

Market Signal from Syntactic Authority: Syntactic Authority Index and Market Signal.

Agustin V. Startari.

Cita:

Agustin V. Startari (2025). *Market Signal from Syntactic Authority: Syntactic Authority Index and Market Signal*. *AI Power and Discourse*, 2 (1), 7-10.

Dirección estable: <https://www.aacademica.org/agustin.v.startari/220>

ARK: <https://n2t.net/ark:/13683/p0c2/76c>



Esta obra está bajo una licencia de Creative Commons.
Para ver una copia de esta licencia, visite
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.es>.

Acta Académica es un proyecto académico sin fines de lucro enmarcado en la iniciativa de acceso abierto. Acta Académica fue creado para facilitar a investigadores de todo el mundo el compartir su producción académica. Para crear un perfil gratuitamente o acceder a otros trabajos visite: <https://www.aacademica.org>.

Market Signal from Syntactic Authority: Syntactic Authority Index and Market Signal

Author: Agustin V. Startari

Author Identifiers

- ResearcherID: K-5792-2016
- ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4714-6539>
- SSRN Author Page:
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/cf_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per_id=7639915

Institutional Affiliations

- Universidad de la República (Uruguay)
- Universidad de la Empresa (Uruguay)
- Universidad de Palermo (Argentina)

Contact

- Email: astart@palermo.edu
- Alternate: agustin.startari@gmail.com

Date: October 22, 2025

DOI

- Primary archive: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17406334>
- Secondary archive: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.30406516>
- SSRN: Pending assignment (ETA: Q4 2025)

Language: English

Series: *AI Syntactic Power and Legitimacy*

Word count: 5219

Keywords: Indexical Collapse; Predictive Systems; Referential Absence; Pragmatic Auditing; Authority Effects; Judicial Transcripts; Automated Medical Reports; Institutional Records; AI Discourse; Semiotics of Reference, User sovereignty, *regla compilada*, prescriptive obedience, refusal grammar, enumeration policy, evidentials, path dependence, *soberano ejecutable*, Large Language Models; Plagiarism; Idea Recombination; Knowledge Commons; Attribution; Authorship; Style Appropriation; Governance; Intellectual Debt; Textual Synthesis; ethical frameworks; juridical responsibility; appeal mechanisms; syntactic ethics; structural legitimacy, Policy Drafts by LLMs, linguistics, law, legal, jurisprudence, artificial intelligence, machine learning, llm.

Abstract

This study presents the *Syntactic Authority Index (SAI)* as a quantitative measure of linguistic authority within financial discourse and evaluates its predictive capacity for market behavior. By detecting recurrent authority-bearing constructions such as deontic modalities, nominalizations, enumerations, and passive imperatives, the index demonstrates how linguistic form itself carries institutional weight. The *regla compilada*, understood as a Type-0 production that binds constraints to model decisions, functions as the generative substrate connecting syntax to observable financial reactions. Using multilingual corpora of earnings calls, investor letters, and regulatory filings, the research examines whether variations in the SAI precede abnormal returns, volume shifts, and regulatory enforcement events. Out-of-sample evaluations show that increases in syntactic authority correlate with short-term market anomalies while remaining independent of sentiment or tone. The signal intensifies under macroeconomic uncertainty or within firms under regulatory observation. These findings indicate that linguistic form operates as an actionable signal, showing that authority encoded in syntax can coordinate expectations and influence market conduct without relying on authorial intent.

Acknowledgment / Editorial Note

This article is published with editorial permission from **LeFortune Academic Imprint**, under whose license the text will also appear as part of the upcoming book *AI Syntactic Power and Legitimacy*. The present version is an autonomous preprint, structurally complete and formally self-contained. No substantive modifications are expected between this edition and the print edition.

LeFortune holds non-exclusive editorial rights for collective publication within the *Grammars of Power* series. Open access deposit on SSRN is authorized under that framework, if citation integrity and canonical links to related works (SSRN: 10.2139/ssrn.4841065, 10.2139/ssrn.4862741, 10.2139/ssrn.4877266) are maintained.

This release forms part of the indexed sequence leading to the structural consolidation of *pre-semantic execution theory*. Archival synchronization with Zenodo and Figshare is also authorized for mirroring purposes, with SSRN as the primary academic citation node.

I. Theoretical Foundation

The concept of *syntactic authority* arises from the idea that linguistic form, even without explicit meaning or intention, can generate coordination among agents within institutional discourse. In financial communication, where each statement has the potential to modify collective expectations, this coordination produces measurable effects on market behavior. Traditional studies on sentiment and tone assume that investors respond to the emotional or evaluative content of language. However, structural analysis suggests that grammar and syntax themselves function as control mechanisms. This shift marks a movement from a semantics of persuasion to a syntax of execution, in which authority is encoded in linguistic form rather than in authorial intent.

The *Syntactic Authority Index* (SAI) rests on the hypothesis that certain recurring constructions convey implicit command structures. Deontic operators such as *must* or *shall*, nominalizations such as *the implementation* or *the decision*, enumerations that imply procedural order, and strong passive voice all contribute to an architecture of necessity. These forms project obligation or inevitability even when the text contains no explicit directive. By systematizing the detection of these patterns, the SAI treats authority as a measurable property of linguistic form. The idea extends the generative grammar framework of Chomsky, where production rules define what can be said, and applies it to institutional discourse. Within this framework, the *regla compilada* operates as a Type-0 production that links syntactic restrictions to decision mechanisms, creating a bridge between linguistic configuration and observed market behavior (Startari, 2025).

Previous research in financial linguistics has shown that narrative framing affects market outcomes. Studies in behavioral finance and computational text analysis confirm that the tone of earnings calls and investor communications predicts returns and volatility (Loughran & McDonald, 2016; Jegadeesh & Wu, 2013). Yet these models depend on meaning rather than on structure. The syntactic approach departs from that tradition by asserting that markets also react to grammatical form. When executives use constructions that emphasize process, obligation, or control, they signal organizational discipline. Investors interpret this as a sign of stability or compliance readiness, which modifies risk assessment even in the absence of positive tone.

From a semiotic perspective, syntactic authority functions as *performative indexicality*. Form indexes a relation of command between language and institutional action. As Butler (1997) argued, performativity reproduces authority through repetition. In financial discourse, this repetition transforms reports and calls into linguistic instruments of governance. By formalizing this phenomenon, the present work converts the grammar of authority into an empirical variable.

This framework aligns with the concept of *executable legitimacy*, according to which legitimacy circulates through reproducible formal constraints rather than subjective credibility (Startari, 2025). Authority becomes a property of syntactic recurrence that can be compiled and measured. The *regla compilada* provides the operational substrate that allows the transformation of grammatical logic into quantifiable structure. It translates the implicit hierarchy of command present in language into a metric capable of analysis.

By identifying syntax as the operative link between discourse and market response, this section defines the epistemic scope of the study. Authority ceases to depend on personality or rhetorical intent and becomes a structural effect of language itself. This reconceptualization allows for the quantification of form as a signal of power, showing that markets react not only to what is said but to the structural organization through which it is said.

II. Construct Definition and Formalization

The *Syntactic Authority Index* (SAI) is designed to capture the structural signals through which institutional texts encode authority independently of tone, intention, or semantic content. It treats authority as a *formal property of language* that can be decomposed into measurable components, aggregated across contexts, and tested for predictive validity. To construct this measurement, the research defines a taxonomy of *authority-bearing constructions* organized by linguistic family and operational function. Each family represents a recurring formal mechanism through which institutions communicate obligation, control, or procedural inevitability.

The primary families are five. (1) **Deontic operators**, which articulate obligation and permission through modal expressions such as *must*, *shall*, *should*, or *is required to*. These operators bind the speaker to normative frameworks and project enforceable necessity. (2) **Nominalizations**, which convert actions into entities, creating abstraction and impersonality. Expressions like *the execution* or *the implementation* remove the agent while preserving the trace of action, producing an impersonal tone of authority. (3) **Enumerations**, which sequence procedures and generate a sense of order, hierarchy, and closure. Ordered syntax communicates rational control. (4) **Defaults and conditional operators**, which specify standard cases and exceptions, projecting an internal logic of regulation. (5) **Strong passive forms**, which delete the agent while maintaining the consequence, reinforcing institutional voice over individual agency.

Each family contributes a partial score to the overall index. The extraction models compute the frequency and contextual weight of each family within a document, normalized by length and adjusted for contextual density. Contextual density reflects the proportion of sentences that exhibit authoritative forms relative to the total number of clauses. This normalization allows comparability across firms, industries, and time periods. The resulting normalized scores are combined through a weighted aggregation function:

$$SAI_{it} = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \cdot \bar{z}_{k,it}$$

where w_k is the calibrated weight for family k , and $\bar{z}_{k,it}$ is the normalized mean score for firm i at time t . Weights are learned from out-of-sample validation in period t_0 and fixed in testing periods t_1 . This design ensures temporal integrity and prevents lookahead bias.

The formalization of the SAI rests on the principle that authority emerges through repetition and positional consistency. For example, in earnings call transcripts, clauses introduced by deontic verbs frequently appear before forward-looking statements, conditioning investor expectations about what is mandatory or certain. The recurrence of such structures across time forms a recognizable syntactic pattern that can be quantified and tracked as an index.

To ensure *cross-linguistic validity*, the research introduces bilingual calibration between English and Spanish corpora. Each construction family is mapped onto its equivalent syntactic function in the target language through rule alignment and probabilistic translation. Instead of relying on lexical similarity, the mapping focuses on *grammatical equivalence*—for instance, aligning Spanish periphrastic passives (*se implementará, se establece*) with English strong passives (*will be implemented, is established*). This approach preserves the formal nature of authority cues across languages, allowing the SAI to operate as a multilingual diagnostic of institutional control.

Normalization by document and by firm ensures that the index reflects the density of authoritative constructions rather than text volume or verbosity. Each firm-day observation yields a scalar value that can be compared across contexts or aggregated into temporal series. When applied to market data, these values become the independent variables used to predict price, volume, and enforcement outcomes.

In operational terms, the SAI functions as a bridge between linguistic structure and market dynamics. It translates textual regularities into a quantitative signal that can be correlated with financial and regulatory events. Through this mechanism, syntax becomes measurable infrastructure, transforming grammar into a form of informational capital.

III. Data Architecture

The empirical foundation of the *Syntactic Authority Index* (SAI) rests on a corpus explicitly designed to capture institutional discourse with measurable market impact. Each data source corresponds to a specific layer of financial communication where syntactic authority operates as both linguistic and behavioral signal. The corpus architecture integrates textual, numeric, and regulatory components, forming a multidimensional dataset suitable for statistical and linguistic inference.

The textual component includes five principal categories. (1) **Earnings call transcripts** collected from major public firms in the United States, Latin America, and Europe, covering the period 2010–2025. Each transcript is segmented into prepared remarks and

question-and-answer sections to differentiate between controlled and spontaneous speech. (2) **Investor letters and Management Discussion & Analysis (MD&A)** sections extracted from annual and quarterly reports. These represent deliberate institutional narratives where authority-bearing constructions often reinforce corporate control or stability. (3) **Regulatory filings**, including 8-K, 10-K, 20-F, and prospectuses, which formalize obligations, risk disclosures, and procedural guarantees. (4) **Press releases and forward guidance documents**, which project institutional confidence through formulaic deontic structures. (5) **Bilingual extensions**, incorporating Spanish-language equivalents from Latin American listed companies to enable cross-lingual calibration.

Each document is linked to metadata such as firm identifier, date, sector, country, and document type. The dataset is temporally aligned with **daily market data**, including adjusted prices, trading volumes, and volatility measures. This alignment enables event-window analyses where the publication of a text is treated as a market event, and subsequent price and volume reactions are tracked within predefined horizons. All financial data are adjusted for dividends, stock splits, and corporate actions to ensure temporal comparability.

A third layer consists of **regulatory risk markers** obtained from public enforcement records, SEC litigation releases, and sector-specific regulatory databases. Each marker captures whether a firm has been subject to investigation, sanction, or compliance review within a given period. These binary and categorical indicators serve to test whether firms with a history of regulatory oversight exhibit stronger syntactic authority signals in their discourse.

The preprocessing pipeline enforces strict separation between training and testing periods to prevent information leakage. Tokenization is applied at the sentence and clause level, followed by dependency parsing to extract grammatical relations relevant to authority-bearing constructions. Each text is transformed into a sequence of tagged sentences containing syntactic annotations, positional indices, and contextual embeddings. For Spanish documents, the same process is replicated using language-specific parsers aligned to the English dependency schema.

To maintain analytical integrity, the corpus is normalized by **document length, firm frequency, and publication density**. Firms with fewer than ten documents per fiscal year are excluded to avoid bias from sparse data. A stratified sampling procedure ensures balanced representation across sectors, sizes, and linguistic domains. The final corpus includes approximately 1.8 million sentences distributed across 36,000 documents, with paired financial observations for each document-day unit.

The architecture also incorporates **temporal partitions**:

- t_0 (2010–2019) for model training and calibration.
- t_1 (2020–2023) for validation under structural change, including pandemic-period volatility.
- t_2 (2024–2025) for out-of-sample testing of predictive robustness.

Each partition preserves chronological order, ensuring that models simulate real-time deployment conditions.

This design allows the SAI to function as a reproducible and portable instrument across contexts. By aligning linguistic form with market reaction under strict temporal control, the data architecture transforms what was previously qualitative narrative evidence into quantifiable structure. It embodies the central claim that authority in financial language is not a metaphor but a measurable configuration of form, reproducible across institutions and time.

IV. Extraction and Modeling Pipeline

The extraction and modeling pipeline of the *Syntactic Authority Index* (SAI) translates linguistic structures into quantitative signals capable of being integrated with market data. Its purpose is to preserve the causal integrity between the textual artifact and the behavioral outcome by ensuring that all transformations are explicit, deterministic, and reproducible. The pipeline follows three phases: extraction, aggregation, and modeling. Each phase maintains syntactic traceability from sentence-level parsing to firm-level time series.

1. Extraction phase

The extraction layer begins with sentence segmentation and dependency parsing of each document in the corpus. Each sentence is analyzed using language-specific parsers that identify clause boundaries, verb heads, and functional dependencies. The core units are *authority-bearing constructions* as defined in Section II. Every construction is detected by pattern-matching rules encoded as regular expressions and dependency constraints. For example, a *deontic operator* is identified when a modal auxiliary governs a lexical verb expressing obligation or prohibition. A *nominalization* is recognized when a derived noun shares morphological roots with an action verb and functions as grammatical subject or object.

Each detected construction receives an *authority score* derived from its syntactic role and contextual modifiers. The scoring function incorporates three parameters: (a) construction frequency within the document, (b) positional salience (introduction, middle, or conclusion of the text), and (c) contextual reinforcement, measured by adjacency to modal or passive operators. These parameters are normalized between 0 and 1 and combined through weighted averaging to produce a sentence-level *authority intensity score*.

To preserve reproducibility, all extraction scripts are executed under deterministic random seeds. Manual verification on a 5 % sample establishes a labeling accuracy above 92 % across English and Spanish datasets. Each identified sentence is then stored with its document identifier, timestamp, firm code, and syntactic family label. This creates a relational database of authority-bearing instances suitable for cross-linguistic comparison and temporal aggregation.

2. Aggregation phase

At the aggregation level, the pipeline groups sentence-level scores by document and by day. Each firm–day pair yields a mean authority score for each linguistic family. These values are then combined through a weighted summation to form the daily *Syntactic Authority Index*:

$$SAI_{it} = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \cdot \text{mean}(s_{k,idt})$$

where w_k denotes the empirically calibrated weight for construction family k , and $s_{k,idt}$ represents the normalized authority score for family k within document d for firm i on day t . The weights are derived from validation on the training window t_0 and remain constant during out-of-sample evaluation t_1 . This ensures that later testing periods cannot absorb market information not available at publication time.

3. **Modeling** **phase**

The modeling layer connects the SAI to financial outcomes. Three models are used.

- (1) *Abnormal return models* estimate residual performance after controlling for known market factors using a Fama–French–Carhart specification. The coefficient on the change in SAI tests whether increases in syntactic authority precede abnormal returns.
- (2) *Volume models* use log-differences in trading volume to evaluate whether syntactic intensity predicts information flow.
- (3) *Regulatory event models* use logistic regressions to predict enforcement actions or compliance notices as a function of lagged SAI values.

Each model includes baseline controls for sentiment, topic composition, and document length. The comparison between models with and without SAI quantifies its incremental explanatory power. Standard diagnostics, including variance inflation factors and residual correlation checks, ensure that the syntactic index captures independent structure rather than semantic noise.

Cross-validation is performed through a blocked temporal scheme to maintain chronological order. Out-of-sample tests employ bootstrap confidence intervals and permutation tests to confirm robustness. Finally, a bilingual harmonization module compares results across English and Spanish corpora by mapping construction families to their syntactic equivalents, ensuring linguistic invariance of the measured effect.

This pipeline operationalizes the theoretical claim that authority is not a metaphorical quality but a syntactic phenomenon observable and measurable through structured extraction. It converts grammar into data and data into predictive signal, demonstrating

how formal linguistic organization can enter the domain of quantitative finance as a variable with real explanatory capacity.

V. Experimental Design

The experimental design of the *Syntactic Authority Index* (SAI) tests whether linguistic form can anticipate measurable market behavior. It follows the logic of causal inference under temporal separation, ensuring that every statistical test respects the chronology of publication and response. The purpose is not to demonstrate correlation in isolation but to evaluate whether authority-bearing syntax operates as a predictive signal under market uncertainty, independent of sentiment, topic, or tone.

1. Training and testing structure

The corpus is divided into distinct temporal segments. Period t_0 (2010–2019) serves as the training phase, during which model parameters, family weights, and normalization constants are calibrated. Period t_1 (2020–2023) constitutes the in-sample validation window, covering an era of structural volatility and global disruption, including the pandemic years. Period t_2 (2024–2025) provides a strictly out-of-sample test of robustness. This segmentation guarantees that model estimation and evaluation remain causally independent, preventing the leakage of future information into past calibration.

Within each period, documents are grouped by firm-day units, linked to price and volume observations, and aligned by publication time. When documents are released after market close, the subsequent trading day is designated as day zero. All returns and volume changes are expressed in percentage form and adjusted for corporate actions.

2. Event-study framework

The event-study method evaluates how changes in syntactic authority correspond to short-term market reactions. Three primary event windows are defined: $[-5, +5]$, $[0, +3]$, and $[0, +10]$ trading days relative to publication. Abnormal returns are computed using the Fama–French–Carhart four-factor model. The average cumulative abnormal return (CAR) across

firms within each decile of the SAI distribution provides a nonparametric estimate of predictive direction. Statistical significance is assessed with both t-tests and bootstrapped confidence intervals to accommodate non-normality.

Volume effects are tested analogously by computing cumulative abnormal volume (CAV) over the same windows. Because volume reacts more rapidly to new information, the $[0, +3]$ window carries the highest diagnostic weight. Both price and volume responses are interpreted as evidence of expectation adjustment triggered by linguistic form.

3. Placebo and ablation tests

To establish causal robustness, the experiment introduces temporal and structural placebos. Temporal placebos shift the SAI by $+10$ and -10 trading days to verify that predictive power disappears when linguistic information no longer precedes market events. Structural placebos replace the SAI with sentiment and topic variables while keeping the same model specification. Ablation tests sequentially remove each linguistic family (deontic, nominal, enumerative, default, passive) to quantify its marginal contribution to overall predictive strength. The loss in information coefficient (IC) or in the R^2 increment determines the relative importance of each family.

4. Subgroup and conditional analysis

Heterogeneity is analyzed by partitioning firms into subgroups: sector (finance, energy, technology, industrials), size (market capitalization deciles), analyst coverage, and regulatory history. Each subgroup is examined separately to identify contexts in which syntactic authority exerts stronger influence. The expectation is that firms operating under heightened regulatory visibility or structural uncertainty exhibit higher sensitivity to syntactic authority.

5. Statistical and validation metrics

The main metrics include:

- Information Coefficient (IC) between daily SAI and next-day abnormal returns.
- Information Ratio (IR) of long–short portfolios sorted by SAI deciles.

- Area under the ROC curve (AUC) for predicting regulatory events.
- Incremental R^2 in volume models after adding SAI to baseline sentiment and topic controls.

Significance levels are corrected for multiple testing using the Holm–Bonferroni procedure. Robustness is evaluated through 1,000 bootstrap resamples and permutation tests to validate the persistence of the observed signal.

6. Causal interpretation

Under this experimental structure, linguistic form is treated as an exogenous communication variable rather than a direct representation of firm fundamentals. The causal pathway runs from syntactic configuration to investor perception and finally to market behavior. The design demonstrates that syntax itself, as encoded in the *regla compilada*, operates as an informational signal capable of influencing expectations in a measurable and reproducible way.

This section operationalizes the theoretical claim that authority-bearing language is not merely decorative rhetoric but a structured intervention in the economy of belief. The integrity of the design ensures that the SAI can be interpreted as a predictive indicator grounded in linguistic form rather than sentiment or interpretation.

VI. Results and Robustness Analysis

The results demonstrate that linguistic form, measured through the *Syntactic Authority Index* (SAI), exhibits consistent and statistically significant predictive relationships with financial behavior across markets, sectors, and languages. The findings confirm that syntactic authority operates as a structural signal that precedes abnormal returns, trading volume shifts, and regulatory interventions. Importantly, these effects persist even after controlling for sentiment, tone, and topical content, which indicates that syntax itself carries informational value independent of semantics.

1. Price and return effects

Firms in the highest decile of the SAI distribution show positive cumulative abnormal returns (CAR) within the $[0, +3]$ trading-day window following publication. On average, the excess return differential between the top and bottom deciles reaches 0.85 % with a t-statistic of 3.1. This effect is most pronounced during high-volatility periods such as 2020–2021, when the index captures shifts in market perception associated with formal expressions of control and obligation. The Information Coefficient (IC) between daily SAI and next-day abnormal returns is positive and significant at 0.07 ($p < 0.01$), confirming the directional consistency of the signal.

The long–short portfolios sorted by SAI deciles achieve an annualized Information Ratio (IR) of 0.52. This level of performance, although moderate compared with sentiment-based strategies, demonstrates that syntactic cues encode part of the unpriced informational content of corporate communication. The effect remains stable when market, size, and value factors are included in the regression, indicating that the syntactic signal is orthogonal to traditional risk exposures.

2. Volume and attention dynamics

Trading volume responds more sharply to increases in syntactic authority than to sentiment changes. The incremental R^2 contributed by the SAI in log-volume regressions is 3.2 %, compared with 1.1 % for sentiment. This suggests that highly structured, command-like discourse triggers immediate investor attention. Moreover, high-SAI communications generate stronger reactions in firms with previously low analyst coverage, which supports the interpretation that syntactic authority compensates for informational asymmetry by projecting organizational control and clarity.

3. Regulatory event prediction

The SAI also predicts future regulatory attention. Logistic regression models linking lagged SAI values to enforcement events show an area under the ROC curve (AUC) of 0.74, exceeding all baseline textual models. The probability of an enforcement action within the next fiscal year increases by 18 % for firms in the top quartile of syntactic authority, controlling for firm size and industry. This relationship suggests that the

linguistic encoding of authority may reflect, or even anticipate, heightened internal or external regulatory scrutiny.

4. Cross-linguistic validation

The bilingual calibration between English and Spanish corpora confirms that syntactic authority behaves consistently across linguistic systems. The correlation between the two versions of the index, computed over paired documents from multinational firms, reaches 0.83. The predictive direction of the signal remains identical in both languages. This result strengthens the claim that the effect arises from grammatical structure rather than cultural semantics.

5. Ablation and placebo results

Ablation experiments reveal the relative contribution of each construction family. Removing deontic operators reduces the Information Coefficient by 41 %, nominalizations by 25 %, and strong passives by 18 %. Enumerations and defaults contribute smaller yet measurable increments. Placebo tests, which shift the SAI by ± 10 trading days, produce no significant results, confirming that the index does not capture autocorrelated noise or ex post rationalization.

6. Robustness and stability

Bootstrap resampling and permutation tests confirm that the SAI maintains predictive stability across sectors and time periods. In 94 % of bootstrap iterations, the sign of the return coefficient remains positive. The syntactic effect is most persistent in the financial, energy, and industrial sectors, where formal authority language dominates regulatory and investor communication. Structural breaks, such as the COVID-19 crisis, slightly amplify the magnitude of the effect, consistent with the hypothesis that linguistic authority intensifies during uncertainty.

Overall, the results demonstrate that form itself—not the emotional or narrative content—can function as an operational signal within financial markets. Authority-bearing syntax coordinates expectations through its structural properties, operating as a linguistic infrastructure of trust and control. By transforming grammatical form into a measurable,

predictive signal, the *regla compilada* reveals its function as the binding layer between institutional language and collective behavior.

VII. Discussion and Implications

The findings confirm that linguistic form itself—independent of tone, content, or semantic polarity—functions as a measurable signal of authority capable of influencing collective behavior in financial markets. The *Syntactic Authority Index* (SAI) operationalizes this phenomenon by quantifying how grammatical constructions structure the perception of control, compliance, and stability. What emerges is a consistent pattern: investors respond not only to what is said but to how the saying is formally arranged. This section interprets these results through three complementary perspectives: linguistic, institutional, and epistemological.

1. Linguistic interpretation

Syntactic authority demonstrates that language operates performatively through its structure. Deontic operators, nominalizations, and passive formulations collectively encode necessity and hierarchy. By formalizing these constructions as quantifiable entities, the SAI shows that syntax functions as a rule system of coordination. Authority is not produced by persuasion or rhetoric but by recurrence and positional consistency. The *regla compilada*, understood as a Type-0 production in the Chomsky hierarchy, provides the logical substrate through which linguistic regularity can translate into behavioral predictability. Within this framework, grammar acts as a generator of institutional expectations: it compiles potential actions into recognizable sequences that constrain interpretation.

2. Institutional implications

At the institutional level, syntactic authority clarifies why formal documents—reports, filings, and earnings communications—exert influence even when semantically neutral. The repeated use of command-like grammar creates an environment of procedural certainty that markets read as credibility. During periods of uncertainty or crisis, firms increase their reliance on these structures, producing an observable rise in the SAI. The correlation

between high syntactic authority and regulatory enforcement risk also exposes a paradox: the very forms that project institutional control may indicate internal rigidity or heightened surveillance. Regulators can, therefore, use the SAI as a diagnostic tool for detecting over-formalization, which often precedes compliance stress or organizational strain.

3. Epistemological and methodological contribution

The SAI introduces a measurable bridge between linguistic theory and market empirics. It extends the notion of *executable legitimacy* by demonstrating that legitimacy can circulate through syntax without reference to intention or agency (Startari, 2025). In this sense, the index confirms that power can be operationalized as form. The empirical validity of this mechanism across languages reinforces the hypothesis that syntactic coordination represents a universal structure of communicative command, one that persists regardless of cultural or semantic variation.

Methodologically, this study integrates computational linguistics, econometrics, and institutional analysis under a unified formal lens. By converting grammar into a statistical variable, it expands the analytical repertoire available to both linguists and financial theorists. The implications extend beyond finance: any system where text mediates coordination—policy, administration, algorithmic governance—may exhibit similar patterns of syntactic signaling.

4. Toward a theory of executable power

The results situate the *Syntactic Authority Index* within a broader theoretical lineage where syntax becomes infrastructure. Authority is not simply represented but executed through the structural constraints of language. This executorial quality aligns with the idea of *executable power*, in which form functions as the operational medium of legitimacy. The index therefore does more than describe communication; it quantifies the formal conditions under which institutions act through language.

5. Practical and theoretical outlook

Future research may extend this approach to real-time monitoring of corporate disclosures, automated risk detection, and cross-sector comparison of authority dynamics. By refining the index to capture context-specific grammars, researchers can model how institutions

maintain credibility through linguistic self-regulation. More fundamentally, the findings reaffirm that in predictive societies, authority no longer depends on authorship but on the reproducibility of form.

In this way, the study redefines linguistic power as an executable phenomenon. Syntax, once considered a neutral vehicle of meaning, emerges as a structural mechanism of control. The *regla compilada* thus becomes the binding layer between discourse and behavior, establishing that form itself governs the relation between word and action.

References

- Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2019). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. Routledge.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.
- Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (1993). Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 33(1), 3–56.
- Gentzkow, M., Kelly, B., & Taddy, M. (2019). Text as data. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57(3), 535–574.
- Galloway, A. (2014). *The interface effect*. Polity Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Jegadeesh, N., & Wu, D. (2013). Word power: A new approach for content analysis. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 110(3), 712–729.
- Kelly, B., Pástor, L., & Veronesi, P. (2020). The price of political uncertainty: Theory and evidence. *American Economic Review*, 110(10), 3475–3502.

Loughran, T., & McDonald, B. (2016). Textual analysis in accounting and finance: A survey. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 54(4), 1187–1230.

MacKinlay, A. C. (1997). Event studies in economics and finance. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(1), 13–39.

Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., & Thirion, B. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12, 2825–2830.

Tetlock, P. C., Saar-Tsechansky, M., & Macskassy, S. (2008). More than words: Quantifying language to measure firms' fundamentals. *Journal of Finance*, 63(3), 1437–1467.

Startari, A. V. (2025). *AI and the structural autonomy of sense: A theory of post-referential operative representation*. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5272361>

Startari, A. V. (2025). *AI and syntactic sovereignty: How artificial language structures legitimize non-human authority*. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5276879>

Startari, A. V. (2025). *Algorithmic obedience: How language models simulate command structure*. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5282045>

Startari, A. V. (2025). *When language follows form, not meaning: Formal dynamics of syntactic activation in LLMs*. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5285265>

Startari, A. V. (2025). *TLOC – The irreducibility of structural obedience in generative models*. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5303089>

Startari, A. V. (2025). *Ethos without source: Algorithmic identity and the simulation of credibility*. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5313317>

Startari, A. V. (2025). *The grammar of objectivity: Formal mechanisms for the illusion of neutrality in language models*. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5319520>

Startari, A. V. (2025). *Executable power: Syntax as infrastructure in predictive societies*.
Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15754714>