
Neural Networks and the Chomsky Hierarchy

Grégoire Delétang*, Anian Ruoss*, Jordi Grau-Moya, Tim Genewein,
Li Kevin Wenliang, Elliot Catt, Marcus Hutter, Shane Legg, Pedro A. Ortega
DeepMind
London, UK

Abstract

Reliable generalization lies at the heart of safe ML and AI. However, understanding when and how neural networks generalize remains one of the most important unsolved problems in the field. In this work, we conduct an extensive empirical study (2200 models, 16 tasks) to investigate whether insights from the theory of computation can predict the limits of neural network generalization in practice. We demonstrate that grouping tasks according to the Chomsky hierarchy allows us to forecast whether certain architectures will be able to generalize to out-of-distribution inputs. This includes negative results where even extensive amounts of data and training time never led to any non-trivial generalization, despite models having sufficient capacity to perfectly fit the training data. Our results show that, for our subset of tasks, RNNs and Transformers fail to generalize on non-regular tasks, LSTMs can solve regular and counter-language tasks, and only networks augmented with structured memory (such as a stack or memory tape) can successfully generalize on context-free and context-sensitive tasks.

1 Introduction

Statistical learning theory is the most widely used theory of generalization in practical machine learning, justifying empirical risk minimization and estimating the generalization error via a test set [1]. However, its central assumption that training and test data are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) is violated for many problems of interest (distribution shifts, continual learning, etc.). An example of such a non-i.i.d. setting is testing generalization on sequence prediction problems, where an agent is trained with sequences of length $\ell \leq N$ and tested with arbitrarily longer sequences $\ell \gg N$. This problem is of particular importance since it subsumes all computable problems [2–6]. Central to sequence prediction is *inductive inference*, which consists of deriving a general rule from a finite set of concrete instances and using this rule to make predictions. For example, in *program induction* [7–14], the goal is to obtain a model that correctly identifies the underlying data-generating process given examples of input-output sequences. Then, if the model is correct, it can produce results in accordance with the generative process for previously unseen input sequences.

The key challenge of inductive inference (as opposed to deduction) is that it does not allow selecting one hypothesis with certainty among the ones that fit the data. For instance, the sequence 2, 4, 6, 8 has infinitely many possible continuations. Thus, any principle that selects a particular continuation requires additional assumptions that are independent of the data, i.e., inductive biases [15]. In machine learning, the network architecture, training mechanisms (e.g., gradient descent), and initial distributions over parameters all generate their corresponding inductive biases. This has led to a vast number of approaches for designing inductive biases via architectural and training protocol changes (see Battaglia et al. [16] for an overview). However, the problem is that stronger inductive biases generally come at the cost of decreasing the universality of a model, and thus finding a good balance between the two is one of the biggest challenges in the contemporary literature.

*Equal contribution. Correspondence to {gdelt, anianr}@deepmind.com.




Figure 1: Formal language classes and their correspondence with neural network architectures. *Left*: Our empirical evaluation locates the architectures on the hierarchy of formal language classes. *Right*: Each formal language class is associated with a minimal computational model (automaton) to recognize or generate the language (see Section 3). All automata have a finite-state controller at their core, in addition to increasingly restrictive memory access as we descend the hierarchy.

Even if a neural architecture is theoretically universal or Turing complete, gradient-based training, which cannot exhaustively search the parameter space, can impede finding the right solution and thus practically render the model non-universal. Therefore, both architectural and training limitations impact which sequence prediction problems can be solved by a model in practice. In formal language theory, the Chomsky hierarchy [17] classifies such (sequence prediction) problems in the order of increasing complexity. This hierarchy is associated with an equivalent hierarchy of models (automata) that are capable of solving different problem classes [2, 18]. Lower-level automata have restrictive memory models and can only solve lower-level problem sets, while Turing machines with infinite memory and unrestricted memory access lie on top of the hierarchy and can solve all computable problems. However, unlike for classical automata, a unified placement of neural architectures on the Chomsky hierarchy has not yet been practically established, which is precisely the goal of our work.

This work We conduct an extensive empirical study with the aim of discovering how neural network models used for program induction relate to the idealized computational models defined by the Chomsky hierarchy *in practice* (see Fig. 1 for a summary of our findings). We investigate whether the theoretical limitations of certain neural models hold in practice when trained with gradient-based methods. For instance, previous work has theoretically argued that RNNs are Turing complete [19]. However, more recent theoretical analyses [20–22] showed that RNNs lie much lower on the Chomsky hierarchy. To complement these theoretical analyses, we conduct a large-scale empirical evaluation on sequence prediction problems. We make the following main contributions:

- We conduct an extensive generalization study (2200 individual models, 16 tasks) of state-of-the-art neural network architectures (RNN [23], LSTM [24], Transformer [25]) and memory-augmented neural networks (Stack-RNN [26–34], NDStack-RNN [35, 36], Tape-RNN) on a battery of sequence-prediction tasks spanning all the levels of the Chomsky hierarchy that can be practically tested with finite-time computation.
- We show how increasing amounts of training data do not enable generalization on our tasks higher up in the hierarchy for some architectures (under sufficient capacity to perfectly learn the training data) potentially implying hard limitations for scaling laws [37].
- We demonstrate how architectures augmented with differentiable structured memory (e.g., with a stack or a tape) can solve tasks higher up the hierarchy.

2 Related work

Learning formal languages A long line of work has empirically investigated whether common machine learning architectures, including RNNs [23], GRUs [38], SCNs [39, 40], LSTMs [24], and Transformers [25], are capable of learning formal languages. The main insights are: RNNs and LSTMs can learn simple counting languages [41–43], as well as harder context-free languages, including palindromes [44] and the Dyck-1 language [45, 46]. However, to learn Dyck languages,

LSTMs require exponential memory in terms of the input length [47]. Similarly, Transformers cannot learn Dyck languages for long sequences [48]. Finally, LSTMs and SCNs are capable of learning simple context-sensitive languages, such as $a^n b^n c^n$ [49–51]. Thus, while prior work has investigated a single architecture on a restricted set of tasks under different experimental conditions, we provide a unified experimental protocol that spans the entire Chomsky hierarchy for a wide range of models.

Neural networks and the Chomsky hierarchy Neural networks were first related to the Chomsky hierarchy when it was theoretically shown that RNNs and Transformers are Turing complete [19, 52–54]. However, these results are impractical as they rely on an unbounded number of recurrent steps and on arbitrary numerical precision. Thus, more recent work has refined these theoretical analyses by considering linear computation steps and logarithmic precision, showing that: (i) RNNs, GRUs, and Transformers can, in theory, recognize regular languages, and (ii) LSTMs are strictly more powerful since they can learn a counting mechanism (i.e., are k-counter machines) [20–22, 55, 56]. Moreover, it was theoretically shown that Transformers are not well-aligned with the Chomsky hierarchy since they cannot recognize certain regular languages (e.g., periodic finite-state languages), while being able to learn some counter languages (e.g., Shuffle-Dyck and n -ary Boolean expressions) [57, 58]. A different approach proposed a computational model to capture the Transformer operations and used it to show which tasks could conceivably be learned by a Transformer (histograms, sorting, Dyck languages) [59]. However, this approach only upper-bounds the capabilities of a model and does not provide any insight on whether gradient-based methods will find parameters that can solve a task in practice, which is precisely the goal of our work. In that sense, our work complements the above studies by investigating how well gradient-based learning can exploit the structure of common machine learning architectures to recognize languages on different levels of the Chomsky hierarchy.

Memory-augmented networks Prior work has investigated how to augment standard architectures with external memory. A popular approach is to equip a recurrent network with read and write access to differentiable memory structures, such as deterministic stacks [26–34], nondeterministic stacks [35, 36], queues [31], random access memory [60, 61], and memory matrices [62–65]. These memory-augmented networks are capable of recognizing more complex languages, including tasks like copying, reversing, and sorting strings [62]. However, they can only perform one computation step per input token. Thus, to solve superlinear tasks (e.g., binary multiplication), memory-augmented networks also need to be able to perform a linear number of steps per token [66–68]. In a different effort, reinforcement learning has been applied to interact with discrete memory interfaces, by making deterministic memory operations amenable to gradient-based training [69, 70]. Finally, prior work also proposed networks with read-only memory access [71, 72] or spatiotemporal connections [73]. In this work, we also consider memory-augmented networks and find that memory structures are necessary to generalize on certain sequence prediction problems higher up in the Chomsky hierarchy.

3 Background

We now provide the necessary background on how to phrase sequence prediction as a formal language recognition problem [4], which allows us to link neural architectures and the Chomsky hierarchy. As we want to evaluate the capability of networks to generalize to sequences of unseen length, we need a way of generating arbitrarily long sequences that all exhibit the same structure. To that end, we will consider sequences as elements of infinite formal languages, which are generated by a grammar.

Formal language A formal language L is a set of words, where each word is a finite string of symbols drawn from a finite alphabet Σ . For example, with a binary alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ we can describe the following infinite languages: $A = \{0^n 1^m \mid n, m > 0\}$, the language of all strings that have at least one 0 followed by at least one 1 and no further 0; $B = \{w \mid w \text{ is a palindrome}\}$, the language of all binary palindromes; $C = \{ww \mid w \text{ is a word}\}$, the language of binary strings where the second half is a copy of the first half; and $D = \{w \mid w \text{ describes a terminating Turing machine}\}$, the language of all (binary encoded) programs that halt (on a universal Turing machine).

Generative grammar Languages of infinite cardinality can be generated with a finite alphabet and a finite generative grammar. A formal grammar [17] is defined by a finite set of terminal symbols, a finite set of non-terminal symbols, a distinctive start symbol, and a finite set of production rules that map from non-terminal symbols to other symbols. The set of all words that can be formed by such a

Table 1: Each grammar type (*left*) in the Chomsky hierarchy and its corresponding minimal automaton required for recognition or generation of the language (*center*) with its memory structure (*right*).

Grammar type (low \rightarrow high)	Automaton	Memory	Example
Regular (R)	Finite-state automaton (FSA)	Automaton state	A
Context-free (CF)	Push-down automaton (PDA)	+ infinite stack (only top entry accessible)	B
Context-sensitive (CS)	Linear bounded automaton (LBA)	+ bounded tape (all entries accessible)	C
Recursively enumerable (RE)	Turing machine (TM)	+ infinite tape (all entries accessible)	D

grammar is its corresponding formal language. Formal grammars can be classified into four types via the Chomsky hierarchy [17] according to the flexibility of allowable production rules. Remarkably, each grammar type corresponds to a minimal computational model for language generation and recognition. These models differ only in their memory structure and are listed in Table 1.

Recognizing a language An automaton recognizes a language if it accepts all strings in the language and does not accept any other strings. The Chomsky hierarchy classifies languages based on the type of automaton that can recognize it (see Table 1). For example, a regular language can be recognized by a FSA. All automata in the hierarchy have a finite state controller at their core, with state transitions being either deterministic or nondeterministic. Going up the hierarchy, automata have increasing flexibility in terms of memory access. For regular and recursively enumerable grammars, nondeterministic automata can always be translated into equivalent deterministic ones. For context-free languages this is not the case: Nondeterministic PDAs can recognize some context-free languages that cannot be recognized by any deterministic PDA. Thus, we refer to these languages as deterministic context-free (DCF) and nondeterministic context-free (NDCF) (see Fig. 1).

Language classes generated by higher grammar types subsume languages generated by those lower in the hierarchy, e.g., all regular languages are CF, all CF languages are CS, etc. In addition to the languages in the Chomsky hierarchy, we also consider finite languages, which only consist of a finite set of words and can be recognized by look-up tables. They form a proper subset of regular languages. Moreover, (real-time) counter languages are recognized by finite automata with one or more (infinite) counters (or, equivalently, a PDA with one or more stacks and a single stack symbol) [21]. Counter languages are a proper superset of regular languages and a proper subset of CS languages (see Fig. 1).

4 Methods

Problem setup While we use formal language theory to classify our tasks, learning to recognize formal languages is hard because finding appropriate negative examples is an ill-defined problem. Therefore, we evaluate our neural architectures on sequence prediction problems, since language recognition can be reformulated as such a problem [2–6]. Let $\mathbf{z} := (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k)$ denote a token sequence of length k representing a word in a language, i.e., $\mathbf{z} \in L$. Each token is an element of the alphabet $z_i \in \Sigma$ and takes the form of a one-hot vector of length $|\Sigma|$ where the j th entry of the i th one-hot token is $z_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$. We write subsequences of \mathbf{z} as $\mathbf{z}_i^j := (z_i, z_{i+1} \dots z_j)$ for $i < j$. The first part of \mathbf{z} is the *input sequence*, defined as $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{z}_1^\ell$, and the second part is the continuation of the sequence or *target sequence*, defined as $\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{z}_{\ell+1}^k$. The goal is to predict the target sequence given the input sequence. Our models are of the form $p_\theta(\cdot|\mathbf{x})$, which is a conditional distribution (with parameters θ) over the next possible sequence continuation. We use gradient-based training to minimize the average cross-entropy loss, where $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := -\frac{1}{\text{len}(\mathbf{y})} \sum_i y_i^T \log p_\theta(\cdot|\mathbf{x})$ denotes the per-example loss (see Algorithm A.1). We compute the per-sequence accuracy as the percentage of correctly predicted tokens, i.e., $A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \frac{1}{\text{len}(\mathbf{y})} \sum_i \mathbb{1}[\arg \max_j y_{ij} = \arg \max_j p_\theta(\cdot|\mathbf{x})_j]$. Moreover, we compute the overall performance score as the per-sequence accuracy averaged over all sequences of unseen length. We run our experiments over 10 different network parameter initialization seeds and report the maximum score instead of the average, as this better indicates if an architecture is capable of learning the right algorithm *at all*, (we provide the means and variances in Appendix B).

Tasks For each level of the Chomsky hierarchy, we choose a variety of different sequence prediction tasks ranging from modular arithmetic (R) to binary addition (CS). We list the tasks in Table 3 and provide a full formalization in Table A.1. Although seemingly simple, these tasks are well-known

Table 2: Neural architectures and their level in the Chomsky hierarchy as found by our experiments.

Level	Architecture	Description
R-	Transformer [25]	The encoder with stacked multi-head attention layers and dense layers.
R	RNN [23]	A classical RNN with ReLU activations.
R+	LSTM [24]	A classical LSTM.
DCF+	Stack-RNN [30, 32]	An RNN with an external stack, with PUSH, POP, and NO-OP actions.
NDCF	NDStack-RNN [35, 36]	An RNN with a nondeterministic stack, simulated using dynamic programming.
CS	Tape-RNN	An RNN with a finite tape, as in a Turing machine (similar to Baby-NTM [32]).

examples in the theory of computation and concisely demonstrate the key properties of the grammars in the Chomsky hierarchy, i.e., counting, repetition, long-distance dependencies, and hierarchy.

Architectures We consider a wide range of neural network architectures (overview in Table 2, full details in Appendix A), including state-of-the-art and memory-augmented models. We aim to have at least one model for each level in the Chomsky hierarchy and to evaluate commonly used architectures like Transformers and LSTMs. To obtain a model per level, we use a standard RNN as a controller and augment it with various differentiable memory structures: a deterministic stack, a nondeterministic stack, and a bounded tape. The stacks and tape have elements in \mathbb{R}^d with $d = 8$, and we ensure that the stack and tape sizes are large enough to simulate infinite memory during training and testing. The Stack-RNN [30] can perform any linear combination of PUSH, POP, and NO-OP operations on the stack. The NDStack-RNN [35, 36] simulates a nondeterministic stack by encoding an exponential number of stack configurations via dynamic programming. The Tape-RNN, which is inspired by the Baby-NTM [32], can perform any linear combination of WRITE-LEFT, WRITE-RIGHT, WRITE-STAY, JUMP-RIGHT, JUMP-LEFT (details in Appendix A). Finally, for the Transformer [25], we compute the output from the encoder model that overlooks the whole input sequence. We consider four different positional encodings: none, classical sin/cos [25], ALiBi [74], and the relative positional encoding proposed for Transformer-XL [75]. The latter two have been shown to allow extrapolation to longer sequences on some language modeling tasks. All models receive the tokens x as an input and are expected to produce the output y (i.e., we do not feed the output back to the input unlike sequence-to-sequence models [76]).

Data generation Instead of using fixed-size datasets, we define training and test distributions from which we continually sample sequences. We define the maximum training sequence length as the *training range* N . Every mini-batch is generated by first sampling a length ℓ from the uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(1, N)$ and then sampling sequences of length ℓ from the task’s generative grammar. For testing, the sequence length ℓ is sampled from $\mathcal{U}(N + 1, M)$, with $N = 40$ and $M = 500$.

We make all our code publicly available at https://github.com/deepmind/neural_networks_chomsky_hierarchy.

5 Results

In this section, we provide the results of our empirical evaluation. In Section 5.1 we relate the networks to the Chomsky hierarchy, in Section 5.2 we analyze the algorithms learned by the networks, in Section 5.3 we investigate how much training data is needed to learn the data-generating grammar, and in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 we discuss the performance of LSTMs and Transformers in more detail.

5.1 Main result

We evaluated the performance of all architectures (defined in Table 2) on all tasks (defined in Table A.1). Table 3 shows the generalization accuracy averaged over the segment $\mathcal{U}(N + 1, M)$, as mentioned in Section 4. Fig. 2 displays the accuracy per sequence length for the best-performing model per architecture on three different tasks (we visualize the remaining tasks in Appendix B). As the evaluation sequences have not been seen during training, we can gauge whether the architectures can learn the “correct” algorithm. Note that networks may be evaluated on unseen sequences even within the training range, as we are sampling from a training distribution and not a finite dataset

Table 3: Accuracy A (see Section 4) averaged over all test lengths and maximized over 10 random seeds. We consider a model to generalize successfully (bold) if the average accuracy is above 0.90. The accuracy of a random policy is 0.5 (except for the two modular arithmetic tasks and Equal Repeats where it is 0.2 and 0.3, respectively). We observe that RNNs with less restrictive memory structures can solve more tasks. The \star denotes counting languages, which can be solved by LSTMs.

Level	Task	RNN	Stack-RNN	NDStack-RNN	Tape-RNN	Transformer	LSTM
R	Even Pairs	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.62	1.00
	Modular Arithmetic (Simple)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.22	1.00
	Parity Check	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.60	1.00
DCF	Compare Occurrence \star	0.94	1.00	0.96	1.00	0.98	0.95
	Modular Arithmetic	0.38	0.82	0.40	0.90	0.31	0.64
	Reverse String	0.61	1.00	0.62	1.00	0.55	0.60
	Solve Equation	0.44	0.52	0.55	0.49	0.27	0.27
	Stack Manipulation	0.55	1.00	0.55	1.00	0.53	0.63
NDCF	Equal Repeats \star	0.47	0.53	0.51	1.00	0.75	0.99
	NDStack Manipulation	0.54	0.96	0.55	1.00	0.55	0.62
	Missing Palindrome	0.54	0.57	0.53	0.67	0.66	0.55
	Divide by 2 \star	0.54	0.81	0.58	0.64	0.52	0.51
CS	Binary Addition	0.50	0.52	0.50	0.74	0.50	0.55
	Duplicate String	0.50	0.53	0.51	1.00	0.54	0.59
	Interlocked Pairing \star	0.52	0.94	0.52	0.99	0.61	0.99
	Odds First	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.72	0.54	0.55




Figure 2: Performance curves on three tasks. The dashed vertical red line is the training range, meaning that sequences to the right have not been seen during training and thus measure generalization.

(as discussed in Section 4). Thus, it is possible that some models do not achieve a perfect accuracy within the training range $\mathcal{U}(1, N)$, such as Transformers on Modular Arithmetic (DCF).

We observe that the networks roughly match the computational models associated with the Chomsky hierarchy: RNNs can solve tasks up to the regular level, Stack-RNNs up to the DCF level, and Tape-RNNs up to the CS level. However, the match is not perfect, as some architectures can solve tasks beyond their supposed level, e.g., Stack-RNN on NDStack Manipulation (NDCF) and Interlocked Pairing (CS). Preliminary investigations suggest that Stack-RNNs can learn to implement multiple counters (leveraging the multidimensionality of each stack entry) and (very simple) nondeterministic PDA (details in Appendix B). Moreover, certain architectures cannot solve all tasks at or below their supposed level in the Chomsky hierarchy, e.g., Stack-RNN and Tape-RNN on Solve Equation (DCF), which may be due to shortcomings in the architecture, the training protocol, or due to the particular difficulty of the task. The NDStack-RNN fails on most tasks beyond regular, potentially due to its large action space (24 actions) and the difficulty of training a tensor that tracks all possible stack values. Finally, we observe that Transformers and LSTMs are even less aligned with the Chomsky hierarchy: Transformers fail on regular tasks, while LSTMs can solve tasks more difficult than regular. We discuss both cases in more detail below (Sections 5.4 and 5.5).




Figure 3: Analysis of the internal representations and memory dynamics of an RNN on a regular task, a Stack-RNN on a DCF task, and a Tape-RNN on a CS task. The reverse-engineered network mechanisms are indicative of the correct algorithms that solve the corresponding tasks.


5.2 Analysis of learned program structure

To provide further evidence supporting the claim that some of the networks are able to learn the data-generating grammars, we now provide an analysis of solutions learned by some of our networks on our tasks, by investigating internal state representations and memory-update dynamics.

Regular tasks According to the Chomsky hierarchy, we expect networks that solve regular tasks to simulate a finite-state automaton. We investigate this hypothesis by analyzing the internal states of the RNN controller and checking whether they are finite (or form a finite number of clusters). Figure 3a shows a scatter plot of a PCA projection of the internal RNN states when trained on Parity Check (R). We observe that the states form four clusters, each representing one of the four values of the tuple (subsequence result, last token seen). In principle, one can solve this task with only two states, corresponding to the subsequence result: if the state is 1 and the input token is 1, move to state 0, otherwise stay in state 1, and finally output the state itself. However, due to the problem symmetry, the network also learns to compute the parity of the number of zeros in the string, therefore adding another two states to the computation. We also investigate whether and how Stack-RNNs use their stack for this task, which is unnecessary, in principle. Indeed, the Stack-RNNs only use NO-OP or POP (which is equivalent to NO-OP in the absence of PUSH) actions, indicating that the RNN controller uses only a finite-state automaton and does not rely on the stack (see Appendix B.2 for more details).

Deterministic context-free tasks On DCF tasks, we anticipate Stack-RNNs to use their stack. Indeed, on Reverse String (DCF), the networks learn the expected algorithm: PUSH until an empty token appears, and then POP until the stack is empty. Moreover, the internal state of the controller seems to be largely guided by the last input token and not the last state (details in Appendix B.2). On Modular Arithmetic (DCF), which requires a stack to remember past results when entering a new bracket, the networks use the stack exactly as expected. Figure 3b shows that the Stack-RNN learns to solve this task by: (i) pushing the last result when a bracket is opened, (ii) not operating on the stack and only using its internal controller when a number or an operator is seen, and (iii) popping the last result from the stack when a bracket is closed. The top plot reports the probability of each action given an input, and the bottom plot shows the stack evolution along the sequence. On the bottom plot, the x-axis is the timestep and the y-axis is the cell position in the stack (top of the stack on the bottom). Each cell is colored according to the first principal component of its actual content.

Context-sensitive tasks In contrast to the RNN and Stack-RNN, the reverse-engineered network mechanisms for the Tape-RNN are less interpretable. Nevertheless, Fig. 3c shows that the Tape-RNN has learned an algorithm that is indicative of the data-generating grammar of the Duplicate String (CS) task. The input to the network consists of the sequence a, a, b, a of length $\ell = 4$, followed by 2ℓ α -symbols that the RNN can use to compute and manipulate the tape, followed by 2ℓ β -symbols used to output the result (i.e., the sequence a, a, b, a, a, a, b, a of length 2ℓ). The panels show the action probabilities and memory contents over time. We observe that up to time $t = 5$ the



(a) Maximum accuracy (over 10 different random seeds) per length for different training ranges (in color). (b) Score per training range (min, max, and mean taken over 10 random seeds).

Figure 4: Phase transition effect for the Stack-RNN on Reverse String (DCF). For training ranges $N < 10$, the model fails to generalize to longer sequences as it memorizes the training distribution. The score in Fig. 4b is the accuracy shown in Fig. 4a averaged over sequence lengths (x-axis).

RNN writes on the memory with WRITE-LEFT. Then, on time-step 6 the RNN mixes JUMP-RIGHT and WRITE-STAY to duplicate the input string in the memory, before moving back to the initial position with JUMP-RIGHT on time-step 7. After this, the RNN idles using WRITE-STAY until it reaches the first β -symbol, whereupon it starts outputting the result using WRITE-LEFT actions.

5.3 Phase transition under increasing training ranges

For certain tasks and architectures we observe a substantial “phase transition” of the test accuracy for different training ranges. For example, Fig. 4 shows the generalization performance of Stack-RNNs on the Reverse String (DCF) task for different training ranges. Clearly, the models fail to learn the data-generating algorithm when only exposed to sequences of length smaller than 10. We hypothesize that for small training ranges the networks overfit to the training data, essentially learning a lookup table to recognize the small finite language. In contrast, larger training ranges encourage the networks to learn the data-generating algorithm that generalizes to sequences of unseen length.


5.4 LSTMs

LSTMs are similar to RNNs in the sense that they also carry a hidden state and are unrolled on a sequence of inputs. However, prior work showed that LSTMs are more powerful than RNNs because they can also solve counting tasks, i.e., implement k-counter machines [20, 21, 49–51]. Our results in Table 3 provide further supporting evidence for this claim as LSTMs are capable of solving the following tasks almost perfectly: Compare Occurrence (DCF), Equal Repeats (NDCF), Interlocked Pairing (CS). While these (counting) tasks reside on higher levels than regular in the Chomsky hierarchy, they can be solved by using a finite set of (real-time) counters.

5.5 Transformers

Unlike the other architectures we consider, Transformers are *permutation invariant* w.r.t. the position of a token in a sequence, since they rely on a global attention mechanism under the hood. As a result, Transformers are more scalable since all tokens can be processed in parallel, however, at the cost of reduced expressivity. In particular, most tasks are not permutation invariant: For instance, reversing a string clearly depends on the position of the tokens. To overcome this problem, Transformers are usually augmented with positional encodings, which are added to the tokens to simulate some notion of position (as the Transformer itself has none). Consequently, the augmented tokens contain position as an intrinsic property, meaning that a token x at position 0 is no longer considered the same as the same token x at position 10. As described in Section 4, we evaluate a variety of different encodings.

Table 3 shows that Transformers can only solve Compare Occurrence (DCF), which is position-invariant as it only needs to check whether there are more 0’s or 1’s in a binary string. For all other tasks, Transformers fail to generalize to sequences of unseen length, regardless of their positional encodings (see Fig. 5a for the performance on Reverse String (DCF)). We hypothesize that this is due to the positional encodings, which take on new values when the sequences grow longer (even for relative encodings), meaning that the network activations will be out-of-distribution. Indeed, Fig. 5b



(a) Accuracy per length by positional encoding. (b) First layer activations (PCA) by sequence length.

Figure 5: Analysis of Transformers on Reverse String (DCF). Transformers generally fail to generalize to sequences of unseen length. Without positional encodings, Transformers are permutation invariant, and with encodings they encounter out-of-distribution position values for longer sequences.

shows that the 2D PCA of the first layer activations is similar for sequences of length 40 (i.e., the training range, in blue) and 42 (in orange), but completely different for length 150 (in green). All other models, which do not rely on global self-attention, do not suffer from this effect, as they only have access to a local view of the input token (and, potentially, a local memory reading).

6 Discussion

In this paper, we considered generalization from a sequence prediction viewpoint, using formal language theory to establish the computational complexity of each task. Naturally, we had to choose a maximum test sequence length for our evaluations, which theoretically renders all of our languages finite. However, our sequences share the structure of an infinite language, allowing us to measure generalization by testing on input sequences that are significantly longer than those seen during training (and are thus out-of-distribution). Therefore, observing successful generalization in our setting is strong evidence that the network has learned the “correct” algorithm. However, for some tasks where we consider generalization to be successful we still see a slight degradation of the accuracy as the test length increases. This is a result of implementing finite state machines and memory updates with a neural network trained via SGD: Even slight numerical inaccuracies in state-transitions or memory dynamics might accumulate when increasing the test sequence length.

Our experiments indicate that RNNs, LSTMs, and Transformers, admittedly powerful architectures, are fairly limited in terms of their ability to generalize to longer inputs. However, this result must be contrasted with their ability to generalize and detect/extrapolate patterns for fixed size inputs or fixed size context windows. Transformers, for instance, are capable of learning complex and highly structured generalization patterns, but they cannot overcome the limitation of not having an extendable memory (which only becomes apparent when probed as in our experiments). This might also imply hard limits for scaling laws [37] in the sense that even significantly increasing the amount of training data and the size of a Transformer are insufficient for it to “climb the Chomsky hierarchy”.

Limitations Although our results are consistent with prior theoretical analyses [20–22], and suggest that we can group neural network architectures according to the Chomsky hierarchy, the claims we can make are limited to our empirical study. In particular, we cannot guarantee that no tasks exist higher in the hierarchy (Fig. 1) that an architecture could solve. Similarly, we cannot guarantee that no tasks exist lower or on the same level of the hierarchy (Fig. 1) that an architecture cannot solve. Moreover, without extracting and analyzing the automata implemented by the networks, we cannot strictly claim that our architectures generalize to arbitrary-length inputs, as we only test up to a maximum length. Finally, all our results are w.r.t. our precise experimental setting, i.e., if an architecture fails to generalize we cannot rule out that there exists a weight configuration that would solve the task; we were simply unable to find such a configuration with our training protocol.

7 Conclusion

We leveraged the theory of computation to better understand how and why neural networks generalize on algorithmic sequence prediction tasks. Our extensive empirical evaluation demonstrates that there

is a model hierarchy on the tasks we investigated, which are representative of the different levels of the Chomsky hierarchy. In particular, we showed that state-of-the-art architectures, such as LSTMs and Transformers, cannot solve seemingly simple tasks, such as duplicating a string, when evaluated on sequences that are significantly longer than those seen during training. Moreover, we showed that models interacting with an external memory structure, such as a stack or a finite tape, can climb the Chomsky hierarchy, indicating a promising direction for improvements in architecture design.

Acknowledgments

We thank Ann He, Chris Dyer, Joel Veness, Markus Kunesch, and Tom McGrath for their helpful feedback and insightful conversations.

References

- [1] Vladimir Vapnik. *Statistical learning theory*. Wiley, 1998.
- [2] Michael Sipser. *Introduction to the theory of computation*. PWS Publishing Company, 1997.
- [3] A. P. Dawid. Present position and potential developments: Some personal views: Statistical theory: The prequential approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*, 1984.
- [4] Ray J. Solomonoff. Algorithmic probability: Theory and applications. In *Information Theory and Statistical Learning*. Springer US, 2009.
- [5] Ray J. Solomonoff. Algorithmic probability, heuristic programming and agi. In *Proceedings of the 3d Conference on Artificial General Intelligence (2010)*, 2010.
- [6] Elaine Rich. *Automata, Computability, and Complexity Theory and Applications*. Pearson Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, 2007.
- [7] Peter Nordin. *Evolutionary program induction of binary machine code and its applications*. PhD thesis, Dortmund University of Technology, 1997.
- [8] Percy Liang, Michael I. Jordan, and Dan Klein. Learning dependency-based compositional semantics. *Comput. Linguistics*, 2013.
- [9] Mark Wineberg and Franz Oppacher. A representation scheme to perform program induction in a canonical genetic algorithm. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature - PPSN III, International Conference on Evolutionary Computation*, 1994.
- [10] Ray J. Solomonoff. A formal theory of inductive inference. part I. *Inf. Control.*, 1964.
- [11] Ray J. Solomonoff. A formal theory of inductive inference. part II. *Inf. Control.*, 1964.
- [12] John H. Holland. *Adaptation in Natural and Artificial Systems: An Introductory Analysis with Applications to Biology, Control, and Artificial Intelligence*. MIT Press, 1992.
- [13] David E. Goldberg. *Genetic Algorithms in Search Optimization and Machine Learning*. Addison-Wesley, 1989.
- [14] Faustino J. Gomez, Jürgen Schmidhuber, and Risto Miikkulainen. Accelerated neural evolution through cooperatively coevolved synapses. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2008.
- [15] Tom M. Mitchell. The need for biases in learning generalizations. Technical report, Rutgers University, 1980.
- [16] Peter W. Battaglia, Jessica B. Hamrick, Victor Bapst, Alvaro Sanchez-Gonzalez, Vinícius Flores Zambaldi, Mateusz Malinowski, Andrea Tacchetti, David Raposo, Adam Santoro, Ryan Faulkner, Çağlar Gülçehre, H. Francis Song, Andrew J. Ballard, Justin Gilmer, George E. Dahl, Ashish Vaswani, Kelsey R. Allen, Charles Nash, Victoria Langston, Chris Dyer, Nicolas Heess, Daan Wierstra, Pushmeet Kohli, Matthew M. Botvinick, Oriol Vinyals, Yujia Li, and Razvan Pascanu. Relational inductive biases, deep learning, and graph networks. *CoRR*, 2018.

- [17] Noam Chomsky. Three models for the description of language. *IRE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 1956.
- [18] John E. Savage. *Models of computation - exploring the power of computing*. Addison-Wesley, 1998.
- [19] Hava T. Siegelmann and Eduardo D. Sontag. Analog computation via neural networks. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 1994.
- [20] Gail Weiss, Yoav Goldberg, and Eran Yahav. On the practical computational power of finite precision rnns for language recognition. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2018.
- [21] William Merrill. Sequential neural networks as automata. *CoRR*, 2019.
- [22] Joshua Ackerman and George Cybenko. A survey of neural networks and formal languages. *CoRR*, 2020.
- [23] Jeffrey L. Elman. Finding structure in time. *Cogn. Sci.*, 1990.
- [24] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural Comput.*, 1997.
- [25] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, 2017.
- [26] Sreerupa Das, C. Lee Giles, and Guo-Zheng Sun. Learning context-free grammars: Capabilities and limitations of a recurrent neural network with an external stack memory. In *Fourteenth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 1992.
- [27] Sreerupa Das, C. Lee Giles, and Guo-Zheng Sun. Using prior knowledge in a NNPDa to learn context-free languages. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 5*, 1992.
- [28] Michael Mozer and Sreerupa Das. A connectionist symbol manipulator that discovers the structure of context-free languages. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 5*, 1992.
- [29] G. Z. Sun, C. L. Giles, H. H. Chen, and Y. C. Lee. The neural network pushdown automaton: model, stack and learning simulations. Technical report, University of Maryland, 1993.
- [30] Armand Joulin and Tomáš Mikolov. Inferring algorithmic patterns with stack-augmented recurrent nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, 2015.
- [31] Edward Grefenstette, Karl Moritz Hermann, Mustafa Suleyman, and Phil Blunsom. Learning to transduce with unbounded memory. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, 2015.
- [32] Mirac Suzgun, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yonatan Belinkov, and Stuart M. Shieber. Memory-augmented recurrent neural networks can learn generalized dyck languages. *CoRR*, 2019.
- [33] Yiding Hao, William Merrill, Dana Angluin, Robert Frank, Noah Amsel, Andrew Benz, and Simon Mendelsohn. Context-free transductions with neural stacks. In *Proceedings of the Workshop: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, 2018.
- [34] Dani Yogatama, Yishu Miao, Gábor Melis, Wang Ling, Adhiguna Kuncoro, Chris Dyer, and Phil Blunsom. Memory architectures in recurrent neural network language models. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [35] Brian DuSell and David Chiang. Learning context-free languages with nondeterministic stack rnns. In *Proceedings of the 24th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, 2020.
- [36] Brian DuSell and David Chiang. Learning hierarchical structures with differentiable nondeterministic stacks. *CoRR*, 2021.

- [37] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *CoRR*, 2020.
- [38] Kyunghyun Cho, Bart van Merriënboer, Çağlar Gülçehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. Learning phrase representations using RNN encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2014.
- [39] Jordan B. Pollack. The induction of dynamical recognizers. *Mach. Learn.*, 1991.
- [40] C. Lee Giles, Clifford B. Miller, Dong Chen, Hsing-Hen Chen, Guo-Zheng Sun, and Yee-Chun Lee. Learning and extracting finite state automata with second-order recurrent neural networks. *Neural Comput.*, 1992.
- [41] Janet Wiles and Jeff Elman. Learning to count without a counter: A case study of dynamics and activation landscapes in recurrent networks. In *Seventeenth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 1995.
- [42] Mark Steijvers and Peter Grünwald. A recurrent network that performs a context-sensitive prediction task. In *Eighteenth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 1996.
- [43] Steffen Hölldobler, Yvonne Kalinke, and Helko Lehmann. Designing a counter: Another case study of dynamics and activation landscapes in recurrent networks. In *Advances in Artificial Intelligence, 21st Annual German Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 1997.
- [44] Paul Rodriguez and Janet Wiles. Recurrent neural networks can learn to implement symbol-sensitive counting. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 10*, 1997.
- [45] Natalia Skachkova, Thomas Alexander Trost, and Dietrich Klakow. Closing brackets with recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the Workshop: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, 2018.
- [46] Mirac Suzgun, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yonatan Belinkov, and Stuart M. Shieber. LSTM networks can perform dynamic counting. *CoRR*, 2019.
- [47] Luzi Sennhauser and Robert C. Berwick. Evaluating the ability of lstms to learn context-free grammars. In *Proceedings of the Workshop: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, 2018.
- [48] Javid Ebrahimi, Dhruv Gelda, and Wei Zhang. How can self-attention networks recognize dyck-n languages? In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2020.
- [49] Felix A. Gers and Jürgen Schmidhuber. LSTM recurrent networks learn simple context-free and context-sensitive languages. *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks*, 2001.
- [50] Mikael Bodén and Janet Wiles. Context-free and context-sensitive dynamics in recurrent neural networks. *Connect. Sci.*, 2000.
- [51] Mikael Bodén and Janet Wiles. On learning context-free and context-sensitive languages. *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks*, 2002.
- [52] Yining Chen, Sorcha Gilroy, Andreas Maletti, Jonathan May, and Kevin Knight. Recurrent neural networks as weighted language recognizers. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2018.
- [53] Jorge Pérez, Javier Marinkovic, and Pablo Barceló. On the turing completeness of modern neural network architectures. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [54] Jorge Pérez, Pablo Barceló, and Javier Marinkovic. Attention is turing-complete. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2021.
- [55] Samuel A. Korsky and Robert C. Berwick. On the computational power of rnns. *CoRR*, 2019.

- [56] William Merrill, Gail Weiss, Yoav Goldberg, Roy Schwartz, Noah A. Smith, and Eran Yahav. A formal hierarchy of RNN architectures. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2020.
- [57] Satwik Bhattamishra, Kabir Ahuja, and Navin Goyal. On the ability and limitations of transformers to recognize formal languages. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2020.
- [58] Michael Hahn. Theoretical limitations of self-attention in neural sequence models. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 2020.
- [59] Gail Weiss, Yoav Goldberg, and Eran Yahav. Thinking like transformers. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [60] Karol Kurach, Marcin Andrychowicz, and Ilya Sutskever. Neural random-access machines. In *4th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2016.
- [61] Ivo Danihelka, Greg Wayne, Benigno Uria, Nal Kalchbrenner, and Alex Graves. Associative long short-term memory. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016.
- [62] Alex Graves, Greg Wayne, and Ivo Danihelka. Neural turing machines. *CoRR*, 2014.
- [63] Greg Yang and Alexander M. Rush. Lie-access neural turing machines. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [64] Alex Graves, Greg Wayne, Malcolm Reynolds, Tim Harley, Ivo Danihelka, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, Sergio Gomez Colmenarejo, Edward Grefenstette, Tiago Ramalho, John P. Agapiou, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, Karl Moritz Hermann, Yori Zwols, Georg Ostrovski, Adam Cain, Helen King, Christopher Summerfield, Phil Blunsom, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Demis Hassabis. Hybrid computing using a neural network with dynamic external memory. *Nat.*, 2016.
- [65] Çağlar Gülçehre, Sarath Chandar, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. Dynamic neural turing machine with continuous and discrete addressing schemes. *Neural Comput.*, 2018.
- [66] Lukasz Kaiser and Ilya Sutskever. Neural gpu learn algorithms. In *4th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2016.
- [67] Eric Price, Wojciech Zaremba, and Ilya Sutskever. Extensions and limitations of the neural GPU. *CoRR*, 2016.
- [68] Karlis Freivalds and Renars Liepins. Improving the neural GPU architecture for algorithm learning. *CoRR*, 2017.
- [69] Wojciech Zaremba and Ilya Sutskever. Reinforcement learning neural turing machines. *CoRR*, 2015.
- [70] Wojciech Zaremba, Tomáš Mikolov, Armand Joulin, and Rob Fergus. Learning simple algorithms from examples. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016.
- [71] Jason Weston, Sumit Chopra, and Antoine Bordes. Memory networks. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- [72] Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Arthur Szlam, Jason Weston, and Rob Fergus. End-to-end memory networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, 2015.
- [73] Nal Kalchbrenner, Ivo Danihelka, and Alex Graves. Grid long short-term memory. In *4th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2016.
- [74] Ofir Press, Noah A. Smith, and Mike Lewis. Train short, test long: Attention with linear biases enables input length extrapolation. *CoRR*, 2021.

- [75] Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime G. Carbonell, Quoc Viet Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Transformer-xl: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context. In *Proceedings of the 57th Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019.
- [76] Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V. Le. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27*, 2014.
- [77] James Bradbury, Roy Frostig, Peter Hawkins, Matthew James Johnson, Chris Leary, Dougal Maclaurin, George Necula, Adam Paszke, Jake VanderPlas, Skye Wanderman-Milne, and Qiao Zhang. JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs, 2018. URL <http://github.com/google/jax>.
- [78] Igor Babuschkin, Kate Baumli, Alison Bell, Surya Bhupatiraju, Jake Bruce, Peter Buchlovsky, David Budden, Trevor Cai, Aidan Clark, Ivo Danihelka, Claudio Fantacci, Jonathan Godwin, Chris Jones, Tom Hennigan, Matteo Hessel, Steven Kapturowski, Thomas Keck, Iurii Kemaev, Michael King, Lena Martens, Vladimir Mikulik, Tamara Norman, John Quan, George Papamakarios, Roman Ring, Francisco Ruiz, Alvaro Sanchez, Rosalia Schneider, Eren Sezener, Stephen Spencer, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Wojciech Stokowiec, and Fabio Viola. The DeepMind JAX Ecosystem, 2020. URL <http://github.com/deepmind>.
- [79] Matteo Hessel, David Budden, Fabio Viola, Mihaela Rosca, Eren Sezener, and Tom Hennigan. Optax: composable gradient transformation and optimisation, in jax!, 2020. URL <http://github.com/deepmind/optax>.
- [80] Tom Hennigan, Trevor Cai, Tamara Norman, and Igor Babuschkin. Haiku: Sonnet for JAX, 2020. URL <http://github.com/deepmind/dm-haiku>.
- [81] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.

A Experimental details

A.1 Models

Here we describe our neural architectures in more detail. All models have a final linear readout layer to produce the output logits. We do not use any regularization, e.g., weight decay, dropout, etc. For training of the memory-augmented models, we set the tape size to twice the maximum sequence length encountered during training (i.e., twice the training range N , see Section 4) and the stack size to $N + 10$, and manually increase their sizes when testing on longer sequences. Note that increasing the memory size does not affect how the RNN controller takes actions, since it only has access to a local view of the external memory (e.g., the top of the stack or the current memory cell).

RNN A vanilla single-layer RNN [23] with hidden size of 256.

Stack-RNN A single-layer RNN controller of hidden size 256 with access to a differentiable stack [30]. The controller can perform any linear combination of PUSH, POP, and NO-OP on the stack, with action weights given by a softmax over a linear readout of the RNN output.

NDStack-RNN A single-layer RNN controller of hidden size 256 with access to a differentiable nondeterministic stack. We consider the NDStack-RNN proposed by DuSell and Chiang [35, 36], which simulates a nondeterministic stack via dynamic programming. Concretely, we use normalized actions and nondeterministic state reading with two states and two symbols (except for the modular arithmetic tasks, where we use five symbols). We did not use unnormalized actions as suggested in DuSell and Chiang [36] because we found the training to be very unstable, i.e., we got NaN losses and gradients despite following the tricks in the original code.

Tape-RNN A single-layer RNN controller of hidden size 256 with access to a differentiable tape, inspired by the Baby-NTM architecture [32]. The controller can perform any linear combination of WRITE-RIGHT, WRITE-LEFT, WRITE-STAY, JUMP-LEFT, and JUMP-RIGHT on the tape, with action weights given by a softmax. The actions correspond to: writing at the current position and moving to the right (WRITE-RIGHT), writing at the current position and moving to the left (WRITE-LEFT), writing at the current position (WRITE-STAY), jumping ℓ steps to the right without writing (JUMP-RIGHT), where ℓ is the length of the input, and jumping ℓ steps to the left without writing (JUMP-LEFT). Finally, to allow the Tape-RNN to perform memory operations without having to produce the output, we append “computation” tokens \square (different from the empty tokens \emptyset used to produce the output, see Appendix A.4 below) to the input sequence.

LSTM A vanilla single-layer LSTM [24] of hidden size 256.

Stack-LSTM A single-layer LSTM controller of hidden size 256 with access to a differentiable stack [30]. The only difference to the Stack-RNN is that this model uses an LSTM as the controller.

Transformer A vanilla Transformer [25], however considering only the encoder model. We do not use the autoregressive sequence-to-sequence model to produce the output but attend the whole input (including the empty tokens \emptyset). We use five blocks with $d_{model} = 64$, where each block is composed of an attention layer, two dense layers, and a layer normalization. We add a residual connection as in the original architecture [25]. We consider four different positional encodings: none, classical/sin [25], ALiBi [74], and the relative positional encoding proposed for Transformer-XL [75].

A.2 Tasks

Here, we describe our tasks (listed in Table A.1) in more detail. As mentioned in Section 4, all tasks consist of an input sequence x from which the models have to predict the target sequence y . The concatenation of these two sequences z represents a word in a formal language, i.e., $z \in L$. Thus, we describe the languages corresponding to each task below. For tasks with a target sequences of length $m > 1$, we append m empty tokens \emptyset to the input sequence, such that the models can process the entire input sequence before having to produce the output.

Even Pairs (R) Given a binary sequence, e.g., $x = aabba$, compute if the number of abs and bas is even. For $aabba$, we have one ab and ba , meaning that the total number is 2 and thus even, i.e., $y = b$ (where we arbitrarily equate odd with a and even with b).

Modular Arithmetic (Simple) (R) Given a sequence of numbers in $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and operations in $\{+, -, \cdot\}$, compute the result modulo 5. For example, $x = 1 + 2 - 4$ evaluates to $y = 4$.

Parity Check (R) Given a binary string, e.g., $aaabba$, compute if the number of bs is even. The sequence $x = aaabba$ contains 2 bs , which is even, i.e., $y = b$ (where we arbitrarily equate odd with a and even with b).

Compare Occurrence (DCF) Given a binary string, check whether the number of as is bigger than the number of bs . For example, $x = aabba$ contains 3 as and 2 bs , i.e., there are more as and thus $y = a$.

Modular Arithmetic (DCF) Given a sequence of numbers in $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$, brackets, and operations in $\{+, -, \cdot\}$, compute the result modulo 5. For example, the sequence $x = -(1-2) \cdot (4-3 \cdot (-2))$ evaluates to $y = 0$.

Reverse String (DCF) Given a binary string, e.g., $x = aabba$, compute its reverse, i.e., $y = abbaa$.

Solve Equation (DCF) Given an equation consisting of numbers in $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$, brackets, operations in $\{+, -, \cdot\}$, and an unknown variable x , compute the value of x such that the equation holds modulo 5. For example, $x = -(x-2) \cdot (4-3 \cdot (-2)) = 0$ modulo 5 holds for $x = 1$, i.e., $y = 1$.

Stack Manipulation (DCF) Given a binary string representing a stack's content and a sequence of PUSH or POP actions, execute the actions on the stack and return the final stack content. For example, executing the sequence POP PUSH POP on the stack $aabba$, i.e., $x = aabba$ POP PUSH POP, results in the stack $y = abba$.

Equal Repeats (NDCF) Given a sequence of the form $a^l b^m a^n$, where either $n = m$, $m = l$, or $n = l$, classify whether $l = m$ (case 0), $m = n$ (case 1), or $n = l$ (case 2). If $l = m = n$, the class is arbitrarily 0. For example, for $x = aabbaaaa$ we have $m = n$, and thus the result is $y = 1$.

NDStack Manipulation (NDCF) As in the Stack Manipulation task, we are given a binary string that represents the stack's content and a sequence of PUSH and POP actions. However, one of the actions is replaced by an empty token and only provided at the end of the input sequence. The output is the stack after having performed all the operations with the omitted action at its correct place. For example, for the stack $aabba$ and the sequence of actions POP _ POP | PUSH, i.e., $x = aabba$ POP _ POP | PUSH, with _ denoting the location of the omitted action (i.e., PUSH) and | signalling the end of the action sequence, the resulting stack is $y = abba$.

Missing Palindrome (NDCF) Given a binary palindrome with one omitted token, e.g., $x = a_baabaa$, deduce its value, i.e., $y = a$ (to obtain $aabaabaa$).

Divide by 2 (NDCF) Given a string of the form $a^{(n-1)} b a^m$, output a string of the form $a^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} b a^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + m}$. For example, the output corresponding to $x = aaabaaaa$ is $y = aabaaaaa$.

Binary Addition (CS) Given two binary numbers, e.g., 10010 and 101, compute their sum in base 2, i.e., $y = 10111$ for $x = 10010 + 101$.

Duplicate String (CS) Given a binary string, e.g., $x = abaab$, output the string twice, i.e., $y = abaababaab$.

Table A.1: Our tasks with their level in the Chomsky hierarchy and example input/output pairs.

Level	Name	Example Input	Example Output
R	Even Pairs	<i>aabba</i>	True
	Modular Arithmetic (Simple)	$1 + 2 - 4$	4
	Parity Check	<i>aaabba</i>	True
DCF	Compare Occurrence	<i>aabba</i>	True
	Modular Arithmetic	$-(1 - 2) \cdot (4 - 3 \cdot (-2))$	0
	Reverse String	<i>aabba</i>	<i>abbaa</i>
	Solve Equation	$-(x - 2) \cdot (4 - 3 \cdot (-2)) = 0$	1
	Stack Manipulation	<i>aabba</i> POP PUSH POP	<i>abba</i>
NDCF	Equal Repeats	<i>aabbbaaa</i>	1
	NDStack Manipulation	<i>aabba</i> POP _ POP PUSH	<i>abba</i>
	Missing Palindrome	<i>a_baabaa</i>	a
	Divide by 2	<i>aaabaaaa</i>	<i>aaabaaaa</i>
CS	Binary Addition	$10010 + 101$	10111
	Duplicate String	<i>abaab</i>	<i>abaababaab</i>
	Interlocked Pairing	<i>aaaab</i>	<i>aaaabbbbba</i>
	Odds First	<i>aaabaa</i>	<i>aaaaba</i>

Interlocked Pairing (CS) Given a string of the form $a^n b^m$, output the string $a^n b^m b^n a^m$. For example, the output corresponding to $x = aaaab$ is $y = aaaabbbbba$.

Odds First (CS) Given a string $t_1 \dots t_n$, output $t_1 t_3 t_5 \dots t_2 t_4 t_6 \dots$. For example, the output corresponding to $x = aaabaa$ is $y = aaaaba$.

A.3 Computational resources

We implemented our evaluation suite in JAX [77] using the DeepMind JAX ecosystem [78–80]. We make all of our code publicly available at https://github.com/deepmind/neural_networks_chomsky_hierarchy. We ran each task-architecture-seed triplet on a single NVIDIA V100 GPU on our internal cluster, i.e., 16 (tasks) · 12 (models) · 10 (seeds) = 1920 GPU-units (we have four different Transformers, one for each positional encoding, and three Tape-RNNs, one for each number of computation steps). Moreover, we used an additional 300 work units for the phase transition experiment (Section 5.3), yielding a total of 2220 GPU-units. We report all the running times, for each task and architecture, in Table A.2. Note that we aggregated the results over the hyperparameters, which explains the high standard deviation for Transformers (four different positional encodings) and Tape-RNN (three different numbers of computation steps). Moreover, note that Transformers are trained for 8 000 000 steps, while all the others are trained for 1 000 000 steps, and NDStack-RNNs are trained only for 400 000 steps on the tasks with an output length strictly larger than 1.

The NDStack-RNN is comparably slow to train. It is roughly four times slower than a classical Stack-RNN, due to the computation of the big tensor γ , denoting the transition weights between nodes (see [35]). Furthermore, this tensor takes a lot of space in memory, i.e., the number of values it contains is, once unrolled on the whole trajectory, proportional to $(\ell + m)^3$, where ℓ and m are the length of the input and output sequences, respectively. Thus, for our training range of 40 and a task where the output length is equal to the input length (e.g., Reverse String (DCF)), the required space is proportional to $(40 + 40)^3 = 512\,000$. Therefore, with a batch size of 128 and 16 possible actions (i.e., state-symbol pairs), the tensor is roughly of size 33.5Gb using float32 representation, which exceeds the memory size of our GPUs. Consequently, we reduced the batch size to 16 (i.e., 8 times smaller than normal) for this architecture.

Table A.2: Mean and standard deviation of the running times (in hours) for all the architectures and tasks. The asterisks (*) denote the NDStack-RNNs that we only trained for 400 000 steps, and the daggers (†) denote the Transformers that were trained for 8 000 000 steps and are thus incomparable to the other running times (see Appendix A.3).

Level	Task	RNN	Stack-RNN	NDStack-RNN	Tape-RNN	Transformer	LSTM	Stack-LSTM
R	Even Pairs	0.55 ± 0.03	2.44 ± 0.03	10.69 ± 0.10	4.83 ± 1.81	15.48 ± 0.21*	0.83 ± 0.02	2.96 ± 0.08
	Modular Arithmetic (Simple)	0.55 ± 0.01	2.39 ± 0.03	10.41 ± 0.06	4.49 ± 1.46	13.96 ± 0.42*	0.85 ± 0.01	2.95 ± 0.07
	Parity Check	0.54 ± 0.02	2.44 ± 0.04	10.69 ± 0.07	5.04 ± 1.43	15.85 ± 0.24*	0.83 ± 0.02	2.93 ± 0.05
DCF	Compare Occurrence*	0.53 ± 0.03	2.46 ± 0.03	10.65 ± 0.06	5.40 ± 1.54	15.68 ± 0.31*	0.83 ± 0.01	2.88 ± 0.03
	Modular Arithmetic	3.96 ± 0.11	4.70 ± 0.15	11.53 ± 0.10	7.80 ± 1.69	38.81 ± 1.55*	4.15 ± 0.11	5.09 ± 0.14
	Reverse String	0.87 ± 0.02	4.37 ± 0.05	6.72 ± 0.05†	7.25 ± 1.49	24.84 ± 0.41*	1.45 ± 0.08	5.29 ± 0.12
	Solve Equation	4.16 ± 0.13	4.79 ± 0.13	11.61 ± 0.09	7.83 ± 1.38	40.49 ± 1.68*	4.32 ± 0.25	5.14 ± 0.09
	Stack Manipulation	5.45 ± 0.13	7.61 ± 0.25	6.89 ± 0.03†	11.83 ± 1.48	56.58 ± 1.86*	5.83 ± 0.11	8.49 ± 0.16
NDCF	Equal Repeats*	0.55 ± 0.02	2.45 ± 0.15	10.63 ± 0.05	4.33 ± 1.49	15.80 ± 0.38*	0.85 ± 0.02	2.91 ± 0.04
	NDStack Manipulation	6.36 ± 0.15	8.60 ± 0.35	6.90 ± 0.04†	12.44 ± 1.49	65.39 ± 2.57*	6.69 ± 0.17	9.73 ± 1.23
	Missing Palindrome	0.56 ± 0.01	2.42 ± 0.03	10.64 ± 0.07	5.45 ± 2.14	15.64 ± 0.13*	0.85 ± 0.02	2.91 ± 0.06
	Divide by 2*	0.86 ± 0.01	4.38 ± 0.04	6.73 ± 0.03†	7.04 ± 2.15	25.00 ± 0.50*	1.44 ± 0.02	5.32 ± 0.12
CS	Binary Addition	4.61 ± 0.08	6.60 ± 0.09	6.90 ± 0.04†	10.31 ± 1.28	51.75 ± 1.38*	4.90 ± 0.07	7.48 ± 0.13
	Duplicate String	1.20 ± 0.04	6.47 ± 0.06	10.25 ± 0.05†	9.02 ± 1.75	39.00 ± 0.54*	2.06 ± 0.02	7.60 ± 0.08
	Interlocked Pairing*	1.29 ± 0.06	6.53 ± 0.12	10.23 ± 0.03†	9.55 ± 1.60	39.21 ± 0.38*	2.10 ± 0.05	7.69 ± 0.09
	Odds First	0.89 ± 0.04	4.40 ± 0.05	6.72 ± 0.03†	8.47 ± 2.17	25.17 ± 0.49*	1.43 ± 0.03	5.23 ± 0.09

A.4 Problem setup

We now provide the full formalization of our problem setup (described in Section 4). Algorithm A.1 illustrates our training procedure. We train on sequences of length $\ell \sim \mathcal{U}(1, N)$, with $N = 40$ (using batches of size 128). For testing, we consider sequences of length sampled from $\mathcal{U}(N + 1, M)$, with $M = 500$. In general, we report the score, which we define as the per-sequence accuracy A (see Section 4) averaged over all sequences of unseen length, i.e., $\text{score} := \frac{1}{M-N} \sum_{\ell=N+1}^M A(z_1^\ell, z_{\ell+1}^k)$, where $z_1^\ell = \mathbf{x}$ denotes the input sequence and $z_{\ell+1}^k = \mathbf{y}$ denotes the corresponding target sequence (see Section 4 for details). We use the Adam optimizer [81] with default hyperparameters and a learning rate of 3×10^{-4} for 1 000 000 steps, which we have found to be sufficient to achieve a near-optimal training performance for all tasks and architectures. As described in Algorithm A.1, we augment our input sequences \mathbf{x} with m empty tokens \emptyset , where m is the length of the corresponding target sequence \mathbf{y} , so that the networks only need to start outputting after they have consumed the entire input sequence. Moreover, we add computational tokens \square (which are different from the empty tokens \emptyset) to the input sequence \mathbf{x} for the Tape-RNN to enable it to perform memory operations without having to output the result. In general, we run all experiments with 10 different random seeds (used for network parameter initialization) and report the result obtained by the seed with the maximum score (means and standard deviations in Appendix B). However, for Transformers, NDStack-RNNs, and Tape-RNNs we additionally sweep over hyperparameters and report the maximum over all hyperparameter-seed combinations. Concretely, for Transformers we consider four different positional encodings, for the NDStack-RNN we optionally read from internal states of the nondeterministic stack (one of the improvements proposed by DuSell and Chiang [36]), and for the Tape-RNN we consider various numbers of computation tokens (0, ℓ , or 2ℓ).

B Additional Experiments

B.1 Main result

We report the performance curves for all tasks in Fig. B.4 and the means and standard deviations of the test accuracies of the architectures on the tasks in Table B.1. We observe that all the networks, except for Transformers, solve the regular tasks perfectly for all the seeds. Only a few tasks above this level can be solved (score above 0.90), but the hierarchy still persists: for instance, the Tape-RNN has much better scores overall, even on average, on the NDCF and CS tasks compared to the other architectures. However, even though the Tape-RNN can solve more tasks, it still fails on some of them. We hypothesize that this is because the limited set of actions makes the right action trajectory long and difficult to find. Typically, to move $\frac{N}{2}$ s-eps-converted-to.pdf on the tape (which is useful for the Missing Palindrome (NDCF) task), the network must perform $\frac{N}{2}$ WRITE-LEFT or WRITE-RIGHT

Algorithm A.1: Training pipeline for our sequence prediction tasks. The comments (in blue) show an example output for the Reverse String (DCF) task.

Input: model $p_\theta(\cdot|\mathbf{x})$ with parameters θ , learning rate α , number of training steps S

```

1 Initialize parameters  $\theta$ 
2 for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $S$  do
3   Sample length  $\ell$  from  $\mathcal{U}(1, 40)$  /*  $\ell = 3$  */
4   Sample sequence  $\mathbf{x}$  of length  $\ell$  from the task grammar /*  $\mathbf{x} = 011$  for  $\ell = 3$  */
5   Compute the corresponding output sequence  $\mathbf{y}$  of length  $m$  /*  $\mathbf{y} = 110$  with  $m = 3$  */
6   Pad  $\mathbf{x}$  with  $m$  empty tokens  $\emptyset$  such that the model only needs to start outputting after having
   consumed the entire input sequence, i.e.,  $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \mathbf{x} \cdot \emptyset \dots \emptyset$  /*  $\mathbf{x} = 011\emptyset\emptyset\emptyset$  */
7   Set output to empty sequence of length  $m$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{o} \leftarrow \emptyset \dots \emptyset$ 
8   for  $t \leftarrow 1$  to  $m$  do
9     Compute the output probability distribution  $o_t \leftarrow p_\theta(\cdot|\mathbf{x}_{1:\ell+t})$  /*  $o_t \in \mathbb{R}^2$  */
10    end
11   Compute the cross-entropy loss (averaged over output tokens)  $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^m y_t^\top \log o_t$ 
12   Update the parameters with gradient descent  $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla \mathcal{C}$ 
13   Compute the per-sequence accuracy  $A \leftarrow \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^m \mathbb{1} [\arg \max_j y_{tj} = \arg \max_j o_{tj}]$ 
14 end
```

Table B.1: Means and standard deviations (computed over random seeds) of the score (average test accuracy, see Section 4) for the results of the main experiment (see Table 3 and Section 5.1).


Level	Tasks	RNN	Stack-RNN	NDStack-RNN	Tape-RNN	Transformer	LSTM
R	Even Pairs	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.01	1.00 \pm 0.00	0.53 \pm 0.04	1.00 \pm 0.00
	Modular Arithmetic (Simple)	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	0.21 \pm 0.01	1.00 \pm 0.00
	Parity Check	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	0.53 \pm 0.02	1.00 \pm 0.00
DCF	Compare Occurrence*	0.90 \pm 0.06	0.96 \pm 0.05	0.89 \pm 0.04	0.93 \pm 0.02	0.98 \pm 0.01	0.91 \pm 0.02
	Modular Arithmetic	0.34 \pm 0.02	0.70 \pm 0.07	0.35 \pm 0.04	0.61 \pm 0.10	0.25 \pm 0.03	0.53 \pm 0.05
	Reverse String	0.61 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	0.61 \pm 0.02	0.97 \pm 0.10	0.53 \pm 0.01	0.57 \pm 0.02
	Solve Equation	0.30 \pm 0.07	0.35 \pm 0.09	0.41 \pm 0.10	0.40 \pm 0.09	0.23 \pm 0.02	0.26 \pm 0.01
	Stack Manipulation	0.53 \pm 0.03	1.00 \pm 0.00	0.53 \pm 0.01	0.84 \pm 0.22	0.51 \pm 0.03	0.60 \pm 0.01
NDCF	Equal Repeats*	0.44 \pm 0.02	0.48 \pm 0.04	0.47 \pm 0.03	0.82 \pm 0.18	0.70 \pm 0.04	0.85 \pm 0.06
	NDStack Manipulation	0.51 \pm 0.01	0.94 \pm 0.17	0.53 \pm 0.02	0.97 \pm 0.03	0.52 \pm 0.04	0.60 \pm 0.01
	Missing Palindrome	0.52 \pm 0.01	0.56 \pm 0.01	0.51 \pm 0.01	0.56 \pm 0.04	0.55 \pm 0.02	0.54 \pm 0.00
	Divide by 2*	0.54 \pm 0.01	0.61 \pm 0.08	0.55 \pm 0.02	0.54 \pm 0.04	0.51 \pm 0.01	0.51 \pm 0.01
CS	Binary Addition	0.50 \pm 0.00	0.51 \pm 0.01	0.50 \pm 0.00	0.55 \pm 0.08	0.39 \pm 0.14	0.54 \pm 0.01
	Duplicate String	0.50 \pm 0.00	0.52 \pm 0.01	0.51 \pm 0.00	0.91 \pm 0.16	0.53 \pm 0.01	0.56 \pm 0.01
	Interlocked Pairing*	0.50 \pm 0.01	0.80 \pm 0.13	0.51 \pm 0.01	0.84 \pm 0.07	0.53 \pm 0.04	0.83 \pm 0.11
	Odds First	0.50 \pm 0.00	0.50 \pm 0.00	0.51 \pm 0.00	0.54 \pm 0.07	0.51 \pm 0.00	0.53 \pm 0.01

actions, which is almost impossible to randomly find during training when N is large. Nevertheless, the Tape-RNN is the closest we have to an architecture capable of solving all tasks from regular to CS.

B.2 Analysis of state- and memory-dynamics

B.2.1 Stack-RNN programm analysis on regular and DCF tasks

Here, we check that the Stack-RNN, which is our simplest memory augmented network, performs as expected on some of our simple tasks. As mentioned in Section 5.2, Fig. B.1a shows that on the Parity Check (R) task the network ignores the stack by only applying NO-OP and POP actions (visualized on an unseen sequence of length 100). We recall that Fig. 3a also showed that the PCA of the states is identical to the one of a simple RNN as it only depends on the last result and the last input token. Moreover, Fig. B.1b demonstrates that on the Reverse String task the network always uses the PUSH action until the first empty token is reached, whereupon it starts performing POP actions until the end, which exactly matches the algorithms we would expect a PDA to implement. Note that in this task the number of empty tokens \emptyset we append to the input sequence is equal to the length of the input sequence, and thus the total sequence is of length 200.



(a) Stack-RNN analysis on Parity Check (R). (b) Stack-RNN analysis on Reverse String (DCF).

Figure B.1: Analysis of the Stack-RNN on the Parity Check (R) and Reverse String (DCF) tasks. *Left*: The network does not use the stack on Parity Check and has the same state structure as a classical RNN. *Right*: The network uses the stack on Reverse String and the PCA of the states shows that they are clustered according to the last input token only.

B.2.2 Stack-RNN beyond DCF tasks

We recall that Table 3 demonstrated that Stack-RNNs generally fail to solve tasks that lie beyond DCF but manage to solve one NDCF task (NDStack Manipulation) and one CS task (Interlocked Pairing). However, both tasks are not solved by a vanilla RNN, so the stack must be involved in solving these tasks. To get an intuition on how the Stack-RNN solves both of these tasks we analyze the stack-dynamics of a typical Stack-RNN that achieves high performance on these tasks (no cherry-picking otherwise). It is worth pointing out that our stack implementation allows 8-dimensional real-valued vectors for each stack-entry (with a maximum stack depth depending on the task). Further, what is written to the stack (in case of a PUSH operation) is a linear projection of the (256-dimensional) RNN state, meaning that the Stack-RNN is not limited to simply pushing input symbols onto the stack but is capable of learning a custom, and potentially complex, alphabet of stack symbols. Finally, the stack operations are probabilistic, meaning that a (softmax) probability is assigned to PUSH, POP, and NO-OP (in order to have differentiable stack operations). This fact together with the ability to learn a complex stack alphabet might allow the Stack-RNN to use its stack in a way that cannot be simulated by a simple PDA with a binary stack alphabet. However, based on our limited number of tasks, this non-DCF behavior seems to be the exception rather than the norm.

Fig. B.2 visualizes the behavior of the Stack-RNN on Interlocked Pairing (CS). The figure shows 2D PCA projections of the 8-dimensional stack-state for a number of trajectories (i.e., input-output sequences). The task lies in CS but can be solved by implementing multiple counters. The PCA plots suggest that the Stack-RNN learns to do the following: The amount of the first input token is tracked along one direction (colored blue), and as soon as the second token starts appearing this is tracked in an almost orthogonal direction (green). Similarly for the other phases of the task, except that there is no change in direction between orange and purple. This makes sense, since the same token needs to be written to the output in both phases; so the Stack-RNN lumps them together with a single “counter”. The counters for each phase seem to be implemented by tracking distance in different directions of the stack state; however rather than using a linear step size, the `s-eps-converted-to.pdf` for each counter-increase decrease for higher counter-values. This could be a clever strategy of dealing with arbitrarily long input sequences (and thus arbitrarily high counter values) while ensuring that the known (and well-trained) region of stack states is not left. If true, such a strategy would eventually break down when numerical resolution becomes insufficient to distinguish counter-increases. Looking at the stack-action probabilities, the dominant action is NO-OP, which is unintuitive. This can be easily explained by noting that PUSH actions are continuously used, albeit with very low probability (which nonetheless allows the Stack-RNN to write small values to the stack). Importantly, the different task-phases are also clearly distinguishable from the action probabilities. It remains unclear why the Stack-RNN can learn this counter-language task, but none of




Figure B.2: Projection of the (8-dimensional) stack state of the Stack-RNN on Interlocked Pairing (CS) onto the first 2 principal components. Panel A shows 256 trajectories of length 300 each (input length is 100); panels B, C, and D show individual trajectories. The colors indicate different phases of the task (explained in panel A), which the stack-state tracks very well. We take this as evidence that the Stack-RNN implements multiple (independent) counters via its multi-dimensional stack state. Panels B, C, and D also show the stack-action probabilities over time: While NO-OP is always the highest-probability action, PUSH actions are clearly used by the RNN. Each task phase is also visible from the stack-action probabilities.

the others that lie above DCF. We hypothesize that weight-configurations that would solve these tasks exist in principle, but they cannot (easily) be found via SGD; thus practically limiting the Stack-RNN roughly to DCF level.

Figure B.3 visualizes the behavior of the Stack-RNN on the NDStack Manipulation (NDCF) task. The figure shows 2D PCA projections of the 8-dimensional stack-state. We were unable to identify an obvious strategy of how the Stack-RNN solves the task. One hypothesis is that the network has learned to encode content (tokens of 0 and 1) and operations (+, -, ?) onto its stack. However, the stack-alphabet seems to be more complex: Rather than pushing single tokens and operations onto the stack, groups of operations seem to be encoded. Looking at the corresponding stack-action probabilities, it seems that groups of operations often get encoded as NO-OPs. This could be a valid strategy, since we often have sub-sequences where + is followed by - or vice versa, which indeed has the effect of a NO-OP. Only groups of multiple consecutive operations of the same kind would lead to PUSH/POP. Such a strategy would be possible as long as the RNN state memorizes something like a “carry” bit: After seeing one operation and performing a NO-OP, the carry bit is required to determine whether the NO-OP was justified or needs to be corrected depending on the token that followed. This hypothesis is further complicated by the fact that the network would need to distinguish between the operations that are affected by the missing operation and the ones that are not affected by it (e.g., for ? + + + the first pair ? + could be a PUSH-PUSH or a NO-OP, but the subsequent + + leads to a PUSH-PUSH regardless of ?). Again, the network could learn a complex representation of these different sub-sequences and use it to operate its stack. Given our current analysis we cannot clearly identify such an algorithm. However, we can conclude that the stack-state space is highly structured and a non-trivial stack-alphabet is used. Nevertheless, regardless of the strategy used by the Stack-RNN, the fact that it solves this task but not any other NDCF task we tested remains; the main conclusions are not affected by this analysis.




Figure B.3: Projection of the (8-dimensional) stack state of the Stack-RNN on NDStack Manipulation onto the first 2 principal components. Panel A shows 256 trajectories of length 141 each (input length is 70); panels B, C, and D show individual trajectories. Colors indicate different phases of the task (explained in panel A). Reading the initial stack content (light blue) and outputting the final stack content (purple) seems to occupy the same region in stack-state space, whereas the stack manipulations during the deterministic (green) and nondeterministic (red) phase seem to occupy the same regions as the stack content plus some additional regions. Panels B, C, and D also show the stack-action probabilities over time: while the initial stack contents are pushed consistently, the push (+) and pop (-) operations during the stack-operation phase (green and red) seem to be implemented via a mix of POP and NO-OP together with the RNN dynamics (not shown). See main text for more discussion.

B.3 Stack-LSTMs

We evaluate the experiment suite from Section 5.1 for the Stack-LSTMs and compare their performance with that of Stack-RNNs in Table B.2. We observe that Stack-LSTMs and Stack-RNNs perform roughly equally well when considering the score (maximum accuracy over the 10 initialization seeds), which is not surprising given that both networks are theoretically located on the same level of the Chomsky hierarchy. However, when considering the average Stack-LSTMs perform worse, i.e., our training protocol (gradient descent) is less stable for this architecture, confirming the results of prior work [33]. We hypothesize that this is due to the fact that LSTMs are more powerful than RNNs (as they can implement k-counter machines) and thus do not always simulate a finite-state automaton. This can be an advantage for more difficult tasks, e.g., counting tasks such as Equal Repeats (NDCF) but also a disadvantage for simpler tasks that only need a finite-state automaton controller to interact with the memory structure. Thus, if the controller is not a finite-state automaton, then its internal state does not interact well with the stack content as it is not part of a finite set, i.e., the interactions are potentially infinite and thus the network does not generalize well beyond the training range.




Figure B.4: Performance curves on all tasks. The dashed vertical red line is the training range, meaning that sequences to the right have not been seen during training and thus measure generalization.

Table B.2: Comparison of the Stack-RNN and Stack-LSTM on our set of tasks. See Tables 3 and B.1 for details of the metrics.

Level	Tasks	Maximum Score		Avg. \pm Std. Dev. Score	
		Stack-RNN	Stack-LSTM	Stack-RNN	Stack-LSTM
R	Even Pairs	1.00	1.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00
	Modular Arithmetic (Simple)	1.00	1.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00
	Parity Check	1.00	1.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	1.00 \pm 0.00
DCF	Compare Occurrence*	1.00	0.93	0.96 \pm 0.05	0.91 \pm 0.01
	Modular Arithmetic	0.82	0.56	0.70 \pm 0.07	0.49 \pm 0.05
	Reverse String	1.00	1.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	0.82 \pm 0.21
	Solve Equation	0.52	0.25	0.35 \pm 0.09	0.24 \pm 0.01
	Stack Manipulation	1.00	1.00	1.00 \pm 0.00	0.77 \pm 0.18
NDCF	Equal Repeats*	0.53	0.94	0.48 \pm 0.04	0.79 \pm 0.11
	NDStack Manipulation	0.96	0.95	0.94 \pm 0.17	0.63 \pm 0.11
	Missing Palindrome	0.57	0.55	0.56 \pm 0.01	0.54 \pm 0.00
	Divide by 2*	0.81	0.58	0.61 \pm 0.08	0.53 \pm 0.02
CS	Binary Addition	0.52	0.54	0.51 \pm 0.01	0.53 \pm 0.01
	Duplicate String	0.53	0.56	0.52 \pm 0.01	0.55 \pm 0.01
	Interlocked Pairing*	0.94	0.94	0.80 \pm 0.13	0.76 \pm 0.11
	Odds First	0.51	0.54	0.50 \pm 0.00	0.53 \pm 0.00