

Signatures of prediction during natural listening in MEG data?

Sahel Azizpour^{1,2}, Britta U. Westner^{2,3}, Jakub Szewczyk⁴, Umut Güçlü^{1,2}, and Linda Geerligs^{1,2}

¹*Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition, and Behaviour* ²*Radboud University*

³*Radboud University Medical Center* ⁴*Jagiellonian University*

(Dated: December 30, 2024)

The brain uses contextual information and prior knowledge to anticipate upcoming content during language comprehension. Recent research has shown predictive signals can be revealed in pre-onset ECoG activity during naturalistic narrative listening, by building encoding models based on word embeddings from Large Language Models (LLMs). Similarly, evidence for long-range predictive encoding has been observed in fMRI data, where incorporating embeddings for multiple upcoming words in a narrative improves alignment with brain activity. This study examines whether similar predictive information can be detected in MEG, a technique with higher temporal resolution than fMRI but a lower signal-to-noise ratio than ECoG. Our findings indicate that MEG captures pre-onset representations up to 1 second before word onset, consistent with ECoG results. However, unlike fMRI findings, incorporating future word embeddings did not enhance MEG encoding, even for one word into the future, which suggests that the pre-onset encoding may not reflect predictive processing. This work demonstrates that MEG combined with LLMs is a valuable approach for studying language processing in naturalistic narratives and highlights the need to study further what constitutes evidence for prediction during natural listening.

INTRODUCTION

Predictive processing is a foundational hypothesis in neuroscience, that proposes that the brain is continuously engaged in making predictions about upcoming stimuli [1, 2]. These predictions are shaped by the context in which the input is presented and are informed by the individual’s previous experiences with similar input sequences [3]. Language processing is one domain where predictions are thought to play a crucial role, particularly in facilitating comprehension by pre-activating linguistic representations [4, 5]. Various approaches have been used to investigate how the availability of predictive information influences lexico-semantic processing. At the behavioral level, studies have shown that highly predictable words result in shorter reaction times and reading times [6, 7]. At the neural level, numerous studies have demonstrated that the ERP response is modulated by the predictability of a word within a contextually constraining sentence [4, 8]. Compelling evidence from studies of natural conversations also shows that the absence of temporal gaps between exchanges requires listeners to predict the upcoming word and content with high accuracy [9, 10]. Over the past five decades, a wealth of research has strongly suggested that language comprehension is inherently predictive [11].

One of the most widely studied ERP prediction markers is the N400 component, which is elicited when there is a mismatch between the predicted and actual target word [12, 13]. To identify this N400 reliably, often words in a sentence are visually presented on the screen one at a time with the last word in the sentence being the target word. However, this measure does not provide a read-out of the prediction itself but instead a measure of how new input is processed in light of what may have been predicted [12].

To examine the actual contents of predictions, one needs to focus on the time period preceding the predicted word’s appearance. Early EEG studies attempted to do this by measuring event-related potentials time-locked to cues (e.g. determiners in English indicating whether an upcoming noun starts with a vowel or a consonant) that signaled whether the most predictable target noun would occur [8, 14]. The reasoning was that a brain response to a prediction-mismatching determiner would indicate noun prediction. Unfortunately, these results proved difficult to replicate [15–18]. Moreover, genuine N400-like effects to pronominal cue words may simply reflect the processing of those words themselves, rather than the prediction of the upcoming word [19].

More direct evidence for pre-target prediction was provided by Wang et al. [20, 21]. They used representational similarity analysis (RSA) to show that EEG patterns just before a highly predictable target word could reveal whether the noun was animate. However, their approach required a one-second gap before the target. While this interval presumably improved the ability to decode the noun’s animacy, it may have encouraged participants to adopt strategic, unnatural predictive processes that are less likely in normal comprehension scenarios.

Overall, previous research has established that prediction influences how upcoming words are processed, but it has not fully captured the representations of the predictions themselves. One reason may be that neural signatures of word prediction are quite subtle. Another is that EEG may lack the spatial resolution needed to disentangle the many semantic or lexical features of a predicted word. Furthermore, studies often rely on carefully controlled stimuli and slowed word-by-word presentations, or artificial gaps to align neural signals with word onset. Such methods limit both the number and diversity of linguistic contexts that participants experience, reducing

the ecological validity of the findings [22].

Recently, new opportunities have arisen to investigate predictive processing in more naturalistic settings. High-quality datasets collected using methods like MEG or ECoG now allow the study of prediction across tens of thousands of words, for example, in participants who listen to entire audiobooks. Such large-scale, naturalistic data provide stronger statistical power that can capture the subtle representations of predictions. Naturalistic data also exposes participants to richer, more varied linguistic contexts. Crucially, in these conditions, a word’s predictability depends on information spanning long stretches of discourse, rather than just the preceding word or sentence.

A potential difficulty with using large datasets is that until recently, it was very difficult to characterize the predictability of all words in the dataset. The traditional method used for this aim, the cloze probability test, is very labor-intensive and impossible to scale to datasets containing tens of thousands of words. Fortunately, recent advances in large language models (LLMs) overcome this obstacle. Trained on vast amounts of text, LLMs capture nuanced linguistic representations and can serve as proper linguistic theories [23], and by extension, proxies for the brain’s language processes. Indeed, across various neuroimaging modalities—such as fMRI [24–26], MEG [25, 27], and ECoG [28],—it has been shown that the internal word embeddings generated by LLMs can be linearly mapped onto brain representations and explain a substantial amount of the variance in neural responses to language.

In this study, we explore the use of Large Language Models (LLMs) to investigate predictive processing in language with MEG, building on two influential recent studies in the field. The first is by Goldstein et al. [28], who examined whether neural signals preceding word onset contain predictive information about upcoming words. Using high-precision ECoG recordings while participants listened to continuous, natural speech, they found that predictive signals for upcoming words were detectable up to two seconds before word onset. This finding has since been replicated and extended to examine various properties of predictive processing in natural language comprehension [29, 30]. Here, we investigate whether similar pre-stimulus decoding can be observed using MEG.

While ECoG provides an excellent signal-to-noise ratio, it is invasive and limited to patient research. Achieving similar results with MEG—a more accessible and non-invasive method—would create new possibilities for studying predictive processing. MEG has previously been used to detect pre-onset predictive activations of expected visual [31] and auditory [32] stimuli in carefully designed experimental setups. However, it remains uncertain whether representations of linguistic predictions are detectable in MEG during natural listening, given that data cannot be averaged across trials and MEG has a lower signal-to-

noise ratio than ECoG. Additionally, it is unclear whether these predictive signals are specifically tied to the envelope of spiking activity in the high gamma range [33], which cannot be captured reliably with MEG.

The second complementary paper that inspired the current work is by Caucheteux et al. [26], who investigated whether brain predictions extend beyond the immediate next word, using fMRI data. They explained brain activity elicited by a word using embeddings of future words, demonstrating that including representations of words further in the future enhanced the LLM-to-brain mapping performance. Their results suggest that the brain predicts multiple upcoming words into the future, not just the immediate next one. However, because of fMRI’s low temporal resolution, the study averaged word embeddings within each 1.5-second TR (time of repetition), which may obscure word-level dynamics. Here, we aim to investigate whether this effect is also observable when we examine word-level predictions, by taking advantage of the higher temporal resolution of MEG.

In summary, this study aims to determine whether MEG signals, combined with LLMs, can be used to investigate predictive processing in the context of natural listening. Specifically, we address the following questions: (1) Can pre-onset neural encoding of an upcoming word be detected in MEG signals, as previously observed in ECoG data? And, (2) does including future word embeddings, as in previous fMRI studies, enhance the alignment between MEG brain data and linguistic predictions? To address these questions, we build encoding models similar to those used by Goldstein et al. [28] and Caucheteux et al. [26] to map GPT-2 embeddings onto an existing MEG dataset recorded while participants listened to approximately 10 hours of narrated stories.

RESULTS

LLM’s embeddings map onto MEG brain responses to narrative

The encoder processes the words from the narrative as input and predicts the corresponding brain signals within a specific time window surrounding the word’s onset (Fig. 1). The encoder is trained to learn a linear mapping between the LLM’s activations (word embeddings) and the MEG broadband signal (filtered in the 0.1 – 40 Hz frequency range), observed at each time point within this window. To assess how much the LLM’s activations capture information in the brain signal, we compute the correlation between the predicted and true brain responses, with the resulting correlation at each time point—called the ‘brain score’ \mathcal{R} —indicating the extent to which the word is represented in the brain signal.

Encoding models are fitted separately for each participant, timepoint, and MEG source. Nearly all MEG sources in each participant show a significant correlation




FIG. 1. **The encoding model finds a linear mapping between words in the narrative and corresponding brain responses.** **a.** The encoding model mimics the brain by taking each word and its context and learning to generate a brain-like response within a time window around the word’s onset. **b.** Word embeddings are extracted from the GPT-2 model and used to predict brain responses at each time point t through linear regression. **c.** The brain score represents the correlation between actual and predicted brain responses across multiple words, calculated at each time point t .

between the predicted and true brain response (144, 143, and 138 out of 150 MEG sources for the three subjects respectively), with the highest values corresponding to the temporal gyri and inferior frontal regions associated with language processing predominantly lateralized in the left hemisphere (Fig. 2.a). To investigate the temporal dynamics of the brain score around the onset of words in the narrative, we computed the average brain scores from 30 sources in each participant. To make sure that the results were unbiased (i.e. avoid double dipping), the source selection for each participant was based on the top 30 sources in the other two participants. Fig. 2.b shows the encoding results computed using all words in the story. It demonstrates that each participant has a slightly different signature encoding profile around word onset and that the brain score reaches its peak value within the first 500 ms after the word onset in all participants. Analysis done separately for each session (1 hour per session) reveals robust encoding across sessions, with brain scores comparable to models trained on 10 hours of data at once.

Words embeddings explain brain responses before word onset

Notably, significant brain scores are observed up to one second before the word onset, indicating pre-onset neural representations consistently in all participants. Fig. 2.c, illustrates that these pre-onset representations are more robust for predictable words compared to unpredictable ones. These findings align with those of Goldstein et al.

[28], who used ECoG recordings to suggest that pre-onset encoding reflects predictions of the upcoming word. Our results further indicate that significant pre-onset encoding is detectable even at the level of individual subjects with only one hour of data. To evaluate whether pre-onset encoding arises from contextual information embedded in GPT-2’s transformer-based embeddings, we reanalyzed the data using static GloVe embeddings. These GloVe embeddings represent the location of each word in the semantic space without contextual information present in GPT-2 embeddings. As shown in Fig. 3.a, pre-onset encoding persists but with reduced magnitude. However, GloVe embeddings may still exhibit statistical dependencies between neighboring words, as supplementary figure Fig. S2 reveals correlations between embeddings of nearby words. These dependencies complicate the interpretation of the pre-onset encoding as solely reflecting the prediction of the upcoming word. To address this, we conducted the analysis with arbitrary embeddings, where each unique word is assigned a vector sampled from a uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}_{[-1,1]}$ [28]. This approach preserves the unique identity of words while removing statistical dependencies within the embedding space as well as any lexico-semantic information in the embeddings. Pre-onset encoding remained statistically significant after controlling for multiple comparisons up to 213 ms, 186 ms, and 240 ms before word onset for each participant, respectively. For one of the three participants, this effect might reflect leakage of post-onset encoding due to the




FIG. 2. **Encoding of words relative to the word onset.** **a.** Brain scores are significant across almost all brain regions in all subjects (144, 143, and 138 out of 150 MEG sources for participants 1,2 and 3 respectively), with peak values in the left hemisphere, especially in the temporal cortex and inferior frontal areas associated with language processing. **b.** Brain scores computed for data from a single session (gray) and data for all 10 sessions (black), focusing on regions with the highest encoding values (see Methods for MEG source selection), show significant encoding beginning before the word onset and peaking at or shortly after it. Star symbols indicate significant brain score values of the black curve. **c.** Separate averages for predictable and unpredictable words reveal stronger encoding of predictable words up to 1 second before word onset. The encoding of unpredictable words appears stronger around 400 ms post-onset, though these effects did not reach statistical significance for subjects 2 and 3. Star symbols indicate where there is a significant difference between predictable and unpredictable words within the range of significance of panel b. All error bars were computed as the standard error of the encoding across the MEG sources.

200 ms smoothing window. When we examined a more lenient statistical threshold of $p < 0.05$ we found significant pre-onset encoding exceeding the 200 ms window in all three participants (from up to 267 ms, 347 ms, and 500 ms before word onset). These results suggest that there is still some evidence for pre-onset encoding after removing correlations among the embeddings.

To further investigate whether this pre-onset encoding truly reflects prediction signals, we considered the possibility that the remaining pre-onset encoding might result from the encoding model learning word co-occurrences, particularly repeated bi-grams in the story. To test this, we re-ran the analysis after removing all but the first instance of any repeated bi-grams, reducing the dataset to approximately 2.5 hours of narrative. Fig. 3 shows that there is no more significant pre-onset encoding for arbitrary embeddings after we remove all bi-grams, also at the uncorrected $p < 0.05$ threshold. These results show that we cannot definitively conclude that the pre-onset

encoding observed with MEG reflects prediction signals.

Including future word embeddings does not enhance encoding performance in MEG, whereas incorporating past word embeddings does.

Caucheteux et al. [26] demonstrated that incorporating future word embeddings alongside the current word in the encoding model improves the model’s performance in explaining fMRI BOLD signals. They interpreted this finding as evidence that the brain continuously predicts not only the next word but also several words ahead, with an average prediction window of eight words across various brain regions. Additionally, they observed a hierarchy of timescales within the brain, where lower-level cortical areas have shorter prediction windows, while frontal areas anticipate further into the future.

In the present study, we applied a similar approach as Caucheteux et al. to assess whether the inclusion of future word embeddings enhances the brain score in MEG




FIG. 3. **Encoding using different embedding types.** A comparison of encoding models using different word embeddings reveals that GPT-2 contextual word embeddings explain MEG responses better than GloVe embeddings, while GloVe embeddings outperform arbitrary embeddings. Notably, pre-onset encoding persists even when correlations between adjacent word embeddings are eliminated by using arbitrary embeddings. However, pre-onset encoding completely disappears after removing bi-grams from the dataset. This removal drastically reduces the brain score, such that even post-onset values fail to reach significance. All error bars represent the standard error of the encoding across the MEG sources. Star symbols (faded for $p < 0.05$ and bold for significance after FDR correction) indicate significant values.

signals. Moreover, given the superior temporal resolution of MEG, we can track this effect over time. Fig. 4.a illustrates the construction of the embedding vector. The variable d represents the number of word embeddings concatenated with the current word embedding to form the final vector. Positive values of d signify the inclusion of future word embeddings and negative d signify the inclusion of past word embeddings.

If the findings of Caucheteux et al. generalize to MEG data, we would expect to observe an increased brain score ($\Delta R > 0$) for models that include future word embeddings around the onset of the current word. However, as shown in Fig. 4.b, the inclusion of the next word embedding ($d = 1$) does not improve the brain score at the current word onset; rather, the increase only becomes apparent approximately 300 ms after the current word onset. Given that the average inter-word interval is 230 ms, this increase is likely due to the fact that the next word has already been heard by this point in the narrative. Fig. 4.c shows that the increase in brain score begins after one inter-word interval, and the curves for different positive values of d diverge around the multiples of the inter-word interval.

In contrast, including previous word embeddings enhances encoding performance at the current word onset (Fig. 4.b and c). This increase is most pronounced for the immediate previous word and diminishes with the inclusion of words further back in the past. This suggests that representations of previous words remain active for a period of time after they have been processed. Fig. 4.b and c clearly show an asymmetry between the representations of past and future words, with past words still being decodable from the current MEG brain responses, while future words leave no detectable traces. The asymmetry of this effect indicates that it cannot simply be attributed to autocorrelation.

To further investigate whether there is truly no im-

provement in encoding performance due to including the embedding of the next word, we repeated this analysis with GloVe embedding. As these GloVe embeddings contain less information about the word context, they would be expected to contain more unique information about individual words when we compare the current word to the future (or past) word. However, also for GloVe embeddings, we did not observe any increase in encoding performance at word onset for including future words. We did observe an increase in encoding performance by adding previous word embeddings, consistent with the results for GPT embeddings (see Fig. S1).

DISCUSSION

Leveraging the power of LLMs in capturing the complexities of human language, recent studies have attempted to explore predictive processing during natural speech comprehension [26, 28, 34]. However, only a few have directly examined pre-onset representations of the next word in brain activity using LLM embeddings, particularly with modalities like ECoG [28] and fMRI [26]. In this study, we investigated whether these findings can be replicated with MEG, a modality offering higher temporal precision than fMRI and greater accessibility than ECoG. To achieve this, we constructed an encoding model using LLM word embeddings to explain broadband 0.1 – 40 Hz MEG brain activity recorded from participants as they listened to 10 hours of natural speech. Our results show that consistent with previous studies, GPT-2’s word embeddings explain a substantial amount of variability in the MEG brain signal evoked after the presentation of each word [25, 27]. More critically, similar to ECoG findings [28], the embeddings of upcoming words can explain brain activity in language-related




FIG. 4. **Encoding of the future and past words.** All curves represent averages across participants. **a.** The embedding vector is constructed by concatenating d future word embeddings when $d > 0$, or $|d|$ previous word embeddings when $d < 0$, along with the embedding of the current word w_i . **b.** Including the next word embedding in the encoding model ($d = 1$) enhances encoding only after that word is actually heard in the story. In contrast, including the previous word embedding ($d = -1$) improves encoding even following the onset of the current word. **c.** The encoding enhancement, ΔR , is shown for negative (upper) and positive (lower) values of d . Vertical gray lines mark the median inter-word interval values. Adding each successive future word embedding improves encoding only after that word is heard in the narrative, while including previous words consistently improves encoding beyond their offset.

regions up to 1 second before word onset, observable even at the individual subject level and even within one-hour sessions. This further reinforces the MEG’s position as a valuable tool for studying language processing during naturalistic speech. However, our results call into question whether these pre-onset signals in MEG truly reflect predictive processing.

Can we find the representation of a target word before it is presented? In line with previous results in ECoG studies [28], we found that the embeddings of upcoming words can explain brain activity in language-related regions up to 1 second before word onset. While in ECoG, these pre-onset signals are observed in the broadband power in the high gamma band, we found that in MEG, they can be observed in lower frequency signals (0.1 – 40 Hz). Before we accept that these pre-onset signals really reflect prediction signals, we must first consider a number of potential confounds. The first is that the embeddings for nearby words can be correlated in both GPT and GloVe. Therefore, pre-onset encoding could simply be a result of the autocorrelation structure in the word embeddings. In other words, the pre-onset effect may not solely indicate next-word prediction but could instead reflect residual information from the previous word (w_{i-1}) encoded within the current word (w_i) embedding. To address this confound, we used arbitrary word embeddings, which assign a unique random vector to each word. Although this analysis removed most pre-onset

encoding, there was still some evidence for a remaining pre-onset signal, suggesting that the correlation between embeddings did not fully explain pre-onset encoding.

Another potential confound is the co-occurrence of words. When two words frequently co-occur, the encoding model could learn to predict brain activity to the first word based on the second one. When we addressed both confounds, and removed all bi-grams from the analysis on top of using arbitrary embeddings, we no longer observed any pre-onset encoding. This suggests that we cannot be sure that the MEG pre-onset signal reflects prediction or if it simply relies on the mixture of embedding autocorrelation and learning of word co-occurrences. An analogical analysis conducted by Goldstein et al. [28] did show significant encoding in the pre-target word time-window. This discrepancy between ECoG and MEG may result from the high spatial resolution of ECoG or the nature of the high gamma envelope signal that we cannot measure with MEG.

These findings highlight the need for further investigation to clarify the nature of pre-onset encoding in MEG data and to determine the extent to which it genuinely reflects predictions about upcoming words. Understanding these nuances will be essential for interpreting MEG data in the context of predictive processing theories.

Do the neural representations at a point in time contain information about upcoming words? Another aim of our study was to determine whether sig-

natures of long-range prediction, as observed in fMRI studies, are detectable in MEG data. Specifically, we tested whether including future word embeddings, as done by Caucheteux et al. [26] in fMRI, would enhance encoding performance for the brain response to a current word (w_i). Our analysis showed that, unlike in the fMRI study by Caucheteux et al., adding future word embeddings did not significantly improve the encoding performance in MEG, even when only the embedding of the immediate next word (w_{i+1}) was included. This was the case both for GPT embeddings, which include a representation of the context of the word, as well as for GloVe embeddings, which are unique to each word, but do represent their semantic meaning. This suggests that, at least with our current analytical approach, the MEG signal at time point t contains no additional information about upcoming words beyond what is already captured by the embedding of the current word.

The discrepancy between fMRI results in Caucheteux et al. [26] and our MEG results raises the question of what is causing these differences. One potential explanation lies in the different treatment of data due to the distinct temporal resolutions of these modalities. When aligning brain activity with word embeddings, Caucheteux et al. averaged the embeddings of words occurring within each TR (approximately 1.5 seconds, covering around 8 words on average). This averaging approach may have produced embeddings that better capture broader semantic contexts, resembling a sentence-level representation rather than an individual word-level representation. Indeed, they also showed that semantic information contributed more to their predictive signal than syntactic information. These findings suggest that what Caucheteux et al. observed in fMRI might reflect the brain’s prediction of broader contextual meaning, rather than the precise prediction of individual upcoming words.

These results are also in line with work by Toneva et al. [27] which suggests that such representations of contextual meaning are encoded strongly in fMRI, but not MEG. This disparity might stem from the differing neural signals captured by the two modalities. In fMRI, Toneva et al. found significant encoding of supra-word meaning, that is the contextual LLM embeddings with lexical (single-word) information residualized from them. Conversely, their MEG analysis primarily captured lexical information, suggesting that MEG is more sensitive to word-level processing.

Does the brain represent information about past words? Our second analysis inspired by Caucheteux et al. (2023), in which we used embeddings of previous words to encode the MEG signal, revealed that adding previous words’ embeddings enhances encoding performance. This suggests that representations of past words remain active for some time (see Fig. 4.c). These results were robust, regardless of whether we used GPT or GloVe embeddings

(Fig. S1), suggesting that they do not depend on the amount of information about the prior context that is included in the embeddings. These results align with those of Toneva et al. [27], who demonstrated that both current and prior individual word meanings are strongly represented in MEG time series.

More broadly, our findings support theories of postdictive processing, which propose that the brain buffers sensory evidence over time, allowing it to refine interpretations of earlier stimuli based on incoming information [19, 35, 36]. If neural representations in MEG indeed cannot capture contextual information, then this information about previous words might be buffered on the lexical or phonological level. Together, these observations highlight the importance of a more nuanced investigation into how MEG signals encode individual word representations and context-dependent information.

Considerations for future work We found that word-level signals could be effectively encoded in the MEG data of individual participants with as little as one hour of recording. This indicates that MEG’s signal-to-noise ratio is sufficient for building encoding models of word-level representations within a relatively short data collection period. However, we noted considerable inter-subject variability, as well as inter-session variability in some participants, suggesting that while MEG is reliable for within-participant comparisons—such as examining the encoding of different word groups—it may be affected by different factors such as signal-to-noise levels or how much participants are engaged in and attending to the story.

Moreover, caution is warranted when interpreting embeddings from large language models (LLMs) in this context. While transformer-based models are significantly more expressive and better suited to explaining brain responses than previous generations of word embeddings, they are also considerably less interpretable [37]. Future efforts should focus on disentangling the specific linguistic representations that these embeddings capture in the brain to improve their interpretive value.

Conclusions In this study, we have shown that we can decode word representations in MEG narrative listening data, even with only one hour of data. We show similar pre-onset representations as have been observed previously in ECoG data. However, we cannot rule out that these pre-onset signals are due to correlations between nearby embeddings and by word co-occurrences. In addition, unlike fMRI findings, adding future word embeddings did not enhance encoding, even for one word into the future, which suggests that the pre-onset encoding in MEG might not reflect prediction processes. Even though we did not find evidence for specific word prediction, we found robust evidence for postdiction. This finding highlights the possibility that many words are not integrated with

the context right away, and thus relevant processing may not be time-locked to word onset. Overall, this study demonstrates that MEG combined with LLMs, serves as a powerful method for investigating language processing in naturalistic narratives and highlights the importance of further exploring what qualifies as evidence for prediction during natural listening.

METHODS

Neural dataset To investigate whether we can encode signatures of word prediction in MEG data, we used an openly available dataset from Armeni et al. [38]. This dataset contains MEG recordings from a 275-channel axial gradiometer CTF system with a sampling rate of 1200 Hz that were collected while three participants passively listened to 10 stories from the Adventures of Sherlock Holmes in English. All participants were native English speakers, (1 female, aged 35, 30, and 28 years), were right-handed and reported no history of neurological, developmental or language deficits. This dataset offers long MEG recordings (10 sessions of approximately 1 hour each) per participant and allows us to look at single-subject effects. Another advantage of this dataset is that participants wore MEG-compatible head casts, which immobilized their head position during recording, resulting in data with a high signal-to-noise ratio.

Preprocessing All data were preprocessed using the MNE-Python open-source software package, v. 1.6.1 [39]. Because our analysis approach required continuous data, we pre-processed the data using ICA, separately for each session and participant, and without removing any noisy segments of the data. The heartbeat and eye movement ICA components were visually identified from raw data filtered between 0.5 and 40 Hz using an FIR filter and resampled to 150 Hz. After identifying the components, we re-filtered the raw data in the broadband frequency band 0.1 – 40 Hz and subsequently removed the previously identified ICA artifact components.

Source reconstruction Using Freesurfer software [40], we reconstructed a cortical surface model for each participant using the 3T MRI anatomical scans provided in the dataset. For each subject, an individual single shell boundary element model (BEM) was made and individual forward models were calculated. Source reconstruction was performed using a linearly constrained minimum variance (LCMV) beamformer [41].

The LCMV adaptive filter was computed using a data covariance matrix within the [0, 150] ms window after the stimulus onset (each word in the story). Finally, the filter was applied to the broadband signal raw time series and averaged across source points resulting in time series for 150 parcels for each participant.

Word embeddings

To extract contextual word embeddings, we used the pre-trained GPT2-small model with 12 hidden layers parameters [42]. We first tokenized the text (without punctuation and capitalization) using the model tokenizer. To obtain the GPT embedding for each token w_i in the story, we fed chunks of the tokenized story in windows of size 50 tokens $[w_{i-49}, w_{i-48}, \dots, w_i]$ to the GPT2-small tokenizer model and extracted the hidden state of the last layer of the model $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{768}$ corresponding to the last word. Note that the first 50 words had a smaller number of words as their preceding context. Finally, words with multiple tokens assigned by the model were excluded to remove within-word effects.

For non-contextual embeddings, we used GloVe (Wikipedia 2014) embeddings [43] with vectors of size 300. To reduce computational load, the embeddings were dimensionally reduced to 50 using PCA. This resulted in $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 50}$ as predictors.

Encoding model and brain score To prepare the brain response for training the encoding model, MEG time series data were smoothed using a rectangular window of 200 ms. The time series was then epoched in time windows of [-2 to +2 sec] around the word-onset and downsampled to include 151 data-points in this range. This resulted in a matrix $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 151}$ as targets where N is the number of words.

The encoding model was built using linear ridge-regression with word embeddings \mathbf{X} as predictors and brain response \mathbf{Y} as targets. We fit a separate model to each time point \mathbf{t} within the window [-2 to +2 sec]. To find the optimal regularization parameter λ of the Ridge regression, we use grid search with generalized cross-validation, which approximates leave-one-out cross-validation [44]. We define a grid to search by first sampling the effective degrees of freedom of the ridge regression fit from $[1, N]$, since its parameter space is bounded from above. In order to find the degrees of freedom of the ridge regression we rewrite the predictor using singular value decomposition namely,

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^T \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} are orthogonal and \mathbf{S} diagonal matrices such that $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T, \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{S} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. The degrees of freedom of the ridge regression fit is then defined as [44]

$$df(\lambda_i) = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{s_j^2}{s_j^2 + \lambda_i} \quad (2)$$

We then use Newton’s method to solve df for λ_i . Once the grid is defined, we choose the optimal λ that minimizes

the generalized cross-validation error using Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation implementation of sklearn library in python.

We evaluate the model performance on the data using 5-fold cross-validation, training on 80% of the story, and testing on the remaining 20% of the story. We used blocks of data separated in time, ensuring that the autocorrelation in the brain activity does not lead to over-fitting of the model due to the temporal vicinity of test and train words [45]. This results in a predicted brain signal for each word in the dataset at each time point around word onset [-2 to +2 sec].

To evaluate how well the encoding model fits the data, we compute the Pearson correlation between the predicted brain signal and the actual brain signal at each time point t around word onset, across all words to compute the brain score.

To investigate whether predictable words are better encoded before the word-onset, we categorized the words as predictable and unpredictable based on whether each word belonged to the top-5 likely predictions of GPT2 for that word or not [28]. Note that this step is done solely by inputting the text into the GPT2 model and looking at its predictions for each word, without using any brain data. To obtain the brain score of predictable/unpredictable words, we fit the encoding model separately on each pool of words.

Analysis with expanded future/past window

To test whether future/past words are represented in the brain response we construct the embedding vector by concatenating those additional word embeddings to the current word embedding. For a given value d of the future/past window, we concatenate $\mathbf{z}_i^d = \mathbf{x}_{i+d} \oplus \mathbf{x}_{i+d-1} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{x}_i$ where \mathbf{x}_i is the word embedding vector of word w_i . Negative and positive d correspond to windows spanning the words in past or future respectively.

To construct the final word embedding used in this analysis we reduce dimensions of both \mathbf{z}_i^d and \mathbf{x}_i to 50 and concatenate the two as $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i^d \oplus \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i$, where $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ are the vectors after applying PCA.

To see how much encoding improves, we look at the change in the brain score with or without including this future/past window, namely

$$\Delta\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^d \oplus \hat{\mathbf{X}}) - \mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}) \quad (3)$$

Where $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ refers to the Pearson correlation (brain score) computed for the respective embeddings.

Source selection and significance testing

To compute the brain-wide brain score, we selected a subset of 30 sources for each participant. To avoid double dipping, we ensured that the source selection for each

participant was not based on their own data. To do this, we averaged the brain score of two participants for each MEG source and chose the top 30 sources with the highest values for the third participant.

To find the threshold above which brain score values are significant, we create a null hypothesis by generating a surrogate time series. Given that we want only to disturb the relationship between the words and the brain response and preserve as much information in the original time series as possible we perform phase shuffling [46]. This process preserves the frequency spectrum and autocorrelation of the data. Given the computational load, we generated 10 permutations, took the maximum value across time for all MEG sources, and generated the null distribution out of this ($10 \times 150 = 1500$) values. We subsequently calculated the p-values and accounted for multiple hypothesis testing using the Benjamini-Hochberg correction, considering q-values below 0.05 to indicate statistical significance.

To evaluate whether brain score values of two groups of words significantly differ, we used a dependent t-test for paired samples on the brain scores of the two groups across the same MEG sources and accounted for multiple hypothesis testing using the Benjamini-Hochberg correction. we considered q values smaller than 0.05 as significant.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Linda Geerligs was supported by a VIDI grant of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (grant number VI.Vidi.201.150).

-
- [1] K. Friston, The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory?, *Nature reviews neuroscience* **11**, 127 (2010).
 - [2] A. Clark, Whatever next? predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science, *Behavioral and brain sciences* **36**, 181 (2013).
 - [3] F. P. De Lange, M. Heilbron, and P. Kok, How do expectations shape perception?, *Trends in cognitive sciences* **22**, 764 (2018).
 - [4] M. Kutas, K. A. DeLong, and N. J. Smith, A look around at what lies ahead: Prediction and predictability in language processing, *Predictions in the brain: Using our past to generate a future* **190207** (2011).
 - [5] K. D. Federmeier, Thinking ahead: The role and roots of prediction in language comprehension, *Psychophysiology* **44**, 491 (2007).
 - [6] M. J. Traxler and D. J. Foss, Effects of sentence constraint on priming in natural language comprehension., *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* **26**, 1266 (2000).
 - [7] N. J. Smith and R. Levy, The effect of word predictability on reading time is logarithmic, *Cognition* **128**, 302 (2013).

- [8] K. A. DeLong, T. P. Urbach, and M. Kutas, Probabilistic word pre-activation during language comprehension inferred from electrical brain activity, *Nature neuroscience* **8**, 1117 (2005).
- [9] L. Magyari and J. P. De Ruiter, Prediction of turn-ends based on anticipation of upcoming words, *Frontiers in psychology* **3**, 376 (2012).
- [10] J.-P. De Ruiter, H. Mitterer, and N. J. Enfield, Projecting the end of a speaker’s turn: A cognitive cornerstone of conversation, *Language* **82**, 515 (2006).
- [11] G. R. Kuperberg and T. F. Jaeger, What do we mean by prediction in language comprehension?, *Language, cognition and neuroscience* **31**, 32 (2016).
- [12] M. Kutas and K. D. Federmeier, Thirty years and counting: finding meaning in the n400 component of the event-related brain potential (erp), *Annual review of psychology* **62**, 621 (2011).
- [13] R. Terporten, J.-M. Schoffelen, B. Dai, P. Hagoort, and A. Kösem, The relation between alpha/beta oscillations and the encoding of sentence induced contextual information, *Scientific Reports* **9**, 20255 (2019).
- [14] J. J. Van Berkum, C. M. Brown, P. Zwitserlood, V. Kooijman, and P. Hagoort, Anticipating upcoming words in discourse: evidence from erps and reading times., *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* **31**, 443 (2005).
- [15] M. S. Nieuwland, S. Politzer-Ahles, E. Heyselaar, K. Segaert, E. Darley, N. Kazanina, S. Von Grebmer Zu Wolfsthurn, F. Bartolozzi, V. Kogan, A. Ito, *et al.*, Large-scale replication study reveals a limit on probabilistic prediction in language comprehension, *ELife* **7**, e33468 (2018).
- [16] M. S. Nieuwland, Y. Arkipova, and P. Rodríguez-Gómez, Anticipating words during spoken discourse comprehension: A large-scale, pre-registered replication study using brain potentials, *Cortex* **133**, 1 (2020).
- [17] A. R. Kochari and M. Flecken, Lexical prediction in language comprehension: A replication study of grammatical gender effects in dutch, *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience* **34**, 239 (2019).
- [18] B. Nicenboim, S. Vasishth, and F. Rösler, Are words pre-activated probabilistically during sentence comprehension? evidence from new data and a bayesian random-effects meta-analysis using publicly available data, *Neuropsychologia* **142**, 107427 (2020).
- [19] J. M. Szwedczyk, E. N. Mech, and K. D. Federmeier, The power of “good”: Can adjectives rapidly decrease as well as increase the availability of the upcoming noun?, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* **48**, 856 (2022).
- [20] L. Wang, T. Brothers, O. Jensen, and G. R. Kuperberg, Dissociating the pre-activation of word meaning and form during sentence comprehension: Evidence from eeg representational similarity analysis, *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* **31**, 862 (2024).
- [21] L. Wang, E. Wlotko, E. Alexander, L. Schoot, M. Kim, L. Warnke, and G. R. Kuperberg, Neural evidence for the prediction of animacy features during language comprehension: evidence from meg and eeg representational similarity analysis, *Journal of Neuroscience* **40**, 3278 (2020).
- [22] R. M. Willems, S. A. Nastase, and B. Milivojevic, Narratives for neuroscience, *Trends in neurosciences* **43**, 271 (2020).
- [23] M. Baroni, On the proper role of linguistically oriented deep net analysis in linguistic theorising, in *Algebraic structures in natural language* (CRC Press, 2022) pp. 1–16.
- [24] M. Schrimpf, I. A. Blank, G. Tuckute, C. Kauf, E. A. Hosseini, N. Kanwisher, J. B. Tenenbaum, and E. Fedorenko, The neural architecture of language: Integrative modeling converges on predictive processing, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118**, e2105646118 (2021).
- [25] C. Caucheteux and J.-R. King, Brains and algorithms partially converge in natural language processing, *Communications biology* **5**, 134 (2022).
- [26] C. Caucheteux, A. Gramfort, and J.-R. King, Evidence of a predictive coding hierarchy in the human brain listening to speech, *Nature human behaviour* **7**, 430 (2023).
- [27] M. Toneva, T. M. Mitchell, and L. Wehbe, Combining computational controls with natural text reveals aspects of meaning composition, *Nature computational science* **2**, 745 (2022).
- [28] A. Goldstein, Z. Zada, E. Buchnik, M. Schain, A. Price, B. Aubrey, S. A. Nastase, A. Feder, D. Emanuel, A. Cohen, *et al.*, Shared computational principles for language processing in humans and deep language models, *Nature neuroscience* **25**, 369 (2022).
- [29] Z. Zada, A. Goldstein, S. Michelmann, E. Simony, A. Price, L. Hasenfratz, E. Barham, A. Zadbood, W. Doyle, D. Friedman, *et al.*, A shared model-based linguistic space for transmitting our thoughts from brain to brain in natural conversations, *Neuron* **112**, 3211 (2024).
- [30] A. Goldstein, E. Ham, S. A. Nastase, Z. Zada, A. Grinstein-Dabus, B. Aubrey, M. Schain, H. Gazula, A. Feder, W. Doyle, *et al.*, Correspondence between the layered structure of deep language models and temporal structure of natural language processing in the human brain, *BioRxiv* , 2022 (2022).
- [31] P. Kok, P. Mostert, and F. P. De Lange, Prior expectations induce prestimulus sensory templates, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**, 10473 (2017).
- [32] G. Demarchi, G. Sanchez, and N. Weisz, Automatic and feature-specific prediction-related neural activity in the human auditory system, *Nature communications* **10**, 3440 (2019).
- [33] S. Ray and J. H. Maunsell, Different origins of gamma rhythm and high-gamma activity in macaque visual cortex, *PLoS biology* **9**, e1000610 (2011).
- [34] M. Heilbron, K. Armeni, J.-M. Schoffelen, P. Hagoort, and F. P. De Lange, A hierarchy of linguistic predictions during natural language comprehension, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **119**, e2201968119 (2022).
- [35] H. Hogendoorn, Perception in real-time: predicting the present, reconstructing the past, *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **26**, 128 (2022).
- [36] L. Gwilliams, T. Linzen, D. Poeppel, and A. Marantz, In spoken word recognition, the future predicts the past, *Journal of Neuroscience* **38**, 7585 (2018).
- [37] S. Arana, J. Pesnot Lerousseau, and P. Hagoort, Deep learning models to study sentence comprehension in the human brain, *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience* , 1 (2023).
- [38] K. Armeni, U. Güçlü, M. van Gerven, and J.-M. Schoffelen, A 10-hour within-participant magnetoencephalography narrative dataset to test models of language comprehension, *Scientific Data* **9**, 278 (2022).

- [39] A. Gramfort, M. Luessi, E. Larson, D. A. Engemann, D. Strohmeier, C. Brodbeck, R. Goj, M. Jas, T. Brooks, L. Parkkonen, *et al.*, Meg and eeg data analysis with mne-python, *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics* **7**, 267 (2013).
- [40] A. M. Dale, B. Fischl, and M. I. Sereno, Cortical surface-based analysis: I. segmentation and surface reconstruction, *Neuroimage* **9**, 179 (1999).
- [41] B. Van Veen, W. Van Drongelen, M. Yuchtman, and A. Suzuki, Localization of brain electrical activity via linearly constrained minimum variance spatial filtering, *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* **44**, 867 (1997).
- [42] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever, *et al.*, Language models are unsupervised multitask learners, *OpenAI blog* **1**, 9 (2019).
- [43] J. Pennington, R. Socher, and C. D. Manning, Glove: Global vectors for word representation, in *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)* (2014) pp. 1532–1543.
- [44] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman, *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction* (2017).
- [45] E. Feghhi, N. Hadidi, B. Song, I. A. Blank, and J. C. Kao, What are large language models mapping to in the brain? a case against over-reliance on brain scores, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01538* (2024).
- [46] E. M. G. (2024), Phaseshuffle, (<https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/71738-phaseshuffle>), MATLAB Central File Exchange. Retrieved November 5, 2024.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION




FIG. S1. Encoding of the future and past words similar to Fig. 4 using GloVe embeddings.




FIG. S2. Average correlation between nearby word embeddings. GPT2 embeddings have large correlations between nearby words whereas correlation values are an order of magnitude smaller for GloVe embeddings. These values were computed by averaging correlation values over the whole 10 hours of data.