

Neurobiber: Fast and Interpretable Stylistic Feature Extraction

Kenan Alkiek
University of Michigan
kalkiek@umich.edu

Anna Wegmann
Utrecht University
a.m.wegmann@uu.nl

Jian Zhu
University of British Columbia
jian.zhu@ubc.ca

David Jurgens
University of Michigan
jurgens@umich.edu

Abstract

Linguistic style is pivotal for understanding how texts convey meaning and fulfill communicative purposes, yet extracting detailed stylistic features at scale remains challenging. We present NEUROBIBER, a transformer-based system for fast, interpretable style profiling built on Biber’s Multidimensional Analysis (MDA). NEUROBIBER predicts 96 Biber-style features from our open-source BIBERPLUS library—a Python toolkit that computes stylistic features and provides integrated analytics (e.g., PCA, factor analysis). Despite being up to 56 times faster than existing open source systems, NEUROBIBER replicates classic MDA insights on the CORE corpus and achieves competitive performance on the PAN 2020 authorship verification task without extensive retraining. Its efficient and interpretable representations readily integrate into downstream NLP pipelines, facilitating large-scale stylometric research, forensic analysis, and real-time text monitoring. All components are made publicly available.

1 Introduction

The style in which text is written plays an instrumental role in how a message can be understood (Coupland, 2007; Eckert, 2012). This style, in part, situates the text within a broader context and social setting based on recognized patterns in style, e.g., the use of a formal writing style, the register of conversation or news, or styles used widely by certain ages. Quantifying style computationally requires some method for *representing style* and comparing these representations for different texts. Such style representations can benefit a broad spectrum of tasks, such as style transfer (Shen et al., 2017; Fu et al., 2017; Dai et al., 2019; Li et al., 2019; Yi et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2022), and machine translation (Niu et al., 2018; Rabinovich et al., 2017). Style representations also form a key technique for forensic linguistics, where style representation forms the bedrock for stylometric analysis, enabling author-

ship verification (Boenninghoff et al., 2019; Hay et al., 2020; Rivera-Soto et al., 2021; Zhu and Jurgens, 2021; Wegmann et al., 2022) and detection of fraudulent texts or malicious activities (Manolache et al., 2022).

Despite its importance, methods for producing linguistically informed, high-coverage, and scalable style representations remain limited. Existing systems (Nini, 2019a; Wilson et al., 2010) often rely on small sets of stylistic features or require significant manual effort to scale to large corpora. We address these gaps through two main contributions. First, we introduce BIBERPLUS, a Python toolkit that combines 96 Biber-style features in a single, easy-to-use package, offering both precise, rule-based tagging and integrated analytics (e.g., PCA, factor analysis). Drawing on foundational works in linguistic style profiling (Biber, 1988; Grieve et al., 2018; Gimpel et al., 2011; Clarke and Grieve, 2017), BIBERPLUS automates the extraction of syntactic, lexical, and discourse-level style attributes. In short, BIBERPLUS aggregates and automates an extensive range of stylistic features to enable straightforward and interpretable style analysis without juggling multiple tools. For example, BIBERPLUS can track the frequency of a specific feature (e.g., the PIT tag for Pronoun it) in the snippet shown in Figure 1.

Building upon these resources, we present the NEUROBIBER system—a neural tagger that predicts whether a given BIBERPLUS feature is present in a text with macro- and micro-F1 scores of 0.97 and 0.98, respectively. This neural approach achieves speeds at an average rate of 117,000 tokens per second, enabling large-scale tagging scenarios that were previously intractable. To illustrate the impact, consider a massive dataset like Common Crawl containing around 1.1 trillion tokens. Using eight GPUs in parallel, NEUROBIBER would require about 13.6 days to process the entire dataset. In contrast, a CPU-based open-source

```
# 1) Install Biberplus and spaCy
pip install biberplus
python -m spacy download en_core_web_sm

# 2) Minimal usage in Python
from biberplus.tagger import \
    calculate_tag_frequencies

# 3) Tag text and count frequencies
text = "It doesn't seem likely ..."
freq = calculate_tag_frequencies(text)
print(freq)
```

Parsing		Tagging	Features	
Token	UPOS	It → [it, PIT, CAP, PRP, SBJP]	Feature	Count
It	PRON	does → [VPRT, SPAU]	PIT	1
doesn	AUX	n't → [XX0, CONT, RB]	DEMP	0
't	PART	seem → [SMP, INF]	XX0	1
seem	VERB	likely → [JJ]	FPP1	0
likely	ADJ	

Figure 1: Minimal example of installing and using BIBERPLUS

Multidimensional Analysis Tagger (Nini, 2019b) run with the same level of parallelism would take approximately 756 days (over two years). NEUROBIBER addresses a critical gap in the field by combining the interpretability of traditional linguistic feature sets with the scalability and efficiency of neural methods. By enabling rapid, high-fidelity style tagging across massive datasets, it bridges the divide between handcrafted linguistic insights and the data-driven demands of modern NLP. This integration sets the stage for future innovations in explainable, large-scale style analysis across diverse applications.

In the remainder of this paper, we first provide background on linguistic style representations in §2, discussing Biber’s framework (Biber, 1988) and other systems such as LISA (Patel et al., 2023) and LUAR (Rivera-Soto et al., 2021). We describe the design and implementation details of both the Python-based and neural versions of the Biber taggers in §3. Our experimental setup and evaluation demonstrate the effectiveness and scalability of NEUROBIBER in generating robust, high-fidelity style representations. We conclude by outlining potential future directions and use cases for large-scale stylometric modeling.

2 Linguistic Style

Style, broadly, refers to the patterns of lexical, syntactic, and discourse features in text (Biber and Conrad, 2009; Hendricks, 1971). However, defining style remains complex because it can be approached in many ways. In this work, we build on the ideas of Biber and Conrad (2019) by using style as a flexible concept that can capture linguistic variation at multiple levels—whether individual (idiolect), group-based, or tied to specific domains. In contrast, register represents the configuration of linguistic forms suited to a particular communicative context, such as news articles or text messages, which exhibit specific levels of formality, conventions, and audiences. While register analysis excels at revealing functional patterns shaped by situational contexts, stylistic analysis highlights how authors or groups may adopt or diverge from those patterns based on various linguistic tendencies. Biber-style features can be leveraged to examine how different authors, groups, or registers choose to realize these forms—making style analysis a complementary approach for both individual and collective language use.

Biber’s Multidimensional Analysis (MDA) (Biber, 1988; Biber and Conrad, 2009, 2019) has been a highly influential method for examining both style and register. MDA enumerates a broad set of lexical and syntactic features that capture variation such as pronoun use, passive constructions, stance markers, and subordination, combining these features into empirically derived dimensions of linguistic variation. MDA has found wide adoption across diverse text genres (Clarke and Grieve, 2017; Clarke, 2019) and inspired multiple open-source taggers and utilities. Three tools—the Multidimensional Analysis Tagger (Nini, 2019a), biberpy (Sharoff, 2021), and profiling-ud (Brunato et al., 2020; De Marneffe et al., 2021)—implement Biber’s feature set and demonstrate the usefulness of explicit, interpretable stylistic features for tasks in corpus linguistics and NLP. Although each of these tools offers valuable capabilities, BIBERPLUS includes an expanded set of stylistic features, supports GPU-based processing for efficiency, and, through our NEUROBIBER model, can operate up to 56x times faster than comparable libraries.

In parallel with Biber-inspired approaches, neural embedding-based methods aim to learn broad, domain-agnostic representations of style. LUAR (Rivera-Soto et al., 2021) focuses on large-scale

authorship verification by combining self-attention with contrastive training, enabling it to handle vast numbers of authors. Meanwhile, LISA (Patel et al., 2023) emphasizes interpretability by leveraging GPT-3-generated annotations to create a synthetic stylometric dataset, STYLEGENOME, which trains models to recognize 768 distinct, linguistically interpretable style attributes, such as formality or humor. This allows LISA to capture high-level stylistic trends while providing transparency into the factors shaping its representations. In contrast, Biber-inspired features, such as syntactic constructions (e.g., frequency of passive voice), offer detailed, low-level insights into linguistic style.

3 Biber Taggers

Extracting linguistic features at scale remains a core challenge when analyzing text style. To address this, we release two complementary tools for Biber-based feature tagging: BIBERPLUS, a rule-based Python implementation that uses explicit patterns, and NEUROBIBER, a neural approach designed for high-speed, large-scale tagging.

3.1 BiberPlus Python Implementation

BIBERPLUS advances the original linguistic framework proposed by Biber (1988), offering an expanded set of features and integrated analytical tools. Implemented entirely in Python, BIBERPLUS tracks 96 linguistic features, encompassing Biber’s original 67 tags and additional features derived from recent research (Clarke and Grieve, 2017; Clarke, 2019). A comprehensive list of these features is provided in Appendix A. At its core, BIBERPLUS first uses SpaCy (Honnibal et al., 2020) for high-performance parsing and then applies a collection of hand-crafted rules to the resulting syntactic trees. These rules capture the exact constructions outlined by Biber’s framework (e.g., passive voice, subordination, stance markers) and newer expansions, thereby ensuring that each feature count remains faithful to known definitions. We developed 225 unit tests to verify and stress-test these handcrafted patterns in realistic scenarios, guaranteeing robust coverage and accuracy across a range of text types.

Flexibility BIBERPLUS is designed to accommodate diverse text types, from very short social media posts to lengthy academic articles. While regular frequency counts are appropriate for longer texts, short passages can lead to highly variable

or skewed frequencies. Therefore, BIBERPLUS also provides a **binary counting** mode, which captures only the presence or absence of each feature in user-defined chunks (e.g., every 100 tokens). This binary option is especially useful for short texts like social media captions or comments, where raw frequencies are less stable and may not accurately capture stylistic presence. In the regular counting mode, the tool calculates how often each feature appears in user-defined chunks of text—commonly every 1000 tokens—and then aggregates the mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation across these chunks. By contrast, the binary counting mode captures only the presence or absence of the feature in each chunk. For instance, if a 500-token text is divided into five 100-token chunks, and a feature appears in two of those chunks, the binary count is 0.4. Under regular counts, if it appears 10 times total, the average frequency is 2 occurrences per 100 tokens. This distinction allows researchers to fine-tune how stylistic features are counted based on text length and analytic goals. Installation and usage require only a simple `pip install` command and a few lines of code (see Figure 1), and the open-source repository¹ welcomes community contributions. Notably, BIBERPLUS is already 2.2x faster than the fastest existing open-source tagger, making it viable even on modest hardware for many text analysis tasks.

Dataset Tagging Using the multi-domain dataset summarized in Table 1, we use BIBERPLUS to tag all 42 text samples. We ran three BIBERPLUS jobs in parallel for two weeks to compute feature frequencies per 100 tokens, producing a comprehensive style profile for each text. To accommodate both short and extended passages, counts and binary indicators were computed simultaneously.

3.2 NEUROBIBER Model

We develop NEUROBIBER, a neural tagger that significantly accelerates the extraction of Biber-style features. By leveraging a transformer-based model, NEUROBIBER predicts whether each of the 96 linguistic features tracked by BIBERPLUS is present in a given text. This approach achieves speeds up to **56 times faster** than the fastest open-source system. The model is available as a HuggingFace transformer,² facilitating easy integration into existing NLP pipelines.

¹<https://github.com/davidjurgens/biberplus>

²<https://huggingface.co/Blablablab/neurobiber/>

Source	Description	Authors	Texts	Avg. Texts per Author	Avg. Text Tokens
Wikipedia editing histories	The edit history from Wikipedia description	506,992	3,134,068	6.18	232
Wikipedia discussions	Article editing discussions from Wikipedia	188,663	4,204,118	22.28	116
Book3Corpus	A large collection of novel books which contains \bn books	66,385	1,276,515	19.22	700
Amazon reviews	Amazon product reviews	128,495	1,771,985	13.79	143
Gmane mailing list	Gmane is a mailing list archive started in 2002	693,135	4,820,910	6.95	123
Realnews article collection	Borpus of news articles from Common Crawl	212,970	15,874,737	74.53	609
Reddit	Reddit comments spanning 15 years	2,459,016	12,290,058	4.99	117

Table 1: Summary of the multi-domain dataset used to train NEUROBIBER. The dataset includes \approx 2 million samples across seven sources, encompassing a wide range of text lengths and styles

Model Architecture and Training NEUROBIBER is built upon RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019), fine-tuned for multi-label sequence classification. Training data comes from the multi-domain corpus tagged by BIBERPLUS (Table 1), with an 80/10/10 split at the chunk level, yielding about 32 million sequences for training, 4 million for development, and 4 million for testing. Each chunk corresponds to 100 tokens, and the label for each of the 96 features is binary (present or absent) based on BIBERPLUS tags. In this way, NEUROBIBER directly mimics whether a Biber feature is found in each chunk, retaining interpretability because its predictions align with the same linguistic definitions as BIBERPLUS. For text segments longer than 512 tokens, we process each 512-token span as a separate input; predictions are then aggregated across spans by marking a feature as present if at least one span predicts it. We evaluate performance by comparing predicted labels against the ground-truth labels from BIBERPLUS on the held-out test set, measuring both micro- and macro-F1. NEUROBIBER achieves macro-F1 = 0.97 and micro-F1 = 0.98 on this held-out set, demonstrating high fidelity in reproducing BIBERPLUS tags. Detailed, per-feature metrics are provided in Appendix B.

NEUROBIBER is built upon the RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019), fine-tuned for multi-label sequence classification. Training data comes from the multi-domain corpus tagged by BIBERPLUS (Table 1), where feature counts were converted into presence/absence labels every 100 tokens with a data split of 80/10/10. In this way, NEUROBIBER directly mimics whether a Biber feature is found in each chunk, retaining interpretability because its predictions align with the same linguistic definitions as BIBERPLUS. For sequences longer than 512 tokens, the text is chunked; predicted features in any chunk are aggregated for the entire text. The model achieves high performance on a held-out test set (macro-F1: 0.97, micro-F1: 0.98). Detailed performance metrics for each feature are provided

in Appendix B.

Efficiency and Throughput Figure 2 compares the throughput of three systems: an existing open-source multidimensional analysis tagger (Nini, 2019a) that runs on a single CPU and 67 features, BIBERPLUS, and NEUROBIBER with 96 features, on 7,000 sampled texts (1,000 from each dataset) totaling 2.4 million tokens. BIBERPLUS alone is 2.2x faster than the open-source baseline. Meanwhile, NEUROBIBER further boosts tagging speed to about 56x faster than the same baseline, enabling real-time or large-scale batch processing scenarios that were previously infeasible. For NEUROBIBER, we run on a single NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPU with a batch size of 128.

Recommendation and Applications For large-scale datasets, we recommend using NEUROBIBER because its trained model can perform high-fidelity style tagging at massive scales, making it ideal for analyzing large corpora or integrating with downstream machine learning systems. We trained NEUROBIBER specifically on presence/absence signals per 100 tokens, which works well for most short to medium-length texts. However, for tasks requiring exact feature counts, or if one is working with long-form texts that benefit from detailed parsing, BIBERPLUS remains a valuable choice, offering precise and customizable feature extraction with integrated analytical capabilities.

4 Demonstrations

In this section, we illustrate how NEUROBIBER combines interpretability with speed for large-scale stylometric analysis. First, we replicate Biber’s original MDA by applying PCA to NEUROBIBER-extracted features, showing that our neural approach naturally separates text types in ways that closely resemble the classic analysis (§4.1). Then, to demonstrate the practical benefit of these quickly generated features, we show they can be used for an authorship-verification task on the PAN dataset




Figure 2: Tagging-speed comparison of three systems on 2.4M tokens. NEUROBIBER achieves the highest throughput, enabling large-scale style analysis at up to 56x the speed of an existing tagger (Nini, 2019b)

(§4.2), where NEUROBIBER matches parser-based taggers’ performance at a fraction of the time and computational cost.

4.1 Principal Component Analysis

We apply PCA to the NEUROBIBER-extracted features across the CORE corpus registers to see if the resulting principal components (PCs) replicate the well-known dimensions from Biber’s MDA framework (Biber, 1988). Figure 3 plots two of these components, illustrating clear, interpretable contrasts among registers. Our main findings include:

PC2 as Involved vs. Informational. The second principal component (PC2) primarily distinguishes more involved (often interactive) registers (e.g., discussion forums, Q&A) from text types that emphasize expository or informational content (e.g., technical reports, encyclopedia articles). In other words, PC2 aligns well with Biber’s Dimension 1, where top-loading features for involved text include personal pronouns and contractions, whereas informational texts rely heavily on nominal and prepositional density. Notably, this dimension can capture either inter-personal style (spoken-like or colloquial) or more objective, formal style.

Other Principal Components In some cases, PCA merges stylistic traits that Biber originally treated as separate dimensions. For instance, PC1 groups short stories, speeches, and interviews with certain opinion-oriented texts, suggesting a continuum of narrative or personal stance versus more formal or impersonal presentation. Our inspection of top-weighting features (e.g., first-person pronouns, stance verbs) reveals that narrative and persuasive elements often cluster because both contain

Model	F1 Score
Random Classifier	0.50
RoBERTA Bi-Encoder	0.78
NEUROBIBER + Random Forest	0.77

Table 2: Performance on the PAN 2020 authorship verification task (small). NEUROBIBER achieves an F1 score comparable to the fine-tuned bi-encoder model, significantly outperforming the random baseline.

direct or subjective expression. Similarly, PC3 and PC4 highlight explicit reference (e.g., nominal references) versus online elaboration (e.g., insertions or parentheticals), occasionally merging text genres (magazine articles, opinion pieces) that share these discourse-level features. Overall, these partial overlaps reflect how factor analyses can conflate multiple stylistic tendencies, especially when the corpus spans written, spoken, and digital registers.

4.2 Authorship Verification with NEUROBIBER

To demonstrate the real-world benefits of rapid style tagging, we apply NEUROBIBER to the authorship verification task from PAN 2020 (Bischoff et al., 2020) (small). This task requires determining whether two text samples—often fanfiction that switches style depending on the fictional “universe”—were written by the same individual. Because the texts can vary widely in topic and register, authorship signals must come from stable stylistic patterns rather than content alone. We compare NEUROBIBER to:

- **Random Classifier:** Assigns labels at random.
- **Bi-Encoder Model:** A RoBERTa-based bi-encoder trained on 42,000 text pairs using a contrastive objective.

At inference, the bi-encoder produces two embeddings that we concatenate for classification. By contrast, NEUROBIBER extracts a 96-dimensional feature vector from each text; these vectors are concatenated and fed into a Random Forest. In both cases, the final classification model is trained on the PAN 2020 data.

Results and Analysis Table 2 shows each model’s F1 score. NEUROBIBER achieves 0.77, nearly matching the fine-tuned bi-encoder (0.78)




Figure 3: CORE corpus registers plotted along PC1 and PC2 of a PCA on NEUROBIBER features. Clusters reveal an *Involved* vs. *Informational* contrast, mirroring Biber’s Dimension 1.

and far exceeding the random baseline (0.50). Notably, generating the NEUROBIBER feature vectors for the entire dataset took only about half an hour—much less than the time and GPU resources typically required to train or re-train large transformer models. These concise style vectors may complement deep learning representations by capturing stable, interpretable signals (e.g., personal pronoun frequencies, modal usage) that large neural models may not explicitly expose. In settings where interpretability or resource constraints are paramount, NEUROBIBER offers a practical alternative or addition to deep embeddings, demonstrating that well-crafted stylistic features can stand alongside more complex representations in tasks like authorship verification.

4.3 Future Applications

NEUROBIBER’s performance shows that carefully designed stylistic features can function as a stable “fingerprint” for authorship, even when texts differ significantly in topic or register. Unlike purely content-based cues, these linguistically grounded signals remain consistent across domains, providing deeper syntactic or lexical insights into an author’s style. This consistency is especially valuable in forensic or literary contexts, where understand-

ing why two texts are stylistically similar matters as much as whether they match. Beyond accuracy, NEUROBIBER’s reduced reliance on parser-based pipelines lowers the computational overhead for large-scale style monitoring. Researchers can thus analyze massive corpora—from historical archives to social media streams—at speeds that enable repeated or near real-time updates. This capability opens new avenues for tracking stylistic shifts across genres or time periods and for practical applications like social media trend analysis, where classical parsing methods would be prohibitively slow. Additionally, NEUROBIBER’s interpretable feature vectors can be combined with deep neural embeddings, merging granular stylistic cues with semantic information. This fusion facilitates personalization (e.g., recommendation systems) and domain adaptation when fine-tuning large language models on specialized corpora. Instead of parsing every text, NEUROBIBER can efficiently scan millions of samples and highlight those that align stylistically with a target domain, making downstream training more focused and transparent.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced NEUROBIBER, a neural approach for fast and interpretable stylistic feature extraction based on Biber’s Multidimensional Analysis framework. By leveraging transformer-based models, NEUROBIBER predicts the presence of 96 linguistic features with high accuracy—achieving speeds up to 56 times faster than parser-based systems. We also presented BIBER-PLUS, an enhanced Python implementation offering flexible counting methods and integrated analytical tools such as PCA and factor analysis. Experimental results showed that NEUROBIBER effectively replicates key findings from traditional linguistic analyses, recovering Biber-style dimensions of variation. Additionally, on an authorship verification task, NEUROBIBER delivered competitive performance without extensive retraining, underscoring its practical value for real-world applications.

Ethical Considerations

When applied to authorship verification and related stylometric tasks, NEUROBIBER raises important privacy considerations. Although our methods can aid forensic or security investigations, they may also be used maliciously to identify or profile individuals without their consent. By revealing distinct linguistic patterns, NEUROBIBER could inadvertently compromise a writer's anonymity, particularly in sensitive domains such as whistleblowing or personal communications. Consequently, deploying these techniques requires careful adherence to legal and ethical guidelines, including transparent data policies and clear user consent.

Our research contributes to responsible use by enhancing model interpretability, allowing practitioners to scrutinize which features drive decisions and thus detect potential bias or misuse. Future work might build on these interpretability insights to develop adversarial defenses that protect user identities. All data used in our experiments were publicly available and processed under applicable terms of service; authors were anonymized to the extent possible. We encourage continued dialogue among technologists, policymakers, and stakeholders to ensure that stylometric technologies like NEUROBIBER serve legitimate, ethical purposes and respect individuals' right to privacy.

References

- Douglas Biber. 1988. *Variation across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Douglas Biber and Susan Conrad. 2009. *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
- Douglas Biber and Susan Conrad. 2019. *Register, Genre, and Style*, 2 edition. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
- Sebastian Bischoff, Niklas Deckers, Marcel Schliebs, Ben Thies, Matthias Hagen, Efstathios Stamatatos, Benno Stein, and Martin Potthast. 2020. [The Importance of Suppressing Domain Style in Authorship Analysis](#). *CoRR*, abs/2005.14714.
- Benedikt Boenninghoff, Robert M. Nickel, Steffen Zeiler, and Dorothea Kolossa. 2019. [Similarity Learning for Authorship Verification in Social Media](#). In *ICASSP 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 2457–2461. ArXiv:1908.07844 [cs, stat].
- Dominique Brunato, Andrea Cimino, Felice Dell'Orletta, Giulia Venturi, and Simonetta Montemagni. 2020. [Profiling-ud: a tool for linguistic profiling of texts](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 7145–7151.
- Isobelle Clarke. 2019. [Functional linguistic variation in Twitter trolling](#). *International Journal of Speech Language and the Law*, 26.
- Isobelle Clarke and Jack Grieve. 2017. [Dimensions of Abusive Language on Twitter](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Abusive Language Online*, pages 1–10, Vancouver, BC, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nikolas Coupland. 2007. *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ning Dai, Jianze Liang, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. 2019. [Style Transformer: Unpaired Text Style Transfer without Disentangled Latent Representation](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5997–6007, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marie-Catherine De Marneffe, Christopher D Manning, Joakim Nivre, and Daniel Zeman. 2021. [Universal dependencies](#). *Computational linguistics*, 47(2):255–308.
- Penelope Eckert. 2012. [Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation](#). *Annual review of Anthropology*, 41(1):87–100.
- Zhenxin Fu, Xiaoye Tan, Nanyun Peng, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2017. [Style Transfer in Text: Exploration and Evaluation](#). ArXiv:1711.06861 [cs].
- Kevin Gimpel, Nathan Schneider, Brendan O'Connor, Dipanjan Das, Daniel Mills, Jacob Eisenstein, Michael Heilman, Dani Yogatama, Jeffrey Flanigan, and Noah A. Smith. 2011. [Part-of-speech tagging for Twitter: Annotation, features, and experiments](#). In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 42–47, Portland, Oregon, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John G. D. Grieve, Andrea Nini, and Diansheng Guo. 2018. [Mapping lexical innovation on american social media](#). *Journal of English Linguistics*, 46:293 – 319.
- Julien Hay, Bich-Lien Doan, Fabrice Popineau, and Ouassim Ait Elhara. 2020. [Representation learning of writing style](#). In *Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text (W-NUT 2020)*, pages 232–243, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- William O. Hendricks. 1971. *Language*, 47(4):990–1000.

- Matthew Honnibal, Ines Montani, Sofie Van Landeghem, Adriane Boyd, et al. 2020. *spacy: Industrial-strength natural language processing in python*.
- Dianqi Li, Yizhe Zhang, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, Chris Brockett, Ming-Ting Sun, and Bill Dolan. 2019. [Domain Adaptive Text Style Transfer](#). ArXiv:1908.09395 [cs].
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. [Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach](#).
- Andrei Manolache, Florin Brad, Antonio Barbalau, Radu Tudor Ionescu, and Marius Popescu. 2022. [VeriDark: A Large-Scale Benchmark for Authorship Verification on the Dark Web](#). ArXiv:2207.03477 [cs].
- Andrea Nini. 2019a. The multi-dimensional analysis tagger. *Multi-dimensional analysis: Research methods and current issues*, pages 67–94.
- Andrea Nini. 2019b. *The Multi-Dimensional Analysis Tagger*, pages 67–94. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, United Kingdom.
- Xing Niu, Sudha Rao, and Marine Carpuat. 2018. [Multi-Task Neural Models for Translating Between Styles Within and Across Languages](#). ArXiv:1806.04357 [cs].
- Ajay Patel, Delip Rao, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023. [Learning Interpretable Style Embeddings via Prompting LLMs](#). ArXiv:2305.12696 [cs].
- Ella Rabinovich, Raj Nath Patel, Shachar Mirkin, Lucia Specia, and Shuly Wintner. 2017. [Personalized Machine Translation: Preserving Original Author Traits](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, pages 1074–1084, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rafael A. Rivera-Soto, Olivia Elizabeth Miano, Juanita Ordonez, Barry Y. Chen, Aleem Khan, Marcus Bishop, and Nicholas Andrews. 2021. [Learning universal authorship representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 913–919, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Serge Sharoff. 2021. Genre annotation for the web: text-external and text-internal perspectives. *Register studies*, 3(1):1–32.
- Tianxiao Shen, Tao Lei, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. 2017. [Style Transfer from Non-Parallel Text by Cross-Alignment](#). ArXiv:1705.09655 [cs].
- Anna Wegmann, Marijn Schraagen, and Dong Nguyen. 2022. [Same Author or Just Same Topic? Towards Content-Independent Style Representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP*, pages 249–268, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- James Wilson, Anthony Hartley, Serge Sharoff, and Paul Stephenson. 2010. Advanced corpus solutions for humanities researchers. In *Proc PACLIC 24*, pages 36–43, Tohoku University.
- Xiaoyuan Yi, Zhenghao Liu, Wenhao Li, and Maosong Sun. 2020. [Text Style Transfer via Learning Style Instance Supported Latent Space](#). In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 3801–3807, Yokohama, Japan. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.
- Jian Zhu and David Jurgens. 2021. [Idiosyncratic but not Arbitrary: Learning Idiolects in Online Registers Reveals Distinctive yet Consistent Individual Styles](#).
- Kangchen Zhu, Zhiliang Tian, Ruifeng Luo, and Xiaoguang Mao. 2022. [StyleFlow: Disentangle Latent Representations via Normalizing Flow for Unsupervised Text Style Transfer](#). ArXiv:2212.09670 [cs].

A Biberplus

Feat.	Description	Feat.	Description	Feat.	Description
VBD	Past tense POS	PEAS	Perfect aspect using patterns like HAVE + (ADV) + (ADV) + VBD/VBN	VPRT	Present tense: VBP or VBZ tag
PLACE	Any item in the place adverbials list that is not a proper noun (NNP)	TIME	Time adverbials excluding 'soon' when followed by 'as'	FPP1	First person pronouns
SPP2	Second person pronouns	TPP3	Third person pronouns	PIT	Pronoun 'it' and its related forms
INPR	Indefinite pronouns list	DEMP	Demonstrative pronouns under certain conditions	PROD	Pro-verb 'do' excluding specific patterns
WHQU	Direct WH-questions	NOMZ	Noun endings like -tion, -ment, -ness	GER	Gerunds of length greater than or equal to 10 ending in ing or ings
NN	Total other nouns (not nominalisations or gerunds)	PASS	Agentless passives	BYPA	By-passives following 'PASS' tag
BEMA	Be as the main verb	EX	Existential 'there'	THVC	That-verb complements with specific preceding or succeeding patterns
PASTP	Past participial clauses: punctuation + VBN	WZPAST	Past participial WHIZ-deletion relatives	WZPRES	Present participial WHIZ-deletion relatives: VBG preceded by an NN
TSUB	That-rel. clauses on subject position	TOBJ	That-rel. clauses on object position	WHSUB	WH-rel. clauses on subject position
WHOBJ	WH rel. clauses on object position	PIRE	Pied-piping relatives (prep + whom/who/whose/which)	SERE	Sentence relatives: punctuation + 'which'
CAUS	Any occurrence of the word "because"	CONC	Any occurrence of "although", "though", "tho"	COND	Any occurrence of "if" or "unless"
OSUB	Other adverbial subordinators (multi-word)	PIN	Total prepositional phrases	JJ	Attributive adjectives
PRED	Predicative adjectives	RB	Adverbs (POS tags RB, RBS, RBR, WRB)	CONJ	Conjuncts with preceding punctuation or specific words
DWNT	Specific downtoners	AMP	Specific amplifiers	DPAR	Discourse particle: pattern preceded by punctuation
HDG	Hedge words	EMPH	Emphatics	DEMO	Demonstratives
POMD	Possibility modals	NEMD	Necessity modals	PRMD	Predictive modals
PUBV	Public verbs	PRIV	Private verbs	SUAV	Suasive verbs
SMP	Seem/Appear verbs	CONT	Reduced forms (contractions)	THATD	Subordinator "that" deletion
STPR	Stranded preposition	SPIN	Split infinitives	SPAU	Split auxiliaries
PHC	Phrasal coordination	ANDC	'and' in coordination of independent clauses	XX0	Words indicating analytic negation ('not')
SYNE	Synthetic negations before adj./noun	QUAN	Quantifier words	QUPR	Quantifier pronouns
ART	Articles ('the', 'a', 'an')	AUXB	Auxiliary verbs that are forms of 'be'	CAP	Words starting with a capital letter
SCONJ	Subordinating conjunctions	CCONJ	Coordinating conjunctions	DET	Determiners
EMOJ	Emojis	EMOT	Common emoticons	EXCL	Exclamation mark '¡'
HASH	Words starting with #	INF	Infinitive verb forms	UH	Interjections
NUM	Numerals	LAUGH	Laughter acronyms like 'lol'	PRP	Possessive pronouns
PREP	Prepositions	NNP	Proper nouns	QUES	Question mark '¿'
QUOT	Quotation marks	AT	Words starting with '@'	SBJP	Subject pronouns
URL	URLs	WH	WH words ('who', 'what', 'where')	INDA	Indefinite articles ('a', 'an')
ACCU	Accusative case pronouns	PGAS	Progressive aspect verb forms	CMADJ	Comparative adjectives

SPADJ	Superlative adjectives	X	Words not fitting other POS categories	AWL	Mean word length
TTR	Type-token ratio	TRB	Total adverbs		

B Neurobiber

B.1 Training Details

We trained a RoBERTa-base model in a multi-label classification setup (96 labels) using `adamw_torch` with a learning rate of $2e-5$, $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$, an ϵ of $1e-8$, and a weight decay of 0.01 . Each mini-batch contained 256 sequences, and training was performed for 8 epochs on a dataset of approximately 31.7 million examples, with a dev and test size of about 4 million examples each. We use gradient checkpointing to reduce memory usage and used bf16 precision throughout training; the random seed was fixed at 42 to ensure reproducibility. A linear scheduler with no warmup steps was applied, and the best checkpoint was selected via validation.

B.2 Performance by Tag

Acronym	Full Name	F1	Train Support
NN	Total other nouns not tagged as a nominalisation or a gerund	0.999	3.96e+6
CAP	Tags words starting with a capital letter	0.999	3.95e+6
PREP	Identifies prepositions	0.999	3.95e+6
PIN	Total prepositional phrases	0.999	3.95e+6
ART	Identifies articles like 'the', 'a', 'an'	0.999	3.93e+6
DET	Identifies determiners	0.999	3.95e+6
AUXB	Tags auxiliary verbs that are forms of 'be'	0.999	3.82e+6
CONJ	Conjuncts with preceding punctuation or specific words	0.999	3.50e+6
INDA	Identifies indefinite articles ('a', 'an')	0.999	3.64e+6
PRP	Tags possessive pronouns	0.999	3.87e+6
SBJP	Labels subject pronouns	0.999	3.87e+6
CCONJ	Labels coordinating conjunctions	0.999	3.81e+6
JJ	Attributive adjectives	0.998	3.93e+6
PRIV	Private Verbs	0.998	3.29e+6
VPRT	Present tense: VBP or VBZ tag	0.997	3.87e+6
TPP3	Third person pronouns	0.997	2.63e+6
RB	Any adverb i.e. POS tags RB, RBS, RBR, WRB	0.996	3.83e+6
PIT	Pronoun 'it' and its related forms	0.996	3.08e+6
CONT	Reduced Forms (Contractions)	0.995	2.55e+6
INF	Tags infinitive verb forms	0.995	3.76e+6
TO	No description available	0.995	3.30e+6
PUBV	Public Verbs	0.995	2.47e+6
WH	Tags WH words like 'who', 'what', 'where'	0.995	3.25e+6
QUAN	Labels quantifier words	0.995	2.87e+6
SCONJ	Recognizes subordinating conjunctions	0.995	3.42e+6
NOMZ	Noun endings like -tion, -ment, -ness	0.995	2.97e+6
BEMA	Be as the main verb	0.994	3.42e+6
PGAS	Recognizes progressive aspect verb forms	0.993	3.39e+6
FPP1	First person pronouns	0.993	3.18e+6
PEAS	Perfect aspect using patterns like HAVE + (ADV) + (ADV) + VBD/VBN	0.992	3.40e+6
XX0	Tags words indicating analytic negation like 'not'	0.990	2.66e+6
DEMO	Demonstratives	0.990	2.73e+6
TIME	Time adverbials excluding 'soon' when followed by 'as'	0.988	1.95e+6
POMD	Possibility Modals	0.988	2.20e+6
PRMD	Predictive Modals	0.988	2.24e+6
ACCU	Tags accusative case pronouns	0.987	2.11e+6
EMPH	Identifies emphatics words	0.987	2.63e+6
SPP2	Second person pronouns	0.987	1.92e+6
NUM	Tags numeral words	0.987	2.95e+6
QUOT	Identifies quotation marks	0.987	1.49e+6
PASS	Agentless passives	0.986	2.43e+6
SUAV	Suasive Verbs	0.985	1.88e+6
VBD	Past tense POS	0.985	3.15e+6
NNP	Tags proper nouns	0.982	3.56e+6
X	Tags words not fitting other parts of speech categories	0.981	2.61e+6
COND	Any occurrence of the words "if" or "unless"	0.981	1.65e+6
QUES	Labels the question mark '?'	0.980	1.24e+6
INPR	Indefinite pronouns list	0.980	1.53e+6
ANDC	Labels 'and' in coordination within independent clauses	0.980	2.24e+6
QUPR	Tags quantifier pronouns	0.978	1.37e+6
PROD	Pro-verb 'do' excluding specific patterns	0.978	2.20e+6
DEMP	Demonstrative pronouns under certain conditions	0.978	2.12e+6
THATD	Subordinator "that" Deletion	0.977	1.80e+6
LAUGH	Recognizes laughter-related acronyms like 'lol'	0.975	4.67e+4

CMADJ	Tags comparative adjectives	0.975	2.01e+6
OSUB	Other adverbial subordinators with specific multi-word units	0.975	1.19e+6
DWNT	Any instance of specific downtoners	0.975	1.28e+6
THVC	That verb complements with specific preceding or succeeding patterns	0.974	1.32e+6
EXCL	Tags the exclamation mark '!'	0.974	6.04e+5
SPADJ	Identifies superlative adjectives	0.972	1.49e+6
PRED	Predicative adjectives with specific conditions	0.972	2.08e+6
SPAU	Split Auxiliaries	0.972	1.88e+6
PLACE	Any item in the place adverbials list that is not a proper noun (NNP)	0.971	1.61e+6
AMP	Any instance of specific amplifiers	0.970	1.08e+6
CAUS	Any occurrence of the word "because"	0.970	8.59e+5
NEMD	Necessity Modals	0.969	8.60e+5
SMP	Seem/Appear Verbs	0.967	6.62e+5
STPR	Stranded Preposition	0.966	1.45e+6
EX	Existential 'there'	0.965	1.23e+6
PHC	Phrasal Coordination	0.963	2.09e+6
SERE	Sentence relatives: A punctuation mark followed by the word "which"	0.963	8.60e+5
WHSUB	WH relative clauses on subject position with specific structure	0.963	1.68e+6
CONC	Any occurrence of the words "although", "though", "tho"	0.959	5.72e+5
TSUB	That relative clauses on subject position	0.959	1.20e+6
BYPA	By-passives following 'PASS' tag	0.956	7.29e+5
WHCL	No description available	0.956	7.01e+5
WHQU	Direct WH-questions	0.955	1.06e+6
SYNE	Identifies synthetic negations followed by adjective, noun, or proper noun	0.953	9.06e+5
URL	Tags URLs in the text	0.950	2.90e+5
PIRE	Pied-piping relatives clauses: Preposition followed by whom, who, whose, or which	0.949	3.44e+5
TOBJ	That relative clauses on object position	0.945	8.12e+5
HASH	Labels words starting with the # symbol	0.943	1.09e+5
HDG	Captures hedge words	0.942	4.42e+5
WZPRES	Present participial WHIZ deletion relatives: VBG preceded by an NN	0.941	1.54e+6
SPIN	Split Infinitives	0.930	2.38e+5
WZPAST	Past participial WHIZ deletion relatives with specific structure	0.927	1.03e+6
EMOT	Labels common emoticons	0.925	9.21e+4
PRES	No description available	0.922	1.08e+6
THAC	No description available	0.920	3.42e+5
WHOBJ	WH relative clauses on object position with specific structure	0.918	1.09e+6
AT	Tags words starting with the '@' symbol	0.916	9.81e+4
UH	Identifies interjections	0.913	1.04e+6
GER	Gerunds with length greater or equal to 10 ending in ing or ings	0.910	7.45e+5
PASTP	Past participial clauses: punctuation followed by VBN	0.878	5.31e+5
EMOJ	Tags emojis in the text	0.842	1.08e+4
DPAR	Discourse particle: Specific words preceded by a punctuation mark	0.832	2.82e+5

B.3 Register Variation

Figure 4 through Figure 6 illustrate the distribution of registers from the CORE corpus using *NeuroBiber*. Each subfigure plots two principal components, revealing clusters that align with Biber's dimensions. For instance, PC1 shows an *Involved vs. Informational Production* tendency in the data, echoing Biber's original analyses.




Figure 4: Distribution of registers along Principal Components **PC1** and **PC3**.




Figure 5: Distribution of registers along Principal Components **PC3** and **PC4**.




Figure 6: Distribution of registers along Principal Components **PC5** and **PC6**.