

Errata of *Statistical Universals of Language*, 2021, published from Springer

Kumiko Tanaka-Ishii

December 20, 2021

Black indicates the previous text, whereas red indicates the modified/added text.

Chapter 3: p.22, Footnote 4, the missing reference is: Torre, Iván González, Luque, Bartolo, Lacasa, Lucas, Luque, Jordi, and Fernández-Fernández, Antoni (2017). Emergence of linguistic laws in human voice. *Scientific Reports*, volume 7, 43862.

Chapter 4: p.43, from the third sentence until the end: For comparison, η is exactly the same for the shuffled text, and 0.82 for the monkey text. Although the overall slope seems not much different from that of *Moby Dick*, regression by likelihood maximization gives this smaller value because of the heavy tail for the monkey text. Therefore, *Moby Dick* can be distinguished from monkey text even only by this value. Overall, the value of η shows a deviation from 1 of 0.04 for *Moby Dick*, which is small but requires attention. Chapter 5 discusses this variation in η .

Chapter 6: p.57, third paragraph: $1.08 \rightarrow 0.82$;
 $\zeta^* = 1 + \frac{1}{1.08} = 1.92 \rightarrow \zeta^* = 1 + \frac{1}{0.82} = 2.21$.

Chapter 6: p.60, last paragraph: $1.08 \rightarrow 0.82$.

Chapter 6: p.61, first line: $\eta^* = 1/\xi = 1/0.94 = 1.07 \rightarrow \eta^* = 1$

Chapter 8: p.84, Section 8.5

The following paragraph replaces the third paragraph.

Previously, we analyzed $ACF(s)$ by changing s . To verify the stationarity from the covariance point of view, the value of $ACF(s)$ should be analyzed by varying i . Fixing s at some value and changing i produces fluctuation of the $ACF(s)$ value locally and globally, for the interval sequences both of “the” and of rare words. This analysis provides some evidence that the interval sequences of natural language are not stationary.