

Are Words the Quanta of Human Language? Extending the Domain of Quantum Cognition

Diederik Aerts and Lester Beltran

*Center Leo Apostel for Interdisciplinary Studies
Brussels Free University, Krijgskundestraat 33
1160 Brussels, Belgium*

E-Mails: diraerts@vub.ac.be, diraerts@gmail.com,
lbeltran@vub.ac.be, lestercc21@yahoo.com

Abstract

Quantum structures, especially the non-classical quantum probability model and the quantum vector space structure of quantum mechanics, were identified as relevant structures for describing certain situations occurring in human cognition during the last two decades within a research domain called quantum cognition. Likewise and in a way connected to the insights within quantum cognition, the same quantum structures were fruitfully used in applications of information retrieval and natural language processing, thus within the research domain of quantum information theory. In the present article, we build on recent prior work and show that additionally to quantum probability and quantum vector space structures, the most original of all quantum structures, namely quantization, is present in human cognition, in the form of the words of human language behaving as quanta of this human language, very analogous to how photons behave as quanta of electromagnetic radiation. We illustrate this finding with an example where we identify the Bose-Einstein statistics in a piece of text that tells a story, and show that this Bose-Einstein statistics provides a perfect model for the piece of text, while the Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics is totally inadequate to model it. Just as it is the case with quantum particles that their indistinguishability introduces a specific form of entanglement, we show that this happens in a very similar way with words in a piece of text. We investigate this entanglement of words, compute their von Neumann entropy, and the amount of non purity of the density matrices corresponding to their partial traces. We note that non-locality occurs spontaneously and is also explained, provided the proper correspondences are made regarding the Heisenberg inequality duality, energy versus time, and momentum versus space. We interpret these results in terms of the prospect of developing a quantum-inspired thermodynamics for the cultural layer of human society, based on a statistical analysis similar to what we propose in this article.

Keywords: human language, Bose-Einstein statistics, indistinguishability, entanglement, quantum cognition, von Neumann entropy, thermodynamics

1 Introduction

If we consider ‘a piece of text that tells a story’ then the same words can be interchanged within the text without changing anything of the story told by the text. Let us demonstrate concretely using a piece of text as an *Example Text* of what we mean.

Example Text. It mists over the flanks of the hillside. In a few hours the climbing sun will dispel the haze. The pine trees are slender against the horizon. The animal saunters slowly

down toward the great river. Before reaching the water, the animal looks into the distance and lets its proud sound reverberate across the valley. The animal continues its way through the young grass to the riverbank where it will enjoy its favorite food. From the small grove of trees growing a little further along the riverbank, another animal appears, surveying the panorama.

We have underlined the four occurrences of the word ‘animal’ in the piece of text, and it is indeed evident that we can interchange these four words ‘animal’ with each other, and that this will not change the piece of text as a story in any possible way. Herein ‘a text representing a story’ behaves differently from ‘a collection of macroscopic physical objects representing a landscape’ in physical reality. Indeed, let us now consider the physical landscape of ‘the animal sauntering down the hillside and the other animal appearing from the grove of trees along the riverbank’. If we swap these two animals in the physical landscape, this landscape will change essentially.

Macroscopic material entities, such as animals, even if they are designated by the same word in a piece of text, cannot be exchanged without fundamentally changing the physical reality of the landscape in which they are present. The reason is that two macroscopic physical objects, both ‘animals’ in our example, are never identical and indistinguishable, whereas two words ‘animals’, in the text of a story, ‘are definitely identical and indistinguishable’. This insight inspired us to investigate the statistical nature of the distribution of words in the texts of stories, paying attention to this symmetry of identity and indistinguishability. We were able to show that this distribution can be modeled in an exceptionally accurate way by Bose-Einstein statistics, while Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics is totally incapable of providing a fitting model. And we tested the two statistics, Bose-Einstein and Maxwell-Boltzmann, on many different pieces of text of stories, short stories and long stories of the size of novels, over and over again a Bose-Einstein distribution turned out to yield a perfect fit, while the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution never came even close to a fit distribution (Aerts & Beltran, 2020).

We note that it is one of the basic principles of quantum mechanics that in a physical landscape of quantum particles the same particles are identical and indistinguishable and if they are bosons, their distribution is described by Bose-Einstein statistics, and more specifically this is the case for photons as particles of light. More so, the direct mathematical expression of this indistinguishability on the formalism of quantum mechanics, and that is done by making the wave functions describing the quantum entities symmetric, in the case of bosons, or anti-symmetric, in the case of fermions, leads as a result of a mathematical derivation to these two possible statistics, for bosons with symmetric wave functions the Bose-Einstein statistics, and for fermions, with anti-symmetric wave functions, the Fermi-Dirac statistics. On the other hand, an equivalent mathematical derivation leads to the Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics when dealing with distinguishable particles. That means that identifying one of the three statistics, Bose-Einstein, Fermi-Dirac, or Maxwell-Boltzmann, is like a fingerprint for what the particles ‘are’, i.e., what their ontology is, indistinguishable and bosonic, indistinguishable and fermionic, or distinguishable (Huang, 1987; Yokoi & Abe, 2018).

Historically, there is also a connection with quantization. Indeed, when Max Planck initiated the birth of quantum mechanics, by proposing a new radiation law for a heated material entity, he introduced the hypothesis of the quantization of energy into packets, which would later be called photons (Planck, 1900). For Planck, it seemed natural to apply the method of Ludwig Boltzmann in his analysis, and so energy packets were spontaneously treated as indistinguishable, according to the way Boltzmann treated energy, after all, for Boltzmann, the distinguishability was carried by the atoms or molecules of the gas. It is only with the later analysis of Satyendra Nath Bose, interpreted by Albert Einstein, that this aspect of Planck’s new law of radiation became clear, namely that it was the photons themselves that were explicitly considered indistinguishable (Bose, 1924). Einstein had then, already in 1924, so before the birth of Heisenberg’s and Schrödinger’s quantum mechanics, understood that something very peculiar and new was going on, especially also when he applied Bose’s method of deriving Planck’s law to a gas consisting, not

of photons, but of atoms or molecules, and in this way explicitly considered the atoms or molecules to be indistinguishable (Einstein, 1924, 1925). This is also why he was able to predict the phenomenon of Bose-Einstein condensation for atoms or molecules of a gas, which was realized in 1995, when methods of cooling gases close enough to absolute zero became technically feasible (Anderson et al., 1995; Davis et al., 1995; Bradley et al., 1995). But Einstein had also understood that with this way of regarding the atoms or molecules of the gas itself as indistinguishable there occurred a peculiar lack of statistical independence between the different atoms or molecules, which at that time were still considered simply as independently randomly moving particles. That was the forerunner of the phenomenon that we now call ‘entanglement’, as introduced by the requirement of indistinguishability expressed on the formalism of quantum mechanics. This lack of statistical independence was noted also by others and heavily criticized by some, e.g. by Paul Ehrenfest (Pérez & Sauer, 2010). Also Erwin Schrödinger became interested and intrigued by this new description of Einstein of an ideal gas, and by the new statistics that appeared in it, now called Bose-Einstein statistics, and very probably wave mechanics, which he developed shortly afterwards, was at least partly influenced by it (Schrödinger, 1926).

It is interesting to note that Einstein’s immediate enthusiasm for Bose’s method, and his persistence in using it to describe an ideal gas of atoms or molecules, found its ground primarily in his conviction that an ideal gas consisting of molecules or atoms should be considered similar to electromagnetic radiation consisting of photons, the only difference being that photons had no mass while atoms or molecules had. There are several passages, also in letters he exchanged around that period with friends and colleagues, in which this conviction can be noticed (Pérez & Sauer, 2010), and likewise in Schrödinger’s article on Einstein’s gas theory Einstein’s motivation is considered to be this one (Schrödinger, 1926). Although Einstein admitted that there were not at all the same direct theoretical indications and experimental facts about an ideal gas that there were about electromagnetic radiation and that compelled Planck to formulate the hypothesis that gave him the new law of radiation, he did not hold back from expressing his deep intuition, writing the following to his close friend Paul Ehrenfest on December 2, 1924: “The thing with the quantum gas turns out to be very interesting. It seems to me more and more that something deep and true is hiding there. I am looking forward to arguing about this with you.” Meanwhile, and certainly so after a Bose-Einstein condensate of a gas was realized in 1995 by three different experimental groups, and the 2001 Nobel Prize in physics was awarded for these realizations (Cornell & Wieman, 2002; Ketterle, 2002), no one doubts the truth of Einstein’s intuition at the time, quantum gases are now well-accepted entities, which are being studied very thoroughly, and the entanglement resulting from the indistinguishability of atoms and molecules is also being studied extensively (see Section 3). However, the elaboration of a quantum thermodynamics that is at the level of where many aspects of quantum mechanics already are, is still in full progress and many aspects of such a quantum thermodynamics are not yet well understood (Gemmer et al., 2009; Mahler, 2015; Gogolin & Eisert, 2016; Yokoi & Abe, 2018).

From a perspective that is in some respects similar to Einstein’s view in relation to the equivalence of electromagnetic radiation and an ideal gas of atoms or molecules, we wish in this article to continue working on our finding in Aerts & Beltran (2020), which was preceded by an initial examination in Aerts, Sozzo & Veloz (2015b), and which consist of considering ‘words as the quanta of human language’. Hence, the ground of our motivation is the perspective that ‘human language and its words’ are similar to ‘electromagnetic radiation and its photons’ and to ‘ideal gases and their atoms or molecules’. In this respect our investigation in the footsteps of Einstein in 1924, also pertains to a research domain called quantum cognition (Busemeyer et al., 2006; Aerts, 2009a; Pothos & Busemeyer, 2009; Bruza et al., 2009; Lambert Mogilianski Zamir & Zwirn, 2009; Busemeyer & Bruza, 2012; Haven & Khrennikov, 2013; Sozzo, 2014; Aerts, Sozzo & Veloz, 2015a; Veloz & Dujardin, 2015; Blutner & beim Graben, 2016; Moreira & Wichert, 2016), where quantum probability models are used to describe human decisions that depart from rationality (conjunction effect, disjunction effect, guppy effect, Ellsberg-type paradoxes, etc.). And more specifically, we want to enlarge

the domain of quantum cognition to the study of the quantum statistical properties of the cognitive apparatus that humans use in cognition, communication and decision making, namely human language itself. More concretely, we want to introduce that aspect of quantum mechanics, which is the oldest one, namely the aspect of ‘quantization’, and more precisely consider ‘words’ as the ‘quanta’ of human language. In this way, we want to show that in the research domain of quantum cognition, not only vector spaces and quantum probability models play a role, but quantization as well appears as a quantum effect.

We investigate what influence this new insight has on the notion of ‘entropy’ in human cognition and propose that rather than the Shannon entropy (Shannon, 1948a,b), which is the equivalent for human cognition of the Maxwell-Boltzmann classical entropy, the von Neumann entropy (von Neumann, 1932) should be used if ‘meaning’ is to be identified as a basic feature of this human cognition. We consider the significance of the von Neumann entropy in human cognition, and suggest that the analogy of human language as an interaction medium between human minds, on the one hand, and the electromagnetic radiation of photons as an interaction medium between pieces of fermionic matter, on the other hand, may shed light on the problems that arise in the nascent theory of quantum thermodynamics.

In Section 2, we explicitly give one of the examples of a piece of text for which we determined the Bose-Einstein distribution in Aerts & Beltran (2020), and use the example to clarify how, in a very analogous way than this is the case for light, the Bose-Einstein nature of its statistics, associated with being identical and indistinguishable, goes together with quantization. Hence, similarly to how photons are the quanta of light, words are the quanta of human language. In Section 3, we study the entanglement that results from indistinguishability, show that it is ‘contextual indistinguishability’ that plays a role, and indicate how our analysis extends the domain of quantum cognition. In Section 4 we calculate the von Neumann entropy for single words of human language, show how it is greater than zero while the entropy of the total text considered is zero, thus demonstrating the subadditivity of entropy in human cognition, very analogous to what takes place for quantum entities. To this end, we use the data from five studies of combinations of words that violate Bell’s inequalities from previous work by our Brussels research group over the last decade. We analyze and reflect on the significance of the results of these entropy calculations and outline avenues for future research.

2 Words as the quanta of human language

We consider as an example of a piece of text again the first piece of texts we examined in Aerts & Beltran (2020), namely the Winnie the Pooh story entitled ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’ (Milne, 1926).

The ‘energy level’ of a word is defined by the number of times this word appears in the considered piece of text. The most often appearing word, namely 133 times, in the considered Winnie the Pooh story is the word *And* (we will denote words when they are looked upon as quanta in italics and with a capital letter, like in our earlier works we have denoted concepts) and we attribute to it the lowest energy level E_0 . The second most often appearing word, 111 times, is *He*, and we attribute to it the second lowest energy level E_1 , and so on, till we reach words such as *Able*, which only appears once.

For a ‘gas of bosonic particles’ in ‘thermal equilibrium with its environment’, such as light consisting of photons, indeed these ‘number of times of appearance’ indicate different energy levels of the particles of the gas, following the ‘energy distribution law governing the gas’, and this is our inspiration for the introduction of ‘energy’ in human language. We want to look at each of these words as ‘states of the quantum of human language’, which we have called ‘the cogniton’ in Aerts & Beltran (2020), exactly like different energy levels of photons (different wavelengths of light) are each ‘states of the photon’. Proceeding in this way, we arrive at 452 energy levels for the story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’, the values of which are taken to be

$$\{E_i = i \mid i \in [0, 1, \dots, 451, 452]\} \tag{1}$$

We denote $N(E_i)$ the ‘number of appearances’ of the word with energy level E_i , and if we denote n the total number of energy levels, we have that

$$N = \sum_{i=0}^n N(E_i) \quad (2)$$

is the total number of words of the considered piece of text, which is 2655 for the story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’.

For each of the energy levels E_i , $N(E_i)E_i$ is the amount of energy ‘radiated’ by the story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’ with the ‘frequency or wave length’ connected to this energy level. For example, the energy level $E_{54} = 54$ is populated by the word *Thought* and the word *Thought* appears $N(E_{54}) = 10$ times in the story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’. Each of the 10 appearances of *Thought* radiates with energy value 54, which means that the total radiation with the wavelength connected to *Thought* of the story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’ equals $N_{54}E_{54} = 10 \cdot 54 = 540$.

The total energy E radiated by the considered piece of text is therefore

$$E = \sum_{i=0}^n N(E_i)E_i \quad (3)$$

For the story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’ we have $E = 242891$. In Table 1, we have presented the list of all words that appear in the story (in the column ‘Words’), with their ‘number of appearances’ (in the column ‘Appearance numbers $N(E_i)$ ’), ordered from lowest energy level to highest energy level (in the column ‘Energy levels E_i ’), where the energy levels are attributed according to these numbers of appearances, lower energy levels to higher number of appearances, and their values are given as proposed in (1).

The question can be asked ‘what is the unity of energy in this model that we put forward?’, is the number ‘1’ that we choose for energy level E_1 a quantity expressed in joules, or in electronvolts, or still in another unity? This question gives us the opportunity to reveal already one of the very new aspects of our approach. Energy will not be expressed in ‘ kgm^2/s^2 ’ like it is the case in physics. Why not? Well, a human language is not situated somewhere in space, like we believe it to be the case with a physical boson gas of atoms, or a photon gas of light. Hence, ‘energy’ is here in our approach a basic quantity, and if we manage to introduce – this is one of our aims in further work – what the ‘human language equivalent’ of ‘physical space’ is, then it will be oppositely, namely this ‘equivalent of space’ will be expressed in unities where ‘energy appears as a fundamental unit’. Hence, the ‘1’ indicating that ‘*He* radiates with energy 1’, or ‘the cogniton in state *He* carries energy 1’, stands with a basic measure of energy, just like ‘distance (length)’ is a basic measure in ‘the physics of space and objects inside space’, not to be expressed as a combination of other physical quantities. We used the expressions ‘*He* radiates with energy 1’, and ‘the cogniton in state *He* carries energy 1’, and we will use this way of speaking about ‘human language within the view of a boson gas of entangled cognitons that we develop here’, in similarity with how we speak in physics about light and photons.

The words *The*, *It*, *A* and *To*, are the four next most often appearing words of the Winnie the Pooh story, and hence the energy levels E_2 , E_3 , E_4 and E_5 are populated by cognitons respectively in the states *The*, *It*, *A* and *To* carrying respectively 2, 3, 4 and 5 basic energy units. Hence, the first three columns in Table 1 describe the experimental data that we extracted from the Winnie the Pooh story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’. As we said, the story contains in total 2655 words, which give rise to 542 energy levels, where energy levels are connected with words, hence different words radiate with different energies, and the size of the energies are determined by ‘the number of appearances of the words in the story’, the most often appearing words being states of lowest energy of the cogniton and the least often appearing

words being states of highest energy of the cogniton. In Table 1, we have not presented all 542 energy levels, because that would lead to a too long table, but we have presented the most important part of the energy spectrum, with respect to the further aspects we will point out.

More concretely, we have represented the range from energy level E_0 , the ground state of the cogniton, which is the cogniton in state *And*, to energy level E_{78} , which is the cogniton in state *Put*. Then we have represented the energy level from E_{538} , which is the cogniton in state *Whishing*, to the highest energy level E_{542} of the Winnie the Pooh story, which is the cogniton in state *You've*.

These last five highest energy levels, from E_{538} to E_{542} , corresponding respectively to the cogniton in states *Whishing*, *Word*, *Worse*, *Year* and *You've*, all have a number of appearance of ‘one time’ in the story. They do however radiate with different energies, but the story is not giving us enough information to determine whether *Whishing* is radiating with lower energy as compared to *Year* or vice versa. Since this does not play a role in our actual analysis, we have ordered them alphabetically. So, different words which radiate with different energies that appear an equal number of times in this specific Winnie the Pooh story will be classified from lower to higher energy levels alphabetically.

In the column ‘Energies from data $E(E_i)$ ’, we represent $E(E_i)$, the ‘amount of energy radiated by the Winnie the Pooh story by the cognitons of a specific word, hence of a specific energy level E_i ’. The formula for this amount is given by

$$E(E_i) = N(E_i)E_i \quad (4)$$

the product of the number $N(E_i)$ of cognitons in the state of the word with energy level E_i multiplied by the amount of energy E_i radiated by such a cogniton in that state. In the last row of Table 1, we give the *Totalities*, namely in the column ‘Appearance numbers $N(E_i)$ ’ of this last row the total number of words

$$\sum_{i=0}^n N(E_i) = N = 2655 \quad (5)$$

and in the column ‘Energies from data $E(E_i)$ ’ of the last row we give the total amount of energy

$$\sum_{i=0}^n E(E_i) = \sum_{i=0}^n N(E_i)E_i = E = 242891 \quad (6)$$

radiated by the Winnie the Pooh story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’. Hence, columns ‘Words concepts cognitons’, ‘Energy levels E_i ’, Appearance numbers $N(E_i)$ and ‘Energies from data $E(E_i)$ ’ contain all the experimental data of the Winnie the Pooh story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’.

Words concepts cognitons	Energy levels E_i	Appearance numbers $N(E_i)$	Bose-Einstein modeling	Maxwell-Boltzmann modeling	Energies from data $E(E_i)$	Energies Bose-Einstein	Energies Maxwell-Boltzmann
<i>And</i>	0	133	129.05	28.29	0	0	0
<i>He</i>	1	111	105.84	28.00	111	105.84	28.00
<i>The</i>	2	91	89.68	27.69	182	179.36	55.38
<i>It</i>	3	85	77.79	27.40	255	233.36	82.19
<i>A</i>	4	70	68.66	27.11	280	274.65	108.43
<i>To</i>	5	69	61.45	26.82	345	307.23	234.09
<i>Said</i>	6	61	55.59	26.53	366	333.55	159.20
<i>Was</i>	7	59	50.75	26.25	413	355.24	183.76
<i>Piglet</i>	8	47	46.68	25.97	376	373.40	207.78
<i>I</i>	9	46	43.20	25.70	414	388.82	231.27
<i>That</i>	10	41	40.21	25.42	410	402.05	254.24

<i>Pooh</i>	11	40	37.59	25.15	440	413.52	276.69
<i>Of</i>	12	39	35.30	24.89	468	423.55	298.64
<i>Had</i>	13	28	33.26	24.62	364	432.38	320.09
<i>Would</i>	14	26	31.44	24.36	364	440.21	341.05
<i>As</i>	15	25	29.81	24.10	375	447.19	361.53
<i>In</i>	16	25	28.34	23.86	400	453.44	381.53
<i>But</i>	17	23	27.00	23.59	391	459.07	401.07
<i>Haffalump</i>	18	23	25.79	23.34	414	464.15	420.15
<i>His</i>	19	23	24.67	23.09	437	468.77	438.78
<i>Very</i>	20	23	23.65	22.85	460	472.96	456.97
<i>You</i>	21	23	22.70	22.61	483	476.79	474.72
<i>Then</i>	22	21	21.83	22.37	462	480.30	492.05
<i>Honey</i>	23	20	21.02	22.13	460	483.51	508.95
<i>So</i>	24	20	20.27	21.89	480	486.47	525.43
<i>Up</i>	25	20	19.57	21.66	500	489.19	541.51
<i>They</i>	26	19	18.91	21.43	494	491.71	557.19
<i>If</i>	27	18	18.30	21.20	486	494.03	572.47
<i>Jar</i>	28	18	17.72	20.98	504	496.18	587.37
<i>There</i>	29	18	17.18	20.75	522	498.18	601.89
<i>At</i>	30	17	16.67	20.53	510	500.03	616.03
<i>Be</i>	31	15	16.19	20.32	465	501.75	629.80
<i>Got</i>	32	15	15.73	20.10	480	503.34	643.21
<i>Just</i>	33	15	15.30	19.89	495	504.83	656.26
<i>What</i>	34	15	14.89	19.68	510	506.22	668.97
<i>Christopher</i>	35	14	14.50	19.47	490	507.51	681.33
<i>This</i>	36	14	14.13	19.26	504	508.71	693.35
<i>Trap</i>	37	14	13.78	19.06	518	509.83	705.03
<i>About</i>	38	13	13.44	18.85	494	510.88	716.40
<i>All</i>	39	13	13.12	18.65	507	511.86	727.44
<i>Should</i>	40	13	12.82	18.45	520	512.77	738.17
<i>For</i>	41	12	12.53	18.26	492	513.62	748.59
<i>Like</i>	42	12	12.25	18.06	504	514.41	758.70
<i>Robin</i>	43	12	11.98	17.87	516	515.15	768.51
<i>See</i>	44	12	11.72	17.68	528	515.84	778.03
<i>When</i>	45	12	11.48	17.49	540	516.48	778.26
<i>Down</i>	46	11	11.24	17.31	506	517.08	796.20
<i>Haffalumps</i>	47	11	11.01	17.12	517	517.64	804.87
<i>With</i>	48	11	10.79	16.94	528	518.15	813.26
<i>Do</i>	49	10	10.58	16.76	490	518.63	821.39
<i>Go</i>	50	10	10.38	16.58	500	519.08	829.25
<i>Off</i>	51	10	10.19	16.41	510	519.49	836.85
<i>On</i>	52	10	10.00	16.23	520	519.87	844.19
<i>Think</i>	53	10	9.82	16.06	530	520.22	851.29
<i>Thought</i>	54	10	9.64	15.89	540	520.54	858.13
<i>More</i>	55	9	9.47	15.72	495	520.83	864.74
<i>No</i>	56	9	9.31	15.56	504	521.10	871.11
<i>Out</i>	57	9	9.15	15.39	513	521.35	877.25
<i>Pit</i>	58	9	8.99	15.23	522	521.57	883.15
<i>Went</i>	59	9	8.84	15.07	531	521.77	888.84
<i>Don't</i>	60	8	8.70	14.91	480	521.95	894.30
<i>Good</i>	61	8	8.56	14.75	488	522.11	899.55
<i>Head</i>	62	8	8.43	14.59	496	522.25	904.58
<i>Know</i>	63	8	8.29	14.44	504	522.37	909.41

<i>Oh</i>	64	8	8.16	14.28	512	522.48	914.03
<i>Right</i>	65	8	8.04	14.13	520	522.57	918.45
<i>Well</i>	66	8	7.92	13.98	528	522.64	922.67
<i>Bed</i>	67	7	7.80	13.83	469	522.70	926.70
<i>Could</i>	68	7	7.69	13.68	476	522.74	930.54
<i>Deep</i>	69	7	7.58	13.54	483	522.77	934.20
<i>Did</i>	70	7	7.47	13.40	490	522.78	937.67
<i>First</i>	71	7	7.36	13.25	497	522.79	940.96
<i>Have</i>	72	7	7.26	13.11	504	522.78	944.08
<i>Help</i>	73	7	7.16	12.97	511	522.76	947.02
<i>Himself</i>	74	7	7.06	12.84	518	522.72	949.79
<i>How</i>	75	7	6.97	12.70	525	522.68	952.40
<i>Looked</i>	76	7	6.88	12.56	532	522.63	954.85
<i>Now</i>	77	7	6.79	12.43	539	522.56	957.13
<i>Put</i>	78	7	6.70	12.30	546	522.49	959.27
...
...
<i>Wishing</i>	538	1	0.67	0.09	538	359.92	48.65
<i>Word</i>	539	1	0.67	0.09	539	359.58	48.22
<i>Worse</i>	540	1	0.67	0.09	540	359.24	47.80
<i>Year</i>	541	1	0.66	0.09	541	358.90	47.38
<i>You've</i>	542	1	0.66	0.09	542	358.55	46.96
		2655	2655.00	2654.96	242891	242891.01	242889.76

Table 1: An energy scale representation of the words of the Winnie the Pooh story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’ by A. A. Milne as published in Milne (1926). The words are in the column ‘Words concepts cognitons’ and the energy levels are in the column ‘Energy levels E_i ’, and are attributed according to the ‘numbers of appearances’ in the column ‘Appearance numbers $N(E_i)$ ’, such that lower energy levels correspond to higher order of appearances, and the value of the energy levels is determined according to (1). The ‘amounts of energies radiated by the words of energy level E_i ’ are in the column ‘Energies from data $E(E_i)$ ’. In the columns ‘Bose-Einstein modeling’, ‘Maxwell-Boltzmann modeling’, ‘Energies Bose-Einstein’ and ‘Energies Maxwell-Boltzmann’ are respectively the predicted values of the Bose-Einstein and the Maxwell-Boltzmann model of the ‘numbers of appearances’, and of the ‘radiated energies’.


In columns ‘Bose-Einstein modeling’ and ‘Maxwell-Boltzmann modeling’ of Table 1, we give the values of the populations of the different energy states for, respectively, a Bose-Einstein and a Maxwell-Boltzmann model of the data of the considered story. Let us explain what these two models are. The Bose-Einstein distribution function is given by

$$N(E_i) = \frac{1}{Ae^{\frac{E_i}{B}} - 1} \quad (7)$$


where $N(E_i)$ is the number of bosons obeying the Bose-Einstein statistics in energy level E_i and A and B are two constants that are determined by expressing that the total number of bosons equals the total number of words, and that the total energy radiated equals the total energy of the Winnie the Pooh story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’, hence by the two conditions

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \frac{1}{Ae^{\frac{E_i}{B}} - 1} = N = 2655 \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \frac{E_i}{Ae^{\frac{E_i}{B}} - 1} = E = 242891 \quad (9)$$



(a) Numbers of appearances distribution graphs



(b) log / log graphs of numbers of appearances distributions

Figure 1: In (a) we represent the ‘number of appearances’ of words in the Winnie the Pooh story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’ (Milne, 1926), ranked from lowest energy level, corresponding to the most often appearing word, to highest energy level, corresponding to the least often appearing word as listed in Table 1. The blue graph (Series 1) represents the data, i.e. the collected numbers of appearances from the story (column ‘Appearance numbers $N(E_i)$ ’ of Table 1), the red graph (Series 2) is a Bose-Einstein distribution model for these numbers of appearances (column ‘Bose-Einstein modeling’ of Table 1), and the green graph (Series 3) is a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution model (column ‘Maxwell-Boltzmann modeling’ of Table 1). In (b) we represent the log / log graphs of the ‘numbers of appearances’ and their Bose-Einstein and Maxwell-Boltzmann models. The red and blue graphs coincide almost completely in both (a) and (b) while the green graph does not coincide at all with the blue graph of the data. This shows that the Bose-Einstein distribution is a good model for the numbers of appearances, while the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution is not.

We remark that the Bose-Einstein distribution function is derived in quantum statistical mechanics for a gas of bosonic quantum particles where the notions of ‘identity and indistinguishability’ play the specific role they are attributed in quantum theory (Huang, 1987; Yokoi & Abe, 2018).

Since we want to show the validity of the Bose-Einstein statistics for words in human language, we compared our Bose-Einstein distribution model with a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution model, hence we introduce also the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution explicitly. It is the distribution described by the following function

$$N(E_i) = \frac{1}{C e^{\frac{E_i}{D}}} \quad (10)$$

where $N(E_i)$ is the number of classical identical particles obeying the Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics in energy level E_i and C and D are two constants that will be determined, like in the case of the Bose-Einstein statistics, by the two conditions

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \frac{1}{C e^{\frac{E_i}{D}}} = N = 2655 \quad (11)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \frac{E_i}{C e^{\frac{E_i}{D}}} = E = 242891 \quad (12)$$




Figure 2: A representation of the ‘energy distribution’ of the Winnie the Pooh story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’ (Milne, 1926) as listed in Table 1. The blue graph (Series 1) represents the energy radiated by the story per energy level (column ‘Energies from data $E(E_i)$ ’ of Table 1), the red graph (Series 2) represents the energy radiated by the Bose-Einstein model of the story per energy level (column ‘Energies Bose-Einstein’ of Table 1), and the green graph (Series 3) represents the energy radiated by the Maxwell-Boltzmann model of the story per energy level (column ‘Energies Maxwell-Boltzmann’ of Table 1).

The Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution function is derived for ‘classical identical and distinguishable’ particles, and can also be shown in quantum statistical mechanics to be a good approximation if the quantum particles are such that their ‘the Broglie waves’ do not overlap (Huang, 1987). In the last two columns ‘Energies Bose-Einstein’ and ‘Energies Maxwell-Boltzmann’ of Table 1, we show the ‘energies’ related to the Bose-Einstein modeling and to the Maxwell-Boltzmann modeling, respectively.

We have now introduced all what is necessary to announce the principle result of our investigation.

When we determine the two constants A and B , respectively C and D , in the Bose-Einstein distribution function (7) and Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution function (10), by putting the total number of particles of the model equal to the total number of words of the considered piece of text, (8) and (11), and by putting the total energy of the model to the total energy of the considered piece of text, (9) and (12), we find a remarkable good fit of the Bose-Einstein modeling function with the data of the piece of text, and a big deviation of the Maxwell-Boltzmann modeling function with respect to the data of the piece of text.

The result is expressed in the graphs of Figure 1 (a), where the blue graph represents the data, hence the numbers in column ‘Energies from data $E(E_i)$ ’ of Table 1, the red graph represents the quantities obtained by the Bose-Einstein model, hence the quantities in column ‘Bose-Einstein modeling’ of Table 1, and the green graph represents the quantities obtained by the Maxwell-Boltzmann model, hence the quantities of column ‘Energies Maxwell-Boltzmann’ of Table 1. We can easily see in Figure 1 (a) how the blue and red graphs almost coincide, while the green graph deviates abundantly from the two other graphs which shows how Bose-Einstein statistics is a very good model for the data we collected from the Winnie the Pooh story, while Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics completely fails to model these data.

To construct the two models, we also considered the energies, and expressed as a second constraint the conditions (9), (12), that the total energy of the Bose-Einstein model and the total energy of the

Maxwell-Boltzmann model are both equal the total energy of the data of the Winnie the Pooh story. The result of both constraints, (8), (11) and (9), (12) on the energy functions that express the amount of energy per energy level – or, to use the language customarily used for light, the frequency spectrum of light – can be seen in Figure 2. We see again that the red graph, which represents the Bose-Einstein radiation spectrum, is a much better model for the blue graph, which represents the experimental radiation spectrum, as compared to the green graph, which represents the Maxwell-Boltzmann radiation spectrum.

Both solutions, the Bose-Einstein shown in the red graph, and the Maxwell-Boltzmann shown in the green graph, have been found by making use of a computer program calculating the values of A , B , C and D such that (8), (9), (11) and (12) are satisfied, which gives the approximate values

$$A \approx 1.0078 \quad B \approx 593.51 \quad C \approx 0.0353 \quad D \approx 93.63 \quad (13)$$

In the graphs of Figure 2, we can see that a maximum is reached for the energy level E_{71} , corresponding to the word *First*, which appears seven times in the Winnie the Pooh story. If we use the analogy with light, we can say that the radiation spectrum of the story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’ has a maximum at *First*, which would hence be, again in analogy with light, the dominant color of the story. We have indicated this radiation peak in Table 1, where we can see that the amount of energy the story radiates, following the Bose-Einstein model, is 522.79.

Due to their shape, the graphs in Figure 1 (a) are not easily comparable, and although quite obviously the blue and red graphs are almost overlapping, while the blue and green graphs are very different, which shows that the data are well modeled by Bose-Einstein statistics and not well modeled by Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics, it is interesting to consider a transformation where we apply the log function to both the x -values, i.e., the domain values, and the y -values, i.e. the image values, of the functions underlying the graphs. This is a well-known technique to render functions giving rise to this type of graphs more easily comparable.

In Figure 1 (b), the graphs can be seen where we have taken the log of the x -coordinates and also the log of the y -coordinates of the graph representing the data, which is again the blue graph in Figure 1 (b), of the graph representing the Bose-Einstein distribution model of these data, which is the red graph in Figure 1 (b), and of the graph representing the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution model of the data, which is the green graph in Figure 1 (b). For readers acquainted with Zipf’s law as it appears in human language (Zipf, 1935, 1949), they will recognize Zipf’s graph in the blue graph of Figure 1 (b). It is indeed the log / log graph of ‘ranking’ versus ‘numbers of appearances’ of the text of the Winnie the Pooh story ‘In Which Piglet Meets a Haffalump’, which is the ‘definition’ of Zipf’s graph. As to be expected, we see Zipf’s law being satisfied, the blue graph is well approximated by a straight line with negative gradient close to -1. We see that the Bose-Einstein graph still models very well this Zipf’s graph, and what is more, it also models the (small) deviation from Zipf’s graph of the straight line. Zipf’s law and the corresponding straight line when a log / log graph is drawn is an empirical law. Intrigued by the modeling of the Bose-Einstein statistics by the Zipf graph, we have analyzed this correspondence in detail in Aerts & Beltran (2020).

3 Indistinguishability and entanglement

In the introduction we argued how the same words in a piece of text, such as the word ‘animal’ in our *Example Text* in Section 1, can be exchanged with each other without changing anything of the text, the text after the exchange is really totally identical and indistinguishable from the text before the exchange of the two words. For macroscopic material entities which are part of a physical landscape, and we mentioned a physical landscape for which the *Example Text* of Section 1 would be a description, this is not the case, if two of the macroscopic material entities are exchanged with each other, there is always a change to the physical landscape of which they are part. For the way, that for quantum entities that are part of a

microphysical physical landscape, the Bose-Einstein statistics, when it comes to bosonic quantum entities, or the Fermi-Dirac statistics, when it comes to fermionic quantum entities, is valid, much more is going on than what we have expressed so far. Let us analyze this ‘much more is going on’, and one of the first aspects of the ‘much more is going on’ consists in pointing out how in quantum mechanics ‘indistinguishability’ entails the presence of ‘entanglement’, already noticed by Einstein and others when in 1924 he proposed his new description of an ideal gas, and then called ‘lack of statistical independence’ of the different atoms or molecules of the gas (Einstein, 1924, 1925; Schrödinger, 1926; Pérez & Sauer, 2010).

Identity and indistinguishability within the formalism of quantum mechanics is expressed by the rule that wave functions should be symmetrized or anti-symmetrized, depending on whether the quantum particles in question are bosons or fermions. This entails that a multi-particle wave functions is always a superposition of products of the single particle building blocks of the multi-particle wave function, such that the different product pieces are chosen in a way that the total wave function is symmetric or anti-symmetric, depending on whether the composed quantum entity is a boson or a fermion. Let us make concrete what this means when we apply a quantum model to the text of the Winnie the Pooh story. The set of energy levels $\{E_0, \dots, E_{542}\}$ shown in Table 1 are in principle the energy levels for a one particle situation in quantum theory, and the many particle situation of a text is then described in a Hilbert space which is the tensor product of, in the case of the Winnie the Pooh story, 2655 Hilbert spaces of which each one describes a one particle situation. The symmetrization is obtained by a superposition of all possible permutations of the original products and a renormalization to make the wave function a unit vector.

Let us consider the very simple version of this symmetrization procedure for two boson quantum particles which we call A and B , to see how entanglement emerges irrevocably. Both particles are described by their wave functions $\psi_A(x_A)$ and $\psi_B(x_B)$, where x_A and x_B are variables we considered for respectively particle A and particle B . When the two particles are joined in a single composite system, the latter is described by the symmetrized wave function

$$\psi(x_A, x_B) = c(\psi_A(x_A)\psi_B(x_B) + \psi_B(x_B)\psi_A(x_A)) \quad (14)$$

where c is the renormalization constant. To see how this symmetrization procedure leads to the phenomenon of entanglement, suppose for a moment that x_A and x_B are position variables pertaining to separated regions of space R_A and R_B , such that for both particles A and B we can understand $\psi_A(x_A)$ and $\psi_B(x_B)$ as being the wave function representing one particle A mainly present in this region of space R_A , and another particle B mainly present in this region of space R_B – $\psi_A(x_A)$ and $\psi_B(x_B)$ are for example wave packets which have negligible values outside respectively regions R_A and R_B of space. The symmetrized wave function $\psi(x_A, x_B)$ describes then a composite quantum entity which however does not consist of one particle pertaining to the region R_A and another particle pertaining to the region R_B , because it also predicts the presence of entanglement correlations between measurements performed in both regions R_A and R_B .

It is interesting to note that a decade after Einstein was enthusiastic about the model he worked out for the ideal quantum gas, with its peculiar lack of ‘statistical independence for the different molecules or atoms’, which we now know were the first signs of the entanglement that indistinguishability entails within the quantum formalism, he wrote the most important article that involved a direct and fierce critique of the phenomenon of entanglement, with two of his students Nathan Rosen and Boris Podolsky (Einstein, Podolsky & Rosen, 1935). The theoretical and experimental study of the EPR type of correlations introduced in the article has been one of the major subjects of quantum theory investigation for the last decades and resulted in showing that these correlations are non-local, so there is no longer any doubt in the physics community that the EPR type of correlations predicted by the entanglement carried in symmetrized states such as (14) constitute an intrinsic reality in the quantum world even if there is still an ongoing debate about how to understand them (Bohm, 1951; Bell, 1964, 1987; Aerts et al., 2019a).

Such a symmetrization for bosons and anti-symmetrization for fermions, following quantum theory, exists for all bosons and all fermions, which literally means that all identical quantum particles are entangled in this strong way, giving rise to non-local correlations of the EPR type. This state of affairs is still nowadays a serious unsolved and not understood conundrum for theoretical physics and philosophy of physics (French & Redhead, 1988; Muller & Seevinck, 2009; Krause, 2010; Dieks & Lubberdink, 2020), and this stands in great contrast with how experimentalists go along with it, for example, photons pertaining to different energy levels, hence carrying different frequencies, are treated by them as distinguishable (Hong, Ou & Mandel, 1987; Knill, Laflamme & Milburn, 2001; Zhao et al., 2014). The way in which experimentalists look at the ‘indistinguishability’ of photons was expressed clearly in more recent times, because of the actual importance of the creation of entangled photons for different reasons, e.g. for the fabrication of optically based quantum computers, and hence the focus in quantum optics on how to achieve this. Spontaneous parametric down conversion, which is a nonlinear optical process that converts one photon of higher energy into a pair of photons of lower energy, has been historically the process for the generation of entangled photon pairs for the well-known Bell’s inequality tests (Aspect, Dalibard & Roger, 1982; Weihs et al., 1998). Parametric down conversion is however an inefficient process because it has a low probability and hence physicists looked for other ways to produce entangled photons. Hence, when a scheme for using linear optics in function of the needs of the production of qubits was presented (Knill, Laflamme & Milburn, 2001), this made arise an abundance of new research. Most of the applications of this new research rely on the two-photon interference effect with two ‘indistinguishable photons’ entering from different sides of a beam splitter and leaving in the same direction after undergoing the so called Hong-Ou-Mandel interference effect (Hong, Ou & Mandel, 1987). The crucial aspect of Hong-Ou-Mandel interference is the ‘indistinguishability of the two photons in the spectral, temporal and polarization degrees of freedom’.

This stimulated the direct study of the ‘indistinguishability of photons from different sources’, with the finding that ‘for photons to behave as indistinguishable bosons neither their frequencies nor their arrival times at the beam splitter can be too different, otherwise they behave as distinguishable quantum particles’ (Lettow et al., 2010). What is however most significant for what concerns our take on this is the result of an amazing experiment that was performed in the series of attempts of quantum opticians to create entanglement within linear optics by making use of the interference due to two photon indistinguishability. In this experiment, photons of different frequencies are used to enter the beam splitter, hence given earlier experiments (Lettow et al., 2010), these photons should not behave as indistinguishable bosons, but on the outgoing part of the beam splitter a setup is realized that ‘erases’ the information about the different frequencies of the incoming photons. The result of the experiment is that this erasing makes the photons of different frequencies behave as indistinguishable bosons (Zhao et al., 2014). This experiment shows that it is sufficient for the photons to be contextually indistinguishable when they are measured, for them to behave as indistinguishable bosons. We should actually not be amazed by this result, because this is what the so called ‘quantum eraser experiments’ are all about (Scully & Druhl, 1982; Kim et al., 2000; Walborn et al., 2002), and if we carefully read the famous analysis of the double-slit experiment by Richard Feynman (Feynman, Leighton & Sands, 1963; Feynman, 1965), the dependence of interference on the possibility of the measurement apparatus to ‘know or not know about the available alternatives’, was already at the center of his analysis.

The principle, that ‘identity’ and ‘indistinguishability’ depend on ‘the capacity of the measuring apparatus to be able to distinguish’ has the conceptual structure of human language in common with how things stand in quantum mechanics. And, in this comparison between the situation in quantum mechanics and the situation in human cognition, we place the measuring apparatus in quantum mechanics, which is generally a macroscopic material physical entity composed of fermionic matter, there where the human mind is in human cognition, it being the agent as far as human language is concerned. Let us illustrate with an example what we mean precisely, we consider again our *Example Text* of Section 1, except that we

substitute the word ‘animal’ by the word ‘horse’, and the expression ‘lets its proud sound reverberate’ by the expression ‘whinnies loudly’.

It mists over the flanks of the hillside. In a few hours the climbing sun will dispel the haze. The pine trees are slender against the horizon. The horse saunters slowly down toward the great river. Before reaching the water, the horse looks into the distance and whinnies loudly across the valley. The horse continues its way through the young grass to the riverbank where it will enjoy its favorite food. From the small grove of trees growing a little further along the riverbank, another horse appears, surveying the panorama.

We could have written first this version of the text, where both ‘animals’ are ‘horses’ and the sound they make is ‘whinnies’. By replacing back then ‘horse’ and ‘whinnies’ by respectively ‘animal’ and ‘sound’, we erase meaning from the piece of text. This is an action on the piece of text for which there is no equivalent at all for a landscape of macroscopic material entities that are objects. There is not even an ‘object’ that in physical material reality precisely corresponds to the concept of ‘animal’, an animal will always be ‘one of the possible animals’ in physical reality. Similarly, ‘makes a noise’ will always be ‘one of the noises being able to be made by an animal’. In the conceptual reality of human language, the concept ‘animal’ is as much a concept than is the case with the concept ‘horse’ and meaning can be erased and appended, very identical to how this can be done with quantum entities. However, if we read the piece of text there are different types of animals that can pop up in the reader’s mind, also ‘animal’ could be substituted by ‘bear’ and the ‘sound’ would then be ‘growls’. When we think of ‘bears’ instead of horses, the ‘favorite food’ would not be the grass but the fish in the river. Some animals are excluded altogether because they do not fit in the context that is described in the text. And, the meaning of the piece of text introduces correlations, as we already noted, if the word ‘animal’ is a ‘horse’ the expression ‘makes a noise’ becomes ‘whinnies’, while if the word ‘animal’ is a ‘bear’ the expression ‘makes a noise’ becomes ‘growls’. These entanglements spread non-locally throughout the piece of text and can violate Bell’s inequalities without difficulty, as we will analyze in Section 4.

If we consider human cognition as the object of the human mind as an agent, the above applies not only to human language, but to human cognition as a whole, ‘identity’ and ‘indistinguishability’ are determined by the capacity of the human mind to be able to ‘distinguish’. We wish to make two assertions in connection with the above observation. The first is concerning areas of research now called quantum cognition and quantum information science and the second is with respect to an interpretation of quantum theory, called the conceptuality interpretation, that we are working on within our Brussels group.

Quantum cognition is a domain where quantum mechanical structures, such as the vector space structure and the probability model of quantum mechanics, are used to describe specific situations of bounded rationality and decision making (conjunction fallacy, disjunction effect, etc.) and concept theory (guppy effect, over and underextension, etc.) (Aerts & Aerts, 1995; Khrennikov, 1999; Atmanspacher, 2002; Gabora & Aerts, 2002; Aerts & Gabora, 2005a,b; Bruza & Cole, 2005; Busemeyer et al., 2006; Aerts, 2009a; Pothos & Busemeyer, 2009; Bruza et al., 2009; Lambert Mogilianski Zamir & Zwirn, 2009; Aerts, 2011; Aerts, Broekaert & Gabora, 2011; Aerts & Sozzo, 2011; Busemeyer & Bruza, 2012; Dalla Chiara et al., 2012; Aerts et al., 2013; Aerts, Gabora & Sozzo, 2013; Haven & Khrennikov, 2013; Aerts & Sozzo, 2014; Sozzo, 2014; Aerts, Sozzo & Veloz, 2015a,b; Dalla Chiara et al., 2015; Pothos et al., 2015; Sozzo, 2015; Veloz & Dujardin, 2015; Aerts, Sassoli de Bianchi & Sozzo, 2016; Aerts, Sozzo & Veloz, 2016; Blutner & beim Graben, 2016; Moreira & Wichert, 2016; Broekaert et al., 2017; Gabora & Kitto, 2017; Sozzo, 2017; Aerts et al., 2018b,c; Aerts Arguëlles, 2018; Busemeyer & Wang, 2018; Aerts et al., 2019a; Sozzo, 2020). Quantum information science, with a focus on information retrieval and natural language processing, uses quantum structures to analyze the contextual interaction between humans and information systems and to develop techniques for information retrieval and natural language processing accordingly. (Aerts & Czachor, 2004;

Van Rijsbergen, 2004; Widdows, 2004; Aerts et al., 2010, 2012; Veloz, Zhao & Aerts, 2013; Melucci, 2015; Aerts et al., 2017; Aerts Arguëlles, 2018; Aerts et al., 2018a, 2021a,b; Beltran, 2021; Beltran & Geriente, 2019). For both areas of research, quantum cognition and quantum information science, our results show that in addition to the vector space structure and the probability model of quantum mechanics, other aspects of quantum mechanics, specifically the aspect of quantization, where words are the quanta of human cognition, are relevant and can be utilized accordingly to enhance quantum cognition as well as quantum information science as a scientific research discipline.

Although it is not our focus in this article to gather more evidence for the ‘conceptuality interpretation’ of quantum mechanics, as a second point we also wish to mention in what way the above supports this interpretation. In the ‘conceptuality interpretation’ of quantum mechanics, quantum entities are assumed to be ‘concepts’ and not ‘objects’ (Aerts, 2009b, 2010a,b, 2013; Aerts et al., 2018d, 2019b). In the archetypal situation where a measurement apparatus interacts with a quantum entity, the measurement apparatus plays with respect to the quantum entity the equivalent role that the human mind plays with respect to the human conceptual entities about which this mind is cognitively active. We should note at the outset that when we claim that quantum entities are ‘concepts’ and not ‘objects’, we do not mean ‘human concepts’. On the contrary, just as human concepts are the building blocks of human language, so these quantum concepts are the building blocks of the quantum fields, which thus behave like quantum languages within the conceptuality interpretation. For example, the photons are then the concepts, i.e. words, of the electromagnetic field, which behaves like a language. Thus, it is a question of an equivalence in behavior and not an equality, as, for example, sound waves and electromagnetic waves are both ‘waves’, but are indeed not the same entities. In this way, the findings in Aerts & Beltran (2020), and our analysis of them in the present article, bring again an element of support for the conceptuality interpretation, together with other elements that are put forward in the already published articles where this interpretation is analyzed and evidence for it is gathered (Aerts, 2009b, 2010a,b, 2013; Aerts et al., 2018d, 2019b).

4 Entropy and purity

Several examples of entanglement in human cognition have been studied in our group in the past (Aerts & Sozzo, 2011, 2014; Aerts et al., 2018b,c; Aerts Arguëlles, 2018; Aerts et al., 2019a, 2021a,b), and we want to bring forward an analysis of them here that includes new aspects, brought forth from our insights about the role that ‘identity’ and ‘indistinguishability’ plays in human cognition. Let us briefly review how we showed that the combination of two words spontaneously makes ‘entanglement’ emerge, such that it can be illustrated in a simple way that it is a quantum entanglement where Bell’s inequalities are violated.

The two words whose combination we studied are ‘animal’ and ‘acts’, and combined into the combination ‘the animal acts’, where the intention is that ‘acts’ is to be understood as ‘making a sound’. It is clear that we composed our *Example Text* of Section 1 in order to make use of this study of the combination of the two words ‘animal’ and ‘acts’, because, as we shall see, in the experiment the subjects were asked to choose for ‘animal’ between ‘horse’ and ‘bear’, and for ‘acts’ to choose between ‘whinnies’ and ‘growls’, in forming the elements of Bell’s inequalities. We used the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt version of Bell’s inequalities

$$-2 \leq E(A'B') + E(A'B) + E(AB') - E(AB) \leq 2 \quad (15)$$

as is the case in most physics experiments (Clauser et al., 1969; Aspect, Dalibard & Roger, 1982; Weihs et al., 1998). A , A' are experiments performed on the first word of the combination, the word ‘animal’, B , B' are experiments performed at the second word of the combination, the word ‘acts’, and AB , AB' , $A'B$ and $A'B'$ are jointly performed experiments on the combination itself ‘the animal acts’. $E(AB)$, $E(AB')$, $E(A'B)$ and $E(A'B')$ are the expectation values of the jointly performed experiments AB , AB' , $A'B$ and $A'B'$.

Experiments	Probabilities				Entropy	Purity
The 2011 Cognitive Experiment Study						
	$p(HG)$	$p(HW)$	$p(BG)$	$p(BW)$	S	γ
<i>AB</i>	0.049	0.630	0.259	0.062	0.177	0.757
The Google Books Natural Language Processing Study						
	$p(HG)$	$p(HW)$	$p(BG)$	$p(BW)$	S	γ
<i>AB</i>	0	0.6526	0.3474	0	0.280	0.547
The COCA Natural Language Processing Study						
	$p(HG)$	$p(HW)$	$p(BG)$	$p(BW)$	S	γ
<i>AB</i>	0	0.8	0.2	0	0.217	0.68
The Google Images Study						
	$p(HG)$	$p(HW)$	$p(BG)$	$p(BW)$	S	γ
<i>AB</i>	0.0205	0.2042	0.7651	0.0103	0.202	0.710
The 2021 Cognitive Experiment Study						
	$p(HG)$	$p(HW)$	$p(BG)$	$p(BW)$	S	γ
<i>AB</i>	0.0494	0.1235	0.7778	0.0494	0.114	0.864

Table 2: The data from the five different studies of ‘entanglement’ performed in our group and calculation of von Neumann entropy and purity.

We conducted five studies in our Brussels group where this combination of concepts was tested again and again and the Clauser Horne Shimony Holt version of Bell’s inequalities were violated, for the details of the experiments we refer to each of the studies whose results can be found in Table 2. There are two studies that consist of a cognitive experiment, where test persons are asked to choose between two alternatives for ‘animal’ and for ‘acts’ in the combination ‘the animal acts’ and from the data collected from these choices are calculated the probabilities needed to fill in the terms of the Clauser Horne Shimony Holt inequality (Aerts & Sozzo, 2011; Aerts et al., 2021b). We have named these two studies ‘The 2011 Cognitive Experiment Study’ and ‘The 2021 Cognitive Experiment Study’ in Table 2. Two studies in Table 2 can be classified in the field of Natural Language Processing. In these studies, we used the corpora of documents ‘Google Books’ and ‘COCA’, and the analogous probabilities, needed to fill in the terms of the Clauser Horne Shimony Holt inequality, were calculated for these studies using the relative frequencies of found texts in the respective corpora of documents (Beltran & Geriente, 2019). We have named these studies ‘The Google Books Natural Language Processing Study’ and ‘The COCA Natural Language Processing Study’ in Table 2. In the fifth study in Table 2, images from ‘Google Images’ were examined for the occurrence of the various images of, ‘the horse growl’, ‘the horse whinnies’, ‘the bear growls’, or ‘the bear whinnies’, respectively, and the statistics generated by this were used to calculate the probabilities needed to fill the terms of the Clauser Horne Shimony Holt inequalities (Aerts Arguëlles, 2018).

Let us note that in Table 2 we have shown only some of the probabilities necessary for the Clauser Horne Shimony Holt inequality, because these are the only ones we need to bring out the new insight into ‘entanglement’ in relation to ‘identity’ and “undistinguishability” that we focus on in this article. More specifically, we only need the four probabilities associated with the choices ‘animal’ becomes ‘horse’ or ‘animal’ becomes ‘bear’, and the choices ‘acts’ becomes ‘growls’ or ‘acts’ becomes ‘whinnies’, and the four corresponding choices for the combination ‘the animal acts’, being ‘the horse growls’, ‘the horse whinnies’, ‘the bear growls’, or ‘the bear whinnies’. The corresponding four probabilities can be found in Table 2 under HG (‘the horse growl’), HW (‘the horse whinnies’), BG (‘the bear growls’) and BW (‘the bear whinnies’) for the five different studies.

Note that our example contains exactly the correlations that we already mentioned for our *Example*

Text of Section 1, namely how the sound made by the animals is correlated with the nature of the animals, whinnying if they are horses, and growling if they are bears. What we also want to make clear is how ‘similar’ our example is to the way entanglement occurs in physics. Let us do so by considering the archetypal state of a tensor product Hilbert space that is often invoked as an example when talking about entanglement, namely the singlet state

$$\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((0, 1) \otimes (1, 0) - (1, 0) \otimes (0, 1)) \quad (16)$$

which is actually also the state we supposed ‘the animal acts’ to be in, within the construction of the Hilbert space model of our data in Aerts et al. (2021a). Since the singlet state is a pure state, its von Neumann entropy equals zero, while the von Neumann entropy of the single spins as subsystems of the coupled spins, because of them being in a probabilistic state, is not zero, and even maximal, given by the formula

$$S = -p((0, 1)) \log p((0, 1)) - p((1, 0)) \log p((1, 0)) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{2} = \log 2 \quad (17)$$

Inspired by how the von Neumann entropy determines the entropy of quantum states, we will now calculate the von Neumann entropy of words as they appear in pieces of text, and we consider specifically the text in the introduction.

Our first hypothesis is the following.

Hypothesis: The state of a piece of text telling a story is a pure state

We will argue this hypothesis in the remainder of this article, but first wish to apply it to the very small piece of text that is the combination of the two words ‘animal’ and ‘acts’ in the piece of text ‘the animal acts’, because we wish to show what our intention is and how, as a consequence, we can calculate the von Neumann entropy of subparts of the piece of text under consideration. So let us suppose that the piece of text ‘the animal acts’ is described by a pure quantum state $|\psi\rangle$. And let us compute the density states in which the partial pieces ‘animal’ and ‘acts’ are in, and, as we announced, let us be inspired by the singlet state and its sub entities. We will then calculate the von Neumann entropy of these partial pieces ‘animal’ and ‘acts’ the von Neumann entropy of the total piece of text ‘the animal acts’ being equal to zero. We also note that we are introducing a simplification that, however, has only to do with making the calculations easier and with the availability of the data we wish to use. Thus we assume that ‘animal’ can only be ‘horse’ or ‘bear’, and ‘acts’ only ‘growls’ or ‘whinnies’. For a more realistic calculation, we should allow that ‘animal’ can be any animal, and ‘acts’ can be any animal sound. First, we have no data available to fill in probabilities associated with such a more realistic situation, but on the other hand, our calculation wishes to indicate a general finding, and when we formulate that general finding, we will see that the simplification we introduced plays no role in whether or not the general finding is true.

After the previous explained elements, it is straightforward to introduce the following quantum state for the piece of text ‘the animal acts’.

$$|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{p(HG)}|HG\rangle + \sqrt{p(HW)}|HW\rangle + \sqrt{p(BG)}|BG\rangle + \sqrt{p(BW)}|BW\rangle \quad (18)$$

where $\{|HG\rangle, |HW\rangle, |BG\rangle, |BW\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal base of a four dimensional complex Hilbert space. To calculate the von Neumann entropy, we use its definition

$$S = -\text{tr} \rho \log \rho \quad (19)$$

where ρ is the quantum density state of the considered entity. What we wish to compute are the von Neumann entropies of the partial traces of the pure state $|\psi\rangle$, these entropies after all represent the von

Neumann entropies of the parts of the piece of text ‘the animal acts’, i.e. the von Neumann entropies of the words ‘animal’ and ‘acts’. So let us first calculate the density matrices of these partial traces. To do that we start from the density matrix form of the pure state $|\psi\rangle$, which has the form $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| &= p(HG)|HG\rangle\langle HG| + \sqrt{p(HG)p(HW)}|HG\rangle\langle HW| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(HG)p(BG)}|HG\rangle\langle BG| + \sqrt{p(HG)p(BW)}|HG\rangle\langle BW| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(HW)p(HG)}|HW\rangle\langle HG| + p(HW)|HW\rangle\langle HW| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(HW)p(BG)}|HW\rangle\langle BG| + \sqrt{p(HW)p(BW)}|HW\rangle\langle BW| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(BG)p(HW)}|BG\rangle\langle HW| + \sqrt{p(BG)p(HW)}|BG\rangle\langle HW| \\
&\quad + p(BG)|BG\rangle\langle BG| + \sqrt{p(BG)p(BW)}|BG\rangle\langle BW| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(BW)p(HG)}|BW\rangle\langle HG| + \sqrt{p(BW)p(HW)}|BW\rangle\langle HW| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(BW)p(BG)}|BW\rangle\langle BG| + p(BW)|BW\rangle\langle BW|
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

This means that the first partial trace density matrix is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
Tr_{\text{acts}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) &= p(HG)|H\rangle\langle H| + \sqrt{p(HG)p(BG)}|H\rangle\langle B| \\
&\quad + p(HW)|H\rangle\langle H| + \sqrt{p(HW)p(BW)}|H\rangle\langle B| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(BG)p(HG)}|B\rangle\langle H| + p(BG)|B\rangle\langle B| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(BW)p(HW)}|B\rangle\langle H| + p(BW)|B\rangle\langle B| \\
&= (p(HG) + p(HW))|H\rangle\langle H| + (\sqrt{p(HG)p(BG)} + \sqrt{p(HW)p(BW)})|H\rangle\langle B| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(BG)p(HG)} + \sqrt{p(BW)p(HW)}|B\rangle\langle H| + (p(BG) + p(BW))|B\rangle\langle B|
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

which means that

$$\rho_{\text{acts}} = \begin{pmatrix} p(HG) + p(HW) & \sqrt{p(HG)p(BG)} + \sqrt{p(HW)p(BW)} \\ \sqrt{p(BG)p(HG)} + \sqrt{p(BW)p(HW)} & p(BG) + p(BW) \end{pmatrix} \tag{22}$$

and the second partial trace becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
Tr_{\text{animal}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) &= p(HG)|G\rangle\langle G| + \sqrt{p(HG)p(HW)}|G\rangle\langle W| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(HW)p(HG)}|W\rangle\langle G| + p(HW)|W\rangle\langle W| \\
&\quad + p(BG)|G\rangle\langle G| + \sqrt{p(BG)p(BW)}|G\rangle\langle W| \\
&\quad + \sqrt{p(BW)p(BG)}|W\rangle\langle G| + p(BW)|W\rangle\langle W| \\
&= (p(HG) + p(BG))|G\rangle\langle G| + (\sqrt{p(HG)p(HW)} + \sqrt{p(BG)p(BW)})|G\rangle\langle W| \\
&\quad + (\sqrt{p(HW)p(HG)} + \sqrt{p(BW)p(BG)})|W\rangle\langle G| + (p(HW) + p(BW))|W\rangle\langle W|
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

which means that

$$\rho_{\text{animal}} = \begin{pmatrix} p(HG) + p(BG) & \sqrt{p(HG)p(HW)} + \sqrt{p(BG)p(BW)} \\ \sqrt{p(HW)p(HG)} + \sqrt{p(BW)p(BG)} & p(HW) + p(BW) \end{pmatrix} \tag{24}$$

We now use these two trace class density matrices to calculate their value for the different probabilities belonging to the five different studies of the entanglement associated with the piece of text ‘the animal acts’, and which can be found in Table 2.

For ‘The 2011 Cognitive Experiment Study’ we get

$$\rho_{\text{acts}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.68 & 0.31 \\ 0.31 & 0.32 \end{pmatrix} \quad \rho_{\text{animal}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.31 & 0.30 \\ 0.30 & 0.69 \end{pmatrix} \tag{25}$$

For ‘The Google Books Natural Language Processing Study’ we get

$$\rho_{\text{acts}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.65 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.35 \end{pmatrix} \quad \rho_{\text{animal}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.35 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.65 \end{pmatrix} \quad (26)$$

For ‘The COCA Natural Language Processing Study’ we get

$$\rho_{\text{acts}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \rho_{\text{animal}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.8 \end{pmatrix} \quad (27)$$

For ‘The Google Images Study’ we get

$$\rho_{\text{acts}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.22 & 0.17 \\ 0.17 & 0.78 \end{pmatrix} \quad \rho_{\text{animal}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.79 & 0.15 \\ 0.15 & 0.21 \end{pmatrix} \quad (28)$$

For ‘The 2021 Cognitive Experiment Study’ we get

$$\rho_{\text{acts}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.17 & 0.27 \\ 0.27 & 0.83 \end{pmatrix} \quad \rho_{\text{animal}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.79 & 0.15 \\ 0.15 & 0.21 \end{pmatrix} \quad (29)$$

To calculate the von Neumann entropy we diagonalize the density matrices and use the following equality

$$S = \text{tr} \log \rho = -\lambda_+ \log \lambda_+ - \lambda_- \log \lambda_- \quad (30)$$

where λ_+ and λ_- are the two eigenvalues of ρ . We remark that the eigenvalues λ_+ and λ_- of a two by two matrix with first row the numbers a and b and second row the numbers c and d are given by the solution of the quadratic equation $\lambda^2 - (a + d)\lambda + (ad - bc) = 0$, and hence we have

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(a + d \pm \sqrt{(a + d)^2 - 4(ad - bc)}) \quad (31)$$

And the calculation of the eigenvalues λ_+ and λ_- for the matrices (25), (26), (27), (28) and (29) gives us, using (30), the von Neumann entropy S for the five studies that were considered, and these are the values of S represented in Table 2.

We also want to calculate the purity γ of the trace class density matrices, which gives a value located between $\frac{1}{2}$ and 1, representing the degree of purity of the state, the further away from 1 the less pure the considered density state. The purity of a density state is given by the trace of the square of the density matrix.

$$\gamma = \text{tr} \rho^2 \quad (32)$$

This trace is again calculated by first diagonalizing these squares of the density matrices, i.e., calculating the eigenvalues, and it is the sum of these eigenvalues that gives the purity. Again, these values for the considered cases can be found in Table 2.

We can see from Table 2 that the entropy for ‘animal’ and ‘acts’ is greater than zero for all five studies, which is consistent with the words ‘animal’ and ‘acts’ being in a non-pure density state. We introduced the hypothesis that for a piece of text that tells a story, the total piece of text is in a pure quantum state. To calculate the von Neumann entropy of the words ‘animal’ and ‘acts’ we considered the very small piece of text consisting of ‘the animal acts’ as being in a pure state. We already mentioned that this assumption had to do with data only being available for this small piece of text consisting of the combination of the two words ‘animal’ and ‘acts’ in ‘the animal acts’. We now wish to return to our *Example Text* of Section 1. It is an experiment we did not conduct, but we can infer from the five studies that the correlations

we measured will occur for this *Example Text* of Section 1 as well. Specifically, for the *Example Text* of Section 1, it is about the words ‘animal’ and ‘sound’ and their replacement with the words ‘horse’ or ‘bear’ and ‘whinny’ or ‘growl’. If we consider the calculations of the von Neumann entropy and of the purity for words ‘animal’ and ‘acts’ for the five studies, it is straightforward that we can extend the obtained results to the assertion that also the von Neumann entropy of the words ‘animal’ and ‘sound’ of the piece of text in the introduction will be different from zero, and that the purity of these words will be smaller than 1. Our hypothesis that the quantum state of the entire *Example Text* of Section 1 is a pure state plays a role in the previous assertion, as our analysis of the five studies in Table 2 shows. Let us now argue the ground of this hypothesis.

The hypothesis that the totality of a piece of text telling a story is in a pure quantum state has its origins in various elements of quantum cognition and quantum information science, on the one hand, and also in various elements of the conceptuality interpretation of quantum mechanics, on the other. Let us first refer to section 4.1 of Aerts (2009b) where is being explained in which way the Heisenberg uncertainty principle can be understood starting from the conceptuality interpretation, where it is assumed that quantum entities are of a conceptual nature, as a consequence of the incompatibility for a concept of an abstract state of this concept with a concrete state of the same concept. More concretely, and using examples already mentioned in this article, the word ‘animal’ is more abstract than the word ‘horse’. But ‘this horse that I touch and that stands before me’ is even more concrete, while the word ‘thing’ is more abstract than the word ‘animal’. If, as is proposed in the conceptuality interpretation, quantum entities are conceptual in nature, then the same applies to these quantum entities as applies to concepts, i.e. words, of human language, ‘thing’ and ‘this horse that I touch and that stands before me’ cannot be states of a concept at the same time, it is one or the other, and the continuous changing of a state of a concept from its most concrete form to its most abstract form is subject to a Heisenberg uncertainty principle very similar to how it occurs in physics. A second element at the origin of the hypothesis of assigning a pure state to a piece of text that tells a story finds its origin in work in quantum information science, for example in Aerts & Czachor (2004), and subsequent work. The main focus in these is on the structural relationship between the mathematical framework developed by computer scientists for semantic spaces as used in Latent Semantic Analysis (Deerwester et al., 1990) and the mathematical framework of quantum mechanics.

To explain how these two elements are at the origin of our hypothesis, the following remark is first necessary. If in human language we draw a line from abstract to concrete, from ‘thing’ to ‘animal’ to ‘horse’ to ‘this horse here in front of me’, and further still to ‘this one and only horse called Jules’, then this line, let us call it a dimension, always goes from the most abstract ‘thing’, to the most concrete, which is very often a physical object, e.g. ‘this one and only horse called Jules’. Let us call this ‘dimension’ from abstract to concrete the ‘parochial dimension’, and we will shortly make clear why we propose this name. We believe that the computer scientists who developed Latent Semantic Analysis and other related semantic methods introduced another dimension from ‘abstract’ to ‘concrete’ without this being explicitly their intention, indeed rather as an accidental extra emerging from the techniques they wished to develop. We will call this dimension ‘universal’, as opposed to parochial. In Latent Semantic Analysis a term-paragraph matrix is built where vertically there are the words of a dictionary and horizontally there are paragraphs of the intended piece of text, and in the matrix there are numbers corresponding to ‘the number of times a particular word occurs in a particular paragraph’ (Deerwester et al., 1990). This means that the dimension from abstract to concrete used in Latent Semantic Analysis starts from the single words as the most abstract states of the corresponding concepts to the paragraphs of pieces of text as the most concrete states of the same concepts. Indeed, when a word appears somewhere in a piece of text the size of a paragraph, that word is as it were ‘surrounded’ by a cloud of other words, which together describe a context, and the presence of this context around the word in question forces the state of the corresponding concept into a more concrete form of that word.

Let us illustrate this with our *Example Text* of Section 1. The word ‘animal’ is a single word, so in the universal dimension of human language, the most abstract. The word ‘animal’ surrounded by the *Example Text* of Section 1, so the cloud of all other words in this text, is much more concrete as a form. It is an ‘animal’ walking down a mountainside towards a river, and so on. We use the name ‘parochial’ for the other dimension from abstract to concrete, this one from ‘thing’ to the name of ‘a unique physical object’, because this dimension refers primarily to the specific way in which human language arose and grew among homo sapiens living on the surface of the planet Earth. Indeed, a very substantial part of the substantives of human language refer to physical objects and to the physical states in which these physical objects may be found, and a large part of the verbs refer to what may happen as a dynamic process with such physical objects on the surface of planet Earth and within human culture. From research in physics, we now know that the surface of planet Earth is a very specific environment, for example, there exist mainly macroscopic classical material entities, which we consider to be objects. Outside of the phenomena that are electromagnetic, just about everything is classically mechanical and not quantum mechanical in the environment in which human languages originated and grew (Aerts & Sozzo, 2015). That is the reason we have called this dimension ‘parochial’.

Let us analyze the difference between parochial and universal in human language a little further before we proceed to the ground of our hypothesis. In Aerts & Beltran (2020) we showed that pieces of text telling a story behave statistically like a Bose gas close to absolute zero, where a Bose-Einstein condensate begins to form (Anderson et al., 1995; Davis et al., 1995; Bradley et al., 1995), and that this also explains the well-known Zipf’s law in human language (Zipf, 1935, 1949). This then does involve what we might call ‘the entangled part’ of human language, the part we have examined further in this article. There is also a part that mainly describes dynamics with physical objects, for example in texts that are manuals for the use of appliances. The quantum nature will still be present, and explanatory of how meaning behaves in these texts, but it will correspond in the physical world to a situation further away from absolute zero.

In this sense, it is very interesting that scientists are currently developing a chemistry close to absolute zero. At such very cold temperatures, the classical description of the collision of particles is no longer valid and must be replaced by a quantum description. Our basic understanding of how chemical processes proceed, that is, how molecules collide and break bonds and rearrange themselves, is no longer valid. The dynamical system of colliding molecules must be described in this very cold temperature as a quantum superposition of wave functions and entanglement becomes a very dominant phenomenon. By way of explanatory comparison, we could say that the part of human language that mainly describes the classical dynamics of material objects, with the extreme example of the text found in a manual of a technical appliance, corresponds to the colliding and moving molecules of chemistry at room temperature. We have called this the parochial aspect of human language, it is indeed the aspect that arose and grew directly from the presence of homo sapiens as a culture-bearing being on the surface of planet Earth. The part of human language that carries meaning above all, in such a way that after reading the whole story, the total meaning of the story is remembered as a whole, corresponds to chemistry at very low temperature, close to absolute zero, the research of which is now underway (Heazlewood & Softley, 2021). This is what we have called the universal aspect of human language. Just as quantum nature is the basic nature of atoms and molecules, this universal aspect is also the basic nature of human language.

We note in this sense that reading a manual of a technical appliance usually requires constant interruption, and some sentences, even just pieces of sentences, must be reread several times, with the appliance at hand, if the manual is to be used, This indicates the fragmentation present in this kind of use of language, like the fragmentation of the material world that surrounds us on this surface of planet Earth. As put forward in Aerts & Sozzo (2015), this fragmentation, and thus lack of coherence, is due to the excessive temperature on the surface of planet Earth, in the constant bombardment of random photons. Our skin protects us very well from the effects of this heat, so that we can hardly intuitively sense that the air

molecules at room temperature are colliding back and forth at the average speed of a jet plane, bombarding our skin. Coherence becomes very difficult in such conditions. Only photons escape the chaotic influence of this heat bath, since photons cannot collide with other photons, and this makes lasers, i.e. totally coherent collections of photons, possible at room temperature. Life and more so the minds of animals, and especially the human mind, with human language and culture as its main driving force, manages to create coherence again, even in this for coherence very difficult environment of the surface of planet Earth. The building of cities with libraries in their centers, where knowledge is stored in a very coherent way cast in texts, is a good example of how the human mind has defied the fundamental fragmentation of the physical environment of the surface of planet Earth in its search for the coherence that the survival of meaning requires.

We have finally put forward enough context to make the case for our hypothesis. As we argued, words are the most abstract states of concepts in terms of the universal dimension of human language. Consider the Heisenberg uncertainty principle and how it realizes itself in the momentum and space coordinates of quantum particles, technically through one being the Fourier Transform of the other. Words lie on the side of momentum coordinates and then what lies on the side of space coordinates? That can only be the pieces of text, think also of how in Latent Semantic Analysis indeed also the words, and the pieces (paragraphs) of text form the columns and rows of the matrix. Pieces of text do constitute a very remote, imperfect and primitive prelude to a possible space, but that is also what we expect, under the assumption that human language is a very primitive version of the proto-language that is supposed to underlie physical quantum coherence within the conceptuality interpretation of quantum mechanics (Aerts, 2009b, 2010a,b, 2013; Aerts et al., 2018d, 2019b). This imperfection of human language becomes even more apparent if we note that the oral version of a story takes place primarily in time, and is not at all connected with physical space in any special way, except in that along the parochial dimension many words are abstractions of physical objects that we think are in physical space. This means that we have to look at the Heisenberg uncertainty principle primarily, not between momentum and position coordinates, but between energy and time. And indeed, words, in our view, can be considered in their most elementary form as ‘energy packets’ that push the story forward in time and thus cause the coherence of meaning. It is this energy that we identified in Aerts & Beltran (2020), and which we elaborate on here in this article. Spatiality, and being only a prelude to what in physics we call our three dimensional space, exists in this primitive form in the possibility of having different words next to and parallel to each other pushing the story forward in time. Human memory realized in matter of fermionic nature is probably the first entity to modestly build out this spatiality for human language, and written language is a human cultural version of it. But, note that even written language is intrinsically one-dimensional, thus still fundamentally bearing the mark of the one dimensionality of time, and in this way is again only a very primitive realization of memory that did realize in a three-dimensional medium, the nervous system and the brain. Just as we do quantum mechanics, we will start with a pure state when we work out a description of the entire quantum entity, and it is with this analogy that we have postulated a pure state for the totality of the piece of text under consideration.

5 Conclusion

We conclude by noting that, if we consider the pieces of text as the primitive prelude to physical space, non-locality is easily illustrated in human language. Indeed, if we consider again our *Example Text* in Section 1, when ‘animal’ changes to ‘horse’, this happens immediately in all places where the word ‘animal’ appears in the story, at least if the context of the story indicates that it is the same animal in those different places. The amount of space between the different places is totally irrelevant for this change from animal to horse. Returning to our calculations of the von Neumann entropy for the words of the text of the introduction, we would like to ask the following questions in preparation for further future research. Could it be that

the intellectual effort we are all familiar with in writing a text that is well-worded is linked to the action of decreasing the von Neumann entropy of the individual words that are generally entangled, until it becomes equal to zero for the entire text? And as a second more global question. Could it be that one of the main achievements of human culture is to create, by exploiting the possibility of entanglement, the purity of coherence that goes along with a pure quantum state for the whole, and in this way directly reduce entropy? Regardless of the answer to these questions, they will perhaps be interesting questions for further development of a quantum thermodynamics, which is in full progress, but where one still struggles with very simple situations of understanding. An approach has now grown where thermodynamic equilibrium is treated back meaningfully also when quantum entities are involved, and where an entity and its environment are assumed to be in a pure quantum state. The entropy for the entity itself is then calculated from the partial trace density state it is in, very analogous also to the analysis we have made here (Gemmer et al., 2009; Mahler, 2015; Gogolin & Eisert, 2016; Yokoi & Abe, 2018). But a quantum thermodynamics cannot escape a better explanation of the behavior of macroscopic entities and how it can be understood given the quantum theory of the microscopic entities of which they are composed. We hope that our investigation of the equivalences between human language, human cognition, and that which takes place in the quantum world can contribute to forming ideas of how to further understand and build a quantum thermodynamics. If the conceptuality interpretation holds some truth, this would not be impossible. After all, we can then use what we understand about human language, and human cognition, to shed light on what might be going on in the region from micro to macro where thermodynamics is applied.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by QUARTZ (Quantum Information Access and Retrieval Theory), the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Innovative Training Network 721321 of the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program.

References

- Aerts, D. (2009a). Quantum structure in cognition. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 53, pp. 314-348. doi: 10.1016/j.jmp.2009.04.005.
- Aerts, D. (2009b). Quantum particles as conceptual entities: A possible explanatory framework for quantum theory. *Foundations of Science* 14, pp. 361-411. doi: 10.1007/s10699-009-9166-y.
- Aerts, D. (2010a). Interpreting quantum particles as conceptual entities. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 49, pp. 2950-2970. doi: 10.1007/s10773-010-0440-0.
- Aerts, D. (2010b). A potentiality and conceptuality interpretation of quantum physics. *Philosophica* 83, pp. 15-52. <http://www.philosophica.ugent.be/fulltexts/83-2.pdf>.
- Aerts, D. (2011). Quantum interference and superposition in cognition: Development of a theory for the disjunction of concepts. In D. Aerts, J. Broekaert, B. D’Hooghe and N. Note (Eds.), *Worldviews, Science and Us: Bridging Knowledge and Its Implications for Our Perspectives of the World*. Singapore: World Scientific. doi: 10.1142/9789814383080_0010.
- Aerts, D. (2013). The quantum mechanics and conceptuality: matter, histories, semantics, and space-time. *Scientiae Studia* 11, pp. 75-100. doi: 10.1590/S1678-31662013000100004. English version <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1110.4766.pdf>.
- Aerts, D., Aerts Arguëlles, J., Beltran, L., Beltran, L., Distrito, I., Sassoli de Bianchi, M., Sozzo, S. and Veloz, T. (2018a). Towards a Quantum World Wide Web. *Theoretical Computer Science* 752, pp. 116-131. doi: 10.1016/j.tcs.2018.03.019.
- Aerts, D., Aerts Arguëlles, J., Beltran, L., Beltran, L., Sassoli de Bianchi, M., Sozzo, S. and Veloz, T.

- (2017). Testing quantum models of conjunction fallacy on the World Wide Web. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 56, pp. 3744-3756. doi: 10.1007/s10773-017-3288-8.
- Aerts, D., Aerts Arguëlles, J., Beltran, L., Geriente, S., Sassoli de Bianchi, M., Sozzo, S. and Veloz, T. (2018b). Spin and wind directions I: Identifying entanglement in nature and cognition. *Foundations of Science* 23, pp. 323-335. doi: 10.1007/s10699-017-9528-9.
- Aerts, D., Aerts Arguëlles, J., Beltran, L., Geriente, S., Sassoli de Bianchi, M., Sozzo, S. and Veloz, T. (2018c). Spin and wind directions II: A Bell State quantum model. *Foundations of Science* 23, pp. 337-365. doi: 10.1007/s10699-017-9530-2.
- Aerts, D., Aerts Arguëlles, J., Beltran, L., Geriente, S., Sassoli de Bianchi, M., Sozzo, S. and Veloz, T. (2019a). Quantum entanglement in physical and cognitive systems: a conceptual analysis and a general representation. *The European Physical Journal Plus* 134, 493. arXiv:1903.09103[q-bio.NC]. doi: 10.1140/epjp/i2019-12987-0.
- Aerts, D., Aerts Arguëlles, J., Beltran, L., Geriente, S., Sozzo, S. (2021b). Entanglement in cognition violating Bell inequalities beyond Cirel'son's bound. arXiv:2102.03847[q-bio.NC].
- Aerts, D. and Aerts, S. (1995). Applications of quantum statistics in psychological studies of decision processes. *Foundations of Science* 1, pp. 85-97. doi: 10.1007/BF00208726.
- Aerts, D. and Beltran, L. (2020). Quantum structure in cognition: Human language as a Boson gas of entangled words. *Foundations of Science* 25, pp. 755-802. doi: 10.1007/s10699-019-09633-4.
- Aerts, D., Beltran, L., Geriente, S. and Sozzo, S. (2021a). Quantum theoretic modeling in computer science. A complex Hilbert space model for entangled concepts in corpuses of documents. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 60, pp. 710-726. arXiv:1901.04299[cs.CL] doi: 10.1007/s10773-019-04155-y.
- Aerts, D., Broekaert, J. and Gabora, L. (2011). A case for applying an abstracted quantum formalism to cognition. *New Ideas in Psychology* 29, pp. 136-146. doi: 10.1016/j.newideapsych.2010.06.002.
- Aerts, D., Broekaert, J., Gabora, L. and Sozzo, S. (2013). Quantum structure and human thought. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 36, pp. 274-276. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X12002841.
- Aerts, D., Broekaert, J., Gabora, L., Veloz, T. (2012). The guppy effect as interference. *Quantum Interaction. QI 2012. Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 7620, pp. 36-47. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-35659-9_4.
- Aerts, D. and Czachor, M. (2004). Quantum aspects of semantic analysis and symbolic artificial intelligence. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 37, L123-L132. doi: 10.1088/0305-4470/37/12/L01.
- Aerts, D., Czachor, M., D'Hooghe, B. and Sozzo, S. (2010). The Pet-Fish problem on the World-Wide Web (2010). In the *Proceedings of the AAAI Fall Symposium (FS-10-08), Quantum Informatics for Cognitive, Social, and Semantic Processes* (pp. 17-21). AAAI Publications: 2010 AAAI Fall Symposium Series.
- Aerts, D. and Gabora, L. (2005). A theory of concepts and their combinations I: The structure of the sets of contexts and properties. *Kybernetes* 34, pp. 167-191. doi: 10.1108/03684920510575799.
- Aerts, D. and Gabora, L. (2005). A theory of concepts and their combinations II: A Hilbert space representation. *Kybernetes* 34, pp.192-221. doi: 10.1108/03684920510575807.
- Aerts, D., Gabora, L. and Sozzo, S. (2013). Concepts and their dynamics: a quantum theoretic modeling of human thought. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 5, pp. 737-772. doi: 10.1111/tops.12042.
- Aerts, D., Sassoli de Bianchi, M. and Sozzo, S. (2016). On the foundations of the Brussels operational-realistic approach to cognition. *Frontiers in Physics* 4, 17. doi: 10.3389/fphy.2016.00017.
- Aerts, D., Sassoli de Bianchi, M., Sozzo, S. and Veloz, T. (2018d). On the conceptuality interpretation of quantum and relativity theories. *Foundations of Science*. Online First. doi: 10.1007/s10699-018-9557-z.
- Aerts, D., Sassoli de Bianchi, M., Sozzo, S. and Veloz, T. (2019b). From quantum axiomatics to quantum conceptuality. *Activitas Nervosa Superior* 61, pp. 76-82. doi: 10.1007/s41470-019-00030-7.
- Aerts, D. and Sozzo, S. (2011). Quantum structure in cognition: Why and how concepts are entangled.

- Quantum Interaction. QI 2011. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 7052*, pp. 116-127. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-24971-6_12.
- Aerts, D. and Sozzo, S. (2014). Quantum entanglement in concept combinations. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 53, pp. 3587-3603. doi: 10.1007/s10773-013-1946-z.
- Aerts, D. and Sozzo, S. (2015). What is quantum? Unifying its micro-physical and structural appearance. *Quantum Interaction. QI 2014. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 8951*, pp 12-23. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-15931-7_2.
- Aerts, D., Sozzo, S. and Veloz, T. (2015a). Quantum structure of negation and conjunction in human thought. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6, 1447. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01447.
- Aerts, D., Sozzo, S. and Veloz, T. (2015b). The quantum nature of identity in human thought: Bose-Einstein statistics for conceptual indistinguishability. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 54, pp. 4430-4443. doi: 10.1007/s10773-015-2620-4.
- Aerts, D., Sozzo, S., and Veloz, T. (2016). A new fundamental evidence of non-classical structure in the combination of natural concepts. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*. 374, 20150095. doi: 10.1098/rsta.2015.0095.
- Aerts Arguëlles, J. (2018). The heart of an image: Quantum superposition and entanglement in visual perception. *Foundations of Science* 23, pp 757-778. doi: 10.1007/s10699-018-9547-1.
- Atmanspacher, H., Römer, H. and Walach, H. (2002). Weak quantum theory: Complementarity and entanglement in physics and beyond. *Foundations of Physics* 32, pp. 379-406. doi: 10.1023/A:1014809312397.
- Anderson, M. H., Ensher, J. R., Matthews, M. R., Wieman, C. E. and Cornell, E. A. (1995). Observation of Bose-Einstein condensation in a dilute atomic vapor. *Science, New Series* 269, pp. 198-201. doi: 10.1126/science.269.5221.198.
- Aspect, A., Dalibard, J. and Roger, G. (1982). Experimental test of Bell's inequalities using time-varying analyzers. *Physical Review Letters* 49, 1804. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.49.1804.
- Bell, J. (1964). On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox. *Physics* 1, pp. 195-200. doi: 10.1103/PhysicsPhysiqueFizika.1.195.
- Bell, J. (1987). *Speakable and Unsayable in Quantum Mechanics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Beltran, L. (2021). Quantum Bose Einstein statistics for indistinguishable concepts in human language. *Foundations of Science*. Online First. doi: 10.1007/s10699-021-09794-1.
- Beltran, L. and Geriente, S. (2019). Quantum entanglement in corpuses of documents. *Foundations of Science* 24, pp. 227-246. doi: 10.1007/s10699-018-9570-2.
- Blutner, R. and beim Graben, P. (2016). Quantum cognition and bounded rationality. *Synthese* 193, pp. 3239-3291. doi: 10.1007/s11229-015-0928-5.
- Bohm, D. (1951). *Quantum Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bohr, N. (1913). On the constitution of atoms and molecules, part I. *Philosophical Magazine* 26, pp. 1-24. doi:10.1080/14786441308634955.
- Bose, S. N. (1924). Plancks Gesetz und Lichtquantenhypothese. *Zeitschrift für Physik* 26, pp. 178-181. doi: 10.1007/BF01327326.
- Bradley, C. C., Sackett, C. A., Tollett, J. J. and Hulet R. G. (1995). Evidence of Bose-Einstein condensation in an atomic gas with attractive interactions. *Physical Review Letters* 75, 1687. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.1687.
- Broekaert, J., Basieva, I., Blasiak, P. and Pothos, E. M. (2017). Quantum-like dynamics applied to cognition: a consideration of available options. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 20160387. doi: 10.1098/rsta.2016.0387.
- Bruza, P., and Cole, R. (2005). Quantum logic of semantic space: An exploratory investigation of context effects in practical reasoning. In S. Artemov, H. Barringer, A. S. d'Avila Garcez, L. C. Lamb and J. Woods (Eds.), *We Will Show Them: Essays in Honour of Dov Gabbay* (pp. 339-361), volume 1. London:

- College Publications.
- Bruza P., Kitto K., Nelson D. and McEvoy C. (2009). Extracting spooky-activation-at-a-distance from considerations of entanglement. *Quantum Interaction. QI 2009. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 5494*, pp. 71-83. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-00834.
- Busemeyer, J. and Bruza, P. (2012). *Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Busemeyer, J. R. and Wang, Z. (2018). Hilbert space multidimensional theory. *Psychological Review 125*, pp. 572-591. doi: 10.1037/rev0000106.
- Busemeyer, J. R., Wang, Z. and Townsend, J. T. (2006). Quantum dynamics of human decision making. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology 50*, pp. 220-241. doi: 10.1016/j.jmp.2006.01.003.
- Clauser, J. F., Horne, M. A., Shimony, A. & Holt, R.A. (1969). Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Physical Review Letters 23*, pp. 880-884. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.23.880.
- Cornell, E. A. and Wieman, C. E. (2002). Nobel Lecture: Bose-Einstein condensation in a dilute gas, the first 70 years and some recent experiments. *Reviews of Modern Physics 74*, 875. doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.74.875.
- Dalla Chiara, M. L., Giuntini, R., Luciani, A. R. and Negri, E. (2012). *From Quantum Information to Musical Semantics*. Illustrated by C. Seravalli. London: College Publications.
- Dalla Chiara, M. L., Giuntini, R., Leporini, R., Negri, E. and Sergioli, G. (2015). Quantum information, cognition, and music. *Frontiers in Psychology 6*, 1583. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01583.
- Deerwester, S., Dumais, S. T., Furnas, G. W., Landauer, T. K. and Harshman, R. (1990). Indexing by Latent Semantic Analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science 41*, pp. 391-407. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199009)41:6<391::AID-ASI1>3.0.CO;2-9.
- Davis, K. B., Mewes, M. -O., Andrews, M. R., van Druten, N. J., Durfee, D. S., Kurn D. M., and Ketterle, W. (1995). Bose-Einstein condensation in a gas of sodium atoms. *Physical Review Letters 75*, 3969. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.3969.
- Dieks, D. and Lubberdink, A. (2020). Identical quantum particles as distinguishable objects. *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*. Online First. arXiv:1902.09280[quant-ph]. doi: 10.1007/s10838-020-09510-w.
- Einstein, A. (1905). Über einen die Erzeugung und Verwandlung des Lichtes betreffenden heuristischen Gesichtspunkt. *Annalen der Physik 17*, pp. 132-148. doi: 10.1002/andp.19053220607.
- Einstein, A. (1924). Quantentheorie des einatomigen idealen Gases. *Sitzungsber. phys.-math. Kl. 1924, Gesamtsitzung vom 10. Juli 1924*, pp. 261-267.
- Einstein, A. (1925). Quantentheorie des einatomigen idealen Gases. *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, Physikalisch-mathematische Klasse, 1925*, pp. 3-14, 18-25.
- Einstein, A, Podolsky, B. and Rosen, N. (1935). Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Physical Review 47*, pp. 777-780. doi: 10.1103/PhysRev.47.777.
- French, S. and Redhead, M. (1988). Quantum physics and the identity of indiscernibles. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science 39*, pp. 233-246. doi: 10.1093/bjps/39.2.233.
- Feynman, R. P., Leighton, R. B. and Sands, M. (1963). *The Feynman Lectures on Physics, Vol III, Chapter 1*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Feynman, R. (1965). *The Character of Physical Law*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Gabora, L. and Aerts, D. (2002). Contextualizing concepts using a mathematical generalization of the quantum formalism. *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Artificial Intelligence 14*, pp. 327-358. doi: 10.1080/09528130210162253.
- Gabora, L. and Kitto, K. (2017). Toward a quantum theory of humor. *Frontiers of Physics 4*, 53. doi: 10.3389/fphy.2016.00053.
- Gemmer, J., Michel, M. and Mahler, G. (2009). *Quantum Thermodynamics: Emergence of Thermodynamic Behavior Within Composite Quantum Systems*. Lecture Notes in Physics 784. Berlin, Heidelberg:

- Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-70510-9.
- Gogolin, C. and Eisert, J. (2016). Equilibration, thermalisation, and the emergence of statistical mechanics in closed quantum systems. *Reports on Progress in Physics* 79, 056001. doi: 10.1088/0034-4885/79/5/056001.
- Haven, E. and Khrennikov, A. (2013). *Quantum Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heazlewood, B. R. and Softley, T. P. (2021). Towards chemistry at absolute zero. *Nature Reviews Chemistry* 5, pp. 125-140. doi: 10.1038/s41570-020-00239-0.
- Hong, C. K., Ou, Z.Y. and Mandel, L. (1987). Measurement of subpicosecond time intervals between two photons by interference. *Physical Review Letters* 59, 2044. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.59.2044.
- Huang, K. (1987). *Statistical Mechanics*. New York: Wiley.
- Ketterle, W. (2002). Nobel lecture: When atoms behave as waves: Bose-Einstein condensation and the atom laser. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 74, 1131. doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.74.1131.
- Khrennikov, A. (1999). Classical and quantum mechanics on information spaces with applications to cognitive, psychological, social and anomalous phenomena. *Foundations of Physics* 29, pp. 1065-1098. doi: 10.1023/A:1018885632116.
- Kim, Yoon-Ho, Yu, R., Kulik, S.P., Shih, Y.H. and Scully, M. O. (2000). Delayed ‘choice’ quantum eraser. *Physical Review Letters* 84, pp. 1-5. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.1.
- Knill, E., Laflamme, R. and Milburn, G. J. (2001). A scheme for efficient quantum computation with linear optics. *Nature* 409, pp. 46-52. doi: 10.1038/35051009.
- Krause, D. (2010). Logical aspects of quantum (non-)individuality. *Foundations of Science* 15, pp. 79-94. doi: 10.1007/s10699-009-9169-8.
- Lambert Mogiliansky, A., Zamir, S. and Zwirn, H. (2009). Type indeterminacy: A model of the KT (Kahneman-Tversky)-man. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 53, 349-361. doi: 10.1016/j.jmp.2009.01.001.
- Lettow, R., Rezus, Y. L. A., Renn, A., Zumofen, G., Ikonen, E., Götzinger, S. and Sandoghdar, V. (2010). Quantum interference of tunably indistinguishable photons from remote organic molecules. *Physical Review Letters* 104, 123605. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.123605.
- Mahler, G. (2015). *Quantum Thermodynamic Processes*. Singapore: Pan Stanford.
- Melucci, M. (2015). *Introduction to Information Retrieval and Quantum Mechanics*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer.
- Milne, A. A. (1926). *Winnie-the-Pooh*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Moreira, C. and Wichert, A. (2016). Quantum probabilistic models revisited: the case of disjunction effects in cognition. *Frontiers in Physics* 4, 26. doi: 10.3389/fphy.2016.00026.
- Muller, F. A. and Seevinck, M. (2009). Discerning elementary particles. *Philosophy of Science* 76, pp. 179-200.
- Pérez, E. and Sauer, T. (2010). Einstein’s quantum theory of the monatomic ideal gas: non-statistical arguments for a new statistics. *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* 64, pp. 561-612. doi: 10.1007/s00407-010-0066-x.
- Planck, M. (1900). Zur Theorie des Gesetzes der Energieverteilung im Normalspectrum. *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft* 2, pp. 237-245. Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth.
- Pothos, E. and Busemeyer, J. (2009). A quantum probability explanation for violations of ‘rational’ decision theory. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 276, pp. 2171-2178. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2009.0121.
- Pothos, E. M., Barque-Duran, A., Yearsley, J. M., Trueblood, J. S., Busemeyer, J. R. and Hampton, J. A. (2015). Progress and current challenges with the quantum similarity model. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6, 205. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00205.
- Schrödinger, E. (1926). Zur Einsteinschen Gastheorie. *Physikalische Zeitschrift* 27, pp. 95-101.
- Scully, M. O., Druhl, K. (1982). Quantum eraser: a proposed photon correlation experiment concerning observation and ‘delayed choice’ in quantum mechanics. *Physical Review A* 25, 2208. doi: 10.1103/

- PhysRevA.25.2208.
- Shannon, C. E. (1948a). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal* 27, pp. 379-423. doi:10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x.
- Shannon, C. E. (1948b). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal* 27, pp. 623-656. doi:10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb00917.x.
- Sozzo, S. (2014). A quantum probability explanation in Fock space for borderline contradictions. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 58, 2014, pp. 1-12. doi: 10.1016/j.jmp.2013.11.001.
- Sozzo, S. (2015). Conjunction and negation of natural concepts: A quantum-theoretic modeling. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 66, pp. 83-102. doi: 10.1016/j.jmp.2015.01.005.
- Sozzo, S. (2017). Effectiveness of the quantum-mechanical formalism in cognitive modeling. *Soft Computing* 21, pp. 1455-1465. doi: 10.1007/s00500-015-1834-y.
- Sozzo, S. (2020). Explaining versus describing human decisions: Hilbert space structures in decision theory. *Soft Computing* 24, pp. 10219-10229. doi: 10.1007/s00500-019-04140-x.
- ter Haar, D. (1967). *The Old Quantum Theory*. London: Pergamon Press.
- van Rijsbergen, C. J. (2004). *The Geometry of Information Retrieval*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Veloz, T and Desjardins, S. (2015). Unitary transformations in the quantum model for conceptual conjunctions and its application to data representation. *Frontiers In Psychology* 6, 1734. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01734.
- Veloz, T., Zhao, X. and Aerts, D. (2014). Measuring conceptual entanglement in collections of documents. *Quantum Interaction. QI 2013. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 8369*, pp. 134-146. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-54943-4_12.
- von Neumann, J. (1932). *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik*. Berlin: Springer.
- Walborn, S. P., Terra Cunha, M. O., Pádua, S. and Monken, C. H. (2002). Double-slit quantum eraser. *Physical Review A* 65, 033818. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.65.033818.
- Weih, G., Jennewein, T., Simon, C., Weinfurter, H. and Zeilinger, A. (1998). Violation of Bell's inequality under strict Einstein locality conditions. *Physical Review Letters* 81, 5039. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.5039.
- Widdows, D. (2004). *Geometry and Meaning*. Stanford: CSLI publications.
- Yokoi, Y. and Abe, S. (2018). Derivation of Bose-Einstein and Fermi-Dirac statistics from quantum mechanics: gauge-theoretical structure. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 023112. doi: 10.1088/1742-5468/aaa794.
- Zhao, T-M., Zhang, H., Yang, J., Sang, Z-R., Jiang, X., Bao, X-H. and Pan, J-W. (2014). Entangling different-color photons via time-resolved measurement and active feed forward. *Physical Review Letters* 112, 103602. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.103602.
- Zipf, G. K. (1935). *The Psycho-Biology of Language*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Zipf, G. K. (1949). *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort*. Cambridge: Addison Wesley.