

---

# THE VECTOR GROUNDING PROBLEM

---

**Dimitri Coelho Mollo**

Department of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies  
Umeå University  
dimitri.mollo@umu.se

**Raphaël Millière**

Philosophy Department  
Center for Science and Society  
Columbia University  
raphael.milliere@columbia.edu

## ABSTRACT

The remarkable performance of large language models (LLMs) on complex linguistic tasks has sparked a lively debate on the nature of their capabilities. Unlike humans, these models learn language exclusively from textual data, without direct interaction with the real world. Nevertheless, they can generate seemingly meaningful text about a wide range of topics. This impressive accomplishment has rekindled interest in the classical ‘Symbol Grounding Problem,’ which questioned whether the internal representations and outputs of classical symbolic AI systems could possess intrinsic meaning. Unlike these systems, modern LLMs are artificial neural networks that compute over vectors rather than symbols. However, an analogous problem arises for such systems, which we dub the Vector Grounding Problem. This paper has two primary objectives. First, we differentiate various ways in which internal representations can be grounded in biological or artificial systems, identifying five distinct notions discussed in the literature: referential, sensorimotor, relational, communicative, and epistemic grounding. Unfortunately, these notions of grounding are often conflated. We clarify the differences between them, and argue that referential grounding is the one that lies at the heart of the Vector Grounding Problem. Second, drawing on theories of representational content in philosophy and cognitive science, we propose that certain LLMs, particularly those fine-tuned with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF), possess the necessary features to overcome the Vector Grounding Problem, as they stand in the requisite causal-historical relations to the world that underpin intrinsic meaning. We also argue that, perhaps unexpectedly, multimodality and embodiment are neither necessary nor sufficient conditions for referential grounding in artificial systems.

## 1. Introduction

Over the past decade, the field of artificial intelligence has witnessed remarkable advancements, largely attributable to the emergence and maturation of deep learning techniques (LeCun et al. 2015, Buckner 2019). Several factors contributed to this progress. The exponential increase in computational power has facilitated the development and training of larger artificial neural networks

on specialised hardware. Additionally, the availability of extensive textual and audiovisual datasets, primarily sourced from the internet, has enabled the application of deep learning methods to a wide array of tasks. One notable development within the domain of natural language processing has been the creation of massive neural networks trained on an abundance of linguistic data, known as Large Language Models (LLMs).<sup>1</sup>

LLMs such as BERT (Devlin et al. 2018), GPT-3 (Brown et al. 2020), and PaLM (Chowdhery et al. 2022) are built upon the Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al. 2017), which features a mechanism—self-attention—specifically designed to model long-range dependencies between linguistic elements across extensive text sequences. Transformer-based LLMs have showcased remarkable capabilities, such as generating coherent and contextually relevant texts spanning a diverse range of subjects, from current events to philosophical essays; answering commonsense questions; explaining novel jokes; and consistently demonstrating near-human, human, or even super-human performance across numerous linguistic tasks (Kiela et al. 2021, Bubeck et al. 2023). This progress has also laid the foundation for vision-language models (VLMs), such as DALL-E 2 (Ramesh et al. 2022), Flamingo (Alayrac et al. 2022), and GPT-4 (OpenAI 2023), which are trained on images in addition to text.

The exceptional performance of LLMs on sophisticated linguistic tasks, which were once considered strong indicators of human-like intelligence, raises intriguing questions regarding the nature of language processing, language understanding, and linguistic acts such as writing or speaking. These questions encompass broad and complex issues, and efforts to address them are still in their infancy. In this paper, we aim to make modest progress toward understanding the capabilities of LLMs and interpreting their outputs. Specifically, we will revisit the so-called ‘Symbol Grounding Problem’, which engaged philosophers and natural language processing researchers during an earlier wave of AI research, and explore its implications for contemporary approaches to artificial language modelling. The core issue can be summarised as follows: if AI systems are merely designed to process linguistic inputs, how can their outputs be grounded in a world with which they have no direct interaction? How can those outputs possess any meaning beyond the interpretations that we, as intelligent beings embedded in the world, may project onto them?

We will show that a similar conundrum arises for LLMs. Since these systems do not compute over symbols, but over vectors and matrices instead, the problem assumes a slightly different form. We call this the Vector Grounding Problem. After outlining this new version of the classical problem and acknowledging its difficulty, we will suggest that there are grounds for optimism, especially in light of recent advancements in the field, such as the use of Reinforcement Learning through Human Feedback (RLHF), and the emergence of in-context learning. We will argue that the Vector Grounding Problem for LLMs is far from insurmountable today, as those novel features of current models allow them to stand in relations to the world that are sufficient to ground their representations and outputs. One surprising implication of our argument is that multimodality and embodiment are neither necessary nor sufficient to escape the Vector Grounding Problem. Indeed, LLMs trained on text only may achieve the relevant form of grounding, while VLMs trained on images in addition to text might not (at least not without meeting additional requirements).

Importantly, this paper does not address whether LLMs or VLMs understand language (or anything at all), engage in linguistic acts, or possess cognitive or mental properties. We do not claim that these models ‘know’ what they mean, or even what meaning is, nor that they have any conception of truth or falsity. Our sole contention is that the problem of grounding internal states in the world is solvable for LLMs and related models. While having grounded internal states may be a crucial step

---

<sup>1</sup>The term ‘model’ can be somewhat misleading, as these systems are often not scientific models created for representing or explaining phenomena; rather, they are engineered systems with practical applications, frequently becoming the subject of scientific investigation themselves.

toward understanding, agency, knowledge, and various other cognitive and mental capacities, it is improbable that they are, by themselves, sufficient for those capacities. This clarification is especially important as the current debate occasionally blurs these distinctions—a conflation we strive to avoid in this paper.

With these caveats in mind, we will proceed as follows. In [section 2](#), we briefly introduce two main approaches to artificial intelligence—classical (or symbolic) and connectionist AI—and introduce the Symbol Grounding Problem in the context of the former. In [section 3](#), we present in more detail the family of connectionist systems to which LLMs and VLMs belong—Large Pre-Trained Models—and reveal that a similar grounding issue arises for them: the Vector Grounding Problem. We differentiate between various senses of grounding and show that referential grounding is the one essential to the Vector Grounding Problem in [section 4](#). Finally, in [section 5](#), we argue that at least some LLMs and related multimodal models possess the necessary elements for being grounded in the world.

## 2. Classical and Connectionist Approaches to AI

Since its inception, research on artificial intelligence has been divided between two main paradigms. The classical or symbolic paradigm focuses on designing systems that represent and manipulate information using discrete symbols (such as words, numbers, and logical expressions). Classical AI systems manipulate symbols based on explicit rules or procedures that are also represented symbolically. Symbolic manipulation is purely syntactic; it is based on the shapes of symbols and the way in which they can be combined into complex symbolic structures ([Simon & Newell 1971](#)).

SHRDLU, developed by Terry Winograd at MIT in 1968, is a canonical example of a symbolic system designed for natural language understanding ([Winograd 1971](#)). The system could parse simple English instructions and questions about a basic virtual environment called the ‘blocks world’. The blocks world contained virtual objects, such as blocks, cones, and balls. SHRDLU could respond to user commands in natural language to move these virtual objects and describe the state of the blocks world. In this system, the meaning of linguistic symbols such as ‘move’, ‘red’ and ‘block’ is programmatically determined to correspond to features of virtual objects and actions in the blocks world. Various hand-coded rules are provided for the system to respond appropriately to user input. These include parsing rules to interpret the syntactic structure of the input (e.g., “Pick up a big red block”), inference rules to infer new or implicit facts (e.g., inferring the location of a block after it has been moved), and action rules specifying changes to the world state in response to commands (e.g., rules for changing block positions after determining that a move was possible based on the parsing and inference rules). SHRDLU’s code also includes explicit axioms used to constrain possible interpretations of sentences by ruling out certain meanings that would violate these axioms. For example, an axiom specifies that no two blocks can be in the same place at the same time, to rule out interpretations of sentences that would require two blocks to be in the same location. Axioms like these encode background knowledge and constraints on what is possible in the blocks world.

By contrast, the connectionist paradigm centres around Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) ([McClelland et al. 1986](#)). ANNs do not represent information through symbols and explicit rules. Instead, they are composed of interconnected nodes (or ‘neurons’) that collectively encode and process information in a distributed way. In addition, they are ‘trained’ using data relevant to the task they are designed to perform, which often involves classification or prediction. During the training process, the network’s parameters (i.e., the numerical values, or weights, of each node-to-node connection) are gradually and automatically adjusted until the ANN succeeds in the task, typically by means of capturing statistical patterns in the training data. Connectionist systems are thus data-driven and bottom-up:

their behaviour emerges from processing signals across weighted connections, rather than by being explicitly programmed with symbolic rules.

From the 1980s on, increased computing power enabled the development of ANNs with increasingly larger number of nodes, organised in several layers, and endowed with non-linear activation functions (LeCun et al. 2015). Larger numbers of nodes and layers allow ANNs to transform the inputs they receive in increasingly abstract ways, and the backpropagation learning algorithm makes it possible for such larger ANNs to be efficiently trained on data with known classifications (Rumelhart et al. 1986). These innovations allowed ANNs to achieve significantly better performance than earlier ones, especially in complex, non-linear real-world problems like computer vision and speech recognition.

In a classical system like SHRDLU, representations and computations are easily interpretable, because rules and symbols have an explicitly programmed interpretation. In contrast, the internal workings of a sufficiently large trained ANN are like a ‘black box’ that maps inputs to outputs. The mechanisms by which this mapping occurs are extremely difficult for humans to understand. There are no simple symbolic interpretations of the patterns of activation over nodes, and no explicit rules or procedures that can be inspected to shed light on how the network functions. While ANNs are able to discover complex patterns and generalise beyond specific examples, their black box nature makes the nature of their internal representations opaque (Castelvecchi 2016).

## 2.1. The Symbol Grounding Problem

The Symbol Grounding Problem, as identified by Harnad (1990), is the problem of how artificial intelligence systems can come to have internal representations and outputs that possess intrinsic meaning—that is to say, that are meaningful in themselves, independently of the interpretation of those representations and outputs by external agents, such as humans. It is common to take Harnad’s Symbol Grounding Problem as an elaboration of an earlier, highly influential criticism of AI: Searle’s 1980 (in)famous Chinese Room thought experiment.<sup>2</sup>

There are important differences, however, between the Symbol Grounding Problem and Searle’s points. First, Searle is concerned with the elusive notion of understanding, which he leaves unexplained. Harnad, on the other hand, is interested in how symbols internal to AI systems can be meaningful, regardless of whether the system itself is capable of understanding (whatever that ends up consisting in). Searle’s criticism, moreover, is targeted at both symbolic and connectionist approaches to AI, while Harnad’s Symbol Grounding Problem is more constrained, aiming only at symbolic AI. Finally, Searle uses the Chinese Room thought experiment to cast doubt on the possibility of strong, or real artificial intelligence in general. Harnad is hopeful that the Symbol Grounding Problem is solvable, and indeed suggests a solution, which involves hybridising symbolic and connectionist AI (see subsection 4.6). For these reasons, we will leave aside Searle’s Chinese Room thought experiment, on which, incidentally, probably too much ink has already been spilled.

Harnad (1990) provides a simple and powerful intuition pump to motivate the existence of a Symbol Grounding Problem in classical, symbolic AI: the Chinese Dictionary. Take a system, be it biological or artificial, which knows no natural language. Suppose that we want it to learn Chinese (or any other language), but the only resource we have available to provide the system is a single language dictionary, say a comprehensive Chinese-Chinese dictionary. Will the system be able to learn Chinese just by using the dictionary? The thought experiment invites the intuition that the system would not be able to do so. After all, the most it can do is to look up strings of symbols and see what other strings of symbols follow them. The former would be the words to be defined, the latter their definitions. However, for the system they are just meaningless shapes followed by other shapes, and it

<sup>2</sup>Harnad (1990) himself followed this line.

seems intuitively hopeless that the meaning of words (parts of those strings of symbols) could be learned in this way. What seems to be missing is a way out from the symbolic ‘merry-go-round’: to connect those symbols in the dictionary to what they pick out in the world. But how can that be possible if the system has no access to the world, but only to further symbols?

Symbolic AI systems, according to Harnad, find themselves in this predicament. All they have access to are strings of symbols and how they follow each other. There seems to be no way for connections between such symbols and the world to be established, and thus no way for the symbols to have intrinsic meaning. They are just strings of computationally-relevant shapes, deprived from any meaning in themselves, insofar as the system itself has no way to learn what it is that they pick out in the world. Humans, who do have representations arguably acquired by means of engagement with the world, are, on the other hand, able to interpret those symbolic representations and outputs as meaningful. The meaning of the representations is hence extrinsic, depending on human interpreters. Take out the interpreter, and no meaning is to be found.

In brief, symbolic AI systems, the argument goes, manipulate symbols that are not connected to the world, that are not grounded in the world; and thereby have no intrinsic meaning. Classical AI systems, in other words, suffer from the Symbol Grounding Problem.

### 3. Large Pre-Trained Models

Connectionist models have come a long way since the 1980s. The increasing availability of large datasets and more powerful computers enabled the development of deep neural networks (DNNs), characterised by having a very large number of layers between input and output. Early DNNs were typically task-specific architectures, designed and trained separately for individual problems like image classification or speech recognition. In the 2010s, researchers began investigating more general-purpose deep network architectures that could be pre-trained on large datasets, then fine-tuned for new tasks (LeCun et al. 2015, Radford et al. 2018).

Research on DNNs recently converged on a unified approach to many problems that previously required dedicated solutions: training large models on a vast amount of data to perform a broad range of tasks they have not been explicitly designed for. The suggestive phrase ‘Foundation Models’ was coined to capture the significance of this trend (Bommasani et al. 2022), although we will prefer the more neutral label ‘Large Pre-Trained Models’. These models share a few key characteristics. They are trained through self-supervision, that is, without relying on manually labelled data; they are relatively adaptable to novel tasks without requiring task-specific fine-tuning; and, finally, scaling up their size (parameter count) and training data has generally proven to be a very effective way to improve their capabilities.

Almost all Large Pre-Trained Models are powered by the Transformer architecture, first introduced by Vaswani et al. (2017). Transformers use an attention mechanism to model global dependencies between sequential elements in the input, such as sentences in natural language. The general inductive biases supplied by this mechanism make Transformers suitable for many domains, including natural language processing and computer vision.

Some Large Pre-Trained Models, called *Large Language Models* (LLMs), are trained exclusively on text. LLMs like GPT-3 and PaLM have over  $10^{11}$  parameters and are trained on massive corpora spanning hundred of billions of words, containing a significant subset of all written text on the internet (e.g., millions of web pages, hundreds of thousands of books, and all of English Wikipedia). After training, LLMs can generate well-written and coherent paragraphs about virtually any topic. Furthermore, given explicit instructions in natural language in the input sequence, or ‘prompts’, they

can perform a broad range of tasks, including: summarising long-form content, translating between multiple languages, answering complex questions, engaging in commonsense reasoning, solving simple logic and maths problems, generating code for simple programs, or explaining jokes.

LLMs learn distributed representations of words conditioned on the contexts in which they appear in the training data. More specifically, these models process input text into a sequence of tokens (i.e., full words, word-parts such as ‘-ing’, punctuation marks, and other linguistic symbols). LLMs encode each token as a vector of real-valued numbers in a high-dimensional vector space, and estimate the probabilities of all possible next tokens in the sequence based on the previous context vectors. The resulting prediction of the next token in the sequence is then compared to the actual next token, and the model’s parameters are subsequently updated to make the correct token more probable in that context, and other tokens less probable. This encourages the model to learn representations of tokens conditioned on the contexts in which they tend to occur, with semantically similar tokens having vectors that are close together in the high-dimensional space.

There is a deep connection between the way in which LLMs learn contextual representations from linguistic corpora, and the old idea from structural linguistics according to which word meaning can be inferred from the contexts in which they appear, known as the ‘distributional hypothesis’ (Harris 1954, Firth 1957). In LLMs, semantic similarity is determined based on distribution across contexts: tokens that appear in similar contexts are modelled by nearby vectors. The dimensions of the vectors are tuned by the model to best predict surrounding tokens, and capture distributional patterns. Though the individual dimensions are not typically interpretable, the positions of vectors in the space are a result of statistical patterns in the linguistic data, and reflect semantic similarities in light of how the words are used in context. In this way, vector representations of tokens in LLMs are not arbitrary or conventional—as the symbols in classical AI systems typically are—since they are shaped by statistical patterns in language.

It is worth noting that not all Large Pre-Trained Models are trained exclusively on linguistic data. *Vision-language models* (VLMs) are trained on images (or videos) in addition to text, allowing them to perform a wide range of tasks that involve exploiting relationships between visual and linguistic information (Radford et al. 2021). For example, VLMs can caption images with natural language descriptions, answer questions about their content, and generate novel images based on text prompts (Ramesh et al. 2022, Alayrac et al. 2022, OpenAI 2023). To do so, VLMs encode text and images as vector representations in a single high-dimensional space. They can be trained on a large corpus of image-caption pairs, where the goal is to predict if a given image-text pair comes from the training data or not. This leads the VLM to learn vector representations of images and text which reflect their semantic relationships, such that images and captions with related content are encoded as nearby vectors in high-dimensional space. Thus, like LLMs, VLMs learn contextual representations that leverage distributional semantics, albeit across modalities: semantically similar images and pieces of text have similar representations because they tend to co-occur in the training data (Chen et al. 2020).

### 3.1. The Vector Grounding Problem

As discussed in section 2, there are fundamental differences between the symbolic approach to AI targeted by Harnad’s Symbol Grounding Problem and the connectionist approach underlying Large Pre-Trained Models. Despite these differences, a challenge analogous to the Symbol Grounding Problem can be posed for connectionist systems. Instead of symbols, these systems employ vectors as units of representation and computation. LLMs are trained exclusively on vast amounts of text, which are translated into vectors representing each text token. This ‘translation’ is achieved through self-supervised learning with minimal hand-coding. Starting from these initial vectors and adjusting

connection weights (or parameters) during training, LLMs’ internal processing generates new vectors that ultimately inform the system’s output, i.e., the probability of each token being the next in the given sequence.

LLMs appear to face a similar predicament to that of traditional symbolic AI systems (*pace* [Harnad \(1990\)](#), see 4.6). They rely on vectors as numerical proxies for statistical relationships between tokens. This reliance on continuous vectors, rather than discrete symbols, seems to make no difference when it comes to escaping the merry-go-round of representations and being connected to the external world—LLMs are trapped in a carousel of numbers, rather than symbols. Much like their classical counterparts, LLMs manipulate vectors that do not seem grounded in the world and thus lack intrinsic meaning. Consequently, they grapple with an analogous difficulty, which we term the *Vector Grounding Problem*.

[Bender & Koller \(2020\)](#) propose a thought-provoking thought experiment, the “Octopus Test”, to pump intuitions about the inescapability of the Vector Grounding Problem for LLMs.

**The Octopus Test.** Two English-speaking castaways find themselves stranded on neighbouring islands, separated by treacherous waters. Fortuitously, they discover telegraphs left by previous inhabitants, connected via an underwater cable, which enables them to communicate by exchanging telegraphic messages. Unbeknownst to them, a superintelligent octopus inhabits these waters and taps into the underwater cable, intercepting their messages. Though the octopus lacks any knowledge of English, its superintelligence allows it to detect statistical patterns in the telegraphic messages and to form an accurate representation of the statistical relationships between various telegraphic signals. The octopus decides to sever the underwater cable and position itself at the ends of the two resulting cable segments, receiving and replying to telegraphic signals from both castaways based on the statistical patterns it has identified. Whether or not the castaways notice this change, the messages sent by the octopus intuitively seem to hold no intrinsic meaning. After all, the octopus simply adheres to the statistical patterns it has learned from listening in on the previous exchanges between the humans, without any understanding of the human interpretation of the signals, such as ‘coconut’ or ‘tree’. Furthermore, the octopus likely does not comprehend that the signals possess meaning or serve a communicative function.<sup>3</sup>

As should be clear, the octopus in this thought experiment is operating roughly as an extremely powerful LLM would. Regardless of how the octopus represents the signals and their statistical relations, be it through vectors or another means, it only has access to the signals and their statistical relations—without any connection to the entities and properties in the real world that the words encoded in those signals represent. Consequently, even if the octopus can produce outputs that appear sensible to humans in all situations, these outputs lack intrinsic meaning, as the octopus does not and cannot assign meaning to them.<sup>4</sup> The Octopus Test implies that LLMs generate outputs as devoid

---

<sup>3</sup>[Bender & Koller \(2020\)](#) emphasise the fact that the octopus lacks communicative intent when generating telegraphic signals. Since our focus here is in the narrower, more basic question of vector grounding, rather than on the more complex capacities related to language comprehension and communication, we will set those considerations aside for now.

<sup>4</sup>Our version of the Octopus Test goes beyond [Bender & Koller \(2020\)](#) by assuming that it is possible the humans would never notice they were no longer communicating with each other. In contrast, [Bender & Koller \(2020\)](#) contends that the octopus would fail to produce appropriate outputs to questions involving concrete objects it has never perceived, such as ‘how do I build a coconut catapult?’. This claim seems to be challenged by the often plausible replies that current LLMs provide to this sort of question. All the more so, we should expect the superintelligent octopus to generate even more reliably plausible responses.

of intrinsic meaning as those produced by the superintelligent octopus.<sup>5</sup> It is humans, whether castaways or otherwise, who interpret these outputs as meaningful because they resemble meaningful words and sentences. LLMs have no access to coconuts, trees, or anything else beyond language. The vectors they receive and manipulate during internal processing are merely meaningless arrays of numbers, ungrounded in anything outside statistical patterns in language, just like the outputs they generate. In other words, the Octopus Test primes the intuition that all meaning in the outputs produced by LLMs lies in the eye of the beholder, their human interpreters. This would be so, we might add, because LLMs are susceptible to the Vector Grounding problem.

Throughout the remainder of this paper, we will challenge this claim and counter the intuition primed by the Octopus Test. We aim to show that, contrary to first appearances, LLMs and other Large Pre-Trained Models, such as VLMs, possess the relevant features to generate meaningful outputs based on meaningful internal representations.

However, before delving into this argument, a more thorough examination of the concept of grounding is necessary.

## 4. Five notions of Grounding

The notion of grounding appears quite frequently in philosophy, cognitive science, and artificial intelligence research. In philosophy, it plays a central role in many discussions on metaphysics (Fine 2012). However, our focus will be on the notion of grounding that directly pertains to the question of whether the internal representations and outputs of LLMs possess intrinsic meaning, enabling them to represent things in the world independently of human interpretation. This understanding of the term is most prevalent in cognitive science and artificial intelligence. Various notions of grounding have been invoked by cognitive scientists and AI researchers as central to establishing meaning, occasionally leading to confusion. In this section, we endeavour to bring clarity to this debate by identifying five primary notions of grounding at play in discussions about intrinsic meaning in cognitive systems, both biological and artificial (Figure 1).

Furthermore, we contend that only one of these five notions of grounding is crucial for addressing the Vector Grounding Problem. If LLMs possess features that enable them to adhere to the criteria for this particular type of grounding, they become candidates for having representations and outputs with intrinsic meaning. With this in mind, let us examine each distinct notion of grounding in turn.

### 4.1. Referential Grounding

The first notion of grounding, which we may call *referential grounding*, closely aligns with the philosophical notion of reference.<sup>6</sup> It is the type of grounding that connects representations to things in the world. Reference can be loosely described as a relation that enables representations to ‘hook onto’ worldly entities or properties.<sup>7</sup> For example, the word ‘Paris’ refers to the city of Paris, and

---

<sup>5</sup>Arguably, LLMs’ outputs might be even more devoid of intrinsic meaning than the octopus’, given that the latter is a biological organism with motivation, superintelligence, and other features that LLMs lack. Similar considerations apply to the comparison between LLMs and parrots (Bender et al. 2021). In the case of these animals, even if their outputs carry some meaning, they typically do not align with the meaning of the language they produce.

<sup>6</sup>Partee (1981) uses the phrase “language-to-world grounding” to designate a closely related notion, which she contrasts with “language-to-language grounding” (see subsection 4.3 below for a discussion of the latter). While Partee’s notion of language-to-world grounding focuses on what ties down the intensions of linguistic expressions with respect to their extralinguistic content, our notion of referential grounding is broader, to include the relation between mental representations and their worldly referents.

<sup>7</sup>Much philosophical work has been dedicated to examining the nature and varieties of reference, particularly for various aspects of linguistic discourse, such as proper names, indexicals, and abstract concepts. Reference is also normally taken to




Figure 1 | Five notions of grounding. A. *Referential grounding*: a lexical representation (<DOG>) is connected to its worldly referent (a dog). B. *Sensorimotor grounding*: a lexical representation (<DOG>) is connected to a sensory representation (image of a dog). C. *Relational grounding*: a lexical representation (<DOG>) is connected to other lexical representations (<PET>, <FURRY>). D. *Communicative grounding*: Two speakers calibrate their interpretation of an exchange to make use of the same lexical concept (<DOG>). E. *Epistemic grounding*: A lexical representation (<DOG>) is connected to information stored in a knowledge base (about dog facts).

arguably, so does a map of Paris. Both representations allow us to receive and convey information about the actual city of Paris. Similarly, many of our thoughts seem to hook onto specific entities and properties in the world, allowing us to entertain thoughts that refer to Paris, such as beliefs about it being the capital of France or desires to visit the city.

Referential grounding, as we use the term, is whatever makes it so that representations, whether public (e.g., words and maps) or internal (e.g., beliefs and subpersonal states), hook onto the world. It is plausible that different kinds of representation require different means for hooking onto the world in the relevant sense, that is, to be referentially grounded in specific worldly entities and properties.

## 4.2. Sensorimotor Grounding

Another type of grounding that is often appealed to, especially in cognitive psychology, is what we call *sensorimotor grounding*. For an internal representation, such as a lexical concept, to be grounded in this sense is for it to be fundamentally linked to sensorimotor representations available within a cognitive system. For instance, the lexical concept 'football' is sensorimotorically grounded if its representation in a cognitive system can be reduced to or is intrinsically connected to sensorimotor representations of kicking movements, of the visual perception of a football pitch, of the auditory perception of the sound of a ball being kicked, etc. This kind of grounding plays a prominent role in theories in cognitive psychology that embrace a moderate form of embodied cognition, such as those positing the existence of “perceptual symbol systems” in human cognition (Barsalou 1999, Pulvermüller 1999).

be very precise: a term refers unambiguously (although there is an ongoing debate about the reference of vague expressions). For our limited purposes, however, the intuitive notion captured by this ‘hooking’ metaphor will suffice.

Interestingly, sensorimotor grounding is also the solution proposed by [Harnad \(1990\)](#) to his Symbol Grounding Problem. He argued that the symbols in classical AI systems needed to be grounded in two types of representation: (a) iconic representations, which depict transformations of the projections of object 'shapes' on a system's sensory surfaces; and (b) categorical representations, which represent invariant sensory features that facilitate the identification and discrimination of objects in different categories. Harnad hypothesised that connectionist approaches to AI would be better equipped to provide the necessary iconic and categorical representations, which could then complement symbolic AI systems and result in hybrid symbolic-connectionist systems.

We will come back to Harnad's suggestion in [subsection 4.6](#), arguing that it fails to solve the Symbol Grounding Problem, and does not help with the Vector Grounding Problem either.

### 4.3. Relational Grounding

A third notion of grounding, that we may call *relational grounding*, is occasionally used to refer specifically to intralinguistic relationships, in accordance with the idea that a word's meaning in a language is partly determined by its relations to other words.<sup>8</sup> Thus, [Partee \(1981\)](#) introduces the notion of "language-to-language grounding", referring to the way in which a language learner acquires knowledge about the meanings of words by learning semantic connections between words in the language. According to Partee, one key way in which this happens is through accepting certain sentences as true, particularly those that are regarded as impervious to empirical challenge within the linguistic community. For example, learning that "bachelors are unmarried males" helps ground the meaning of 'bachelor' in terms of its relation to 'unmarried' and 'male'. More generally, semantic relations like synonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, and the like can help ground a word's meaning by relating it to the meanings of other words.<sup>9</sup>

Partee's analysis of language-to-language grounding focuses on the kinds of logical and conceptual relations between word meanings that can be expressed by meaning postulates or lexical decomposition. Meaning postulates are metalinguistic statements that explicitly specify analytic relations between words or expressions (such as "For every  $x$ , if  $x$  is red then  $x$  is coloured") ([Carnap 1952](#)). By contrast, lexical decomposition is a method of representing word meaning by breaking it down into smaller units of meaning. For example, [Katz \(1972\)](#) argues that word meanings are composed of semantic markers, which are labels that express certain semantic or conceptual content (e.g., 'dog' can be decomposed into [+ANIMATE], [+MAMMAL], and [+CANINE]). Likewise, [Jackendoff \(1990\)](#) proposes to decompose the meaning of linguistic expressions into conceptual primitives. These approaches converge in the assumption that meaning can be at least partly grounded in relations among words or expressions in a language.

Relational grounding is also closely related to inferential role semantics ([Block 1986](#), [Brandom 1994](#)). Inferential role semantics identifies the meaning of a linguistic expression with its inferential relations to other expressions. While lexical decomposition focuses on conceptual structures, inferential role semantics focuses more broadly on the role played by words in inferences. For example, the word 'and' plays a logical role in reasoning that determines when compound statements are true or false based on the truth or falsity of their components. Likewise, words like 'larger' or 'slower' have inferential roles in comparisons, allowing us to determine comparisons between items or the relative

---

<sup>8</sup>The label is somewhat under-descriptive, since all forms of grounding are relational, though in different ways. What we wish to underline, however, is that on this sense of grounding the meaning of representations is dependent on the relations they stand in to other representations in the same representational system.

<sup>9</sup>Partee contrasts language-to-language grounding with language-to-world grounding, referring to the idea that word meanings must also be tied to the external world, and not just to other words (i.e., what we called *referential grounding* above).

properties of a single item. Knowledge of such relations between words underlies our ability to draw material inferences in language and thought.

Finally, there is a clear connection between Partee’s “language-to-language grounding” and distributional semantics. Like meaning postulates, lexical decomposition, and inferential role semantics, distributional semantics seeks to analyse word meanings in terms of word-to-word relationships. However, instead of drawing on linguistic analyses of word meaning to identify semantic primitives, structures, or inferential roles, it relies on analysing co-occurrence statistics in text corpora. Consequently, distributional semantic models capture relationships between words grounded in patterns of use, rather than linguistic theory. In particular, modern vector space models such as LLMs trained on large amounts of data can capture a wide range of usage-based relationships between words, including more colloquial or informal relationships that may be missed by lexical decomposition. Additionally, they represent words in a continuous vector space, so that semantic relationships are reflected in distance relations in such a space. This can accommodate nuances in relatedness that are harder to capture with the discrete components and relations of lexical decomposition. The high dimensionality of vector spaces also allows for representing complex, multifaceted similarities between words—some of which plausibly reflect conceptual structure and/or inferential roles (Piantadosi & Hill 2022).

#### 4.4. Communicative Grounding

Confusingly, the notion of grounding is also used in relation to another aspect of language, which has to do with communication (Clark & Brennan 1991, Traum 1994). In this context, the ‘grounding problem’ refers to the problem of establishing *common ground* between speakers in conversation:

In communication, common ground cannot be properly updated without a process we shall call *grounding* . . . In conversation, for example, the participants try to establish that what has been said has been understood. In our terminology, they try to ground what has been said – that is, make it part of their common ground. (Clark & Brennan 1991, p. 128)

From this perspective, linguistic communication can be seen as a form of coordinated action that involves collaborating to reach a common understanding of what is said. The process of communicative grounding may involve explicit clarification strategies, such as prompting an interlocutor to repeat or reformulate a corrupted or ambiguous statement. But it also involves tracking communicative intentions during the exchange, to infer what is communicated from what is said. Such inferences can be made partly on the basis of pragmatic presuppositions, namely what speakers take for granted or assume to be true when they use certain sentences in the context of the conversation (Stalnaker 2002).

The communicative notion of grounding has also been discussed by natural language processing (NLP) researchers (Brennan 1998, Di Maro 2021, Chandu et al. 2021). For example, Chandu et al. (2021) distinguish between *static* grounding, in which common ground in basic communication between a human user and a virtual agent is automatically established by querying a database (e.g., asking for a weather report); and *dynamic grounding*, in which common ground is more gradually established in back-and-forth communication between a human and a dialogue agent. Bender & Koller (2020) define meaning to be a relation between linguistic expressions and communicative intent, and characterise this relation as a form of grounding:

Without access to a means of hypothesizing and testing the underlying communicative intents, reconstructing them from the forms alone is hopeless, and [LLMs’] language use

will eventually diverge from the language use of an agent who can ground their language in coherent communicative intents. (Bender & Koller 2020, p. 5189)

While communicative and referential grounding are distinct notions, they are related in important ways. Referential grounding anchors language to the world, but the same linguistic expressions may be referentially grounded in different ways for different speakers, due to differences in perception, knowledge, and conceptualisation. This means that calibrating reference in conversation requires communicative grounding—language users must work together to negotiate a common way of connecting language to the world. Without such collaboration, there is no guarantee that speakers really mean the same thing, even if they are using the same words.

#### 4.5. Epistemic Grounding

Finally, the notion of grounding is occasionally used by NLP researchers to refer more minimally to the relationship between linguistic expressions and information stored in knowledge bases (Poon 2013, Tsai & Roth 2016, Chandu et al. 2021, Thoppilan et al. 2022). For example, an expert system may contain a knowledge base of facts and rules belonging to a particular domain. When the system receives user input, it can query this knowledge base to determine an appropriate response. A classic example is MYCIN, an expert system for diagnosing infectious blood diseases (Shortliffe 1977). When given patient symptoms, MYCIN would search its knowledge base of medical rules and facts to suggest possible diagnoses and recommend treatments. In this system, language is grounded in the structured knowledge contained in the expert system’s knowledge base. We can call this notion *epistemic grounding*.

There are two ways in which current LLMs may involve epistemic grounding. Firstly, they can be hooked up to external databases used to retrieve information (Borgeaud et al. 2022, Thoppilan et al. 2022). Secondly, it has been suggested that even LLMs that are not augmented with retrieval capabilities might be functionally similar to knowledge bases themselves (Petroni et al. 2019). Indeed, they may encode a significant amount of world knowledge in their weights after pre-training on a very large corpus, as illustrated by the remarkable performance of state-of-the-art LLMs on a wide range of factual question-answering benchmarks (OpenAI 2023, Bubeck et al. 2023).

#### 4.6. What Grounding for LLMs?

We have identified five distinct notions of grounding that play prominent roles in discussions about meaning grounding in biological and artificial systems. Which of these notions is necessary for LLMs to possess representations and produce outputs endowed with intrinsic meaning? Recall that in order to possess such meaning, it is minimally required that a system’s representations and outputs be intrinsically about worldly entities and properties, rather than have this connection be fixed through external ascription—for example from a human user. To identify the most suitable notion of grounding for this task, we will employ an elimination strategy, examining each notion for its adequacy, beginning with Harnad’s proposal of sensorimotor grounding as a solution to the Symbol Grounding Problem.

Sensorimotor grounding connects conceptual or linguistic representations to sensorimotor representations within the same cognitive system. This sort of grounding can be useful to shed light on some features of the former representations, how they work, and what roles they can play in the economy of a cognitive system. However, sensorimotor grounding falls short in addressing the merry-go-round problem, as it merely grounds one type of representation in another, rather than elucidating how they are tied to worldly entities and properties. Consequently, it fails to resolve the

central question of how sensorimotor representations, which are posited to ground conceptual and linguistic ones, establish a meaningful connection with the world.

One might argue that sensorimotor representations are grounded in the world by resembling, to some extent, the entities they represent. However, the success of such an approach relies on an additional factor beyond sensorimotor grounding itself: it is the relevant resemblance relations that are supposed to ground those sensorimotor representations in the world.<sup>10</sup> Grounding a set of symbols in iconic (and categorical) representations—whether within a purely symbolic, connectionist, or hybrid system—offers no solution without an explanation of how these representations acquire intrinsic meaning. As sensorimotor grounding does not directly provide a connection with the world but only with other representations, it appears insufficient in addressing the Symbol Grounding Problem, at least without further elaboration. Similarly, this form of grounding does not resolve the Vector Grounding Problem, as grounding vectors in other vectors still leaves open the question of how any of those vectors come to be about anything at all.

The same line of reasoning applies to relational, communicative, and epistemic grounding. Relational grounding anchors linguistic representations in their relationships to other linguistic representations, suggesting that a representation's meaning is determined by its connections to the meanings of other representations within a network of inferential, conceptual, or statistical relations. Although this kind of grounding clearly does not escape the representational carousel, the question arises whether it is sufficient to provide intrinsic meaning nonetheless. One immediate challenge to such an idea is the existence of a indefinite number of possible networks of mutually coherent representations (assuming that at least approximately coherent systems of representations are required). What picks out which of those networks are appropriate for our world? And how did we come to possess an appropriate one? Ruling out miraculous coincidences or pre-established harmony (both of which are clearly untenable positions), the only plausible explanation involves appealing to an additional, world-involving factor that ensures that at least a subset of the representations in the network actually connects with the world more directly (see 5.3).

Communicative grounding seeks to anchor representations in the shared content of linguistic interactions between agents. However, this shared content relies itself on the representations within the agents' cognitive systems and the meanings of any public representations used in the exchange. As with sensorimotor grounding, one type of representation is grounded in another, perpetuating the representational carousel without direct engagement with the world. To address the Vector Grounding Problem (or the Symbol Grounding Problem, for that matter), communicative grounding requires an additional component: an account of how the grounding representations establish a connection with the world.

Epistemic grounding, on the other hand, aims to ground linguistic representations in knowledge bases. Yet, this approach encounters a familiar obstacle: the representations within the knowledge bases themselves call for an explanation of how they acquire intrinsic meaning. Consequently, epistemic grounding alone fails to provide a comprehensive solution to the Grounding Problem, as it does not address the question of how representations come to possess intrinsic meaning to start with.

As the foregoing analysis suggests, the form of grounding that underlies the other four types and is most relevant to addressing the Grounding Problem is what we have termed referential grounding. The primary objective of referential grounding is to anchor a representation—be it a symbol, a map, or a vector—in the world itself, rather than in other representations. It stands as the sole form of grounding that escapes the representational merry-go-round and establishes a connection between a representation and whatever worldly entity or property it is about. Consequently, to

---

<sup>10</sup>See [subsection 5.3](#) below for more on resemblance-based approaches to meaning.

determine whether Large Pre-Trained Models such as LLMs manipulate and produce representations with intrinsic meaning, we must assess whether they can achieve referential grounding. To do so, we first need to examine the requirements for a representation to be referentially grounded.

## 5. Grounding Large Pre-Trained Models

### 5.1. Theories of Representational Content: causes and history

Fortunately, philosophers of cognitive science have dedicated considerable effort over the past several decades to developing theories that explain how mental and cognitive states, such as beliefs, desires, and neural activations, can be about, or mean, entities and properties in the world. A subset of these mental and cognitive states plausibly enables external, public representations—such as words and sentences—to be meaningful. The meaning of these external representations derives from the beliefs, intentions, and conceptual representations of language users. Therefore, the *aboutness* of these mental and cognitive states is considered fundamental rather than derived from any other type of meaningful state or process. What mental and cognitive processes are about, or mean, is typically called ‘representational content’, or ‘content’ for short. The philosophical project of developing theories of representational content has the aim of illuminating how meaning can emerge in a world that otherwise seems devoid of it. After all, natural objects such as rocks and lakes generally do not possess internal states endowed with meaning and, by themselves at least, do not mean anything.

It is, of course, beyond the scope of this paper to review and assess existing theories of representational content.<sup>11</sup> What matters for our limited purposes is that, despite some disagreements on the finer details, philosophers of cognitive science have largely reached a consensus on the key factors that enable internal states to acquire content, and thus become representations with intrinsic meaning (Coelho Mollo 2022). The first, most fundamental point of agreement is that an account of representational content must identify one or more natural relations between internal states and external entities and properties responsible for making the former about the latter. These natural relations must not be ones that already involve states with meaning. Since the goal is to account for the emergence of meaning in the world, theories of content must exclusively rely on meaning-less states and processes to avoid vicious circularity. Much of the work in this area has been dedicated to identifying those relations that can yield fruitful content ascriptions and contribute to explaining the behaviour of cognitive systems.

Two natural relations are widely considered to be central to endowing states with meaning: causal-informational relations, and historical relations. In general terms, causal-informational relations occur when one state of the world conveys information about another due to a causally-generated correlation between the two states. A classic example is the relationship between smoke and fire: smoke is correlated with fire because it is caused by it, so the presence of smoke carries information about the presence of fire. Less evidently, neurons in brain area V1 convey information about edges in the perceived visual scene, as their activation correlates (through a relatively complex causal chain) with the presence of edges in the world in front of the perceiving subject. However, the mere existence of a causal-informational relation is widely believed to be insufficient to provide an account of representational content. Such relations are abundant in nature, including instances where no meaningful state appears to be present, as in the smoke-fire example. An additional requirement often mentioned is that the causal-informational relation be exploited, that is, used by a system due to its information-carrying nature (Shea 2018). In other words, a system must use the presence of smoke to obtain information about the presence of fire, form a belief about there being a fire, guide

<sup>11</sup>See Neander (2017), Millikan (2017), Shea (2018) for book-length defences of the main contenders in current debate.

fire-related behaviour, and so on, for smoke to be a viable candidate for representing fire for that system.

However, there are several reasons to believe that exploited causal-informational relations alone are insufficient to form the basis for an adequate theory of representational content. One of the primary reasons is that causal-informational relations fail to account for a key aspect of meaningful states: their capacity for truth or falsehood, correctness or incorrectness. To be a representation inherently involves the possibility of *misrepresentation*—the possibility of getting things wrong and failing to fit to the world accurately. The addition of historical relations in theories of content is partially motivated by their ability to address this gap. Indeed, the historical relations relevant to elucidating the emergence of meaning in the natural world involve selection and learning processes. The guiding idea is that, through selection and/or learning, states and processes in cognitive system come to acquire functions they are supposed to perform. For example, neurons in V1 have the function of detecting edges in the visual scene because they were selected for this purpose during evolution via natural selection; and such selection occurred due to the causal-informational relations they maintain with actual edges in the world. When these neurons successfully detect edges, they represent correctly; when they fail to fire in the presence of an edge or fire in the absence of one, they misrepresent. Meaning involves a kind of descriptive normativity (Neander 2017), which can be accounted for through the appropriate historical relations between systems and the world.

Existing theories vary in the emphasis they place on causal-informational or historical relations when accounting for the contents of representations, as well as in the specific types of such relations they prioritise. Additionally, they may diverge on the inclusion of further relations, such as structural resemblance relations. Nevertheless, all of these theories, in one way or another, assert that a combination of these relations is central to the emergence of meaning in the world. To possess underived meaning, at a minimum, is to stand in a specific set of causal-informational and historical relations with the thing in the world being represented. It is due to this fundamental meaningfulness of cognitive states that external symbols, such as those used in language, acquire meaning. Theories of content, therefore, provide the essential ingredients that determine referential grounding, enabling internal states to hook onto things in the world.

## 5.2. The Sensorigraph

In light of theories of representational content, there are two promising, complementary routes to arguing that Large Pre-Trained Models, such as LLM and VLMs, are referentially grounded in the world. One appeals to grounding from structure, and the other to causal-historical relations. Before we explore each of these factors in more detail, we will briefly motivate their relevance with another thought experiment designed to counteract intuitions elicited by the Octopus Test.

Imagine that in the distant future, scientists design a remarkably advanced brain implant called a *sensorigraph*, capable of recording an individual’s sensory input and motor output streams with perfect fidelity. Suppose millions of people are fitted with sensorigraphs at birth, and these devices capture a lifetime’s worth of multimodal data for each person. The dataset of sensorimotor streams collected from sensorigraphs would contain everything the hosts have ever perceived, including speech, as well as every motor action they have ever enacted, including speaking and writing (Figure 2, left).

This gigantic dataset could be used to train a deep neural network, which we shall call an S-model. An encoder component could divide sensorigraph streams into chunks (e.g., 5-second clips) and encode each chunk as a vector that summarises its content. A decoder component would then translate internal vector representations back into the format of sensorigraph streams (Figure 2, right).




Figure 2 | Sensorigraph and S-model. Left: the sensorigraph records the host’s sensory input and motor input over a lifetime. Right: an autoregressive S-model is trained on sensorigraph data by predicting the embedding for the next timestep in the sensorimotor stream sequence.

During training, the S-model would be shown portions of actual sensorigraph streams and learn to predict the next chunk of the stream based on the previous chunks. The encoder would compress the previous chunks into a vector representation, and the decoder would translate the representation into a prediction of the next chunk. The system would then get feedback on the accuracy of the prediction. Over time, it would learn how to accurately capture the relationships between modalities in the vector representations and reconstruct full, detailed streams.<sup>12</sup>

We could thus provide the S-model with a snippet from someone’s sensorigraph recording and have it generate a plausible continuation of the stream. The encoder would compress the starting snippet into a vector representation, the decoder would translate it into a generated continuation, the encoder would compress the generated chunk, and this process could be repeated indefinitely to yield an open-ended sensorigraph stream. Just like novel text produced by state-of-the-art LLMs is often indistinguishable from text written by actual humans, novel sensorigraph streams produced by the S-model would be indistinguishable from those recorded in actual humans. By learning to predict across vision, audition, motion, and other modalities, the S-model would acquire representations that capture the complex statistical relationships between these modalities as they unfold in human experience.

This thought experiment serves as a counterpoint to the Octopus Test. Since Bender and Koller’s 2020 superintelligent octopus is a colourful metaphor for current LLMs, we will simply use that term for our discussion. One notable difference between S-models and LLMs lies in the nature of their training data: the S-model is trained on rich multimodal data, while LLMs rely solely on

<sup>12</sup>Of course, the architectural details of the fictional S-model are merely sketched to flesh out the thought experiment, and do not really matter for the overall argument. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that despite the sci-fi premise, there are already much simpler and smaller models that illustrate ideas in the general vicinity of our S-model. For example, Phenaki is an ANN that learns from a diachronic stream composed of videos, and outputs other diachronic streams (again in video format) (Villegas et al. 2022). Gato is another multimodal model designed to be a generalist agent; it is trained not only on text and images, but also on robotic joint torques (analogous to proprioception) and button presses (analogous to motor action) (Reed et al. 2022).

text. Specifically, the S-model has access to statistical patterns connecting shapes, sounds, words, movements, etc., whereas LLMs are limited to linguistic corpora.

In learning to predict sensorigraph streams accurately, S-models would likely develop highly sophisticated linguistic representations associated with phonemes from the auditory stream, written words from the visual stream, as well as motor commands for phonation and writing. These linguistic representations in an S-model would achieve a high degree of sensorimotor grounding, as they would be intricately linked to various sensory and motor representations, unlike those in an LLM trained on text alone. This distinction constitutes a major difference between the two types of systems.

However, both the S-model and LLMs share a common learning objective and generative goal, focusing on next-item prediction (stream clips for the S-model and linguistic tokens for LLMs). In each case, the model predicts the subsequent items in a sequence based on the preceding context, i.e., previous sequences of items. As such, neither LLMs nor the S-model possess 'direct' access to worldly entities and properties. The S-model is trained on sequences of multimodal information taken from human behaviour, while LLMs are trained on sequences of tokens produced by humans. In essence, their training does not involve direct interaction with the sources of the multimodal or linguistic information contained in the relevant datasets; instead, they have access only to data generated by humans through *their own* interactions with the world and language. The Sensorigraph thought experiment vividly demonstrates that sensorimotor grounding differs from referential grounding. While the S-model is maximally grounded from a sensorimotor perspective, this does not imply referential grounding. Conversely, the absence of sensorimotor grounding in LLMs has no immediate implications for their ability to achieve referential grounding, i.e., to avoid the Vector Grounding Problem.

Beyond this important point about sensorimotor grounding, there is another interesting difference between S-models and LLMs. The S-model has access to a wealth of information about the world's structure, and how it is affected by human agency, much of which is presumably inaccessible to LLMs (and the metaphorical octopus, at least in the above-sea environment). It is hard to resist the intuition that the sensorigraph dataset is closer to the world than the linguistic corpora on which LLMs are trained, even though it doesn't allow the S-model to directly 'touch' the world either. LLMs' training data certainly carries a lot of information about the world, but such information is mediated by the constraints and limitations of the language used to describe it. In contrast, the sensorigraph dataset encodes proximal sensory and motor signals, which often closely mirror the structure of the external stimuli that elicited them. This difference is likely reflected in the respective capabilities of these systems, even regarding linguistic performance. For instance, one could imagine that the S-model would generate speech significantly more compelling and coherent than that produced by LLMs.

This difference is not attributable solely to the distinction between unimodal and multimodal datasets; rather, it relates to the amount of information about the world encoded within the statistical properties of these datasets. This disparity is not categorical but a matter of degree. The sensorigraph dataset encodes a considerable amount of information about patterns of causal interactions involving human agents in the world, and about the structure of the world itself. In comparison, both multimodal datasets used to train VLMs (e.g., image-caption pairs) and unimodal datasets used to train LLMs (i.e., linguistic corpora) encode significantly less information about these aspects. However, this does not imply a complete absence of such information. In fact, as we shall see, there are compelling reasons to believe that even LLMs trained solely on text can extract information about the world by means of the causal interactions of the agents whose linguistic outputs are reflected in the training data. If this holds true, then LLMs, VLMs, and S-models might be seen as existing on a continuum with respect to the quantity and quality of information about the world they can access from their respective datasets, and that they can encode during training.

### 5.3. Grounding from Structure

Some aspects of the world have an intrinsic relational structure. The identity and properties of components in these domains are defined in terms of their relations to other components. For example, colours form an organised system in which each colour is defined by its similarity to adjacent colours: *red* is more similar to orange than to *green*. Spatial directions are also defined by their relationships: *left* is defined relative to *right*, *east* relative to *west*.

In some cases, the relational structure of a domain corresponds to patterns in human language and cognition. One way to conceptualise such correspondences is in terms of mappings between the components of a domain and linguistic expressions that preserve certain relationships. For instance, words for closely related colours like ‘red’ and ‘orange’ may co-occur more frequently than words for less similar colours, like ‘red’ and ‘green’. Similarly, spatial terms like ‘left’ and ‘right’ or ‘east’ and ‘west’ commonly co-occur. More broadly, the internal relations between component parts of a domain partially determine the linguistic distinctions, properties, and categories we use to describe them.

Such correspondences need not be deterministic or universal. While colour similarity might correlate with word co-occurrence statistics for colour terms, the mappings can be imperfect or probabilistic. Other types of relations or domains may not exhibit any clear correspondences of this kind. Our hypothesis is merely that there are at least approximate mappings between some structural properties of linguistic expressions reflected in their patterns of use, and some structural properties of specific worldly domains these expressions refer to. If this hypothesis is correct, then we should expect LLMs that learn to encode word meanings based on co-occurrence statistics to acquire linguistic representations whose structure in the high-dimensional vector space can be mapped to the structure of the world, at least in limited domains. There is, in fact, mounting empirical evidence that this is the case.

In the spatial domain, [Liétard et al. \(2021\)](#) probed representations of cities and countries in various language models. All models performed better than chance at encoding both absolute spatial information (probed by predicting GPS coordinates) and relational spatial information (probed by predicting whether two countries share a border), with larger models performing better than smaller ones. [Patel & Pavlick \(2022\)](#) took a different approach, constructing a grid world using only text characters, where the position of a special character reflects either relational spatial concepts (*left*, *right*, *up*, *down*, *top*, *bottom*) or cardinal directions (*north*, *south*, *east*, *west*, *northeast*, *northwest*, *southeast*, *southwest*). They found that language models can learn spatial representations that generalise to unseen worlds and unseen related representations, after being explicitly shown mappings between language and grid world states just for a small subset of such representations. While smaller models could not generalise in this way, the largest model (GPT-3) made intuitive errors and could generalise even to rotated worlds. This shows that LLMs may learn representations that closely reflect the structure of the real world, at least for the narrow domain of spatial relations.

[Patel & Pavlick \(2022\)](#) also considered the geometry of colour representations, evaluating how well LLMs can map their representations of colour terms to structural relationships in RGB colour space. Models were shown examples of how some colour terms (e.g., *red*, *cyan*, *forest green*) mapped to RGB colour codes (e.g., [255; 0; 0]), and were then prompted with held-out colour terms and asked to generate the corresponding RGB codes. Performance was evaluated by comparing the model’s predictions to the true RGB codes, testing the models’ ability to generalise from seen colour mappings to unseen but related colours. Again, GPT-3 performed well, suggesting that language models may learn representations of colour terms whose geometry is near-isomorphic to the structure of RGB colour space. Interestingly, [Abdou et al. \(2021\)](#) also found a structural correspondence between representations of colour terms in LLMs and CIELAB, a colour space with a perceptually meaningful distance metric.

Beyond the spatial and colour domains, [Li, Kementchedjheva & Søgaaard \(2023\)](#) show that there is a broader structural correspondence between the representational space of 12 LLMs trained only on text, and the representational space of 14 deep learning models trained only on images. Indeed, it is possible to learn precise linear mappings between these spaces. Once again, scale was found to have an effect: the larger they get, the more LLMs and computer vision models seem to converge on vector spaces with similar geometries. [Merullo et al. \(2023\)](#) report a similar finding: training linear projections from the representations of a computer vision model into the input space of a language model is often sufficient to produce accurate captions describing images.

Does such evidence suggest that LLMs might possess referentially grounded representations, at least in specific domains like colours and space? Not quite. For this argument to be persuasive, we would need to accept the additional assumption that some form of mapping between representations and the relevant domain—such as isomorphism or, more plausibly, homomorphism—is sufficient for referential grounding. However, philosophical work on theories of representational content has long established that this is not the case ([Newman 1928](#), [Goodman 1976](#), [Shea 2018](#)). Morphisms between two sets of objects or properties are trivial to find, and relying solely on the existence of morphisms between internal representations and structured domains in the world could lead to a trivialisation of the notions of representation and meaning ([Piantadosi & Hill 2022](#), [Søgaaard 2022](#), [Patel & Pavlick 2022](#)).

Nevertheless, such mapping relations between sets of internal representations and structured domains in the world can contribute to the referential grounding of those representations, provided that they are complemented by other factors. Representations that derive meaning partly through mapping relations are often referred to as ‘structural representations’ ([Swoyer 1991](#), [Ramsey 2007](#), [Shea 2018](#)). Accounts of structural representation, as with all influential current theories of content, call upon causal-informational and historical relations to complement the grounding role of the relevant morphism. Therefore, a comprehensive defence of referential grounding in LLMs requires demonstrating that these systems do, or at least can, stand in such relations with what they are about.

As a side note, there do appear to be special domains in which grounding from structure is sufficient for intrinsic meaning. One such domain involves logical connectives, such as AND, OR, etc. Their meaning is indeed fully captured by the relational structures they stand in ([Fodor 1990](#)). It is plausible that a similar principle applies to certain lexical items, such as conjunctions (‘and’, ‘but’, ‘therefore’, etc.). If an LLM can learn the structure of relations that constitute the meaning of logical connectives and linguistic conjunctions from its training data, then its representations of these terms might be as intrinsically meaningful as they can be.

However, one might argue that this is not truly an instance of referential grounding. After all, logical connectives and linguistic conjunctions do not refer to entities or properties in the world—they are function terms, fully characterised by their functional roles within a symbolic system. Consequently, the only grounding they need is what we referred to as relational grounding, rather than referential grounding. We shall refrain from taking a particular stance on this question, as it potentially involves complex metaphysical issues. Regardless of whether one considers the grounding in this case to be relational or referential, it is presumably sufficient to underpin the meaningfulness of LLM representations within these restricted domains.

#### 5.4. Indirect Grounding of LLMs: causes and history redux

As discussed in [subsection 5.1](#), philosophical theories of representation have identified sets of relations that imbue representations with content, giving them intrinsic meaning. These primarily include causal-informational and historical relations. Crucially for our purposes, these theories have focused

on more ordinary cases of representation involving lexical concepts, perceptual representations, and the like, as opposed to the specialised domains of logic and function words.

Our aim is to show that Large Pre-Trained Models, such as LLMs, may possess grounded representations and outputs in this ordinary sense, which is the one captured by the concept of referential grounding. To begin, we will examine whether appropriate causal-informational relations exist between LLM representations/outputs and entities and properties in the world.

### *Causal-informational relations*

Although LLMs are trained exclusively on linguistic data, thus precluding any direct causal-informational relationship with extra-linguistic entities, the linguistic data itself is generated by humans who maintain causal-informational connections to worldly entities and properties. Those data are shaped by humans' interactions with the world. Among its various functions, language enables humans to express facts about the world, as well as their experiences, emotions, and ideas concerning that world. The extensive corpus of text upon which LLMs are trained likely embodies the 'imprint' that the world has left on language and linguistic expression.

The patterns of language use derived from the training corpus are likely to reveal important aspects of the world's statistical structure. These patterns are neither random nor predominantly stochastic; rather, language and linguistic expressions are highly organised in systematic ways. This structure embeds information about patterns of interaction between humans and the world, human methods of categorising their environments, and the selection of features that are more or less salient to them. The structure reflected in these patterns of linguistic use carries significant information about the meaning of linguistic expressions.

Furthermore, a plausible hypothesis for LLMs' success in a wide range of linguistic tasks is that they have induced general semantic patterns from their training data, which closely resemble what could be termed semantic 'laws'.<sup>13</sup> These laws are not merely formal or syntactic; rather, they tap into the intricate relationships between linguistic form and the world it describes, namely, the semantics of language. The requirements for linguistic expression of worldly states-of-affairs underlie the patterns in form and syntax found in human linguistic output.

A strict separation of form and meaning has been a central assumption in much of linguistics, from Ferdinand de Saussure's principle of the "arbitrariness of the linguistic sign" (de Saussure 1916) to contemporary formal theories of syntax and semantics (Chomsky 1957, Montague 1970). However, this notion has faced increasing scrutiny since the 1980s, especially in light of empirical investigations of the iconicity of language (Perniss & Vigliocco 2014). In this context, iconicity refers to a non-arbitrary relationship between the form of a linguistic sign and its referent, based on some similarity or analogy. The nature of this similarity relation can vary: imagistic iconicity involves a perceptual resemblance between a word and its referent (e.g., in onomatopoeias), while diagrammatic iconicity entails a structural resemblance (Haiman 1985).

Diagrammatic iconicity is pervasive in linguistic structures. For example, the ordering of events in narrative sequences tends to reflect closeness and succession in time (e.g. "Veni, vidi, vici"); what is nearest to the speaker in a literal or metaphorical sense tends to be mentioned first (e.g. "here and there"); elements whose referents are closely related in some way or other tend to be adjacent in sentences (principle of adjacency); the use of subordination reflects causality or conditionality between states-of-affairs (e.g., "If you study hard, you will pass the exam"), etc. (Van Langendonck 2010). The pervasiveness of diagrammatic iconicity in linguistic structures suggests that there is a deep connection between the surface form of language and the meaning it conveys. The way in which

<sup>13</sup>For some preliminary work on the potential form of such semantic laws, see Wolfram (2023).

linguistic signs are organised and structured is not arbitrary, and may reflect some ways in which the world is organised and structured.

While diagrammatic iconicity is not typically characterised in distributional terms, patterns of co-occurrence in language reflect stable statistical regularities in the way in which linguistic elements are used together. Certain words tend to occur together more frequently than others, and certain grammatical constructions tend to co-occur with particular semantic categories. These patterns of co-occurrence are not random, and often reflect the underlying structure of the world that speakers are trying to describe. Thus, *contra* Bender & Koller (2020), form and meaning are far from being so easily separable, especially at the level of general patterns of language use—such patterns are caused and shaped by human expressive needs in light of the structure of causes and action opportunities in the world.

One might argue that the highly mediated nature of the causal-informational relationships between LLMs and the world disqualifies them from possessing intrinsically meaningful representations. The paradigmatic case studies on which theories of content focus tend to involve relatively simple and straightforward situations where an occurrent causal chain extends from an object in the system’s immediate environment to the excitation of the system’s sensory surfaces. Such occurrent causal chains are absent in the training of LLMs, or, for that matter, during that of VLMs and even that of our hypothetical S-model. Consequently, one might think that these models fail to establish the appropriate causal-informational connections to worldly entities and properties that partly underlie referential grounding.

It is worth noting that theories of representational content strategically focus on relatively simple cases as a foundation for understanding more complex scenarios. However, it is undeniable that a significant portion of the cognitive representations humans employ refer to entities and properties that are not present in their immediate surroundings and for which no occurrent, relatively unmediated causal chain is available. As such, a system’s ability to employ meaningful representations does not depend on the presence of unmediated causal connections to objects in its surroundings. Nonetheless, the basic cases in which such connections are available could be regarded as the paradigmatic grounding instances required to produce the relevant representations, which are subsequently employed in other contexts. On the face of it, LLMs do lack grounding instances from direct immediate causal connections to the world.

This picture is overly simplistic, however. Many human representations acquire meaning without such direct grounding instances. Instead, they are obtained by means of testimony and social learning through representations produced by others, who may have learned them in the same manner, rather than through direct contact with their worldly referents. For example, most people have never been in direct causal contact with enriched uranium, but that does not entail that their thoughts and statements about uranium lack referential grounding—they are indeed about uranium. A similar principle applies to LLMs: their representations are at least partially grounded through testimony and ‘social’ learning, as their training data contains innumerable instances of human communication. In this sense, LLMs represent an additional link in the chain of testimony transmission that provides representations with causal-informational relations to worldly entities, and thus partly underpins intrinsic meaning.

In this sense, the causal-informational relationships that underpin meaning in LLMs are dependent on humans. However, this dependence is distinct from the one that drives the Vector Grounding Problem. The Problem is not *how* the representations of connectionist models come to acquire intrinsic meaning, but *whether* these representations have intrinsic meaning at all, instead of being merely ascribed extrinsic meaning by external interpreters. To take once again the example of enriched uranium, LLMs find themselves in a position similar to most humans: their representations and outputs

about enriched uranium intrinsically refer to enriched uranium—irrespective of any interpreter’s gloss—even though the process enabling such reference depends on a chain of transmission that involves other systems with intrinsic meaning.

LLMs appear to possess the necessary elements to fulfil the causal-informational requirement for referential grounding. They stand in complex, mediated causal-informational relations to the world. These connections are mediated since they pass through human linguistic production, where language primarily functions as a tool to express aspects of the world.<sup>14</sup> They are complex due to the intricate causal-informational relationships between the patterns of language use, the semantic ‘laws’ that govern them, the structure of the world they have (culturally) evolved to capture, and the causal chains of communication and testimony that produce the learning data—of which the LLM itself can be considered a link. In light of these considerations, we contend that Large Pre-Trained Models, such as LLMs, can meet the causal-informational criteria necessary for possessing referentially grounded representations and outputs.

### *Historical Relations*

Although it is important to differentiate between causal-informational and historical relations when considering referential grounding, these aspects are often intertwined in real-world cases. The causal-informational relations previously discussed with respect to LLMs possess a historical dimension, as they depend on patterns of interaction between humans and their environments. Likewise, in many of the interesting cases pertaining to human cognition, the meaning-endowing causal-informational relationships can be traced back to past episodes of learning.

As discussed in [subsection 5.1](#), learning and selection processes are the historical mechanisms that theories of representational content commonly invoke. These processes explain how a system acquires a specific function or purpose, particularly in relation to the production and/or use of representations. Such functions clarify how cognitive systems can represent *accurately*—when they produce and use representations that fulfil the relevant function—as well as *misrepresent*, which occurs when the representations produced and/or used are inappropriate for the task. While it is widely accepted that Large Pre-Trained Models undergo a learning-like process during training, it is less clear whether they undergo the relevant kind of selection process. It can be argued that they do, at least to the same degree as other human artefacts ([Artiga 2016](#), [Coelho Mollo 2019](#)), given that numerous design and implementation choices form an integral part of creating artefacts such as AI systems. Nevertheless, according to some of the most prominent theories of content, selection processes are not essential for imbuing representations with meaning: learning processes alone may be sufficient for establishing the relevant historical relations that contribute to grounding meaning ([Shea 2018](#)).

The crux of the matter, however, lies in determining whether LLMs stand in historical relations with the *right* sorts of things, namely the entities and properties in the world that could ground their representations. At first glance, the situation appears analogous to that of causal-informational relations: LLMs stand in historical relations to the world, albeit in a mediated manner, through the human-generated data used for training them. The critical question is: can LLMs nonetheless acquire world-involving functions that enable the sort of descriptive normativity that is an essential feature of meaning?

---

<sup>14</sup>This analysis would extend, *mutatis mutandis*, to multimodal inputs, which are also mediated by human interactions with the world (e.g., photographs are captured by humans with a camera). However, one might argue that some worldly properties instantiated by visual samples in a multimodal dataset, such as shapes, can be accessed more directly than they could through the mediation of language. This is because images (and samples in other sensory domains) are entirely iconic, while language only exhibits limited patterns of iconicity.

To address this question, it is important to distinguish between the proximate and ultimate functions performed by LLMs during training and inference. The proximate function of LLMs is plainly next-token prediction: predicting the next token in a text sequence, given the context provided by that sequence. This proximate function is infra-linguistic, and so are the standards for its fulfilment or failure, namely whether the LLM predicts the correct tokens reliably enough. While such function may be suitable to underpin *relational grounding*, it appears inadequate for contributing to the world-involving normativity necessary for *referential grounding*.

Ultimate functions refer to the broader, more abstract goals that the model is tasked with achieving through next-token prediction. These functions can be world-involving in principle, such as generating text that accurately describes real-world states of affairs, or solving problems based on real-world information. In what follows, we will consider several potential sources for world-involving ultimate functions in the training and use of LLMs.

Recent language models and chatbots are often fine-tuned, after pre-training, with a technique known as ‘Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback’ (RLHF) (Ziegler et al. 2019, Ouyang et al. 2022, Bai et al. 2022). RLHF is used to align the outputs of LLMs with specific normative goals, using direct human feedback on their outputs. The process involves several steps. First, a set of norm-sensitive prompts that could elicit unwanted outputs are selected. Some of these prompts are morally sensitive, such as asking for the instructions to build a bomb, while others are epistemically sensitive, such as asking a factual question that only admits of one true answer. Second, these prompts are given as input to the pre-trained LLM multiple times, such that the model generates multiple outputs for each of them. Human workers are subsequently instructed to rank outputs for each prompt according to explicit norms chosen to align the model. These norms typically include epistemic goals such as ‘honesty’ or ‘truthfulness’, in addition to moral goals such as ‘harmlessness’ and ‘helpfulness’ (Askell et al. 2021). Third, the preferences acquired through human feedback are used to train a reward model aimed at predicting how humans would rank any output. Finally, the pre-trained LLM is optimised with respect to that reward model by means of reinforcement learning.

RLHF is a promising candidate to infuse LLMs with world-involving functions. Indeed, the evaluation standards for the outputs of LLMs fine-tuned with RLHF are extra-linguistic, being determined by the normative criteria embedded in human feedback. Of particular interest for our discussion is the criterion of ‘honesty’ or ‘truthfulness’ commonly used in RLHF. This criterion ensures that the evaluation standards for the outputs of the fine-tuned model are world-involving, as they hinge on the actual state of the world. During RLHF fine-tuning, one of the LLM’s objective is to generate outputs accurately reflecting real-world facts, receiving ‘rewards’ for success and ‘punishments’ for failure. The learning process is thus partly driven by the degree to which the generated outputs match reality, endowing the model with the ultimate function of producing factually correct statements. If, upon completing training, an LLM produces an output incongruous with worldly states-of-affairs, it has failed to fulfil one of its ultimate functions—namely, producing ‘truthful’ outputs—and thus misrepresents. This ultimate function is the missing ingredient for referential grounding, providing RLHF fine-tuned LLMs with the kind of descriptive normativity essential to meaning.<sup>15</sup>

Models that are not fine-tuned with RLHF, like the majority of LLMs until recently, are less obvious candidates for possessing all the required ingredients for referential grounding. However, in some instances, the required normativity may still be obtained within a specific subset of domains, even without fine-tuning. Indeed, *in-context learning* offers another potential source of world-involving

---

<sup>15</sup>The system’s accuracy is irrelevant; the crucial factor is the presence of a representational world-involving function. In nature, it is not uncommon for organisms to systematically misrepresent, particularly in high-stakes situations. For instance, prey may frequently misrepresent the presence of a predator, as a false-positive poses a far lesser problem to the organism than a false-negative.

normativity in pre-trained models. In-context learning refers to the phenomenon wherein LLMs learn to perform tasks they have not been explicitly designed or trained for, simply by being prompted to perform that task (explicitly or implicitly) in the input sequence fed to the model.<sup>16</sup> For instance, an LLM trained through next-word prediction can be prompted to translate between languages, summarise text, or solve a mathematical problem without requiring domain-specific fine-tuning for each task. In-context learning examples typically involve several instances of successful task completion (‘few-shot learning’), but state-of-the-art models also excel at ‘zero-shot learning’, i.e., performing tasks based solely on instruction, without illustrative examples. Notably, in-context learning is an emergent capability of the largest LLMs, such as GPT-3 and PaLM; smaller models generally cannot learn new tasks on-the-fly and require supervised fine-tuning instead.

The tasks explicitly specified at inference time through in-context learning arguably go beyond mere next-word prediction. Consider, for example, the experiment by [Patel & Pavlick \(2022\)](#) previously described. It involves prompting the model in a few-shot learning regime to learn mappings from colour terms like ‘cyan’ to points in RGB colour space such as  $[0, 100, 100]$ . This is an instance of a world-involving function, having a standard of success and failure directly contingent on how the world is. Although in-context learning does not actually involve adjusting the model’s weights, it has been shown to be functionally equivalent to a form of virtual gradient descent ([von Oswald et al. 2022](#), [Dai et al. 2022](#)). As such, it does qualify as a genuine form of learning. Anything that is learned in this way will not persist after inference, but it may nonetheless enable LLMs to acquire the ability to perform world-involving functions on-the-fly. This capability allows the model to acquire and use representations suitable for the task at hand, and to misrepresent when these representations prove inadequate. In particular, the prompts used in few-shot in-context learning can set a normative standard for LLM outputs, which may be world-involving if they involve an explicit or implicit requirement of truthfulness. This type of normative grounding, being transient, is quite unlike the human case. This illustrates how the investigation of referential grounding in AI systems may uncover partly different reference-fixing mechanisms across artificial and biological systems.

We have argued that fine-tuning with RLHF and, to some extent, few-shot in-context learning can endow LLMs with world-involving ultimate functions that go beyond mere next-word prediction. In a more speculative vein, zero-shot in-context learning (without hidden pre-prompts) may enable world-involving normativity in a limited number of domains, such as games, where the ground truth is entirely determined by the rules of the domain. If LLMs can learn game rules by extrapolating patterns found during training, zero-shot in-context learning may supply the normativity essential for referential grounding. This is because the learned rules, whether represented explicitly or implicitly within the LLM, provide the necessary success and failure standards. Extending this line of reasoning even further, it is plausible that some training events during pre-training (rather than inference or fine-tuning) involve context windows containing a sequence of game moves. If LLMs can deduce game rules from this subset of the training data, then their game-related outputs should possess, for the same reasons as above, the type of normativity relevant to referential grounding.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Some chatbots used in commercial services include a hidden ‘pre-prompt’ automatically added to the user’s input on the system’s back end. This pre-prompt is akin to a set of explicit instructions to steer the model’s behaviour in certain ways, and may include a requirement to be ‘honest’ and ‘truthful’.

<sup>17</sup>This is especially plausible in the special case of models trained entirely on sequences of game moves in standard (text-based) notation. For example, Othello-GPT is a Transformer model trained exclusively on scripts describing moves in the two-player game Othello ([Li, Hopkins, Bau, Viégas, Pfister & Wattenberg 2023](#)). While the model has no built-in knowledge of the board and its rules, there is converging evidence that it acquires during training an internal representation of the board state that allows it to predict legal moves ([Nanda 2023](#)). This could be seen as an example of a model inducing a world-involving function (predicting a legal move on an Othello board given a game state) purely from pre-training on next-token prediction.

In the case of predicting game moves, even if we assume that the game’s rules implicitly provide some degree of normativity, one might object that this only meets the conditions for relational rather than referential grounding—akin to logical connectives and linguistic conjunctions examined in [subsection 5.3](#). However, there is an important distinction between these cases. Games do not exist solely within the realm of linguistics; they have, as it were, their own ‘worlds’ governed by specific rules. Outputs generated in the context of game-playing (whether through zero-shot in-context learning or pre-training) refer to extralinguistic entities such as game pieces, moves, board positions, etc., which constitute the game ‘world.’ These are not simply components of language itself, but belong to a distinct domain with its own extralinguistic rules, providing a potential source of normativity for referential grounding.

This claim might still be resisted on the grounds that game rules ostensibly learned by LLMs whose pre-training data (or zero-shot prompts) include game moves are not genuinely *world*-involving in the required sense, even if we take the world in question to be a simple game world. After all, the model’s explicit learning objective is next-token prediction, not game-move prediction. But this is where the distinction between proximal and ultimate functions proves useful. It is plausible that, in order to fulfil the function of next-token prediction in this particular domain, the model must learn the rules of the game, as this is the most efficient way to minimise error in this specific prediction task. In such a case, the proximate function gives rise to a distinct ultimate function for the domain, namely, predicting legal moves according to the rules of a game. This is superficially analogous to LLMs learning syntactic rules; however, in this case, the domain is extralinguistic, and the rules learned pertain to the game world rather than to the linguistic notation of game moves.

In sum, we have argued that the kind of descriptive normativity associated with referential grounding—which accounts for the fact that grounded representations can be correct or incorrect, appropriate or inappropriate—is present at least in LLMs that have undergone additional training through Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF). This type of fine-tuning measures LLMs against the world, imbuing them with world-involving functions acquired through learning. More speculatively, we have argued that such world-involving functions may also be acquired by LLMs without fine-tuning. This is plausibly the case in certain instances of few-shot in-context learning, particularly when the prompt explicitly or implicitly encompasses a requirement for truthfulness or adequacy of the outputs, such that the standard of success or failure for the outputs is world-involving. This may also be the case with zero-shot in-context learning, or even mere pre-training, in highly specific domains like those involving descriptions of game states. In such cases, if the model is able to induce game rules merely from next-token prediction, and thus acquire a distinct ultimate function of next-game-move prediction, it may satisfy the requirements for referential grounding with respect to the game world.

## 5.5. Multimodality and Embodiment

The preceding discussion has primarily centred on LLMs trained exclusively on text. Other large pre-trained models, such as vision-language models (VLMs), are trained on multimodal datasets (e.g., image-caption pairs). Our hypothetical S-model would also belong to this category, although its sensorigraph dataset is substantially larger and richer compared to any existing multimodal dataset. Notably, both LLMs and multimodal models are pre-trained passively, so to speak, by sampling from serialised datasets rather than by actively interacting with the world. Consequently, both types of models would seem to face the Vector Grounding Problem.

Our argument has a surprising implication: while LLMs trained on text-only data may achieve referential grounding at least in certain cases, typical multimodal models do not. To illustrate this claim, let us examine a simple VLM like CLIP ([Radford et al. 2021](#)). CLIP is developed by jointly

training an image encoder and a text encoder to predict the correct pairings of images and text captions using an objective called contrastive learning. Suppose we have a batch of images paired with their respective descriptions. We can jointly train an image encoder and a text encoder to produce image and text vectors for these samples, in a way that (a) maximises the similarities of the correct image-text vector pairs, and (b) minimises the similarities of dissimilar pairs. After pre-training with this contrastive objective, CLIP can predict the most relevant caption for any given image, without directly optimising for the task, in a manner reminiscent of the zero-shot capabilities of LLMs like GPT-3.

Through contrastive pre-training with image-caption pairs, CLIP achieves what we called *sensorimotor* grounding, albeit to a very limited extent, if compared to biological organisms or even to our fictional S-model—namely connecting linguistic vector representations to pictorial vector representations. CLIP also arguably achieves some degree of *relational* grounding in the purely linguistic domain, although there is evidence that contrastive learning from image-caption pairs severely limits the degree to which this kind of model can induce syntactic structure compared to text-only LLMs (Yuksekgonul et al. 2023). As far as causal-informational relations go, the account we gave for LLMs should also apply to VLMs like CLIP: since both images and their captions are shaped by human interactions with the world, CLIP should stand in complex, mediated causal-informational relations to the world.

The major difference between LLMs and VLMs when it comes to the Vector Grounding Problem lies in their potential sources of world-involving ultimate functions that could provide the kind of normativity suitable for referential grounding. We have argued that LLMs trained on text only could secure such functions from fine-tuning with human feedback (RLHF), or, more speculatively, from in-context learning and perhaps even pre-training in limited domains (e.g., sequences of game moves). By contrast, there is no obvious mechanism that could enable CLIP to acquire world-involving ultimate functions from contrastive pre-training, or at inference time. We ought to conclude that, despite the common claim that VLMs and other multimodal models are ‘grounded’ by definition, such models actually fail to achieve *referential* grounding, and thus cannot overcome to the Vector Grounding Problem without further modifications.

This is certainly not a limitation of *all* multimodal models. For example, state-of-the-art multimodal models like PaLM-E (Driess et al. 2023) and GPT-4 (OpenAI 2023) are based on pre-trained LLMs, and are capable of sophisticated in-context learning over text and images.<sup>18</sup> If we are correct in suggesting that in-context learning can provide a world-involving function beyond next-token prediction, then we can expect such models to achieve referential grounding in those tasks that involve worldly standards of success. Similar considerations apply should future multimodal models be fine-tuned in ways analogous to RLHF, including a ‘honesty’ or ‘truthfulness’ criterion.

There are ongoing efforts to overcome the limitations of LLMs and VLMs by designing *embodied* systems that do not just process sequences of tokens—whether purely linguistic or multimodal—passively, but also actively interact with real or virtual environments. One might expect such embodied systems to escape the Vector Grounding Problem. Whether they do, however, cannot be settled without paying attention to implementation details. Some models do appear to clear that bar. For example, Hill et al. (2020) trained an embodied agent in a 3D virtual environment to learn the names of unfamiliar objects in a single exposure, and immediately apply this knowledge to carry out instructions involving

<sup>18</sup>PaLM-E was designed by combining an LLM pre-trained on text only, PaLM (Chowdhery et al. 2022), with a large Vision Transformer (ViT) pre-trained on images only (Dehghani et al. 2023); the resulting model was fine-tuned on training sequences in which multimodal tokens were inserted within language tokens. GPT-4 has two versions: an LLM only capable of processing text, and a VLM that can only take images as input. There is no official information about the architecture of either version of GPT-4, so we are forced to speculate in this case, but it is plausible that the multimodal version also combines a pre-trained LLM with a pre-trained ViT.

those objects. They used a combination of predictive and reinforcement learning to train the agent in two steps. In the discovery phase, the agent explores the virtual environment, fixates on each object, and gets in return a text string containing the name of the object (e.g., “This is a dax”). In the instruction phase, the locations of the objects and the agent are randomised; the agent must respond to linguistic instructions about objects (e.g., “pick up a dax”), and it is trained by means of reward signals dictated by success or failure in carrying out the instructions. In this experiment, the agent clearly learns to represent the names of virtual objects through a world-involving function (relative to the virtual world in which it can move). As such, there is little doubt that the model achieves referential grounding.

Some artificial systems are embodied in the real world. For example, SayCan is a project aiming to provide “real-world grounding” to an LLM by integrating it with a robot to perform physical tasks from natural language instructions (Ahn et al. 2022). In this system, the LLM is simply a module used to break down the verbal introductions (e.g., “bring me an apple”) into sequences of ‘atomic’ behaviours that the robot can subsequently enact through low-level visuomotor control. In order to parse instructions in a format suitable for downstream processing and actionable goals, the LLM is provided with a carefully engineered prompt that sets up the task as an instance of few-shot learning. This prompt contains a number of examples of possible instructions and the corresponding acceptable outputs for downstream processing, formatted as a set of templatic sub-goals (e.g. “1. find an apple”, “2. pick up the apple”, etc.).

Does SayCan really provide the LLM with “real-world grounding”, in the referential sense? Not quite. The mere fact that the LLM embedded in the SayCan system generates outputs that can be subsequently processed to perform robotic actions in the real world is irrelevant to the question of whether the LLM itself is referentially grounded, since the LLM is not trained or fine-tuned in light of the success or failure of such actions. Admittedly, the LLM component of SayCan is prompted through few-shot learning. As we have argued, few-shot learning could in principle provide a text-only model with world-involving ultimate functions, without further fine-tuning. For that to be the case, however, a normative standard for success and failure would have to be implicitly specified by the prompt format, such that the task learned in context requires accuracy with respect to the actual state of the world. By contrast, the few-shot prompt supplied in SayCan involves translating linguistic instructions into low-level goals appropriate for visuomotor control of the robot. Such goals are not normatively equivalent to factual statements, as they have a different direction of fit: while in factual statements the representation is supposed to fit to how the world is, goals are satisfied when the world is changed so as to fit to the goal representation. While this feature of SayCan may endow its embedded LLM with a sort of (more complicated) normativity derived from standards of goal satisfaction—an idea that calls for further investigation—it should be clear that embodiment in this case is playing no role in ensuring referential grounding: all the work, if any, is being done by the LLM. Perhaps surprisingly, embodiment ends up being irrelevant to tackling the Vector Grounding Problem in this kind of system.

Multimodal and embodied models may be referentially grounded if they meet specific requirements, such as the availability of a mechanism for few-shot learning on a world-involving task. However, they are not referentially grounded just by being embodied, as it is often assumed. Contrary to popular belief, they do not offer a straightforward solution to the Vector Grounding Problem. There are thus instances of multimodal and embodied models that are less plausible candidates for referential grounding than text-only LLMs fine-tuned with RLHF and/or prompted for few-shot learning.

## 6. Concluding Remarks

We have argued that the Symbol Grounding Problem, as introduced by Harnad, can be adapted to apply to deep neural networks such as large pretrained models, thereby taking the form of what we have termed the Vector Grounding Problem. Despite first appearances, we have sought to demonstrate that at least a subset of current large pretrained models have the features necessary to be endowed with representations and outputs grounded in the world. Our analysis has primarily focused on Transformer-based LLMs, which are some of the most successful models in natural language processing to date.

While our discussion has focused on LLMs and, to a lesser extent, on their multimodal counterparts, any AI system fulfilling the causal-informational and historical relations requirements delineated above can possess representations with intrinsic meaning. Meeting these requirements is far from trivial, but it may also be less demanding than it initially seems. As philosophical theories of representation have forcefully shown, in order to understand how cognitive systems—both biological and artificial—function, including at the subpersonal level, we must carefully scrutinise our intuitions about the requirements for intrinsic meaning. We must also resist the temptation to assume that the availability of intrinsic meaning necessarily entails the existence of complex cognitive abilities such as understanding, knowledge, or consciousness. While having states imbued with intrinsic meaning might constitute one of the fundamental conditions for possessing these other cognitive abilities, it is insufficient on its own. For instance, activations of specific populations of neurons in the mammalian cortex may represent the presence of edges in the visual scene, but these neuronal activations do not inherently understand or possess knowledge about edges. We suggest that a similar claim can be made regarding the internal representations and outputs of LLMs and related connectionist models.

We argued for this claim in two steps. First, we distinguished between various forms of grounding, which are often conflated in the cognitive science and computer science literature. We suggested that one particular form of grounding, which we termed *referential grounding*, is central to both the Vector Grounding Problem and the older Symbol Grounding Problem. Referential grounding pertains to the way in which representations hook onto the world. It is the most fundamental type of grounding, and arguably serves as the basis for all other notions of grounding (with the partial exception of relational grounding). As theories of representational content have persuasively demonstrated, referential grounding requires two main factors: causal-informational relations between representations and the world, and historical relations that imbue representations with a sort of descriptive normativity.

Second, we have shown that certain LLMs trained exclusively on linguistic data, particularly those fine-tuned with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF), are referentially grounded. These models benefit from indirect causal-informational relations with worldly entities and properties, mediated by human interactions with the world, which in turn shape the linguistic inputs they receive during training and inference. Furthermore, RLHF introduces an additional learning objective that is directly world-involving, as it encompasses a requirement for truthfulness or factuality. The normativity of this requirement supplies an extralinguistic accuracy standard for the representations and outputs of LLMs. More tentatively, we have suggested that even without RLHF, the representations and outputs of LLMs may achieve referential grounding in some limited domains, through in-context learning, and perhaps even through mere pre-training on specific kinds of input sequences, such as those describing game moves.

This discussion leads us to a potentially surprising conclusion: some multimodal models trained on images in addition to text, like CLIP or DALL-E 2, are poor candidates for referential grounding, since they lack the kind of learning process that could supply world-involving functions. In fact, even some embodied systems that combine a ‘frozen’ LLM with a robotic body, like SayCan, might also

fail to achieve referential grounding of the LLM’s representations and outputs. In such systems, the robot’s interaction with the real world turns out to be irrelevant to the Vector Grounding Problem, as it cannot provide the LLM with the right kind of world-involving function. Whether the few-shot learning prompt passed to the LLM component is suitable to play that role is debatable, given its focus on goal specification rather than factual accuracy. One benefit of our analysis is to highlight that multimodality and embodiment are neither necessary nor sufficient conditions for referential grounding in artificial systems, although they are certainly compatible with it if the right kind of learning process is available.

## References

- Abdou, M., Kulmizev, A., Hershovich, D., Frank, S., Pavlick, E. & Søgaard, A. (2021), ‘Can Language Models Encode Perceptual Structure Without Grounding? A Case Study in Color’.
- Ahn, M., Brohan, A., Brown, N., Chebotar, Y., Cortes, O., David, B., Finn, C., Fu, C., Gopalakrishnan, K., Hausman, K., Herzog, A., Ho, D., Hsu, J., Ibarz, J., Ichter, B., Irpan, A., Jang, E., Ruano, R. J., Jeffrey, K., Jesmonth, S., Joshi, N. J., Julian, R., Kalashnikov, D., Kuang, Y., Lee, K.-H., Levine, S., Lu, Y., Luu, L., Parada, C., Pastor, P., Quiambao, J., Rao, K., Rettinghouse, J., Reyes, D., Sermanet, P., Sievers, N., Tan, C., Toshev, A., Vanhoucke, V., Xia, F., Xiao, T., Xu, P., Xu, S., Yan, M. & Zeng, A. (2022), ‘Do As I Can, Not As I Say: Grounding Language in Robotic Affordances’.
- Alayrac, J.-B., Donahue, J., Luc, P., Miech, A., Barr, I., Hasson, Y., Lenc, K., Mensch, A., Millican, K., Reynolds, M., Ring, R., Rutherford, E., Cabi, S., Han, T., Gong, Z., Samangooei, S., Monteiro, M., Menick, J., Borgeaud, S., Brock, A., Nematzadeh, A., Sharifzadeh, S., Binkowski, M., Barreira, R., Vinyals, O., Zisserman, A. & Simonyan, K. (2022), ‘Flamingo: A Visual Language Model for Few-Shot Learning’.
- Artiga, M. (2016), ‘New perspectives on artifactual and biological functions’, *Applied Ontology* **11**, 89–102.
- Askell, A., Bai, Y., Chen, A., Drain, D., Ganguli, D., Henighan, T., Jones, A., Joseph, N., Mann, B., DasSarma, N., Elhage, N., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Hernandez, D., Kernion, J., Ndousse, K., Olsson, C., Amodei, D., Brown, T., Clark, J., McCandlish, S., Olah, C. & Kaplan, J. (2021), ‘A General Language Assistant as a Laboratory for Alignment’.
- Bai, Y., Jones, A., Ndousse, K., Askell, A., Chen, A., DasSarma, N., Drain, D., Fort, S., Ganguli, D., Henighan, T., Joseph, N., Kadavath, S., Kernion, J., Conerly, T., El-Showk, S., Elhage, N., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Hernandez, D., Hume, T., Johnston, S., Kravec, S., Lovitt, L., Nanda, N., Olsson, C., Amodei, D., Brown, T., Clark, J., McCandlish, S., Olah, C., Mann, B. & Kaplan, J. (2022), ‘Training a Helpful and Harmless Assistant with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback’.
- Barsalou, L. W. (1999), ‘Perceptual symbol systems’, *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **22**, 577–660.
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A. & Shmitchell, S. (2021), On the dangers of stochastic parrots, in ‘Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency’, ACM.
- Bender, E. M. & Koller, A. (2020), Climbing towards NLU: On meaning, form, and understanding in the age of data, in ‘Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics’, Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Block, N. (1986), ‘Advertisement for a Semantics for Psychology’, *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* **10**, 615–678.

- Bommasani, R., Hudson, D. A., Adeli, E., Altman, R., Arora, S., von Arx, S., Bernstein, M. S., Bohg, J., Bosselut, A., Brunskill, E., Brynjolfsson, E., Buch, S., Card, D., Castellon, R., Chatterji, N., Chen, A., Creel, K., Davis, J. Q., Demszky, D., Donahue, C., Doumbouya, M., Durmus, E., Ermon, S., Etchemendy, J., Ethayarajh, K., Fei-Fei, L., Finn, C., Gale, T., Gillespie, L., Goel, K., Goodman, N., Grossman, S., Guha, N., Hashimoto, T., Henderson, P., Hewitt, J., Ho, D. E., Hong, J., Hsu, K., Huang, J., Icard, T., Jain, S., Jurafsky, D., Kalluri, P., Karamcheti, S., Keeling, G., Khani, F., Khattab, O., Koh, P. W., Krass, M., Krishna, R., Kuditipudi, R., Kumar, A., Ladhak, F., Lee, M., Lee, T., Leskovec, J., Levent, I., Li, X. L., Li, X., Ma, T., Malik, A., Manning, C. D., Mirchandani, S., Mitchell, E., Munyikwa, Z., Nair, S., Narayan, A., Narayanan, D., Newman, B., Nie, A., Niebles, J. C., Nilforoshan, H., Nyarko, J., Ogut, G., Orr, L., Papadimitriou, I., Park, J. S., Piech, C., Portelance, E., Potts, C., Raghunathan, A., Reich, R., Ren, H., Rong, F., Roohani, Y., Ruiz, C., Ryan, J., Ré, C., Sadigh, D., Sagawa, S., Santhanam, K., Shih, A., Srinivasan, K., Tamkin, A., Taori, R., Thomas, A. W., Tramèr, F., Wang, R. E., Wang, W., Wu, B., Wu, J., Wu, Y., Xie, S. M., Yasunaga, M., You, J., Zaharia, M., Zhang, M., Zhang, T., Zhang, X., Zhang, Y., Zheng, L., Zhou, K. & Liang, P. (2022), ‘On the Opportunities and Risks of Foundation Models’.
- Borgeaud, S., Mensch, A., Hoffmann, J., Cai, T., Rutherford, E., Millican, K., Driessche, G. B. V. D., Lespiau, J.-B., Damoc, B., Clark, A., Casas, D. D. L., Guy, A., Menick, J., Ring, R., Hennigan, T., Huang, S., Maggiore, L., Jones, C., Cassirer, A., Brock, A., Paganini, M., Irving, G., Vinyals, O., Osindero, S., Simonyan, K., Rae, J., Elsen, E. & Sifre, L. (2022), Improving Language Models by Retrieving from Trillions of Tokens, in ‘Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning’, PMLR, pp. 2206–2240.
- Brandom, R. (1994), *Making It Explicit: Reasoning, Representing, and Discursive Commitment*, Harvard University Press.
- Brennan, S. E. (1998), The grounding problem in conversations with and through computers, in S. R. Fussell & R. J. Kreuz, eds, ‘Social and Cognitive Approaches to Interpersonal Communication’, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 201–225.
- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D. M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I. & Amodei, D. (2020), ‘Language Models are Few-Shot Learners’, *arXiv:2005.14165 [cs]* .
- Bubeck, S., Chandrasekaran, V., Eldan, R., Gehrke, J., Horvitz, E., Kamar, E., Lee, P., Lee, Y. T., Li, Y., Lundberg, S., Nori, H., Palangi, H., Ribeiro, M. T. & Zhang, Y. (2023), ‘Sparks of Artificial General Intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4’.
- Buckner, C. (2019), ‘Deep learning: A philosophical introduction’, *Philosophy Compass* **14**(10), e12625.
- Carnap, R. (1952), ‘Meaning postulates’, *Philosophical Studies* **3**(5), 65–73.
- Castelvecchi, D. (2016), ‘Can we open the black box of AI?’, *Nature News* **538**(7623), 20.
- Chandu, K. R., Bisk, Y. & Black, A. W. (2021), Grounding ‘Grounding’ in NLP, in ‘Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021’, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, pp. 4283–4305.
- Chen, T., Kornblith, S., Norouzi, M. & Hinton, G. (2020), A Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning of Visual Representations, in ‘Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning’, PMLR, pp. 1597–1607.

- Chomsky, N. (1957), *Syntactic Structures*, Mouton.
- Chowdhery, A., Narang, S., Devlin, J., Bosma, M., Mishra, G., Roberts, A., Barham, P., Chung, H. W., Sutton, C., Gehrmann, S., Schuh, P., Shi, K., Tsvyashchenko, S., Maynez, J., Rao, A., Barnes, P., Tay, Y., Shazeer, N., Prabhakaran, V., Reif, E., Du, N., Hutchinson, B., Pope, R., Bradbury, J., Austin, J., Isard, M., Gur-Ari, G., Yin, P., Duke, T., Levskaya, A., Ghemawat, S., Dev, S., Michalewski, H., Garcia, X., Misra, V., Robinson, K., Fedus, L., Zhou, D., Ippolito, D., Luan, D., Lim, H., Zoph, B., Spiridonov, A., Sepassi, R., Dohan, D., Agrawal, S., Omernick, M., Dai, A. M., Pillai, T. S., Pellat, M., Lewkowycz, A., Moreira, E., Child, R., Polozov, O., Lee, K., Zhou, Z., Wang, X., Saeta, B., Diaz, M., Firat, O., Catasta, M., Wei, J., Meier-Hellstern, K., Eck, D., Dean, J., Petrov, S. & Fiedel, N. (2022), ‘PaLM: Scaling Language Modeling with Pathways’.
- Clark, H. H. & Brennan, S. E. (1991), Grounding in communication, in ‘Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition’, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US, pp. 127–149.
- Coelho Mollo, D. (2019), ‘Are there teleological functions to compute?’, *Philosophy of Science* 86(3), 431–452.
- Coelho Mollo, D. (2022), ‘Deflationary Realism: Representation and idealisation in cognitive science’, *Mind & Language* 37(5), 1048–1066.
- Dai, D., Sun, Y., Dong, L., Hao, Y., Sui, Z. & Wei, F. (2022), ‘Why Can GPT Learn In-Context? Language Models Secretly Perform Gradient Descent as Meta-Optimizers’.
- de Saussure, F. (1916), *Cours de Linguistique Générale*, Payot, Paris.
- Dehghani, M., Djolonga, J., Mustafa, B., Padlewski, P., Heek, J., Gilmer, J., Steiner, A., Caron, M., Geirhos, R., Alabdulmohsin, I., Jenatton, R., Beyer, L., Tschannen, M., Arnab, A., Wang, X., Riquelme, C., Minderer, M., Puigcerver, J., Evci, U., Kumar, M., van Steenkiste, S., Elsayed, G. F., Mahendran, A., Yu, F., Oliver, A., Huot, F., Bastings, J., Collier, M. P., Gritsenko, A., Birodkar, V., Vasconcelos, C., Tay, Y., Mensink, T., Kolesnikov, A., Pavetić, F., Tran, D., Kipf, T., Lučić, M., Zhai, X., Keysers, D., Harmsen, J. & Houlsby, N. (2023), ‘Scaling Vision Transformers to 22 Billion Parameters’.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K. & Toutanova, K. (2018), ‘BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding’, *arXiv:1810.04805 [cs]* .
- Di Maro, M. (2021), ‘Computational Grounding: An Overview of Common Ground Applications in Conversational Agents’, *IJCoL. Italian Journal of Computational Linguistics* 7(1 | 2), 133–156.
- Driess, D., Xia, F., Sajjadi, M. S. M., Lynch, C., Chowdhery, A., Ichter, B., Wahid, A., Tompson, J., Vuong, Q., Yu, T., Huang, W., Chebotar, Y., Sermanet, P., Duckworth, D., Levine, S., Vanhoucke, V., Hausman, K., Toussaint, M., Greff, K., Zeng, A., Mordatch, I. & Florence, P. (2023), ‘PaLM-E: An Embodied Multimodal Language Model’.
- Fine, K. (2012), Guide to Ground, in F. Correia & B. Schnieder, eds, ‘Metaphysical Grounding’, Cambridge University Press, pp. 37–80.
- Firth, J. R. (1957), *Papers in Linguistics, 1934-1951*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Fodor, J. A. (1990), *A Theory of Content and Other Essays*, MIT Press.
- Goodman, N. (1976), *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*, Hackett Publishing.
- Haiman, J. (1985), *Iconicity in Syntax*, Vol. 6, John Benjamins Publishing.

- Harnad, S. (1990), ‘The symbol-grounding problem’, *Physica D* **42**, 335–346.
- Harris, Z. S. (1954), ‘Distributional structure’, *Word* **10**, 146–162.
- Hill, F., Tieleman, O., von Glehn, T., Wong, N., Merzic, H. & Clark, S. (2020), ‘Grounded Language Learning Fast and Slow’.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1990), *Semantic Structures*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Katz, J. J. (1972), *Semantic Theory*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Kiela, D., Bartolo, M., Nie, Y., Kaushik, D., Geiger, A., Wu, Z., Vidgen, B., Prasad, G., Singh, A., Ringshia, P., Ma, Z., Thrush, T., Riedel, S., Waseem, Z., Stenetorp, P., Jia, R., Bansal, M., Potts, C. & Williams, A. (2021), ‘Dynabench: Rethinking Benchmarking in NLP’.
- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y. & Hinton, G. (2015), ‘Deep learning’, *Nature* **521**(7553), 436–444.
- Li, J., Kementchedjhieva, Y. & Søgaard, A. (2023), ‘Implications of the Convergence of Language and Vision Model Geometries’.
- Li, K., Hopkins, A. K., Bau, D., Viégas, F., Pfister, H. & Wattenberg, M. (2023), ‘Emergent World Representations: Exploring a Sequence Model Trained on a Synthetic Task’.
- Liétard, B., Abdou, M. & Søgaard, A. (2021), ‘Do Language Models Know the Way to Rome?’.
- Mcclelland, J. L., Rumelhart, D. E. & Group, P. R. (1986), *Parallel Distributed Processing, Explorations in the Microstructure of Cognition*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Merullo, J., Castricato, L., Eickhoff, C. & Pavlick, E. (2023), ‘Linearly Mapping from Image to Text Space’.
- Millikan, R. G. (2017), *Beyond Concepts: Unicepts, Language, and Natural Information*, Oxford University Press.
- Montague, R. (1970), ‘Universal Grammar’, *Theoria* **36**(3), 373–398.
- Nanda, N. (2023), ‘Actually, Othello-GPT Has A Linear Emergent World Representation’.
- Neander, K. (2017), *A Mark of the Mental: in defense of informational semantics*, The MIT Press.
- Newman, M. (1928), ‘Mr. Russell’s ‘Causal Theory of Perception’’, *Mind* **XXXVII**(146), 137–148.
- OpenAI (2023), ‘GPT-4 Technical Report’.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., Schulman, J., Hilton, J., Kelton, F., Miller, L., Simens, M., Aspell, A., Welinder, P., Christiano, P. F., Leike, J. & Lowe, R. (2022), ‘Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35**, 27730–27744.
- Partee, B. H. (1981), Montague Grammar, Mental Representations, and Reality, in S. Kanger & S. Öhman, eds, ‘Philosophy and Grammar: Papers on the Occasion of the Quincentennial of Uppsala University’, Synthese Library, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 59–78.
- Patel, R. & Pavlick, E. (2022), Mapping Language Models to Grounded Conceptual Spaces, in ‘International Conference on Learning Representations’.

- Perniss, P. & Vigliocco, G. (2014), 'The bridge of iconicity: From a world of experience to the experience of language', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **369**(1651), 20130300.
- Petroni, F., Rocktäschel, T., Lewis, P., Bakhtin, A., Wu, Y., Miller, A. H. & Riedel, S. (2019), 'Language Models as Knowledge Bases?'
- Piantadosi, S. T. & Hill, F. (2022), 'Meaning without reference in large language models'.
- Poon, H. (2013), Grounded Unsupervised Semantic Parsing, in 'Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)', Association for Computational Linguistics, Sofia, Bulgaria, pp. 933–943.
- Pulvermüller, F. (1999), 'Words in the brain's language', *Behavioural and Brain Sciences* **22**, 253–336.
- Radford, A., Kim, J. W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., Krueger, G. & Sutskever, I. (2021), 'Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision', *arXiv:2103.00020 [cs]* .
- Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T. & Sutskever, I. (2018), 'Improving language understanding by generative pre-training'
- Ramesh, A., Dhariwal, P., Nichol, A., Chu, C. & Chen, M. (2022), 'Hierarchical Text-Conditional Image Generation with CLIP Latents'.
- Ramsey, W. M. (2007), *Representation Reconsidered*, Cambridge University Press.
- Reed, S., Zolna, K., Parisotto, E., Colmenarejo, S. G., Novikov, A., Barth-maroon, G., Giménez, M., Sulsky, Y., Kay, J., Springenberg, J. T., Eccles, T., Bruce, J., Razavi, A., Edwards, A., Heess, N., Chen, Y., Hadsell, R., Vinyals, O., Bordbar, M. & de Freitas, N. (2022), 'A Generalist Agent', *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* .
- Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E. & Williams, R. J. (1986), 'Learning representations by back-propagating errors', *Nature* **323**(6088), 533–536.
- Searle, J. R. (1980), 'Minds, brains and programs', *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **3**(3), 417–457.
- Shea, N. (2018), *Representation in Cognitive Science*, Oxford University Press.
- Shortliffe, E. H. (1977), 'Mycin: A Knowledge-Based Computer Program Applied to Infectious Diseases', *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Computer Application in Medical Care* pp. 66–69.
- Simon, H. A. & Newell, A. (1971), 'Human problem solving: The state of the theory in 1970', *American Psychologist* **26**(2), 145–159.
- Søgaard, A. (2022), 'Understanding models understanding language', *Synthese* **200**(6).
- Stalnaker, R. (2002), 'Common Ground', *Linguistics and Philosophy* **25**(5-6), 701–721.
- Swayer, C. (1991), 'Structural representation and surrogative reasoning', *Synthese* **87**, 449–508.
- Thoppilan, R., De Freitas, D., Hall, J., Shazeer, N., Kulshreshtha, A., Cheng, H.-T., Jin, A., Bos, T., Baker, L., Du, Y., Li, Y., Lee, H., Zheng, H. S., Ghafouri, A., Menegali, M., Huang, Y., Krikun, M., Lepikhin, D., Qin, J., Chen, D., Xu, Y., Chen, Z., Roberts, A., Bosma, M., Zhao, V., Zhou, Y., Chang, C.-C., Krivokon, I., Rusch, W., Pickett, M., Srinivasan, P., Man, L., Meier-Hellstern, K., Morris, M. R., Doshi, T., Santos, R. D., Duke, T., Soraker, J., Zevenbergen, B., Prabhakaran, V., Diaz, M.,

- Hutchinson, B., Olson, K., Molina, A., Hoffman-John, E., Lee, J., Aroyo, L., Rajakumar, R., Butryna, A., Lamm, M., Kuzmina, V., Fenton, J., Cohen, A., Bernstein, R., Kurzweil, R., Aguera-Arcas, B., Cui, C., Croak, M., Chi, E. & Le, Q. (2022), 'LaMDA: Language Models for Dialog Applications'.
- Traum, D. (1994), 'A Computational theory of grounding in natural language conversation'.
- Tsai, C.-T. & Roth, D. (2016), 'Concept Grounding to Multiple Knowledge Bases via Indirect Supervision', *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 4(0), 141–154.
- Van Langendonck, W. (2010), Iconicity, in D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens, eds, 'The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics', Oxford University Press, p. 0.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L. & Polosukhin, I. (2017), 'Attention is all you need'.
- Villegas, R., Babaeizadeh, M., Kindermans, P.-J., Moraldo, H., Zhang, H., Saffar, M. T., Castro, S., Kunze, J. & Erhan, D. (2022), 'Phenaki: Variable Length Video Generation From Open Domain Textual Description'.
- von Oswald, J., Niklasson, E., Randazzo, E., Sacramento, J., Mordvintsev, A., Zhmoginov, A. & Vladymyrov, M. (2022), 'Transformers learn in-context by gradient descent'.
- Winograd, T. (1971), 'Procedures as a Representation for Data in a Computer Program for Understanding Natural Language'.
- Wolfram, S. (2023), 'What is chatgpt doing ... and why does it work?', BlogPost, accessed on 23.03.2023.  
**URL:** <https://writings.stephenwolfram.com/2023/02/what-is-chatgpt-doing-and-why-does-it-work/>
- Yuksekgonul, M., Bianchi, F., Kalluri, P., Jurafsky, D. & Zou, J. (2023), 'When and why vision-language models behave like bags-of-words, and what to do about it?'.
- Ziegler, D. M., Stiennon, N., Wu, J., Brown, T. B., Radford, A., Amodei, D., Christiano, P. & Irving, G. (2019), 'Fine-tuning language models from human preferences'.