

Towards a Theory of Pragmatic Information

Edward D. Weinberger
Department of Finance and Risk Engineering
NYU Tandon School of Engineering

March 20, 2024

Abstract

The subject generally known as “information theory” has nothing to say about how much meaning is conveyed by the information. Accordingly, we fill this gap with the first rigorously justifiable, quantitative definition of “pragmatic information” as the amount of information that becomes meaningful because it is used in making a decision. We posit that such information updates a “state of the world” random variable, ω , that informs the decision. The pragmatic information of a single message is then defined as the Kulbach-Leibler divergence between the *a priori* and updated probability distributions of ω , and the pragmatic information of a message ensemble is defined as the expected value of the pragmatic information values of the ensemble’s component messages. We justify these definitions by showing, first, that the pragmatic information of a single message is the expected difference between the shortest binary encoding of ω under the *a priori* and updated probability distributions, and, second, that the average of the pragmatic values of individual messages, when sampled a large number of times from the ensemble, approaches its expected value.

The resulting pragmatic information formulas have many hoped-for properties, such as non-negativity and additivity for independent decisions and “pragmatically independent” messages. We also sketch two applications of these formulas: The first is the single play of a slot machine, a.k.a. a “one armed bandit”, with an unknown probability of payout; the second being the reformulation of the efficient market hypothesis of financial economics as the claim that the pragmatic information content of all available data about a given security is zero.

1 Introduction

Just about any discussion of standard information theory notes that the standard entropy measure of the amount of information in a transmitted message says nothing about the “meaningfulness” of the message. Indeed, Warren Weaver’s introduction to Shannon’s foundational paper [1] famously observes that the effectiveness of a communications process could be measured by answering any of the following three questions:

- A. How accurately can the symbols that encode the message be transmitted (“the technical problem”)?
- B. How precisely do the transmitted symbols convey the desired meaning (“the semantics problem”)?
- C. How effective is the received message in changing conduct (“the effectiveness problem”)?

Weaver then observes that Shannon’s paper — and thus the entire edifice of what is now known as “information theory” — concerns itself only with the answer to above question A.¹ The present paper, in contrast, is a continuation of previous work [2], in which it was proposed that the only definitive way to assess the “meaning” of above question B is to quantify the “changed conduct” of question C.²

[2] explained why such a theory was needed in order to better understand the role of information in biological evolution. While the primary goal of the present work is to advance the theory as such, we will conclude with a few remarks on how the theory applies to both biological evolution and the efficient market hypothesis of financial economics.

We discuss, first, the pragmatic information of a single message, preparing our quantitative results with a discussion of the properties that pragmatic information should have. Some of these properties have been noted by other authors, qualitatively by such authors as [7] and [8] and more quantitatively by [9] and [10], the latter having proposed definitions of pragmatic information similar to ours. However, we are able to show that our definition follows from natural assumptions about what

¹Arguably, however, *every* answer to question A is implicitly an answer to question C, as every transmission implies that *something* in the receiver, which might be called its “conduct”, must have changed.

²Such a quantification begs the question of whether this change in conduct is actually a change for the better! Indeed, recent events have shown that dis-information can be quite effective in changing conduct, but that is beyond the scope of the present work.

a “measure of meaning” should be.

We then consider the pragmatic information of messages in an ensemble. As part of that discussion, we provide an example of how our definition applies to the simplest multi-armed bandit problem, that of playing a single slot machine with an unknown payout probability. We also consider what it means for message ensembles to be “pragmatically independent” and the relationship between the pragmatic information of an ensemble of messages and the mutual information between the message ensemble and the “state of the world” variable ω .

We conclude with speculation about how a kind of “computational capacity” may play a role in the theory of pragmatic information similar to that of channel capacity in the Shannon theory, in that beliefs about ω cannot be updated until all message processing is completed. We conjecture, in particular, that markets are efficient when incoming market information overwhelms the computational capacities of market participants.

2 The Pragmatic Information of a Single Message

2.1 Our Conceptual Framework

If the practical meaning of a message stems from its usefulness in making a decision, the message must do so by changing those beliefs about the state of the world that will inform the subsequent action. Accordingly, we consider a decision maker, Δ , which may be a machine, a human, or a non-human organism, whose decision will be informed by beliefs about a random variable ω in some discrete sample space $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_i, \dots, \omega_N\}$. Δ ’s knowledge of the world is subject to constraints such as the following:

- Δ is uncertain about its beliefs,
- Δ has imperfect knowledge about which of the actions are, from its point of view, better than others,
- Δ is unable to process its knowledge optimally, perhaps because of computational limitations,
- Etc.

We summarize this indeterminacy by assuming that Δ assigns *a priori* probabilities $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N)$, each of which are positive, to the various possible values of ω . We refer to $\mathbf{q}$ as *a priori* probabilities because we then supply Δ with a “message”, m . As a result, Δ ’s beliefs about

the state of the world change from $\mathbf{q}$ to $\mathbf{p}_m = (p_{1|m}, p_{2|m}, \dots, p_{N|m})$.

³ The implicit assumption is that m is an input to a calculation that Δ performs, the ultimate output of which is $\mathbf{p}_m$.

While our conceptual framework can be applied to the wealth of so-called “multi-armed bandit problems” (See, for example, [3] and [4]), we consider the following, even simpler “one-armed bandit” problem: we can pay \$1 to play a slot machine (also known as a “one armed bandit”) as many times as we wish. After each play, we will win a \$2 payout with some constant probability p , or nothing, with probability $1 - p$, with the payout events independent from one play to the next. The problem is that p is not known in advance!

Suppose we denote the result of the t^{th} such play by the random variable $\mathbf{1}_t$, with

$$\mathbf{1}_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if there is a payout on the } t^{th} \text{ play} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, we learn something about p , and thus the correct play/no play decision for subsequent trials from the realized values of the sequence $\mathbf{1}_1, \mathbf{1}_2, \dots, \mathbf{1}_T$, but exactly how much? If we have won w times in the T trials, Laplace’s Rule of Succession [6] estimates p as

$$\hat{p}(w, T) = \frac{w + 1}{T + 2}. \quad (1)$$

$\hat{p}(w, T)$ is less and less sensitive to whether or not any individual trial results in a payout as T increases. Thus, we learn less and less about what we need to know from each additional value in this sequence; indeed, after a finite number of such values, we know essentially all we need to know to make our decision.

In contrast, the amount of Shannon information,

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{1}_t) = p \log_2 p + (1 - p) \log_2 (1 - p),$$

per play remains constant from one play to the next, so that the Shannon information for the T independent plays is $T[p \log_2 p + (1 - p) \log_2 (1 - p)]$. However, the Shannon information captures data such as the particular order of successes and failures, which is more than we need to know to estimate p .

³We note that m can include a series of instructions that may affect Δ ’s decision making capabilities, perhaps by affecting internal states that Δ maintains. For example, m might be the code in some computer language.

2.2 Defining the Pragmatic Information of a Single Message

Informed by the above, we propose the following

Definition. *The pragmatic information of a single message m acting on Δ is*⁴

$$D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q}) = \sum_i p_{i|m} \log \left(\frac{p_{i|m}}{q_i} \right), \quad (2)$$

with the usual convention that $p_{i|m} \log \left(\frac{p_{i|m}}{q_i} \right) = 0$ if $p_{i|m} = 0$, i.e. the Kullback-Liebler divergence of $\mathbf{p}_m$ and $\mathbf{q}$.

As we will see in more detail below, our definition of pragmatic information incorporates many of the features postulated by [7] and [8], such as:

- $D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q}) = 0$ if m is already known to Δ .
- $D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q}) = 0$ if Δ cannot process m .
- $D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q})$ will depend on Δ , and, more specifically, on the context in which Δ receives m .
- For two different messages, m and m' ,

$$D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q}) = D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_{m'}||\mathbf{q})$$

if m and m' always lead Δ to choose the same decision probabilities, even if m and m' have different lengths and/or content.

- $D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q})$ increases if Δ is able to recognize the increasing novelty of m as $\mathbf{p}_m$ differs more from $\mathbf{q}$. However, if m is completely novel, in the sense that Δ will be unable to process it, $D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q}) = 0$. This situation is considered in more detail below.

Our conceptual framework also allows us to look more carefully at the following example, introduced by [8]:

Consider a cash register which stores the data of all sales over the day. After closing time, the shopkeeper is not interested in the list of numbers, but in the total. By performing the addition the cash register produces pragmatic information, since that total comes closer to the user requirements than the list of raw data would do.

⁴As is customary in writing about information theory, all logarithms will subsequently be assumed to be base 2 logarithms, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

In our framework, Δ would be the shopkeeper who, presumably, needs to make decisions based on the true value of total sales for the day, which we take as the relevant random variable ω . We can either take m to be a single number that purports to be this total sales value, m_T , or the list of individual sales, m_I . Both are subject to input error, various processing errors, etc., but the result of manually aggregating the total sales from the list is more likely to be incorrect than the automatically computed result from the cash register. Hence the distribution $\mathbf{p}_{m_T}$ is more likely to be clustered around a single, presumably correct, value than $\mathbf{p}_{m_I}$. On the other hand, the shopkeeper's *a priori* estimate of daily sales, and thus $\mathbf{q}$, is likely to be much more spread out than either $\mathbf{p}_{m_T}$ or $\mathbf{p}_{m_I}$. It follows that the aggregating function of the cash register does indeed produce pragmatic information in the sense that, in all likelihood, $D_\Delta(\mathbf{p}_{m_T}||\mathbf{q}) > D_\Delta(\mathbf{p}_{m_I}||\mathbf{q})$.

But everything depends on the shopkeeper's subjective beliefs! The shopkeeper might believe that the buggy software of the cash register is less reliable than the shopkeeper's own manual addition, in which case $D_\Delta(\mathbf{p}_{m_T}||\mathbf{q}) < D_\Delta(\mathbf{p}_{m_I}||\mathbf{q})$.

The formula that [10] proposed for “surprise” is essentially the same as (2) for a single message (Below, we will generalize this definition to any m in some ensemble of possible messages.). However, [10] left ambiguous whether to define this quantity as (in our notation) $D_\Delta(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q})$ or $D_\Delta(\mathbf{q}||\mathbf{p}_m)$. They prefer the latter, as it is easier for them to compute intuition-building analytic results in specific cases; however, we prefer the former, as we assume – perhaps naively! – that $\mathbf{p}_m$ really does provide an improvement over $\mathbf{q}$. Our preferred definition also makes more sense in subsequent sections of this paper, where we list some known/easily derivable properties ⁵ of $D_\Delta(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q})$ that make it an appealing choice for a measure of pragmatic information of a single message.

2.3 Properties of the Pragmatic Information of a Single Message

The fundamental justification for our definition of the pragmatic information of a single message is found in the following two theorems and a corollary to the second:

⁵See [11] for proofs of all of the theorems in this subsection, except for our “Wrong Code Theorem”, which is an embellishment of their results, and the obvious corollaries to Theorems 2.1.3.

Theorem 2.3.1 (Wrong Code Theorem). *Suppose $L_{\mathbf{q}}(\omega)$ is the length, in bits, of the shortest binary code required to communicate that Δ has decided upon outcome ω , assuming the prior probabilities $\mathbf{q}$, and suppose $L_{\mathbf{p}_m}(\omega)$ is the corresponding length, assuming the prior probabilities $\mathbf{p}_m$. Then*

$$\mathcal{E}[L_{\mathbf{q}}(\omega) - L_{\mathbf{p}_m}(\omega)] = D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_m || \mathbf{q}),$$

where $\mathcal{E}[L_{\mathbf{q}}(\omega) - L_{\mathbf{p}_m}(\omega)]$ is the expected length of $L_{\mathbf{q}}(\omega) - L_{\mathbf{p}_m}(\omega)$ under the a posteriori probabilities $\mathbf{p}_m$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}_m)$ be the Shannon entropy of $\mathbf{p}_m$. Then, per [11],

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}_m) + D(\mathbf{p}_m || \mathbf{q}) \leq \mathcal{E}[L_{\mathbf{q}}(\omega)] < \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}_m) + D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_m || \mathbf{q}) + 1,$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}_m) \leq \mathcal{E}[L_{\mathbf{p}_m}(\omega)] < \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}_m) + 1,$$

The desired result follows upon subtracting the second set of inequalities from the first. $\square$

We conclude that $D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_m || \mathbf{q})$ can reasonably be interpreted as the amount of information that Δ has “learned” from m .

Next, consider two decision makers, Δ and Δ' , with respective input messages m and m' , estimating the likelihood of random variables $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\omega' \in \Omega'$, respectively. Suppose

- $\{q_{i,i'}\}$ is the set of *a priori* joint probabilities regarding outcome $\omega_i \in \Omega$ and, simultaneously, outcome $\omega'_{i'} \in \Omega'$, each without knowledge of respective input messages m and m' .
- the action of both messages changes $\{q_{i,i'}\}$ to the *a posteriori* joint probabilities, $\{p_{i,i'|m,m'}\}$, and
- $\{q'_{i'|i}\}$ is the set of prior probabilities of Δ' 's decisions, given the decisions of Δ , but not message m , and $\{p'_{i'|i,m,m'}\}$ is the *a posteriori* probability distribution of Δ' 's decisions, given the decisions of Δ and both messages m and m' .

We then have the

Theorem 2.3.2 (Chain Rule for Kullbach-Leibler Divergence).

$$D(\{p_{i,i'|m,m'}\} || \{q_{i,i'}\}) = D(\mathbf{p}_m || \mathbf{q}) + D(\{p'_{i'|i,m,m'}\} || \{q'_{i'|i}\})$$

Corollary (Additivity of Kullbach-Leibler Divergence). *In the special case where Δ and Δ' are completely independent of each other, i.e. that $\{q'_{i'|i}\} = \mathbf{q}'$ and $\{p'_{i'|i,m,m'}\} = \mathbf{p}'_m$,*

$$D(\{p_{i,i'|m,m'}\} || \{q_{i,i'}\}) = D(\mathbf{p}_m || \mathbf{q}) + D(\mathbf{p}'_m || \mathbf{q}'),$$

about which Kullbach writes in [12] that

“Additivity of information for independent events is intuitively a fundamental requirement, and is indeed postulated in most axiomatic developments of information theory. Additivity is the basis for the logarithmic form of information. A sample of n independent observations from the same population [Here n copies of Δ making n identical and independent decisions] provides n times the mean information in a single observation.”

$D_\Delta(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q})$ has a few other properties that would seem to be required of a measure of meaning, as stated in the following theorems:

Theorem 2.3.3 (Non-negativity of Kullbach-Leibler Divergence).

$$D_\Delta(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q}) \geq 0,$$

with equality if and only if $\mathbf{p}_m = \mathbf{q}$.

Thus, m always conveys positive pragmatic information, unless m is ignored by Δ .

Theorem 2.3.4 (Convexity of Kullbach-Leibler Divergence). *For pairs of probability distributions $\mathbf{p}_m$ and $\mathbf{p}'_m$ and $\mathbf{q}$, and $\mathbf{q}'$ and, for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, form the pair of interpolated distributions*

$$\mathbf{p}_m^\lambda = \lambda \mathbf{p}_m + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{p}'_m$$

and

$$\mathbf{q}^\lambda = \lambda \mathbf{q} + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{q}',$$

then

$$D(\mathbf{p}_m^\lambda||\mathbf{q}^\lambda) \leq \lambda D(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q}) + (1 - \lambda) D(\mathbf{p}'_m||\mathbf{q}')$$

In the special case where $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}' = \mathbf{q}_\lambda$ and $\mathbf{u}_j$ and $\mathbf{u}_k$ are unit vectors in the j^{th} and k^{th} direction, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} D(\lambda \mathbf{u}_j + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{u}_k||\mathbf{q}) &\leq \lambda D(\mathbf{u}_j||\mathbf{q}) + (1 - \lambda) D(\mathbf{u}_k||\mathbf{q}) \\ &\leq \lambda D(\mathbf{u}_j||\mathbf{q}) + (1 - \lambda) D(\mathbf{u}_k||\mathbf{q}) \\ &\leq \max(-\log q_j, -\log q_k) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that, for given $\mathbf{q}$, we have the following

Corollary. *The maximum value of $D_\Delta(\mathbf{p}_m||\mathbf{q})$ is $\max_l(-\log q_l)$, where the max is taken over all of the q 's for which $p_{l|m} > 0$.*

In other words, the pragmatic information conveyed by a single message is a maximum when Δ treats it as a certainty.

3 The Pragmatic Information of an Ensemble of Messages

We now assume that the input messages m are drawn from some finite ensemble $\mathcal{M}$ of possible messages, each with probability φ_m . We further assume that Δ makes a sequence of N independent decisions, each with the same prior, and each informed by input message m_k for $1 \leq k \leq N$, with each m_k drawn independently from $\mathcal{M}$. Given the additivity of Kullback-Leibler divergence for independent decisions, the pragmatic information per message is the random variable

$$\Phi_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_{m_k} || \mathbf{q}).$$

Even though the terms in the above sum have different means, Kolmogorov's Strong Law of Large Numbers [13] still applies because, per the corollary to Theorem 2.3.4, each term in this sum, and thus its variance, is bounded. We conclude that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_N = E[D(\mathbf{p}_m || \mathbf{q})],$$

with probability 1. We therefore propose the following

Definition. *The pragmatic information, $\Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega)$, of an ensemble of messages $\mathcal{M}$ is the expected value*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) &= E[D(\mathbf{p}_m || \mathbf{q})] \\ &= \sum_{i,m} \varphi_m p_{i|m} \log \left(\frac{p_{i|m}}{q_i} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,m} p_{i,m} \log \left(\frac{p_{i|m}}{q_i} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$p_{i|m}$ remains the conditional probability of outcome ω_i , given the receipt of message m , so that the joint probability, $p_{i,m}$, of outcome ω_i upon receiving message m is $p_{i,m} = \varphi_m p_{i|m}$. Once again, we take $p_{i|m} \log \left(\frac{p_{i|m}}{q_i} \right) = 0$ if $p_{i|m} = 0$.

3.1 An Example: The One Armed Bandit Problem

It is instructive to apply this definition to the “one armed bandit problem” discussed above. Evidently, the relevant decision is whether it is worth playing the slot machine, a decision that is informed by a random variable, ω , that can assume the two values PAYOUT and NOPAYOUT, *i.e.*

$\Omega = \{\text{PAYOUT}, \text{NOPAYOUT}\}$. We want to know the pragmatic information accruing from a knowledge of $\mathbf{1}_{T+1}$, given that the T prior trials have resulted in w wins. Thus, per (1), we take $\hat{p}(w, T)$ as q_1 , our *a priori* estimate of the payout probability, and $1 - \hat{p}(w, T)$ as q_0 , our *a priori* estimate of the no payout probability.

The ensemble, $\mathcal{M}_{T+1}$, of possible messages for the $T + 1^{\text{st}}$ trial is PAYOUT_{T+1} and NOPAYOUT_{T+1} . If Δ receives the PAYOUT_{T+1} message, the *a posteriori* PAYOUT and NOPAYOUT probabilities are updated to

$$\mathbf{p}_1 = \left(\hat{p}(w+1, T+1), 1 - \hat{p}(w+1, T+1) \right).$$

Similarly, if Δ receives the NOPAYOUT_{T+1} message, the corresponding *a posteriori* probability vector is

$$\mathbf{p}_0 = \left(\hat{p}(w, T+1), 1 - \hat{p}(w, T+1) \right).$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_1 || \mathbf{q}) &= \hat{p}(w+1, T+1) \log \left[\frac{\hat{p}(w+1, T+1)}{\hat{p}(w, T)} \right] + \\ &\quad [1 - \hat{p}(w+1, T+1)] \log \left[\frac{1 - \hat{p}(w+1, T+1)}{1 - \hat{p}(w, T)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_0 || \mathbf{q}) &= \hat{p}(w, T+1) \log \left[\frac{\hat{p}(w, T+1)}{\hat{p}(w, T)} \right] + \\ &\quad [1 - \hat{p}(w, T+1)] \log \left[\frac{1 - \hat{p}(w, T+1)}{1 - \hat{p}(w, T)} \right], \end{aligned}$$

both of which can be interpreted as the reduction in the uncertainty surrounding the estimate of p , upon receipt of the corresponding value of $\mathbf{1}_{T+1}$. We conclude that the pragmatic information provided by the $T + 1^{\text{st}}$ trial is

$$\Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}_{T+1}; \Omega) = p D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_1 || \mathbf{q}) + (1 - p) D_{\Delta}(\mathbf{p}_0 || \mathbf{q}).$$

As T gets large, $w = pT + o(T)$ with probability 1, by the Kolmogorov Strong Law of Large Numbers. Straightforward algebraic manipulation then shows that the arguments of all of the logarithms in $\Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}_{T+1}; \Omega)$ approach 1 monotonically as T increases. We conclude that $\Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}_{T+1}; \Omega)$ steadily decreases to zero with increasing T , as claimed above.

3.2 Properties of the Pragmatic Information of an Ensemble of Messages

The theorems in the previous section remain true for $\Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega)$, since it is just a weighted sum of Kullbach-Leibler divergences. We therefore have immediately

Theorem 3.2.1 (Non-negativity of Pragmatic Information). $\Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) \geq 0$, with equality if and only if all of the messages in $\mathcal{M}$ are pragmatically irrelevant with respect to Δ .

and

Theorem 3.2.2 (Wrong Code Theorem for Pragmatic Information). $\Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega)$ is the expected number of extra bits required to code samples from $\mathbf{p}_m$, averaged over $m \in \mathcal{M}$, using, for each m , an encoding optimized for that $\mathbf{p}_m$.

As a generalization of joint Kullbach-Leibler Divergence, suppose that

- decision makers Δ and Δ' , have respective output sets Ω and Ω' ,
- $\{q_{i,i'}\}$ is the set of *a priori* joint probabilities that Δ chooses outcome $\omega_i \in \Omega_{\Delta}$ and Δ' chooses outcome $\omega'_{i'} \in \Omega'$, each without knowledge of their respective input messages m and m' .
- the action of both messages changes the joint probabilities of outcomes ω_i and $\omega'_{i'}$ from the prior probabilities $\{q_{i,i'}\}$ to the *a posteriori* joint probabilities, $\{p_{i,i'|m,m'}\}$, and
- $\{q'_{i'|i}\}$ is the set of prior probabilities of Δ' 's decisions, given the decisions of Δ , but not message m , and $\{p'_{i'|i,m,m'}\}$ is the *a posteriori* probability distribution of Δ' 's decisions, given the decisions of Δ and both messages m and m' .

In addition, suppose further that the joint probability that Δ receives message m and Δ' receives message m' is $\varphi_{m,m'}$, and that the joint probability that these messages are received and the decision makers output ω_i and $\omega'_{i'}$, respectively, is $p_{i,i',m,m'}$. We then have the following

Definition. The joint pragmatic information of messages in $\mathcal{M}$ acting on Δ and messages in $\mathcal{M}'$ acting on Δ' is

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\Delta,\Delta'}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'; \Omega, \Omega') &= E [D(\{p_{i,i'|m,m'}\} || \{q_{i,i'}\})] \\ &= \sum_{i,i',m,m'} \varphi_{m,m'} p_{i,i'|m,m'} \log \left(\frac{p_{i,i'|m,m'}}{q_{i,i'}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,i',m,m'} p_{i,i',m,m'} \log \left(\frac{p_{i,i'|m,m'}}{q_{i,i'}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

Definition. *The conditional pragmatic information of messages in $\mathcal{M}'$ acting upon Δ' , given that $m \in \mathcal{M}$ acting on Δ , as well as the resulting outcome ω is*

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{\Delta'|\Delta}(\mathcal{M}'; \Omega' | \mathcal{M}, \Omega) &= E [D(\{p_{i'|i,m,m'}\} || \{q_{i'|i}\})] \\ &= \sum_{i,i',m,m'} p_{i,i',m,m'} \log \left(\frac{p_{i'|i,m,m'}}{q_{j|i}} \right)\end{aligned}$$

Since the Kullbach-Leibler divergence of each $m \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfies the Chain Rule for Kullbach-Leibler divergence, the generalization of that Rule follows immediately:

Theorem 3.2.3 (Chain Rule for Pragmatic Information). *Suppose each $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $m' \in \mathcal{M}'$ acts, respectively, on decision makers Δ and Δ' , with respective prior decision probabilities $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{q}'$ and with corresponding a posteriori decision probabilities $\mathbf{p}_m$ and $\mathbf{p}'_{im'}$, then*

$$\Phi_{\Delta,\Delta'}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega, \Omega') = \Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) + \Phi_{\Delta'|\Delta}(\mathcal{M}'; \Omega' | \mathcal{M}, \Omega)$$

3.3 Pragmatic Independence of Messages

It is well known that the joint Shannon entropy of two random variables is the sum of their individual entropies if and only if the random variables are independent. Here, we consider the corresponding situation for pragmatic information, *i.e.* conditions under which

$$\Phi_{\Delta,\Delta'}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'; \Omega, \Omega') = \Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) + \Phi_{\Delta'}(\mathcal{M}'; \Omega')$$

holds. If so, we say that message ensembles $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ are **pragmatically independent** with respect to their respective decision makers, Δ and Δ' , with the understanding that Δ and Δ' could be the same. The following corollary to Theorem 3.2.3 gives a sufficient, but not necessary condition for such pragmatic independence:

Corollary (Additivity of Pragmatic Information). *If, in addition, to the hypotheses of Theorem 2.3.4, we have*

$$q'_{i'|i} = q'_{i'} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{i,i',m,m'} = p_{i,m} p'_{i',m'} \quad \text{for all } i, i', m, m', \quad (3)$$

then

$$\Phi_{\Delta,\Delta'}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'; \Omega, \Omega') = \Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) + \Phi_{\Delta'}(\mathcal{M}'; \Omega') \quad (4)$$

Proof. Summing over i and i' , we conclude that $\varphi_{m,m'} = \varphi_m \varphi_{m'}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{i,i'|m,m'} &= \frac{p_{i,i',m,m'}}{\varphi_{m,m'}} \\ &= \left[\frac{p_{i,m}}{\varphi_m} \right] \left[\frac{p'_{i',m'}}{\varphi_{m'}} \right] \\ &= p_{i|m} p'_{i'|m'}, \end{aligned}$$

The result follows, since

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\Delta,\Delta'}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'; \Omega, \Omega') &= \sum_{i,i',m,m'} p_{i,i',m,m'} \log \left(\frac{p_{i,i'|m,m'}}{q_{i,i'}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,i',m,m'} p_{i,m} p'_{i',m'} \log \left(\frac{p_{i|m} p'_{i'|m'}}{q_i q_{i'}} \right) \\ &= \Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) + \Phi_{\Delta'}(\mathcal{M}'; \Omega') \end{aligned}$$

□

(3) is not necessary, because since any message ensemble $\mathcal{M}$ is pragmatically independent of any other ensemble $\mathcal{M}'$ for which $D_{\Delta'}(\mathbf{p}_{m'}|\mathbf{q}) = 0$ for all $m' \in \mathcal{M}'$.

3.4 The Relationship between Pragmatic Information and Mutual Information

This subsection corrects a mistake in [2] by clarifying the relationship between pragmatic information and the mutual information, $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega)$, between $\mathcal{M}$ and Ω . In particular, we resolve the confusion in that paper by showing that these two quantities are equal only in the important special case in which the *a priori* probabilities are the marginal probabilities $p_i = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} p_{i,m}$ for all i . Defining $\mathbf{p}$ as the vector of these marginal probabilities ⁶ we have the following

Theorem 3.4.1.

$$\Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) + D\Delta(\mathbf{p}|\mathbf{q})$$

⁶Note the distinction between $\mathbf{p}_m$ and $\mathbf{p}$: the former is the probability distribution of ω , given a specific m , but the latter is the average of these distributions over all m 's.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) &= \sum_{i,m} \varphi_m p_{i|m} \log \left[\frac{p_{i|m}}{q_i} \right] \\
&= \sum_{i,m} p_{i,m} \log \left[\frac{p_{i|m} p_i}{p_i q_i} \right] \\
&= \sum_{i,m} p_{i,m} \log \left[\frac{p_{i|m}}{p_i} \right] + \sum_i p_i \log \left[\frac{p_i}{q_i} \right] \\
&= \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) + D(\mathbf{p}||\mathbf{q}),
\end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_i p_i \log \left(\frac{p_i}{q_i} \right)$ is the Kullback-Leibler Divergence of $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$. $\square$

We also have the immediate

Corollary. $\Phi(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) \geq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega)$, with equality if and only if $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$.

4 Directions for Future Research

A motivation for this work was mentioned in the introduction; namely, the so-called efficient market hypothesis of financial economics (See, for example, [14].), which states, roughly, that asset prices, such as stock and bond prices, reflect all available information. If so, there is nothing to be gained by, for example, poring over charts of previous price histories or annual reports of companies. In other words, the pragmatic information contained in all of this data is zero!

The standard quantitative statement of the efficient market hypothesis is that, after adjusting for the time value of money, asset prices are martingales. However, this version of the hypothesis suggests that all investors should find the markets equally inscrutable, a claim that is belied by the conspicuous long term success of such investors as Warren Buffett. The characterization of market efficiency in terms of pragmatic information raises the possibility that some market participants might be better able to perform the processing implicit in turning incoming data into pragmatic information than others.

A useful direction for future research is therefore a careful examination of how the computational power of the decision maker affects the pragmatic information it uses. Indeed, the important role that this computation plays in the theory is suggested by an example due to [10]: If Δ has *no* computational abilities at all, in the sense that any message received will be ignored, $\mathbf{p}_m = \mathbf{q}$ for all messages m , and

$\Phi_{\Delta}(\mathcal{M}; \Omega) = 0$, regardless of the length or complexity of m !

The importance of computational limitations in applications of pragmatic information is underscored by the example of quasi-species evolution, as previously discussed in [2] (For present purposes, the quasi-species is a simplified model of selection and mutation of abstract “replicators” that exhibits the Darwinian paradigm of “survival of the fittest”. It is the interaction of the quasi-species with its environment that “decides” which of these replicators is, in fact, the fittest, so that this interaction is the Δ in the present theory. Thus, the identity of the fastest growing replicator is the random variable, ω , whose value is being sought; furthermore, the environmental details that determine growth and mutation rates are the “messages” that the quasi-species environment system processes.). Indeed, in [15], wherein the quasi-species was first formulated, the whole point of the discussion was to demonstrate the existence of an “error catastrophe”, which is a limit to the information that the quasi-species “computation” could reliably accrue.

The most compelling results of the Shannon theory, the so-called noisy coding theorems [11], do not seem to have an analogue for pragmatic information, *i.e.* a “pragmatic channel capacity”, a rate above which pragmatic information cannot be transmitted. This is because a given message can have an arbitrarily small *a priori* probability of receipt, resulting in the logarithm in (2) being arbitrarily large. The above paragraphs suggest, instead, a “pragmatic computational capacity”. This limit on pragmatic information production arises, in more general situations than the above, from the fact that pragmatic information is always zero until the computation of $\hat{\omega}$, an estimate of “the state of the world”, is completed. This computation is therefore subject to all of the computational complexity issues that can arise with any such computation.

References

- [1] Shannon, Claude and Weaver, Warren. *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*, University of Illinois Press, 1962.
- [2] Weinberger, Edward D., “A Theory of Pragmatic Information and Its Application to the Quasi-species Model of Biological Evolution”, *BioSystems*, **66** (3), 105-119, 2002.
- [3] Robbins, Herbert, “Some aspects of the sequential design of experiments”, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, **58** (5): 527–535, doi:10.1090/S0002-9904-1952-09620-8, 1952.

- [4] Slivkins, Aleksandrs, *Introduction to Multi-Armed Bandits*, ArXiv abs/1904.07272, 2019.
- [5] Berger-Tal O, Nathan J, Meron E, Saltz D, “The exploration-exploitation dilemma: a multidisciplinary framework”, PLoS One. 2014 Apr 22;9(4):e95693. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0095693. Erratum in: PLoS One. 2015;10(3):e0119116. PMID: 24756026; PMCID: PMC3995763
- [6] Oxford Reference. Retrieved 16 Feb. 2024, from <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100433529>.
- [7] Weizsäcker, E.U. von, “Erstmaligkeit und Bestätigung als Komponenten der pragmatischen Information”, in *Offene Systeme I*, ed. by E.U. von Weizsäcker, 82-113, Klett, 1974.
- [8] Gernert, Dieter. “Pragmatic Information: Historical Exposition and General Overview”. *Mind & Matter*. **4** (2): 141–167, 2006.
- [9] Junarie, Guy, *Relative Information: Theories and Applications*, Springer, 1990.
- [10] Pierre Baldi, Laurent Itti, “Of bits and wows: A Bayesian theory of surprise with applications to attention,” *Neural Networks*, **23**, Issue 5, 649-666, 2010. ISSN 0893-6080, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2009.12.007>. (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0893608009003256>).
- [11] Cover, Thomas M. and Thomas, Joy, A., *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd Ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2006.
- [12] Kullback, Solomon, *Information Theory and Statistics*, Dover Publications, 1997.
- [13] Feller, William. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Volume 1*, 3rd Ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp. 243-245, 1968.
- [14] Fama, Eugene. ”Efficient Capital Markets: A Review of Theory and Empirical Work”. *Journal of Finance*, **25** (2): 383–417, 1970.
- [15] Eigen, M. ”Self-Organization of Matter and the Evolution of Biological Macromolecules”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, **58**: 465-532, 1971.