







# **Cognitive Models of Semantic Representation**

## **Lecture 14: How Humans Represent Meaning**

**PSYC 51.07: Models of Language and Communication - Week 4**

Winter 2026

# Today's Lecture

1.  Human vs. Computational Semantics
2.  Cognitive Theories of Meaning
3.  Embodied & Grounded Cognition
4.  Semantic Similarity: What Does It Mean?
5.  Empirical Evidence from Cognitive Science
6.  Bridging the Gap: Models Meet Minds

*Goal: Understand what computational models are really learning*

# The Fundamental Question

What does "meaning" actually mean?

## Computational View:

- Vectors in high-dimensional space
- Learned from text co-occurrence
- Distributional patterns
- Statistical relationships
- "You shall know a word by the company it keeps"

## Human View:

- Sensory experiences
- Emotional associations

# How Do Humans Represent Meaning?

Example: The word "coffee"

What comes to YOUR mind?

- **Visual:** brown liquid, mug, steam, beans
- **Olfactory:** aroma, roasted smell
- **Gustatory:** bitter taste, smooth texture
- **Tactile:** hot, warm cup, liquid
- **Auditory:** brewing sounds, pouring
- **Motor:** lifting cup, drinking motion
- **Contextual:** morning routine, work, café
- **Emotional:** comfort, alertness, pleasure
- **Social:** conversations, meetings

# The Symbol Grounding Problem

**Harnad (1990): Can symbols have intrinsic meaning?**

**The Chinese Room (Searle, 1980):**

```
1Input:
2      ↓
3[Rule Book: If see
4      output      ]
5      ↓
6Output:
7
8Correct response! But no
9understanding of Chinese.
```

**Analogy to LLMs:**

# Embodied Cognition Theory

Meaning arises from bodily experience and sensorimotor interaction

## Key Principles:

1. **Embodiment:** Cognition shaped by body
2. **Situatedness:** Meaning context-dependent
3. **Enactivism:** Knowing through doing
4. **Grounding:** Concepts tied to perception/action

## Neuroscience Evidence:

1 Reading "kick the ball":  
2 → Motor cortex activates  
3 → Leg area specifically!

# The Distributional Hypothesis Revisited

*"You shall know a word by the company it keeps"*

--- J.R. Firth (1957)

**Strong version:** Word meaning IS distributional patterns

**Weak version:** Distributional patterns REFLECT meaning

**Supports:**

- Works remarkably well in practice
- Captures semantic similarity
- Enables analogical reasoning
- Scales to huge vocabularies

# What Does "Semantic Similarity" Really Mean?

## Different types of similarity:

### Taxonomic (IS-A):

```
1dog ↔ cat: Both are animals
2          Similarity: HIGH
```

### Thematic (GOES-WITH):

```
1dog ↔ leash: Co-occur in events
2          Relatedness: HIGH
3          Similarity: LOW!
```

## Test Yourself:



# Semantic Projection: Recovering Human Knowledge



**Grand et al. (2022): Can we extract human-like features from embeddings?**

## **The Experiment:**

1. Collect human ratings on perceptual features
  - Is it edible?
  - Is it heavy?
  - Is it alive?
  - Can you hold it?
2. Train linear projections from word embeddings
3. Test if embeddings predict human ratings

# Multimodal Models: Bridging the Gap

## Combining language with perception

### Vision-Language Models:

- CLIP (OpenAI)
- ALIGN (Google)
- Flamingo (DeepMind)
- GPT-4V (OpenAI)

### Key Idea:

- Learn joint embedding space
- Text and images map to same space
- Enables cross-modal understanding

# Conceptual Spaces Theory

**Gärdenfors (2000): Meaning as geometry**

**Key Ideas:**

- Concepts represented in quality dimensions
- Dimensions: color, size, temperature, etc.
- Each dimension has a metric
- Concepts are regions in space
- Similarity = geometric proximity

**Example: Colors**

- Hue, saturation, brightness
- Natural categories (red, blue, green)

# Lexical Semantic Theories

How do linguists think about word meaning?

## 1. Feature-Based:

- Words = bundles of features
- bachelor = [+human, +male, +adult, -married]
- Compositional
- Logical

## 2. Prototype Theory:

- Categories have best examples
- Robin is a prototypical bird
- Penguin is peripheral

# Empirical Evidence from Neuroscience

**What does the brain tell us about semantic representation?**

**fMRI Studies:**

- Can predict brain activity from word embeddings
- Semantic information distributed across cortex
- Different regions for different features
- Temporal lobe: objects
- Motor cortex: actions
- Visual cortex: visual features

**Findings:**

- Word2Vec correlates with neural patterns

# The "Stochastic Parrots" Debate

**Bender et al. (2021): On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots**

## **The Argument:**

- LLMs learn form, not meaning
- "Stochastic parrots" - repeating patterns
- No understanding of world
- No communicative intent
- Risk: Mistaking fluency for understanding

## **Evidence:**

- Fail on simple reasoning
- Sensitive to phrasing

# Common Sense Reasoning 🤯

**What humans know but models don't**

**Physical Intuition Failures:**

```
1Q: "Can you fit an elephant
2   in a refrigerator?"
3
4GPT-3: "Yes, if you open the
5       door wide enough..."
```

**Winograd Schema (reasoning):**

```
1"The trophy doesn't fit in the
2 brown suitcase because it is
3 too [small/large]."
4
```

# Compositionality: Phrases and Sentences

How do we combine word meanings?

The Problem:

```
1# Vector math doesn't work!  
2vec("hot") + vec("dog") ≠ vec("hot dog")  
3  
4# "hot dog" = food item  
5# "hot" + "dog" = warm canine  
6  
7# Same issue:  
8vec("red") + vec("herring") ≠ vec("red herring")  
9# red herring = distraction, not a fish!
```

Non-compositional Phrases:

- Kick the bucket (= die)



# Grand Discussion

Do large language models "understand" language?

Arguments FOR:

- Solve complex tasks
- Generalize to new domains
- Show emergent capabilities
- Capture linguistic structure
- Pragmatic criterion: if it works...
- Maybe understanding = prediction
- Human understanding also imperfect

*"The question is not whether machines think, but whether they behave intelligently" -*

*Turing*

# Summary

## What we learned today:

1. **Symbol Grounding:** Computational models lack perceptual grounding
2. **Embodied Cognition:** Human meaning tied to bodily experience
3. **Distributional Semantics:** Powerful but incomplete theory
4. **Semantic Similarity:** Multiple types, models capture some
5. **Empirical Evidence:** Models align with neural patterns but miss multimodality
6. **Common Sense:** Models struggle with physical and social reasoning
7. **Compositionality:** Non-literal language remains challenging

**The gap between computation and cognition remains, but we're making progress!**

# Key References

## Foundational Papers:

- Searle, J. (1980). "Minds, Brains, and Programs"
- Harnad, S. (1990). "The Symbol Grounding Problem"
- Barsalou, L. (2008). "Grounded Cognition"
- Gärdenfors, P. (2000). "Conceptual Spaces: The Geometry of Thought"

## Distributional Semantics:

- Firth, J.R. (1957). "A Synopsis of Linguistic Theory"
- Boleda, G. (2020). "Distributional Semantics and Linguistic Theory"
- Hill et al. (2015). "SimLex-999"

## Critical Perspectives:

# Questions?

## Next Week:

Advanced Topics in Language Models

*Scaling, emergent abilities, and the future of NLP*