y is the amount of information contained in X about Y : $I[X : Y] = \sum p(x, y) \log \frac{p(x, y)}{p(x)p(y)}$. It is the most general measure of dependence between two variables.




Figure 2: **A.** Schematic calculation of predictive information. An example string is separated into two random variables, $X_{<t}$ and $X_{\geq t}$. Predictive information can be calculated as the sum of n -gram entropy rates h_n minus the asymptotic entropy rate h . **B.** Calculation of predictive information for two languages for the source in Eq. 5. The systematic language has lower predictive information. **C.** Predictive information of all bijective mappings from meanings to length-3 binary strings, for a meaning source consisting of three independent coinflips (Eq. 5). Languages are ordered by predictive information and colored by the number of components expressed systematically: 3 for a fully systematic language and 0 for a fully holistic language. The inset box zooms in on the low predictive information region. **D.** Predictive information of various languages for varying levels of mutual information between meaning components M_2 and M_3 (see text). Zero mutual information corresponds to panel C. The ‘natural’ language expresses M_2 and M_3 together holistically. The ‘unnatural’ language expresses M_1 and M_2 together holistically. **E.** Predictive information of all string permutations of a systematic language for a Zipfian source. Permutations that combine components by concatenation, marked in red, achieve the lowest predictive information. Inset zooms in on the 2000 permutations with lowest predictive information. **F.** A hierarchically-structured source distribution (see text) and predictive information of all permutations of a systematic language for this source. A language is well-nested when all groups of symbols corresponding to groupings in the inset tree figure are contiguous.

Source $p(M)$	Local Syst. $L_1L_2L_3$	Natural $L_1L_2L_3$	Unnatural $L_1L_2L_3$
■ $2/3 \times 5/9$	aaa	aaa	aaa
■ $2/3 \times 1/9$	aab	aab	aab
■ $2/3 \times 1/9$	aba	abb	aba
■ $2/3 \times 2/9$	abb	aba	abb
■ $1/3 \times 5/9$	baa	baa	bba
■ $1/3 \times 1/9$	bab	bab	bbb
■ $1/3 \times 1/9$	bba	bbb	baa
■ $1/3 \times 2/9$	bbb	bba	bab

Table 1: Languages used in Figure 2D along with an example source. Each row corresponds to a distinct meaning. Example source has mutual information $I[M_2 : M_3] \approx 0.18$ bits.

Systematic expression of independent components Consider a world with 8 possible meanings. We consider all possible one-to-one languages that map these meanings onto length-3 strings with alphabet $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}$. We set up a source distribution which consists of independent flips of three weighted coins:

$$M \sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(\frac{2}{3}\right) \times \text{Bernoulli}\left(\frac{2}{3} + \varepsilon\right) \times \text{Bernoulli}\left(\frac{2}{3} + 2\varepsilon\right), \quad (5)$$

with $\varepsilon = .05$. Figures 2B and 2C show that the minimum predictive information is achieved by all and only languages that are systematic with respect to the independent components of the source: that is, when the strings have parts that correspond systematically to each coinflip, as shown in the inset of Figure 2B.

Intuitively, the reason systematic languages minimize predictive information here is that they produce strings whose probabilities factorize in the same way as the source distribution, that is:

$$p(L(M)) = p(L(M_1)) \times p(L(M_2)) \times p(L(M_3)) \quad (6)$$

if and only if L is systematic. Because the independent components are expressed separately, there is no statistical dependence among symbols in the string, so predictive information is minimized. In general, if a source distribution admits a factorization into independent components, then any one-to-one language which minimizes predictive information will be systematic with respect to those components. A formal proof of this property is found in SI Appendix A.

Holistic expression of correlated components What happens to predictive information when the source distribution does not consist of fully independent components? In that case, it becomes advantageous to express the more correlated components in a way which is *holistic*: that is, a meaning maps to a string in a way that lacks natural systematic structure [55]. This holistic mapping is what we find in natural language for the mapping between individual words (or more precisely, morphemes) and their meanings, according to the famous principle of arbitrariness of the sign [56]. For example, the word *cat* has no identifiable parts that correspond to parts of its meaning.

We demonstrate this effect by varying the source distribution used above, introducing correlations between the second and third components so that the distribution factorizes as $p(M) = p(M_1) \times p(M_2, M_3)$ —as if we are still flipping three coins, but the second and third are tied together so that their outcomes might be correlated. Figure 2D shows predictive information for a number of possible languages as a function of the mutual information between meaning components M_2 and M_3 . In the low-mutual-information regime, the best language is fully systematic, but as mutual

information increases, the best language is one that expresses meaning components M_2 and M_3 together holistically. An ‘unnatural’ language that expresses the uncorrelated components M_1 and M_2 holistically is much worse, as is a ‘nonlocal’ systematic language that separates the symbols corresponding to the correlated components M_2 and M_3 .

It is advantageous to express correlated components holistically because this allows the low-order statistical structure of the string distribution to match the statistical structure of the meaning source. When M_2 and M_3 are expressed holistically as $L(M) = L(M_1) \cdot L(M_2, M_3)$, then it is possible to have a symbol that reflects the *conditional* random variable $M_3 \mid M_2$, which has lower entropy than M_3 alone, thus keeping the unigram entropy low. Conversely, if the uncorrelated M_1 and M_2 are expressed holistically as $L(M) = L(M_1, M_2) \cdot L(M_3)$, then the symbol corresponding to M_3 can only be predicted after decoding all the parts of the string corresponding to M_1 and M_2 , so the higher-order entropy rate will be high.


Locality Next, we show that minimization of predictive information yields languages that are local, in the sense that components of meaning correspond to localized parts of strings. We consider a language L for a source consisting of a Zipfian distribution over 100 meanings, in which strings consist of two length-4 ‘words’ reflecting components of the meaning, such that $L(m_1 \times m_2) = L(m_1) \cdot L(m_2)$, where \cdot is concatenation. We then consider scrambled languages L_f , where f is a deterministic permutation applied to the string output of L . For example, if we have $L(m_1 \times m_2) = 0000 \cdot 1111$, a possible scrambled language would have $L_f(m_1 \times m_2) = 10001101$. These scrambled languages reflect possible string combination functions other than concatenation.

Calculating predictive information for the enumeration of all possible scrambled languages L_f , we find that the languages in which the ‘words’ are contiguous have the lowest predictive information, as shown in Figure 2F. This happens because the coding procedure above creates correlations among symbols within a word. When these correlated symbols are separated from each other by a large distance—such as when symbols from another word intervene—then the language has long-range correlations, increasing predictive information. Interestingly, it is not the case that every concatenative language is better than every nonconcatenative one (see the inset box in Figure 2F). In fact, this pattern corresponds to the reality of natural language, in which limited nonconcatenative and nonlocal morphological processes do exist, for example in Semitic nonconcatenative morphology [57].


Hierarchical structure Natural language sentences typically have well-nested hierarchical syntactic structures, of the kind generated by a context-free grammar [58]: for example the sentence *[[the big dog] chased [the small cat]]* has two noun phrases, indicated by brackets, which are contiguous and nested within the sentence. Here we show that the pressure for locality, which comes from minimization of predictive information, creates these well-nested word orders, with phrases corresponding to groups of words that are more or less strongly correlated. We consider a source distribution defined over six random variables M_1, \dots, M_6 with a covariance structure shown in the inset of Figure 2F: each of the variable pairs (M_1, M_2) and (M_4, M_5) are highly internally correlated; these pairs are weakly correlated with M_3 and M_6 respectively; and both groups of variables are very weakly correlated with each other. As above, we consider all possible permutations of a systematic code for these source variables. We find that the codes which minimize predictive information are those which are well-nested with respect to the correlation structure of the source variables, keeping all groups of correlated variables contiguous. Further simulation results involving context-free languages are found in SI Section G. For a mathematical analysis of predictive information in local and random orders for structured sources, see SI Section H.

Mapping these simulation results onto natural language, we hypothesize that individual words correspond to bundles of highly correlated features, which are expressed holistically. For example, a word like *cat* expresses features such as furriness, mammalianness, etc., which are highly correlated with each other, and we cannot analyze the form into parts like *c* and *at* corresponding to these features. Sentences are then formed by systematic combination of these holistic words, in a way that respects locality. This is the structure that generally results from reduction of predictive information. We will provide empirical evidence for this view in the corpus studies below.


A. Phonological forms




D. Noun phrase orders



B. Noun inflections



C. Adjective-noun pairs



E. Lexical semantic features




Figure 3: **A.** Predictive information calculation for phonological forms in selected diverse languages, comparing the attested forms against forms that have been deterministically shuffled in a way that preserves manner of articulation. **B.** Letter-level predictive information of noun forms as a function of number, case, possession, and definiteness (black vertical line), compared with the density of predictive information values for four random baselines (see text). p values indicate the proportion of baseline samples with lower predictive information than the attested forms. **C.** Letter-level predictive information of adjective–noun pairs from 12 languages, compared with nonsystematic baselines. (Nonconcatenative baselines always generate much higher predictive information than the attested forms, and are not shown.) **D.** Typological frequency of noun phrase orders (number of unrelated language genera showing the given order) as a function of predictive information. **E.** Top: Pairwise mutual information of semantic features from the Lancaster Sensorimotor Norms [59] with a number feature as indicated by plural morphology. Bottom: Pairwise mutual information values for Lancaster Sensorimotor Norm features across and within words, for pairs of verbs and their objects.

Cross-Linguistic Empirical Results

We now present cross-linguistic empirical evidence that natural languages are configured in a way that reduces predictive information at the levels of phonotactics, morphology, syntax, and semantics, and that low predictive information coincides with systematicity.

Phonotactics We compare attested wordforms in vocabulary lists of 6 languages against counterfactual alternatives generated by deterministically scrambling phonemes within a word while preserving manner of articulation, thus ensuring that the resulting counterfactual forms are roughly pronounceable. For example, an English word *fasted* might be scrambled to form *sefdat*. Calculating predictive information at the level of phoneme segments, and assuming a uniform source distribution over words, we find that the attested forms have lower predictive information than the counterfactual variants. The increased predictive information in the counterfactual variants arises because the shuffling disrupts the primarily local phonotactic restrictions in each language. Results are similar for a further 55 languages and using corpus frequencies instead of a uniform source distribution over words, as shown in SI Appendix C.

Morphology Words change form to express grammatical features in a way that is often systematic; for example the forms of the Hungarian noun shown in Table 2 express a case feature and a number feature systematically and locally. We estimate predictive information of these morphological affixes across five languages, with source distributions based on corpus counts of the frequencies of the grammatical features. In Figure 3B, we show that affixes for case, number, possession, and definiteness in 5 languages are structured in a way that reduces predictive information. We compare the predictive information of attested forms against three alternatives: (1) a nonconcatenative baseline generated by applying a deterministic shuffling function to each form, (2) a nonsystematic baseline generated by shuffling the assignment of forms to meanings (features), and (3) a more controlled nonsystematic baseline which shuffles the form–meaning mapping while preserving form length, thus preserving the entropy rate of the original system. The non-systematic baselines are effectively shuffling the assignment of forms to probabilities.

Across the languages, we find that the attested forms have lower predictive information than the majority of baselines. The weakest minimization effect is in Latin, which also has the least systematic (most fusional) morphology [62]. Note that Arabic nouns often show nonconcatenative morphology in the form of so-called ‘broken’ plurals: for example, the plural of the loanword *film* meaning ‘film’ is *’af1ām*. This pattern is represented in the forms used to generate Figure 3B, and yet Arabic noun forms still have lower predictive information than the majority of baseline samples.

Syntax Phrases such as *blue triangle*, *green triangle*, *blue square*, *green square* are locally systematic, as shown in Table 3. We compare these systematic adjective–noun combinations against non-systematic and non-concatenative baselines generated the same way as in the morphology study. We estimate the probability of a meaning as the frequency of the corresponding adjective–noun pair in a corpus. Results for 12 languages are shown in Figure 3C. We find that the real adjective–noun systems have lower predictive information than a large majority of baselines across all languages tested. These results indicate the adjectives and nouns are less correlated than they would be by chance, representing relatively independent components of the source distribution on meanings.

Word Order In a noun phrase such as *the three cute cats*, the elements Determiner (D, *the*), Numeral (N, *three*), Adjective (A, *cute*), and Noun (n, *cats*) are combined in the order D–N–A–n. This order varies across languages—for example Spanish has D–N–n–A (*los tres gatos lindos*)—but

Frequency	Features	Form	Form (Nonsyst.)	Form (Nonconcat.)	Meaning
█	Nominative Singular	ember	emberekhez	ember	person (subj.)
█	Accusative Singular	embert	embert	embert	person (obj.)
▮	Dative Singular	embernek	embereknek	kembeern	to the person
▮	Allative Singular	emberhez	embereket	zemberh	toward the person
█	Nominative Plural	emberek	emberhez	embekre	people (subj.)
▮	Accusative Plural	embereket	emberek	eembektre	people (obj.)
†	Dative Plural	embereknek	embernek	knembekere	to the people
‡	Allative Plural	emberekhez	ember	zhembekere	toward the people

Table 2: Forms of the Hungarian noun *ember* meaning ‘person’, along with examples of the nonsystematic and nonconcatenative baseline used in Figure 3B. 231 additional forms not shown. ‘Prob.’ column illustrates the total relative frequency of the relevant grammatical features in Hungarian Szeged UD corpus [60, 61].









Frequency	Meaning	Form	Form (Nonsyst.)	Form (Nonconcat.)
		blue square	green square	squbluearee
		green square	blue square	squgreareen
		blue circle	blue circle	cirbluelee
		green circle	green circle	cirgreecleen

Table 3: English expressions for the given meanings, along with frequencies from the English Common Crawl web corpus [63]. Example nonsystematic and nonconcatenative baseline forms are shown.

not without bound: certain orders are much more common than others [64]. We aim to explain the cross-linguistic distribution of these orders by a pressure to reduce predictive information, which drives words that are statistically predictive of each other to be close to each other [5, 52, 65]. To do so, we estimate source probabilities for noun phrases (consisting of single head lemmas for a noun along with an optional adjective, numeral, and determiner) based on corpus frequencies. We then calculate predictive information at the word level (treating words as atomic symbols) for all possible permutations of D–N–A–n. Note that predictive information is symmetric with respect to time reversal, so we cannot distinguish orders such as D–N–A–n from n–A–N–D, etc. As shown in Figure 3D, the orders with low predictive information are also the orders that are more frequent cross-linguistically, where cross-linguistic frequency is measured as the number of unrelated language genera in which some language shows the given order [64]. Alternative source distributions also yield this downward correlation, and are shown in SI Appendix D.

Semantics The theory predicts that individual words and morphemes in a language correspond to relatively independent components of the source distribution. Considering a word such as *cats*, all the semantic features of a cat (furriness, mammalianness, etc.) are expressed in the morpheme *cat* and the semantic feature of numerosity is separated out into the plural marker *-s*; plural marking of this kind is common across languages. We hold that the reason that numerosity is selected to be expressed in a separate morpheme so frequently across languages is that all the other features are highly correlated with each other in the environment, whereas numerosity is relatively independent.

We validate this prediction in a study of semantic features in English, using the Lancaster Sensorimotor Norms [59] to provide semantic features for English words and using the English Universal Dependencies (UD) corpus to provide a frequency distribution over words. The Lancaster Sensorimotor Norms provide human ratings for words based on sensorimotor dimensions, such as whether they involve the head or arms. As shown in Figure 3E (top), we find that the lexical semantic norm features are highly correlated with each other, and relatively uncorrelated with numerosity (as indicated by plural marking).

For the same reason, the theory also predicts that semantic features should be more correlated within words than across words: the reason that certain bundles of features are separated out to be expressed using two words is that they are relatively uncorrelated. In Figure 3E (bottom) we show within-word and cross-word correlations of the semantic norm features for pairs of verbs and their objects taken from the English UD corpus. As predicted, the across-word correlations are weaker. Correlations based on features drawn from other semantic norms are presented in SI Appendix E.

Discussion

Our results underscore the fundamental roles of prediction and memory in human cognition, and provide a link between the algebraic structure of human language and information-theoretic concepts used in machine learning and neuroscience. Our work joins the growing body of information-theoretic models of human language based on optimization for efficiency [8–12, 66, 67].

Language models and machine learning Large language models have recently revolutionized natural language processing. The foundation models underlying these systems are neural networks trained to predict the next token of text given previous tokens in an autoregressive fashion [68]. Our results suggest a connection between the structure of human language and the statistical prediction task performed by language models: linguistic structure makes autoregressive prediction easier by minimizing predictive information. Although it has been claimed that large language models have little to tell us about the structure of human language—because their architectures do not reflect formal properties of grammars and because they can putatively learn unnatural languages as well as natural ones [69–71]—our results suggest that these models have succeeded so well precisely because natural language is structured in a way that makes their prediction task simple. Indeed, neural architectures show biases toward natural linguistic structure only when trained on a true sequential prediction task [72], and they struggle to learn languages that lack the information locality properties of human language [73].

Our results establish a connection between the structure of human language and the machine learning concept of Independent Components Analysis (ICA). ICA is a powerful method for taking input in which several sources are mixed together and separating it into meaningful components through minimization of mutual information [74]. For example, applied to images of faces, ICA separates out eyes, noses, and mouths as independent basis images [75]. More generally, minimization of mutual information is widely deployed to create representations that are ‘disentangled’ or compositional [40, 76], and to detect object boundaries in images, under the assumption that pixels belonging to the same object exhibit higher statistical dependence than pixels belonging to different objects [77]. We propose that human languages follow a similar principle: languages perform a kind of generalized sequential ICA on the source distribution on meanings, factoring it into nested groups of relatively independent components which are expressed systematically as words and phrases, with more statistical dependence within these units than across them.

Neuroscience In order to understand how information is encoded in patterns of neuronal activity, neuroscientists have characterized neural codes in terms of maximizing information throughput subject to constraints [78], including explicit constraints on predictive information [31, 79]. These models generally predict that neural codes are *decorrelated*, with distinct neural populations encoding statistically independent components of sensory input [80]. For example, early visual processing is performed by neurons whose receptive fields are edge filters; these edge filters can be derived by ICA applied to the statistical distribution on natural images [81]. Our results suggest that human languages operate on similar principles to neural codes: they decorrelate the source distribution on meanings, and express the resulting components in contiguous parts of utterances. This view is compatible with neuroscientific evidence on language processing: minimization of predictive information equates to maximization of local predictability of the linguistic signal, a driver of the neural response to language [23, 24].

Information theory and language Previous work derived locality in natural language from a related information-theoretic concept, the memory–surprisal tradeoff or predictive information

bottleneck [29, 82, 83]. The memory–surprisal tradeoff is a curve that describes the best achievable sequential predictability for the linguistic signal as a function of memory capacity. The current theory is a simplification of the memory–surprisal tradeoff, effectively looking at only one part of the curve: predictive information is the minimal memory capacity at which sequential predictability is maximized. A more complete information-theoretic model of linguistic structure may require looking at the whole shape of this curve.

Other work on predictive information (typically under the name excess entropy) in natural language has focused on the long-range scaling of the n -gram entropy rate in connected texts, which seems to follow a (shifted) power law $h_n \sim n^{-\beta}$ with $\beta \approx 1/5$ [84–87]. This scaling law implies that predictive information for connected texts diverges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ [7, 88]. The difference between this previous work and ours is that we have focused on only single utterances, effectively considering only relatively short-range predictive information.

Linguistics and Cognitive Science Our results provide a formalization and explanation of a widespread generalization in human language, first formulated as Behaghel’s ‘highest law’ of ordering [89]: “that which is mentally closely related is also placed close together.” For example, words are contiguous units and the order of morphemes within them is determined by a principle of relevance [3, 90], and word order across languages is governed by a principle that syntactically linked words are close to each other [4, 91–93].

The precise locality principle that comes out of minimization of predictive information is information locality: elements of a linguistic form should be close to each other when they predict each other [28, 65]. We propose that information locality subsumes existing intuitive locality ideas. Thus since words have a high level of statistical inter-predictability among their parts [94], they are mostly contiguous within an utterance, and as a residual effect of this binding force, related words are also close together [5, 29, 52, 95]. Here we have shown that the same formal principle provides a possible explanation for the existence of linguistic systematicity and the way that languages divide the world into natural kinds [49].

Our theory of linguistic systematicity is independent of any assumptions about the content or form of mental representations of grammars, linguistic forms, or the meanings expressed in language. Predictive information is a function only of the probability distribution on forms, seen as one-dimensional sequences of symbols unfolding in time. This independence from representational assumptions is an advantage, because there is as yet no consensus about the basic nature of the mental representations underlying human language [96, 97]. Our results support the idea that key properties of language emerge from generic constraints on sequential information processing [15, 98–100]. The structure of language ultimately reflects the statistical properties of the environment that it is describing [101, 102].

Limitations We have argued that certain fundamental properties of human language emerge in codes that are constrained to have low predictive information. Much work is required to push this hypothesis to its limit. It remains to be investigated whether further more detailed properties of human language, such as mildly context-sensitive syntax [103], also result from this setup. Also, we have assumed throughout that languages are one-to-one mappings between form and meaning; the behavior of ambiguous or nondeterministic codes, where ambiguity might trade off with predictive information, has not yet been explored. One known limitation of the theory is that predictive information (in fact, the whole h_n curve [104, p. 58]) is symmetric to time reversal, so any time-asymmetric properties of language—for example, the pattern of ‘given’ information preceding ‘new’ information [105]—are out of scope for the present theory. Nevertheless, we believe it is noteworthy

that such basic properties of language emerge from a simple information processing constraint, and we are hopeful that this work points toward a view of human language that is not so different from other natural and artificial communication systems.

Methods

Code availability Code to reproduce our results is available at <http://github.com/Futrell/infolocality>.

Data availability Unique data required to reproduce our results is available at <http://github.com/Futrell/infolocality>. Corpus count data is drawn from Universal Dependencies v2.8, available at <https://lindat.mff.cuni.cz/repository/xmlui/handle/11234/1-3683>. The Lancaster Sensorimotor Norms are available at <https://osf.io/7emr6/>. Wordform data is drawn from the WOLEX database [106], which is not publicly available, but a subset can be made available upon request to the authors.

Constructing a stochastic process from a language We define a language as a mapping $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ from a meaning in set \mathcal{M} to a string drawn from alphabet Σ . In order to define predictive information *of a language*, we need a way to derive a stochastic process from a language in a way that is stationary and ergodic. To do so, we use a construction where an infinite stream of symbols comes from the following generative process: (1) meanings $m \sim p_M$ are sampled iid from the source distribution p_M , (2) each meaning is translated into a string as $s = L(m)$, (3) the strings s are concatenated end-to-end with a delimiter $\# \notin \Sigma$ between them. The strings are concatenated on both ends, creating a stream of characters which extends unboundedly in both directions. Finally, a form is chosen with probability reweighted by its length, and a time index t (relative to the closest delimiter to the left) is selected uniformly at random within this form.

This construction has the effect of zeroing out any mutual information between symbols with the delimiter between them. Thus, we are measuring predictive information within single utterances. This means that when we compute n -gram statistics in order to calculate predictive information by Eq. 4, we can treat each form as having infinite padding symbols to the left and right. This is the standard method for collecting n -gram statistics when developing n -gram language models [107].

Three-feature source simulation For Figure 2D, we need a way to generate distributions of the form $p(M) = p(M_1) \times p(M_2, M_3)$ in a way that varies the mutual information $I[M_2 : M_3]$. We do so by starting with the source from Eq. 5 (whose components are here denoted p_{indep}) and mixing it with a source that creates a correlation between the outcomes of M_2 and M_3 :

$$p_\alpha(M = ijk) = p_{\text{indep}}(M_1 = i) \times \left[(1 - \alpha) (p_{\text{indep}}(M_2 = j) \times p_{\text{indep}}(M_3 = k)) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \delta_{jk} \right], \quad (7)$$

with δ the Kronecker delta. The mixture weight α controls the level of mutual information, ranging from 0 at $\alpha = 0$ to 1 bit at $\alpha = 1$. A more comprehensive study of the relationship between feature correlation, systematicity, and predictive information is given in SI Appendix B, which examines systematic and holistic codes for a comprehensive grid of possible distributions on the simplex over 4 outcomes.

Locality simulation For the simulation shown in Figure 2E, we consider a source over 100 objects labeled $\{m^{00}, m^{01}, \dots, m^{99}\}$, following a Zipfian distribution $p(M = m^i) \propto (i + 1)^{-1}$. We

consider a language based on a decomposition of the meanings of the form $m = m_1 \times m_2$, with for example m^{89} decomposing into features as $m^8 \times m^9$. Each utterance decomposes into two ‘words’ as $L(m_1 \times m_2) = L(m_1) \cdot L(m_2)$, where the word for each feature m^k is a random string in $\{0, 1\}^4$, maintaining a one-to-one mapping between features m^k and words.

Hierarchy simulation For the simulation shown in Figure 2F, we consider a source M over $5^6 = 15625$ meanings which may be expressed in terms of six random variables $\langle M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4, M_5, M_6 \rangle$ each over 5 outcomes, with a probability distribution as follows:

$$p(M) = \alpha q(M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4, M_5, M_6) + (1 - \alpha) \left(\begin{aligned} & [\beta q(M_1, M_2, M_3) + (1 - \beta) [\gamma q(M_1, M_2) + (1 - \gamma) q(M_1)q(M_2)]] q(M_3) \\ & \times [\beta q(M_4, M_5, M_6) + (1 - \beta) [\gamma q(M_4, M_5) + (1 - \gamma) q(M_4)q(M_5)]] q(M_6) \end{aligned} \right), \quad (8)$$

where $\alpha = .01$, $\beta = 0.20$, $\gamma = 0.99$ are coupling constants, and each $q(\cdot)$ is a Zipfian distribution as above. The coupling constants control the strengths of the correlations shown in Figure 2F.

Deterministic shuffles The studies on phonology, morphology, and syntax involve nonconcatenative baselines where symbols within a form are shuffled deterministically. This deterministic shuffling preserves the entropy rate of the original process. The deterministic shuffle is accomplished by applying the `numpy.random.permutation` function from NumPy² to every form while holding the random seed constant.

Morphology study We estimate the source distribution on grammatical features (number, case, possessor, and definiteness) using the feature annotations from UD corpora, summing over all nouns, with add- α smoothing at $\alpha = 1/2$. The dependency treebanks used are drawn from UD v2.8 [61]: for Arabic, the NYUAD Arabic UD Treebank; for Finnish, the Turku Dependency Treebank; for Turkish, the Turkish Penn Treebank; for Latin, the Index Thomisticus Treebank; for Hungarian, the Szeged Dependency Treebank. Forms are represented with a dummy symbol X standing in for the stem, and then orthographic forms for suffixes, for example **Xoknak** for the Hungarian dative plural. For Hungarian, Finnish, and Turkish, we use the forms corresponding to back unrounded vowel harmony. For Latin, we use first-declension forms. For Arabic, we use regular masculine triptote forms with a broken plural; to do so, we represent the root using three dummy symbols, and the plural using a common ‘broken’ form [108], with for example **XaYZun** for the nominative indefinite singular and **’aXYāZun** for the nominative indefinite plural. Results using an alternate broken plural form **XiYāZun** are nearly identical.

Adjective–noun pairs From UD corpora we extract adjective–noun pairs, defined as a head wordform with part-of-speech NOUN modified by an adjacent dependent wordform with relation type `amod` and part-of-speech ADJ. The forms examined in Figure 3C are formed from the pair of adjective and noun from the corpus, in their original order, in original orthographic form with a whitespace delimiter between them. The source distribution is proportional to empirical frequencies of the forms with no smoothing.

²<https://numpy.org/doc/stable/reference/random/generated/numpy.random.permutation.html>

Noun phrase order The source distribution on noun phrases is estimated from the empirical frequency of noun phrases in the German GSD UD corpus, which has the largest number of such noun phrases among the UD corpora. To estimate this source, we define a noun phrase as a head lemma of part-of-speech `NOUN` along with the head lemmas for all dependents of type `amod` (with part-of-speech `ADJ`), `nummod` (with part-of-speech `NUM`), and `det` (with part-of-speech `DET`). We extract noun phrases of this form from the dependency corpus. For noun phrases with multiple adjectives modifying, one of the adjectives is chosen randomly and the others are discarded. The result is counts of noun phrases of the form below:

Det	Num	Adj	Noun	Count
die	—	—	Hand	234
ein	—	alt	Kind	4
—	drei	—	Buch	2
ein	—	einzigartig	Parfümeur	1
...

The source distribution is taken to be proportional to these counts, with no smoothing. We then compute predictive information at the word level over the attested noun phrases for all possible permutations of determiner, numeral, adjective, and noun.

Semantic features Semantic norms from the Lancaster Sensorimotor Norms [59] were transformed into binary features by recoding each norm as 1 if it exceeded the mean value for that feature across all words, and 0 otherwise. Word frequencies were calculated by maximum likelihood based on lemma frequencies in the concatenation of the English GUM [109], GUMReddit [110], and EWT [111] corpora from UD 2.8. The ‘Number’ feature was calculated based on the value of the `Number` feature in the UD annotations. Verb–object pairs were identified as a head token with universal part-of-speech `VERB` with a dependency of type `obj` to a dependent token with part-of-speech `NOUN`.

Acknowledgments

We thank Steve Piantadosi, Neil Rathi, Greg Scontras, Noga Zaslavsky, Tiago Pimentel, Robert Hawkins, Nathaniel Imel, Jim Crutchfield, Ruichen Sun, Zyg Pizlo, Brian Skyrms, Jeff Barrett, and audiences at NeurIPS InfoCog 2023, the UCI Center for Theoretical Behavioral Sciences, EvoLang 2024, TedLab, and the Society for Computation in Linguistics 2024 for discussion.

Author contributions

RF designed and ran studies in the main text. RF and MH performed mathematical analyses, and designed and ran studies in the Supplementary Information. RF and MH wrote the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

- [1] Gottlob Frege. *Gedankengefüge*. *Beiträge zur Philosophie des deutschen Idealismus*, 3(1): 36–51, 1923.

- [2] Theo M. V. Janssen and Barbara H. Partee. Compositionality. In Johan van Benthem and Alice G. B. ter Meulen, editors, *Handbook of Logic and Language*, pages 417–473. Elsevier, 1997.
- [3] Talmy Givón. Isomorphism in the grammatical code: Cognitive and biological considerations. *Studies in Language*, 15(1):85–114, 1991.
- [4] John A. Hawkins. *Efficiency and complexity in grammars*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
- [5] John Mansfield and Charles Kemp. The emergence of grammatical structure from inter-predictability. *PsyArXiv*, 2023.
- [6] William Bialek, Ilya Nemenman, and Naftali Tishby. Predictability, complexity, and learning. *Neural Computation*, 13(11):2409–2463, 2001.
- [7] James P Crutchfield and David P Feldman. Regularities unseen, randomness observed: Levels of entropy convergence. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 13(1):25–54, 2003.
- [8] Benoit B. Mandelbrot. An informational theory of the statistical structure of language. In W. Jackson, editor, *Communication Theory*, pages 486–502. Academic Press, Princeton, 1953.
- [9] Ramon Ferrer-i-Cancho and Ricard V. Solé. Least effort and the origins of scaling in human language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100(3):788, 2003.
- [10] T. Florian Jaeger and Harry J. Tily. On language ‘utility’: Processing complexity and communicative efficiency. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 2(3):323–335, 2011.
- [11] Edward Gibson, Richard Futrell, Steven T. Piantadosi, Isabelle Dautriche, Kyle Mahowald, Leon Bergen, and Roger P. Levy. How efficiency shapes human language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23(5):389–407, 2019.
- [12] Richard Futrell and Michael Hahn. Information theory as a bridge between language function and language form. *Frontiers in Communication*, 7:657725, 2022.
- [13] David A Huffman. A method for the construction of minimum-redundancy codes. *Proceedings of the IRE*, 40(9):1098–1101, 1952.
- [14] Patricia Smith Churchland and Terrence Joseph Sejnowski. *The Computational Brain*. MIT Press, 1992.
- [15] Morten H. Christiansen and Nick Chater. The Now-or-Never Bottleneck: A fundamental constraint on language. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 39:e62, 2016. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X1500031X.
- [16] Natalia Levshina. *Communicative Efficiency*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [17] Frieda Goldman-Eisler. Speech production and language statistics. *Nature*, 180(4600):1497–1497, 1957.

- [18] Ira Fischler and Paul A Bloom. Automatic and attentional processes in the effects of sentence contexts on word recognition. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 18(1):1–20, 1979.
- [19] Susan F Ehrlich and Keith Rayner. Contextual effects on word perception and eye movements during reading. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 20(6):641–655, 1981.
- [20] Fernanda Ferreira and Benjamin Swets. How incremental is language production? Evidence from the production of utterances requiring the computation of arithmetic sums. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 46(1):57–84, 2002.
- [21] Alan Bell, Jason M Brenier, Michelle Gregory, Cynthia Girand, and Dan Jurafsky. Predictability effects on durations of content and function words in conversational English. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 60(1):92–111, 2009.
- [22] Nathaniel J Smith and Roger P Levy. The effect of word predictability on reading time is logarithmic. *Cognition*, 128(3):302–319, 2013.
- [23] Martin Schrimpf, Idan Asher Blank, Greta Tuckute, Carina Kauf, Eghbal A Hosseini, Nancy Kanwisher, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Evelina Fedorenko. The neural architecture of language: Integrative modeling converges on predictive processing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(45):e2105646118, 2021.
- [24] Micha Heilbron, Kristijan Armeni, Jan-Mathijs Schoffelen, Peter Hagoort, and Floris P De Lange. A hierarchy of linguistic predictions during natural language comprehension. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(32):e2201968119, 2022.
- [25] Rachel Ryskin and Mante S Nieuwland. Prediction during language comprehension: What is next? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 27(11):1032–1052, 2023.
- [26] Richard Futrell. Information-theoretic principles in incremental language production. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(39):e2220593120, 2023.
- [27] George A. Miller and Noam Chomsky. Finitary models of language users. *Handbook of Mathematical Psychology*, 2:419–491, 1963.
- [28] Richard Futrell, Edward Gibson, and Roger P. Levy. Lossy-context surprisal: An information-theoretic model of memory effects in sentence processing. *Cognitive Science*, 44:e12814, 2020.
- [29] Michael Hahn, Judith Degen, and Richard Futrell. Modeling word and morpheme order in natural language as an efficient tradeoff of memory and surprisal. *Psychological Review*, 128(4):726–756, 2021.
- [30] Peter Grassberger. Toward a quantitative theory of self-generated complexity. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 25:907–938, 1986.
- [31] William Bialek, Rob R De Ruyter Van Steveninck, and Naftali Tishby. Efficient representation as a design principle for neural coding and computation. In *2006 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 659–663. IEEE, 2006.
- [32] Keyan Zahedi, Nihat Ay, and Ralf Der. Higher coordination with less control—A result of information maximization in the sensorimotor loop. *Adaptive Behavior*, 18(3-4):338–355, 2010.

- [33] Richard Montague. Universal grammar. *Theoria*, 36(3):373–398, 1970.
- [34] Simon Kirby. Syntax out of learning: The cultural evolution of structured communication in a population of induction algorithms. In Dario Floreano, Jean-Daniel Nicoud, and Francesco Mondada, editors, *Advances in Artificial Life*, pages 694–703, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1999. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-48304-5.
- [35] Kenny Smith, Henry Brighton, and Simon Kirby. Complex systems in language evolution: The cultural emergence of compositional structure. *Advances in Complex Systems*, 6(4):537–558, 2003.
- [36] Kenny Smith, Monica Tamariz, and Simon Kirby. Linguistic structure is an evolutionary trade-off between simplicity and expressivity. In Markus Knauff, Michael Pauen, Natalie Sebanz, and Ipke Wachsmuth, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, CogSci 2013, Berlin, Germany, July 31 - August 3, 2013*, 2013. URL <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8j64g39c>.
- [37] Michael Franke. Creative compositionality from reinforcement learning in signaling games. In *Evolution of Language: Proceedings of the 10th International Conference (EVLANG10)*, pages 82–89. World Scientific, 2014.
- [38] Simon Kirby, Monica Tamariz, Hannah Cornish, and Kenny Smith. Compression and communication in the cultural evolution of linguistic structure. *Cognition*, 141:87–102, 2015.
- [39] Wlodek Zadrozny. From compositional to systematic semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 17:329–342, 1994.
- [40] Francesco Locatello, Stefan Bauer, Mario Lucic, Gunnar Rätsch, Sylvain Gelly, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Olivier Bachem. Challenging common assumptions in the unsupervised learning of disentangled representations. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4114–4124. PMLR, 2019. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/locatello19a.html>.
- [41] John Batali. Computational simulations of the emergence of grammar. In J. R. Hurford, M. Studdert-Kennedy, and C. Knight, editors, *Approaches to the Evolution of Language: Social and Cognitive Bases*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [42] Jinyun Ke and John H Holland. Language origin from an emergentist perspective. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4):691–716, 2006.
- [43] Francesca Tria, Bruno Galantucci, and Vittorio Loreto. Naming a structured world: A cultural route to duality of patterning. *PLOS ONE*, 7(6):1–8, 06 2012. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0037744. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0037744>.
- [44] Angeliki Lazaridou, Alexander Peysakhovich, and Marco Baroni. Multi-agent cooperation and the emergence of (natural) language. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2017.

- [45] Igor Mordatch and Pieter Abbeel. Emergence of grounded compositional language in multi-agent populations. In Kilian Q. Weinberger Sheila A. McIlraith, editor, *The Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-18)*. AAAI Press, 2018.
- [46] Shane Steinert-Threlkeld. Toward the emergence of nontrivial compositionality. *Philosophy of Science*, 87(5):897–909, 2020.
- [47] Łukasz Kuciński, Tomasz Korbak, Paweł Kołodziej, and Piotr Miłoś. Catalytic role of noise and necessity of inductive biases in the emergence of compositional communication. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:23075–23088, 2021.
- [48] Martin A. Nowak, Joshua B. Plotkin, and Vincent A. A. Jansen. The evolution of syntactic communication. *Nature*, 404(6777):495–498, 2000.
- [49] Jeffrey A. Barrett. Dynamic partitioning and the conventionality of kinds. *Philosophy of Science*, 74(4):527–546, 2007.
- [50] Michael Franke. The evolution of compositionality in signaling games. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 25(3-4):355–377, 2016.
- [51] Jeffrey A. Barrett, Calvin Cochran, and Brian Skyrms. On the evolution of compositional language. *Philosophy of Science*, 87(5):910–920, 2020.
- [52] Jennifer Culbertson, Marieke Schouwstra, and Simon Kirby. From the world to word order: Deriving biases in noun phrase order from statistical properties of the world. *Language*, 96(3):696–717, 2020.
- [53] Michaela Socolof, Jacob Louis Hoover, Richard Futrell, Alessandro Sordani, and Timothy J. O’Donnell. Measuring morphological fusion using partial information decomposition. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Chu-Ren Huang, Hansaem Kim, James Pustejovsky, Leo Wanner, Key-Sun Choi, Pum-Mo Ryu, Hsin-Hsi Chen, Lucia Donatelli, Heng Ji, Sadao Kurohashi, Patrizia Paggio, Nianwen Xue, Seokhwan Kim, Younggyun Hahm, Zhong He, Tony Kyungil Lee, Enrico Santus, Francis Bond, and Seung-Hoon Na, editors, *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 44–54, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 2022. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.coling-1.5>.
- [54] Claude E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27:623–656, 1948.
- [55] Alison Wray. Protolanguage as a holistic system for social interaction. *Language & Communication*, 18(1):47–67, 1998.
- [56] Ferdinand de Saussure. *Cours de linguistique générale*. Payot, Lausanne & Paris, 1916.
- [57] John J. McCarthy. A prosodic theory of nonconcatenative morphology. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 12(3):373–418, 1981.
- [58] Noam Chomsky. *Syntactic Structures*. Walter de Gruyter, 1957.
- [59] Dermot Lynott, Louise Connell, Marc Brysbaert, James Brand, and James Carney. The Lancaster Sensorimotor Norms: Multidimensional measures of perceptual and action strength for 40,000 English words. *Behavior Research Methods*, 52:1271–1291, 2020.

- [60] Veronika Vincze, Dóra Szauter, Attila Almási, György Móra, Zoltán Alexin, and János Csirik. Hungarian dependency treebank. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Khalid Choukri, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Jan Odijk, Stelios Piperidis, Mike Rosner, and Daniel Tapias, editors, *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'10)*, Valletta, Malta, May 2010. European Language Resources Association (ELRA). URL http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2010/pdf/465_Paper.pdf.
- [61] Joakim Nivre, Cristina Bosco, Jinho Choi, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Timothy Dozat, Richárd Farkas, Jennifer Foster, Filip Ginter, Yoav Goldberg, Jan Hajič, Jenna Kanerva, Veronika Laippala, Alessandro Lenci, Teresa Lynn, Christopher Manning, Ryan McDonald, Anna Missilä, Simonetta Montemagni, Slav Petrov, Sampo Pyysalo, Natalia Silveira, Maria Simi, Aaron Smith, Reut Tsarfaty, Veronika Vincze, and Daniel Zeman. *Universal Dependencies 1.0*. Universal Dependencies Consortium, 2015. URL <http://hdl.handle.net/11234/1-1464>.
- [62] Neil Rathi, Michael Hahn, and Richard Futrell. An information-theoretic characterization of morphological fusion. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10115–10120, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.793. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.793>.
- [63] Christian Buck, Kenneth Heafield, and Bas van Ooyen. N-gram counts and language models from the Common Crawl. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Khalid Choukri, Thierry Declerck, Hrafn Loftsson, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Asuncion Moreno, Jan Odijk, and Stelios Piperidis, editors, *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'14)*, pages 3579–3584, Reykjavik, Iceland, May 2014. European Language Resources Association (ELRA). URL http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2014/pdf/1097_Paper.pdf.
- [64] Matthew S Dryer. On the order of demonstrative, numeral, adjective, and noun. *Language*, 94(4):798–833, 2018.
- [65] Richard Futrell. Information-theoretic locality properties of natural language. In Xinying Chen and Ramon Ferrer-i-Cancho, editors, *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Quantitative Syntax (Quasy, SyntaxFest 2019)*, pages 2–15, Paris, France, 26 August 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W19-7902>.
- [66] Charles Kemp and Terry Regier. Kinship categories across languages reflect general communicative principles. *Science*, 336(6084):1049–1054, 2012.
- [67] Noga Zaslavsky, Charles Kemp, Terry Regier, and Naftali Tishby. Efficient compression in color naming and its evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(31):7937–7942, 2018. ISSN 0027-8424. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1800521115. URL <http://www.pnas.org/content/115/31/7937>.
- [68] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
- [69] Jeff Mitchell and Jeffrey Bowers. Priorless recurrent networks learn curiously. In Donia Scott, Nuria Bel, and Chengqing Zong, editors, *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference*

- on *Computational Linguistics*, pages 5147–5158, Barcelona, Spain (Online), December 2020. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.451. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.coling-main.451>.
- [70] Noam Chomsky, Ian Roberts, and Jeffrey Watumull. Noam Chomsky: The false promise of ChatGPT. *The New York Times*, March 8 2023. URL <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/08/opinion/noam-chomsky-chatgpt-ai.html>.
- [71] Andrea Moro, Matteo Greco, and Stefano F. Cappa. Large languages, impossible languages and human brains. *Cortex*, 167:82–85, 2023. ISSN 0010-9452. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2023.07.003>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0010945223001752>.
- [72] Kabir Ahuja, Vidhisha Balachandran, Madhur Panwar, Tianxing He, Noah A Smith, Navin Goyal, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Learning syntax without planting trees: Understanding when and why Transformers generalize hierarchically. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16367*, 2024.
- [73] Julie Kallini, Isabel Papadimitriou, Richard Futrell, Kyle Mahowald, and Christopher Potts. Mission: Impossible language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06416*, 2024.
- [74] Anthony J. Bell and Terrence J. Sejnowski. An information-maximization approach to blind separation and blind deconvolution. *Neural Computation*, 7(6):1129–1159, 11 1995. ISSN 0899-7667. doi: 10.1162/neco.1995.7.6.1129. URL <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1995.7.6.1129>.
- [75] Marian Stewart Bartlett, Javier R Movellan, and Terrence J Sejnowski. Face recognition by independent component analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 13(6):1450–1464, 2002.
- [76] Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Pascal Vincent. Representation learning: A review and new perspectives. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 35(8): 1798–1828, 2013.
- [77] Phillip Isola, Daniel Zoran, Dilip Krishnan, and Edward H Adelson. Crisp boundary detection using pointwise mutual information. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part III 13*, pages 799–814. Springer, 2014.
- [78] Ralph Linsker. Self-organization in a perceptual network. *Computer*, 21(3):105–117, 1988.
- [79] Stephanie E Palmer, Olivier Marre, Michael J Berry, and William Bialek. Predictive information in a sensory population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(22):6908–6913, 2015.
- [80] Horace B. Barlow. Unsupervised learning. *Neural Computation*, 1(3):295–311, 1989.
- [81] Anthony J Bell and Terrence J Sejnowski. The “independent components” of natural scenes are edge filters. *Vision Research*, 37(23):3327–3338, 1997.
- [82] Susanne Still. Information bottleneck approach to predictive inference. *Entropy*, 16(2):968–989, 2014.

- [83] Neil Rathi, Michael Hahn, and Richard Futrell. Explaining patterns of fusion in morphological paradigms using the memory-surprisal tradeoff. In Jennifer Culbertson, Hugh Rabagliati, Verónica C. Ramenzoni, and Andrew Perfors, editors, *Proceedings of the 44th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, CogSci 2022, Toronto, ON, Canada, July 27-30, 2022*, 2022. URL <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0v03z6xb>.
- [84] Wolfgang Hilberg. Der bekannte Grenzwert der redundanzfreien Information in Texten—eine Fehlinterpretation der Shannonschen Experimente? *Frequenz*, 44(9–10):243–248, 1990.
- [85] Łukasz Dębowski. The relaxed Hilberg conjecture: A review and new experimental support. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 22(4):311–337, 2015.
- [86] Ryosuke Takahira, Kumiko Tanaka-Ishii, and Łukasz Dębowski. Entropy rate estimates for natural language—a new extrapolation of compressed large-scale corpora. *Entropy*, 18(10):364, 2016.
- [87] Kumiko Tanaka-Ishii. *Statistical Universals of Language*. Springer, 2021.
- [88] Łukasz Dębowski. Excess entropy in natural language: Present state and perspectives. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 21(3):037105, 2011.
- [89] Otto Behaghel. *Deutsche Syntax: Eine geschichtliche Darstellung. Band IV: Wortstellung*. Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1932.
- [90] Joan L Bybee. *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1985.
- [91] Haitao Liu, Chunshan Xu, and Junying Liang. Dependency distance: A new perspective on syntactic patterns in natural languages. *Physics of Life Reviews*, 21:171–193, 2017.
- [92] David Temperley and Daniel Gildea. Minimizing syntactic dependency lengths: Typological/cognitive universal? *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 4:1–15, 2018.
- [93] Richard Futrell, Roger P. Levy, and Edward Gibson. Dependency locality as an explanatory principle for word order. *Language*, 96(2):371–413, 2020.
- [94] John Mansfield. The word as a unit of internal predictability. *Linguistics*, 59(6):1427–1472, 2021.
- [95] Richard Futrell, Peng Qian, Edward Gibson, Evelina Fedorenko, and Idan Blank. Syntactic dependencies correspond to word pairs with high mutual information. In Kim Gerdes and Sylvain Kahane, editors, *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Dependency Linguistics (Depling, SyntaxFest 2019)*, pages 3–13, Paris, France, August 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W19-7703. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W19-7703>.
- [96] Ray Jackendoff. Linguistics in cognitive science: The state of the art. *The Linguistic Review*, 24:347–402, 2007.
- [97] Adele E. Goldberg. Constructions work. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 20(1):201–224, 2009. doi: doi:10.1515/COGL.2009.013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/COGL.2009.013>.

- [98] Jeshua Bratman, Michael Shvartsman, Richard L Lewis, and Satinder Singh. A new approach to exploring language emergence as boundedly optimal control in the face of environmental and cognitive constraints. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Cognitive Modeling*, pages 7–12. Citeseer, 2010.
- [99] Carlos Gómez-Rodríguez, Morten H. Christiansen, and Ramon Ferrer-i-Cancho. Memory limitations are hidden in grammar. *Glottometrics*, 52:39–64, 2022.
- [100] Jessica F Cantlon and Steven T Piantadosi. Uniquely human intelligence arose from expanded information capacity. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, pages 1–19, 2024.
- [101] Jacob Feldman. Symbolic representation of probabilistic worlds. *Cognition*, 123(1):61–83, 2012.
- [102] Jacob Feldman. Probabilistic origins of compositional mental representations. *Psychological Review*, 2023.
- [103] David J. Weir. *Characterizing mildly context-sensitive grammar formalisms*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 1988.
- [104] Claude E. Shannon. Prediction and entropy of printed English. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 30(1):50–64, 1951.
- [105] J Kathryn Bock. The effect of a pragmatic presupposition on syntactic structure in question answering. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 16(6):723–734, 1977.
- [106] Peter Graff. *Communicative efficiency in the lexicon*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2012.
- [107] Stanley F. Chen and Joshua Goodman. An empirical study of smoothing techniques for language modeling. *Computer Speech & Language*, 13(4):359–393, 1999.
- [108] Wheeler M. Thackston. *An Introduction to Koranic and Classical Arabic: An Elementary Grammar of the Language*. IBEX Publishers, Inc., Bethesda, Maryland, 1994.
- [109] Amir Zeldes. The GUM Corpus: Creating multilayer resources in the classroom. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 51(3):581–612, 2017. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10579-016-9343-x>.
- [110] Shabnam Behzad and Amir Zeldes. A cross-genre ensemble approach to robust Reddit part of speech tagging. In Adrien Barbaresi, Felix Bildhauer, Roland Schäfer, and Egon Stemle, editors, *Proceedings of the 12th Web as Corpus Workshop*, pages 50–56, Marseille, France, May 2020. European Language Resources Association. ISBN 979-10-95546-68-9. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.wac-1.7>.
- [111] Natalia Silveira, Timothy Dozat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Samuel Bowman, Miriam Connor, John Bauer, and Chris Manning. A gold standard dependency corpus for English. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Khalid Choukri, Thierry Declerck, Hrafn Loftsson, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Asuncion Moreno, Jan Odijk, and Stelios Piperidis, editors, *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2014)*, Reykjavik, Iceland, may 2014. European Language Resources Association (ELRA). ISBN 978-2-9517408-8-4.

Supplemental Information: Linguistic Structure from a Bottleneck on Sequential Information Processing

October 10, 2024

A Formal Arguments

A.1 Forms of predictive information

Consider a stationary ergodic bi-infinite stochastic process generating symbols labelled $\dots, X_{t-1}, X_t, X_{t+1}, \dots$. Predictive information is defined as the mutual information of the past and future of such a process,

$$E = \text{I}[X_{<t} : X_{\geq t}]. \quad (1)$$

Theorem 1. *We have that the predictive information $E = E_2$, where*

$$E_2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (h_n - h), \quad (2)$$

where h_n is the n -gram entropy rate

$$h_n = \text{H}[X_t | X_{t-n+1}, \dots, X_{t-1}] \quad (3)$$

and h is the asymptotic entropy rate

$$h = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n. \quad (4)$$

Here we establish this claim from the main text, largely reproducing the argument from Crutchfield and Feldman [1].

Proof. We start by expanding the mutual information form of E in Eq. 1. We rewrite the mutual information more carefully as a limit of mutual information between blocks of n symbols, setting $t = 0$ without loss of generality because the process is stationary:

$$E = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{I}[X_{-N:0} : X_{0:N}], \quad (5)$$

where $a : b$ represents an exclusive range $a, \dots, b - 1$.

We now define notation: let H^n be the **block entropy** of n adjacent symbols:

$$H^n = \text{H}[X_{0:N}]. \quad (6)$$

Then from the definition of conditional entropy, the n -gram entropy rate is a difference of block entropies:

$$h_n = H^n - H^{n-1}. \quad (7)$$

Now we rewrite the mutual information in Eq. 5 in terms of entropies of blocks of adjacent symbols, and apply the chain rule for conditional entropy:

$$I[X_{-N:0} : X_{0:N}] = H[X_{0:N}] - H[X_{0:N} | X_{-N:0}] \quad (8)$$

$$= H[X_{0:N}] - \sum_{n=1}^N H[X_n | X_{-N:n}] \quad (9)$$

$$= H^N - \sum_{n=1}^N h_{N+n}. \quad (10)$$

In the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$, each term in the sum is equal to h_N , yielding:

$$E = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} I[X_{-N:0} : X_{0:N}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} H^N - Nh_N. \quad (11)$$

Now we will show that the second form of predictive information, E_2 in Eq. 2, gives the same value. We start by rewriting Eq. 2 more carefully as a limit, and then rewrite the n -gram entropy rates in terms of differences of block entropies:

$$E_2 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N (h_n - h_N) \quad (12)$$

$$= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N (H^n - H^{n-1} - h_N) \quad (13)$$

$$= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} H^N - Nh_N \quad (14)$$

$$= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} H^N - Nh_N. \quad (15)$$

Thus, we have

$$E = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} H^N - Nh_N \quad (16)$$

and

$$E_2 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} H^N - Nh_N \quad (17)$$

so $E = E_2$, as claimed. \square

Remark The form $E = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} H^N - Nh_N$ reveals another useful interpretation of predictive information. It is the excess information content in a block of N symbols in isolation (H^N), compared against the information content in that block of symbols after conditioning on context (Nh_N).

A.2 Length-2 languages

Let \mathcal{M} be a set of meanings with source distribution p_M , Σ_1 and Σ_2 be disjoint sets of symbols, and \mathcal{L} be a set of languages defined as bijections $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2$. The predictive information of a language $E(L)$ is the predictive information of the stream of symbols generated by repeatedly sampling meanings from p_M , translating them to strings as $s = L(m)$, and concatenating the resulting strings with a delimiter $\# \notin \Sigma_1, \notin \Sigma_2$ between them.

Theorem 2. Any language $L^* \in \mathcal{L}$ that achieves $E(L^*) = \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} E(L)$ has the form

$$L^*(m) = \ell_1(m) \cdot \ell_2(m), \quad (18)$$

where ℓ_i denotes some mapping $\ell_i : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ and where the outputs from ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 have minimal mutual information:

$$\ell_1, \ell_2 = \arg \min \mathbb{I}[\ell_1(M) : \ell_2(M)], \quad (19)$$

with the minimization performed over all mappings $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Sigma_i$.

Proof. Because the languages have strings of length 2, we calculate predictive information as

$$E = h_1 + h_2 + h_3 - 3h, \quad (20)$$

up to length 3 accounting for the delimiter $\#$ attached after the end of the string. The entropy rate $h = \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{H}[M]$ is constant across all languages because they are all bijections, so we ignore the entropy rate going forward. Furthermore, there is no decrease in n -gram entropy rate from adding more context after h_3 , so we have $h_3 = h$. Dropping all irrelevant constants, E is thus

$$E \sim h_1 + h_2. \quad (21)$$

Calculation of h_1 : The unigram entropy rate is the entropy over the distribution over symbols generated by first sampling a time index t relative to the most recent delimiter, and then looking at the symbol at that position. With maximum time index $T = 3$, this is

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 &= - \sum_{t=1}^T p(t) \sum_{x \in \Sigma_t} p(X_t = x) \log p(t)p(X_t = x) \\ &= - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{x \in \Sigma_t} p(X_t = x) \log \frac{1}{T} p(X_t = x) \\ &= - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{x \in \Sigma_t} p(X_t = x) \log p(X_t = x) \\ &= \log T + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{H}[X_t], \end{aligned}$$

that is, a constant reflecting how much information is contained in each symbol about its position in the string, plus the average entropy of symbols found in each position. Ignoring constants not affected by choice of language L , in our case this is

$$h_1 \sim \mathbb{H}[X_1] + \mathbb{H}[X_2] + \underbrace{\mathbb{H}[X_3]}_{=0}, \quad (22)$$

where $\mathbb{H}[X_3] = 0$ because we always have $X_3 = \#$.

Calculation of h_2 : The bigram entropy rate h_2 can be calculated following the same logic, yielding

$$h_2 \sim \underbrace{\mathbb{H}[X_1 | X_0]}_{=\mathbb{H}[X_1]} + \mathbb{H}[X_2 | X_1] + \underbrace{\mathbb{H}[X_3 | X_2]}_{=0}. \quad (23)$$

Putting these together and ignoring irrelevant constants yields

$$E \sim h_1 + h_2 \tag{24}$$

$$\sim \text{H}[X_1] + \text{H}[X_2] + \text{H}[X_1] + \text{H}[X_2 | X_1] \tag{25}$$

$$= \text{H}[X_1] + \text{H}[X_2 | X_1] + \text{I}[X_1 : X_2] + \text{H}[X_1] + \text{H}[X_2 | X_1] \tag{26}$$

$$= 2 \text{H}[X_1] + 2 \text{H}[X_2 | X_1] + \text{I}[X_1 : X_2] \tag{27}$$

$$= 2 \text{H}[X_1, X_2] + \text{I}[X_1 : X_2] \tag{28}$$

$$= 2 \text{H}[M] + \text{I}[X_1 : X_2]. \tag{29}$$

Thus, we are left with

$$E \sim \text{I}[X_1 : X_2], \tag{30}$$

where all remaining constants do not depend on the choice of language L . Without loss of generality, we can write $X_1 = \ell_1(M)$ and $X_2 = \ell_2(M)$ for any language L with the appropriate choice of the ℓ_1, ℓ_2 , and thus we have that minimal predictive information is achieved by finding functions ℓ_1, ℓ_2 to minimize mutual information:

$$\arg \min \text{I}[\ell_1(M) : \ell_2(M)]. \tag{31}$$

□

Remark. As predictive information is symmetrical with respect to time reversal, the solutions here are symmetric with respect to swapping ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 .

Remark. The argument reveals that there is a degenerate solution when $|\Sigma_i| \geq |\mathcal{M}|$: you could encode the source M entirely with ℓ_i , with the other $\ell_{j \neq i}$ a constant function. In that case it is always possible to achieve $\text{I}[\ell_1(M) : \ell_2(M)] = 0$. This result mirrors the claim from Nowak et al. [2] that combinatorial communication requires that the number of available signals is less than the number of available meanings.

A.3 Length-3 languages

Now consider bijective languages $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2 \times \Sigma_3$ producing strings of length 3, with the alphabets Σ_i all disjoint. Now we no longer have invariance with respect to interchanging the features ℓ_1, ℓ_2, ℓ_3 : the order in which features are expressed now matters. Below, we show that languages which minimize E order these features so as to minimize the mutual information of the nonlocal features ℓ_1 and ℓ_3 .

Theorem 3. *Any length-3 language $L^* \in \mathcal{L}$ that achieves $E(L^*) = \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} E(L)$ has the form*

$$L^*(m) = \ell_1(m) \cdot \ell_2(m) \cdot \ell_3(m) \tag{32}$$

where the functions $\{\ell_i\}$ are ordered so that $\text{I}[\ell_1(M) : \ell_3(M)]$ is minimal.

Proof. Dropping irrelevant constants in the length-3 case yields

$$E \sim \text{I}[X_1 : X_2] + \text{I}[X_2 : X_3] + 2 \text{I}[X_1 : X_3 | X_2]. \tag{33}$$

This expression can be written out and then rearranged as so:

$$E \sim \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{p(X_1, X_2)}{p(X_1)p(X_2)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{p(X_2, X_3)}{p(X_2)p(X_3)} \right] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{p(X_1, X_2, X_3)p(X_2)}{p(X_1, X_2)p(X_2, X_3)} \right] \quad (34)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{p(X_1, X_2, X_3)p(X_1, X_2, X_3)p(X_2)p(X_2)}{p(X_1)p(X_2)p(X_3)p(X_1, X_2)p(X_2, X_3)} \right] \quad (35)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{p(X_1, X_2, X_3)}{p(X_1)p(X_2)p(X_3)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\ln \frac{p(X_1, X_3 | X_2)}{p(X_1 | X_2)p(X_3 | X_2)} \right] \quad (36)$$

$$= \text{TC}[X_1 : X_2 : X_3] + \text{I}[X_1 : X_3 | X_2] \quad (37)$$

$$= \underbrace{\text{TC}[X_1 : X_2 : X_3]}_{\text{Order-independent}} - \underbrace{\text{I}[X_1 : X_2 : X_3]}_{\text{Order-dependent}} + \underbrace{\text{I}[X_1 : X_3]}_{\text{Order-dependent}} \quad (38)$$

where $\text{TC}[\cdot : \cdot : \cdot]$ is total correlation [3] and $\text{I}[\cdot : \cdot : \cdot]$ is multivariate mutual information [4]. Both the TC term and the multivariate mutual information term are invariant to permutations, so the ordering of X_1, X_2, X_3 does not matter for them. The only term that depends on the order of symbols is $\text{I}[X_1 : X_3]$. Thus any candidate optimal language L may be improved by re-ordering the functions ℓ_1, ℓ_2, ℓ_3 to minimize $I[\ell_1(M) : \ell_3(M)]$. \square

Remark. The multivariate information term $\text{I}[X_1 : X_2 : X_3]$ may be positive or negative. If it is positive, the situation is called redundancy. If it is negative, the situation is called synergy. The result above shows that codes with synergy among the three symbols X_1, X_2, X_3 are dispreferred, and codes with redundancy are preferred.

B Sources over Two Features

Simulation results in the main text are based on distributions of the form

$$p(M) = p(M_1) \times p(M_2, M_3) \quad (39)$$

for varying levels of correlation between the binary random variables M_2 and M_3 . The main result is that when M_2 and M_3 have lower mutual information, a systematic code for these features minimizes predictive information, but as mutual information increases, a holistic code is more preferred. Here we complement these results with a more in-depth study of a source distribution over two features of the form $p(M) = p(M_1, M_2)$ for binary random variables M_1 and M_2 , looking at a grid of possible distributions over 4 outcomes. This comprehensive approach allows us to examine the effects of the marginal probabilities for M_1 and M_2 , as well as the effects of different *kinds* of correlations between features on the relative preference for systematic vs. holistic codes.

The main result is shown in Figure 1, which shows predictive information for all possible mappings from the four outcomes of M to strings in $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\} \times \{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}\}$. The rows indicate different marginal probabilities for $p(M_1 = 1)$, the columns indicate different marginal probabilities for $p(M_2 = 1)$, and the x axis indicates the Pearson correlation between M_1 and M_2 . The Pearson correlation is necessary to make sense of the pattern here, because there are two kinds of correlation that can induce mutual information between M_1 and M_2 : a *positive* correlation between the most probable outcomes and a *negative* correlation, as shown in Table 1. In the positive correlation case, the feature M_1 and M_2 are effectively ‘fused’—at maximal correlation, there is actually only one feature here, as we always have $M_1 = M_2$. In the negative correlation case, it is as if one of the four outcomes has been effectively removed from the probability distribution.




Figure 1: Predictive information (labelled as excess entropy) of length-2 codes for a grid over the simplex of possible sources over two binary random variables, $p(M) = p(M_1, M_2)$. Rows show the marginal probability $p(M_1 = 1)$. Columns show the marginal probability $p(M_2 = 1)$. The x axis shows the Pearson correlation between M_1 and M_2 .








Outcome	Corr. Source	Anticorr. Source	Systematic	cnot(1,2)	cnot(2,1)
00	 3/8	0	ac	ac	ac
01	 1/8	 1/4	ad	ad	bd
10	 1/8	 1/4	bc	bd	bc
11	 3/8	 1/2	ad	bc	ad

Table 1: Some possible sources and codes for the two binary random variables M_1, M_2 . The correlated source has Pearson’s $r = 1/2$. The anticorrelated source has $r = -1/3$.

There are two conclusions to be drawn from Figure 1 beyond the conclusions in the main text. First, the level of preference for systematicity in the low-correlation case depends on the marginal distributions being imbalanced: at $p(M_1) = p(M_2) = \frac{1}{2}$, even when there is zero correlation between the features, the holistic code is just as good as the systematic code. This makes sense, because for a uniform distribution over 4 outcomes, there is no reason to favor any one factorization over another. However, as the marginals become more imbalanced (moving downward or to the right in the figure), the systematic code becomes better in the low-correlation range. For these imbalanced marginals, there are generally two red lines to be seen in the figure, corresponding to the two possible classes of non-systematic codes for the source: cnot(1, 2) and cnot(2, 1), which differ in which feature is used as the control bit to flip the other one.

The second conclusion to be drawn from Figure 1 is that there is different behavior for positive and negative feature correlations when the marginals for M_1 and M_2 are both imbalanced. In particular, in the lower right corner, the systematic code is sometimes better than the holistic code when there is a negative correlation. This happens because, in the negatively correlated source, the systematic code allows the appearance of individual symbols to be correlated with the overall probability of the string: for example, in the systematic code for the negatively correlated source in Table 1, high-frequency strings always have d, and a only appears in low-frequency strings. The result is that the unigram entropy is minimized by the systematic code for such a source.

Figure 2 shows predictive information for codes as a function of mutual information between random variables M_1 and M_2 , with the negatively-correlated sources separated out and indicated with a dotted line. We see that the preference for holistic codes as a function of mutual information is weaker for the negatively-correlated sources, and also that these sources cannot achieve mutual information as high as the positively-correlated ones.

C Phonological Locality in 61 languages

Figure 3 shows the calculation of predictive information for all 61 languages in the WOLEX database, for the real languages compared against two baselines generated by applying deterministic shuffling functions to the attested forms. Table 2 shows the calculated predictive information values.

D NP Orders with Other Source Distributions

The noun phrase ordering results in the main text were derived using a source distribution over NPs estimated from the German Universal Dependencies corpus. Here we show results using other naturalistic source distributions, from corpora of Spanish (Figure 4), English (Figure 5), Czech (Figure 6), Icelandic (Figure 7), and Latin (Figure 8). We also show results using the artificial source developed by Mansfield and Kemp [5] to study NP order in Figure 9.




Figure 2: Predictive information (labelled as excess entropy) of codes for a grid over the simplex of possible sources over two binary random variables as in Figure 1, but now by mutual information instead of Pearson correlation. Dotted lines indicate codes for sources whose Pearson correlation is negative.




Figure 3: Calculation of predictive information for all 61 languages in the WOLEX database, for the attested forms (black), a deterministic shuffle that preserves manner of articulation (red), and a general deterministic shuffle (blue).

Language	Real	Manner	Shuffled
Acholi	5.64	6.17	6.39
Alekano	7.42	8.79	9.60
Amharic	5.62	6.67	7.42
Armenian	6.91	8.04	8.60
Arrernte	6.34	8.17	8.37
Ata	5.98	6.76	7.59
Ayacucho Quechua	6.49	7.23	7.82
Bargam	6.26	6.74	7.45
Benabena	6.57	8.92	9.33
Bunama	6.94	7.59	8.69
Chickasaw	8.60	10.80	11.30
Dadibi	7.43	8.43	9.15
Daga	7.99	9.70	10.60
Delaware	7.88	9.97	10.60
Dobu	6.99	7.86	8.91
Dutch	9.38	11.90	12.40
English	6.91	8.34	8.65
French	6.35	7.78	8.50
Georgian	7.52	8.83	9.38
German	8.83	11.20	11.60
Greek	8.10	10.20	10.90
Guarani	7.00	8.21	8.66
Haitian Creole	6.05	6.82	7.63
Hausa	8.35	9.21	9.83
Hebrew	5.96	6.83	7.33
Hindi	6.64	7.56	8.12
Iamalele	7.21	8.10	9.09
Iduna	8.02	9.38	10.60
Javanese	5.72	6.57	7.08
Kewa	7.22	7.92	8.82
Khmer	8.30	10.00	10.50
Lake Miwok	6.20	6.75	6.87
Lithuanian	7.24	8.54	9.00
Maisin	5.72	6.07	7.03
Mandarin Chinese	6.06	7.65	8.05
Mauwake	6.53	8.05	8.79
Mengen	4.66	4.95	5.85
Mianmin	6.80	8.01	8.83
Moroccan Arabic	6.20	6.71	6.99
Mountain Koiali	5.55	5.99	6.72
Muna	5.13	5.46	6.53
Muyuw	6.12	6.79	7.36
Polish	7.85	9.35	9.90
Romanian	7.44	8.37	8.67
Rotokas	6.49	7.49	8.41
Ryan	3.87	5.02	5.63
Sepik Mende	6.77	7.48	8.47
Siroi	5.79	6.37	7.06
Sudest	6.59	6.96	7.90
Suena	6.08	6.89	7.74
Tatar	7.96	8.82	9.39
Thompson Salish	7.49	7.87	8.38
Turkish	7.00	7.66	8.37
Waffa	6.64	7.74	8.49
Wantoat	6.63	7.69	8.17
Waris	6.55	7.39	7.98
Waskia	6.40	7.09	7.85
Woleaian	6.83	7.92	8.57
Yana	6.82	7.38	8.13
Yup'ik	6.09	6.75	7.43
Zulu	6.79	8.12	9.00

Table 2: Predictive information values (in bits) for 61 languages of the WOLEX sample, visualized in Figure 3. ‘Real’ is the predictive information of the attested wordforms. ‘Manner’ is for wordforms shuffled while preserving manner. ‘Shuffled’ is for wordforms shuffled without regard for manner.




Figure 4: Typology frequencies of NP orders by predictive information estimated using the **Spanish** UD source [6].




Figure 5: Typology frequencies of NP orders by predictive information estimated using the **English** UD source [7].




Figure 6: Typology frequencies of NP orders by predictive information estimated using the **Czech UD source** [8]. We believe the weaker correlation here is due to the rarity of determiners in the Czech corpus.




Figure 7: Typology frequencies of NP orders by predictive information estimated using the **Icelandic UD source** [9].




Figure 8: Typology frequencies of NP orders by predictive information estimated using the **Latin UD source** (based on all Latin UD corpora). As the text genre for this corpus is highly unusual (consisting of over 1000 years worth of text, much of it poetry or written by non-native speakers), we believe that the distribution of NPs in this corpus is not representative of the ‘true’ source distribution over NP meanings.




Figure 9: Typology frequencies of NP orders by predictive information estimated using the artificial **MK23 source** [5].

E Correlation of Semantic Features

In Figure 10 we present results of the study on correlation of semantic features, but using the semantic feature norms from the Glasgow Word Norms [10], which rate words for features such as dominance, valence, and arousal. Features are binarized and their frequencies and pairwise MIs are calculated as in the main text. Results are similar as to the main text: the across-morpheme and across-word features largely have lower mutual information than within-morpheme and within-word features.

F Phonotactic Results with Corpus Frequencies

Recall that our analysis of phonotactics assumed a uniform distribution over forms. This is because the phonological forms, as listed in the WOLEX database, cannot straightforwardly be matched to corpus data. However, for four languages (Dutch, English, French, German), WOLEX provides orthographic forms. Using these, we derived corpus frequencies from the full Wikipedia texts in these languages. We applied simple Laplace smoothing at $\alpha = 1$. Results closely agree with those derived under a uniform distribution.

G Further Simulations for Hierarchical Sources

G.1 Varying Coupling Parameters in Tree Structures

We created further sources by keeping the tree structure from Main Paper, Figure 2F, but varying the parameters $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in [0, 1]$ randomly subject to the constraint $4\alpha < 2\beta < \gamma$. We created 70 random samples. Results, shown in Figure 12, reproduce the pattern from Main Paper, Figure 2F.

G.2 Sources Defined by PCFGs

We constructed probabilistic context-free grammars (PCFGs) defined by 5 terminals and 5 nonterminals. For each nonterminal a , we considered the 100 possible binary productions $a \rightarrow bc$ where b, c are terminals or nonterminals. For each nonterminal, we defined a distribution over these 100 possible productions $a \rightarrow bc$ by defining

$$p(a \rightarrow bc) \propto \exp(Tp_{a \rightarrow bc}), \quad (40)$$

where $T > 0$ is an inverse temperature parameter and each $p_{a \rightarrow bc} \in [0, 1]$ is a random number. The probabilities are normalized to sum up to one for each left hand side a . The inverse temperature parameter controls the variability in the probabilities of different productions; higher values result in a sparser source.

We then enumerated all 5^6 strings at length 6 over the given nonterminals, and used the CKY algorithm to compute the probabilities of all of these strings under the given PCFG. This defines a source over all strings at length 6.

At inverse temperatures $T = 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 20$ we sampled 10 PCFGs each, and compared the predictive information of the language given by the PCFG (systematic and local), deterministic permutations of the 6 positions (systematic and nonlocal), and 360 randomly chosen shuffles of the mapping between forms and probabilities (neither local nor systematic).

Results (Figure 13) show that local orderings usually achieve lower predictive information. Nonsystematic codes have much higher predictive information, very closely concentrating around values clearly separated from the systematic codes.




Figure 10: (A) Pairwise mutual information of semantic features from the Glasgow Word Norms [10] across words and within words, for pairs of verbs and objects in Universal Dependencies English corpora. (B) Pairwise mutual information of the Glasgow Word Norms along with a number feature indicated by plural morphology. The across-word and across-morpheme features have generally lower MI than the within-word and within-morpheme features.




Figure 11: Calculation of predictive information using corpus frequencies, for the 4 languages in the WOLEX database for which orthographic forms are available in WOLEX. As in Main Paper, Figure 3A, we show the attested forms (black) and a deterministic shuffle that preserves manner of articulation (red). Results match those found with uniform distributions (Main Paper Figure 3A and SI Appendix Figure 3).



Figure 12: Results for 70 sampled combinations of coupling parameters for the tree structure in Main Paper, Figure 2F. Across samples, well-nested orderings achieve lower predictive information than non-well-nested orderings.




Figure 13: Distribution of predictive information, for 10 randomly constructed PCFG sources for length-6 strings over 5 symbols, at six different inverse temperature parameters (T in (40)). We compare the local and systematic code given the PCFG (red) with the systematic codes given by the deterministic shuffles of the six positions (green), and an equal number (360, up to reversal) of unsystematic codes given by shuffles of the mapping between forms and probabilities (blue). Local and systematic codes tend to achieve lower predictive information than other systematic codes. Unsystematic codes strongly concentrate at substantially higher predictive information.

H Predictive Information in a Finite-State Source

The following result shows that predictive information is bounded at a constant when a language puts symbols in an order that respects the correlational structure of the source distribution, when the source distribution has the form of a Hidden Markov Model. On the other hand, random orders have average predictive information that grows linearly with the sequence length.

Theorem 4. *Let $(S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a Hidden Markov Model (HMM) with finite state space \mathcal{S} and finite emission alphabet \mathcal{A} generating a bi-infinite stationary stochastic process $\dots, X_{-1}, X_0, X_1, \dots$. Let $L \in \mathbb{N}$, and consider the length- L language given by $X_1 \dots X_L$.*

1. *The predictive information is bounded independently of the sequence length L :*

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{I}[X_{1\dots i} : X_{i+1\dots L}] = O(1) \quad (41)$$

where $O(1)$ contains constants depending on the HMM but not L .

2. *Assume the process contains predictive information beyond its ergodic components, in the sense that:*

$$\inf_{\Delta > 0} \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{\dots w - \Delta}] < \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{\dots, w-2, w-1}] \quad (42)$$

Consider the uniform distribution over bijections $\rho : [1, \dots, L] \rightarrow [1, \dots, L]$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}_\rho \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{I}[X_{\rho(1\dots i)} : X_{\rho(i+1\dots L)}] \right] = \Theta(L) \quad (43)$$

where the expectation describes an average over all bijections ρ , and constants in $\Theta(L)$ depend on the HMM but not L .

In fact the second statement does not specifically assume that the process is generated by an HMM; it holds for any bi-infinite stationary process. The intuition is that for any process with local statistical structure, beyond its ergodic components, permutations of the positions will tend to disrupt this local structure and create long-range dependencies.

Proof. For the first claim, let $s_i \in \mathcal{S}$ be the state of the HMM after generating $\dots X_{i-2} X_{i-1} X_i$. Note that s_i is a random variable with $\mathbb{H}[s_i] \leq \log |\mathcal{S}|$. Further, $\mathbb{I}[X_{1\dots i} : X_{i+1\dots L} | s_i] = 0$. Hence, by the Data Processing Inequality, $\mathbb{I}[X_{1\dots i} : X_{i+1\dots L}] \leq \mathbb{H}[s_i] \leq \log |\mathcal{S}| = O(1)$ independently of L .

For the second claim, the expectation is evidently $O(L)$, we need to show it is $\Omega(L)$. Define $A = \rho(1 \dots i)$, $B = \rho(i+1 \dots L)$. The proof idea is to focus attention on positions w where $w \in A$ but a contiguous sequence of positions to its left is in B . Such situations create opportunity for X_B

to provide predictive information about X_A . Formally, for any $\Delta > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}[X_A : X_B]] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{w \in A} \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{j \in B} | X_{j < w, j \in A}] \right] \\
&= \sum_{w=1}^L \mathbb{E} [1_{w \in A} \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{j \in B} | X_{j < w, j \in A}]] \\
&\geq \sum_{w=1}^L \mathbb{E} [1_{w \in A} 1_{[w-\Delta, w-1] \cap A = \emptyset} \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{j \in B} | X_{j < w, j \in A}]] \\
&\geq \sum_{w=1}^L \mathbb{E} [1_{w \in A} 1_{[w-\Delta, w-1] \cap A = \emptyset} \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{[w-\Delta, w-1]} | X_{j < w, j \in A}]] \\
&= \sum_{w=1}^L \mathbb{E} [1_{w \in A} 1_{[w-\Delta, w-1] \cap A = \emptyset} \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{[w-\Delta, w-1]} | X_{j < w-\Delta, j \in A}]] \\
&= \sum_{w=1}^L p_\rho(w \in A; [w-\Delta, w-1] \cap A = \emptyset) \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{[w-\Delta, w-1]} | X_{j < w-\Delta, j \in A}] | w \in A, 1_{[w-\Delta, w-1] \cap A = \emptyset}]
\end{aligned}$$

We now need to show that, for large Δ ,

$$\mathbb{I}[X_i : X_{[w-\Delta, w-1]} | X_{j < w-\Delta, j \in A}] \quad (44)$$

is bounded away from 0 uniformly over A . Consider¹

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{[w-\Delta, w-1]} | X_{j < w-\Delta, j \in A}] \\
&= \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{[w-\Delta, w-1]}] - \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{j < w-\Delta, j \in A}] + \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{j < w-\Delta, j \in A} | X_{[w-\Delta, w-1]}] \\
&\geq \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{[w-\Delta, w-1]}] - \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{j < w-\Delta, j \in A}] \\
&\geq \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{[w-\Delta, w-1]}] - \mathbb{I}[X_w : X_{j < w-\Delta}]
\end{aligned}$$

When $\Delta \rightarrow \infty$, the first term converges to $\mathbb{I}[X_w | X_{\dots w-2, w-1}]$. By assumption, the difference between this and the second term is strictly greater than zero. Overall, this shows (44) is bounded strictly away from zero independently of A , for some sufficiently large Δ which we henceforth fix for the given HMM, independently of L . It remains to understand why, assuming $|A|$ and $|B|$ are sufficiently large, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}[X_A : X_B]]$ is $\Omega(L)$. Given the Δ we have fixed,

$$p_\rho(w \in A; [w-\Delta, w-1] \cap A = \emptyset) \geq D > 0 \quad (45)$$

for a constant D independent of w , for L sufficiently large, when $0.1L < |A| < 0.9L$. Taken together,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}[X_A : X_B]] \geq L \cdot D \cdot C = \Omega(L) \quad (46)$$

¹Reflecting the general identity

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{I}[A : B | C] &= H[A | C] - H[A | C, B] \\
&= H[A] - H[A | B] - H[A] + H[A | C] + H[A | B] - H[A | B, C] \\
&= \mathbb{I}[A : B] - \mathbb{I}[A : C] + \mathbb{I}[A : C | B]
\end{aligned}$$

when $0.1L < |A| < 0.9L$. The claim follows. □

We note that one can strengthen the proof to provide a high-probability bound, showing that *most* permutations ρ satisfy such linear scaling. The reason is that a random permutation, when $|A|$ and $|B|$ are both large, is very likely to satisfy the event described in (45) on a constant fraction of positions w .

References

- [1] James P Crutchfield and David P Feldman. Regularities unseen, randomness observed: Levels of entropy convergence. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 13(1):25–54, 2003.
- [2] Martin A. Nowak, Joshua B. Plotkin, and Vincent A. A. Jansen. The evolution of syntactic communication. *Nature*, 404(6777):495–498, 2000.
- [3] Satosi Watanabe. Information theoretical analysis of multivariate correlation. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 4(1):66–82, 1960.
- [4] William J. McGill. Multivariate information transmission. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 4(4):93–111, 1955.
- [5] John Mansfield and Charles Kemp. The emergence of grammatical structure from inter-predictability. *PsyArXiv*, 2023.
- [6] M. Antònia Martí Mariona Taulé and Marta Recasens. AnCora: Multilevel annotated corpora for Catalan and Spanish. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Khalid Choukri, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Jan Odijk, Stelios Piperidis, and Daniel Tapias, editors, *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’08)*, Marrakech, Morocco, may 2008. European Language Resources Association (ELRA). ISBN 2-9517408-4-0. <http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2008/>.
- [7] Amir Zeldes. The GUM Corpus: Creating multilayer resources in the classroom. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 51(3):581–612, 2017. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10579-016-9343-x>.
- [8] Barbora Hladká, Jan Hajic, Jirka Hana, Jaroslava Hlaváčová, Jirí Mírovský, and Jan Raab. The Czech academic corpus 2.0 guide. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics*, 89:41, 2008.
- [9] Þórunn Arnardóttir, Hinrik Hafsteinsson, Einar Freyr Sigurðsson, Kristín Bjarnadóttir, Anton Karl Ingason, Hildur Jónsdóttir, and Steinþór Steingrímsson. A Universal Dependencies conversion pipeline for a Penn-format constituency treebank. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Universal Dependencies (UDW 2020)*, pages 16–25, Barcelona, Spain (Online), December 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.udw-1.3>.
- [10] Graham G Scott, Anne Keitel, Marc Becirspahic, Patrick J O’Donnell, and Sara C Sereno. The Glasgow Norms: Ratings of 5,500 words on 9 scales. 2017.