Absence of Phase Transition in Random Language Model

Kai Nakaishi¹ and Koji Hukushima^{1,2}

¹Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Mequro-ku, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan

²Komaba Institute for Science, The University of Tokyo,

3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan

The Random Language Model is a simple model of human languages. A study on this model proposes that the emergence of order in language can be considered as a phase transition. The model expresses the process of sentence generation as a tree graph with nodes having symbols as variables. We discuss theoretically that the analysis of the "order parameter" introduced in previous studies can be reduced to solve the maximum eigenvector of a transition probability matrix, which makes the analysis of given probabilistic context-free grammars dramatically easier. This helps reveal that no phase transition occurs in the case with a finite number of nonterminal symbols.

Chomsky attempted to establish formal models that represent the universal grammar underlying all languages [1, 2]. One such model is context-free grammar (CFG) [3], which has been used beyond the scope of linguistic research in various fields, such as quasicrystal^[4] and molecular optimization[5]. To better understand natural languages, a possible extension of this abstract model is a probabilistic version, called probabilistic context-free grammar (PCFG) [6], which has been studied as a model of cosmic inflation [7], recurrent neural network [8], a prior distribution of RNA secondary structures [9], etc. However, partly because Chomsky strongly denied the importance of a statistical approach to language, limited research has been conducted on PCFG in the context of understanding natural languages. Several studies [10– 12] on grammar induction and parsing based on PCFG, which are analogies for how humans acquire and recognize their first language, focus on specific corpora and not on the universal or typical properties of languages.

Recently, DeGiuli, in their study on the typical properties of PCFG, introduced a model of PCFG averaged over grammars, called the Random Language Model (RLM)[13]. This model can be viewed as a statisticalmechanical model of random systems, which helps derive the free energy formula of the model using theoretical physics methods, such as the replica method and Feynman diagrams[14]. Numerical simulations and statisticalmechanical analyses of the model suggest that a phase transition occurs between ordered and random phases as the model parameters vary, demonstrating the emergence of order in language just as a child initially speaks incoherently, but later learns to speak grammatically correct language. However, the results of previous studies and their analyses do not prove the existence of phase transitions. We address this issue because it is a fundamental problem whether the phase transition exists in a simple model such as the RLM.

A conventional approach in linguistics is to analyze syntactic structures underlying sentences in terms of immediate constituent (IC) analyses. In this framework, these structures are represented graphically by tree diagrams as shown in Fig. 1(a) [1]. CFG or type 2 grammar is a formal grammar which generates sentences with underlying such tree-like structures [2, 3]. The grammar G of CFG consists of a set Σ of symbols called a vocabulary or an alphabet, and a set R of rules. The vocabulary Σ is the union of two disjoint finite sets Σ_N and Σ_T , which are sets of nonterminal and terminal symbols, respectively. Each rule in R is of the form $A \to \varphi$, i.e., an instruction to rewrite a single nonterminal symbol A as a string φ in Σ . Given the special nonterminal symbol S, called a starting symbol, one applies rules in R iteratively until the string comprises solely terminal symbols. This string is defined as a sentence generated by G. Furthermore, the complete process of generating a sentence is called a derivation. A derivation is represented as a tree, the leaves of which represent the sentence. In linguistics, nonterminal symbols correspond to constituents or phrases such as sentences, noun phrases, or verb phrases, while terminal symbols correspond to words or morphemes, such as "ideas" or "sleep". Although CFG does not explain all aspects of natural languages, it reflects the fundamental structure of a class called kernel comprising basic sentences such as active and declarative sentences. Without the loss of generality, one can restrict rules to the form $A \to BC$ and $A \rightarrow a$, where A, B, and C are nonterminal symbols and a is a terminal symbol [15]. We shall call them nonterminal rules and terminal rules, respectively.

Sentences we generate depend not only on the grammar, but also on the intentions of speakers or writers and situations where they are generated. However, for simplicity, we consider the model in which sentences are gen-



FIG. 1. (a) Example of IC analysis. The diagram shows the syntactic structure of the sentence "Colorless green ideas sleep furiously." (b) Layer decomposition of trees generated by PCFG.

erated randomly according to given probabilistic weights and CFG, i.e., PCFG [6]. We assign weight M_{ABC} to each $(A, B, C) \in \Sigma_N^3$, and O_{Aa} to each $(A, a) \in \Sigma_N \times \Sigma_T$. M_{ABC} and O_{Aa} define the probability that nonterminal symbol A is rewritten by nonterminal rule $A \to BC$ and terminal rule $A \to a$, respectively. Notice that $M_{ABC} = 0$ or $O_{Aa} = 0$ in PCFG corresponds to the situation that R does not include $A \to BC$ or $A \to a$ in CFG. The sets $M = \{M_{ABC}\}$ and $O = \{O_{Aa}\}$ of weights determine the probability with which each sentence or derivation is generated. With fixed Σ , each PCFG is only characterized by M and O.

According to [13, 14], we introduce the "emission probability" p, which is the probability that a nonterminal symbol is rewritten as a terminal symbol, and redefine weights M_{ABC} and O_{Aa} such that the probability for $A \to BC$ and $A \to a$ are $(1-p)M_{ABC}$ and pO_{Aa} respectively. In this setup, the topology \mathcal{T} of a derivation is independent of the occurrence of symbols on \mathcal{T} , and is only controlled by the emission probability p.

We are interested in typical properties of a general language, not of a particular language. To analyze the typical properties, we consider an averaged model, assuming a prior distribution $P_{M,O}(M,O)$. The emission probability introduced allows us to divide $P_{M,O}(M,O)$ into $P_M(M)$ and $P_O(O)$. As these distributions, we choose lognormals:

$$P_M(\tilde{M}_{ABC}) \propto e^{-\epsilon_M \ln^2 \tilde{M}_{ABC}}, \ M_{ABC} = \frac{\tilde{M}_{ABC}}{\sum_{B,C} \tilde{M}_{ABC}},$$
$$P_O(\tilde{O}_{Aa}) \propto e^{-\epsilon_O \ln^2 \tilde{O}_{Aa}}, \ O_{Aa} = \frac{\tilde{O}_{Aa}}{\sum_a \tilde{O}_{Aa}},$$
(1)

where ϵ_M and ϵ_O are parameters that characterize the prior distributions. This is the RLM introduced by DeGiuli[13, 14].

In the previous studies, to clarify the behavior of the RLM for a given nonterminal set Σ_N with the size N, the "order parameter" Q_{ABC} is introduced as

$$Q_{ABC}(M;p) \equiv \left\langle \frac{1}{\Omega(\mathcal{T})} \sum_{(i,j,k)} \delta_{\sigma_i,A} \left(N^2 \delta_{\sigma_j,B} \delta_{\sigma_k,C} - 1 \right) \right\rangle_{M,p}.$$

where $\Omega(\mathcal{T})$ is the number of applications of nonterminal rules in a derivation. i, j, and k are the indices of nodes of given \mathcal{T} , and σ_i is a nonterminal symbol on node i. The summation runs over all (i, j, k) such that $\sigma_i \to \sigma_j \sigma_k$ is applied in \mathcal{T} . $\langle \cdots \rangle_{M,O}$ denotes the average over derivations generated according to weights (M, O)and the emission probability p. This definition is motivated by that of the order parameter for Potts model[16].

Numerical simulations of this quantity suggest the existence of a phase transition with a change in the parameter ϵ_M . The transition point separates a random phase and an ordered phase. In the former, the averaged sum $\sum_{A,B,C} Q_{ABC}^2$ of squared "order parameters" is vanishingly small, while, in the latter, it takes a finite value. This may be interpreted as an indication of the emergence of nontrivial order, which allows sentences to communicate information. However, the origin and characteristics of the singularity associated with a phase transition are not always evident. Indeed, the previous studies present no concrete evidences for the phase transition.

In this letter, we theoretically revisit the phase transition in the RLM from a viewpoint different from that of previous studies. To simplify the problem, we focus on the structure of nonterminal symbols, independent of O, as in the previous studies. The key point is that the singularity of "order parameter" Q_{ABC} is reduced to that of the probability of occurrence of symbol A. First, we denote this as

$$\pi_A(M;p) \equiv \left\langle \frac{\# \text{ of symbol } A \text{ in a derivation}}{\text{ the size of a derivation}} \right\rangle_{M,p}.$$

Note that nonterminal symbols rewritten by terminal rules are not counted here. Thus, the "order parameter" Q_{ABC} can be rewritten consistently as

$$Q_{ABC}(M;p) = N^2 \pi_A \left(M_{ABC} - \frac{1}{N^2} \right).$$
 (2)

Because the prior P_M is an analytic function of ϵ_M , the behavior of factor $M_{ABC} - 1/N^2$ is also analytic. Thus, the order parameter Q_{ABC} will not present any singularity unless the distribution of π_A non-analytically changes.

For the analysis of π_A , it is useful to decompose a tree into D + 1 layers $0, 1, \dots, D$ from the root to leaves, as shown in Fig. 1(b). In addition, we denote the number of nodes and occurrence of symbol A in layer d as l_d and $n_A^{(d)}$, respectively. In terms of these, π_A is represented as

$$\pi_A(M;p) = \lim_{D \to \infty} \sum_{d=0}^{D} \left\langle \frac{n_A^{(d)}}{\sum_{d'=0}^{D} l_{d'}} \right\rangle_{M,p}.$$
 (3)

Considering the process of developing the layers, the transition probability that a symbol A in layer d turns into a symbol B in layer d + 1 is given by

$$W_{BA}(M) \equiv \frac{\sum_{C} M_{ABC} + \sum_{C} M_{ACB}}{2}$$
$$= \frac{\sum_{C} \tilde{M}_{ABC} + \sum_{C} \tilde{M}_{ACB}}{2\sum_{B,C} \tilde{M}_{ABC}}$$

Using the transition matrix W and taking the the averages of the topology \mathcal{T} and symbols for given p and Mseparately, the summand of Eq. (3) becomes

$$\left\langle \frac{\boldsymbol{n}^{(d)}}{\sum_{d'=0}^{D} l_{d'}} \right\rangle_{M,p} = f_d^{(D)}(p) W^d(M) \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(0)}, \qquad (4)$$

$$f_d^{(D)}(p) \equiv \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{l_0,\cdots,l_D} \left[\frac{l_d}{\sum_{d'=0}^D l_{d'}} \right], \qquad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{n}^{(d)} \equiv (n_0^{(d)}, \cdots, n_{N-1}^{(d)})$, and $\mathbf{\pi}^{(0)} = (\pi_0^{(0)}, \cdots, \pi_{N-1}^{(0)})$ is the distribution of starting symbols. It would be interesting to see that Eq. (3) is separated into the product form of the dependencies on p and M.

The factor $f_d^{(D)}(p)$ can be expressed in terms of a mo-ment generating function (see SM). For general p, it is difficult to write it down explicitly, but in the special case of p = 0, the following argument can be proceeded. In this case, $l_d = 2^d$, and $f_d^{(D)}(0) = 2^d/(2^{D+1}-1)$. Substi-tuing this to Eq. (3) and (4), it turns out that $\pi_A = v_A$, where $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_0, \cdots, v_{N-1})$ is the maximum eigenvector of W. The maximum eigenvalue is 1 because W is a transition probability matrix. If $\epsilon_M > 0$, the eigenvalue 1 is not degenerate with probability 1 from the Perron–Frobenius theorem. Since $f_d^{(D)}(0)$ increases exponentially with d, only the steady state $\boldsymbol{v} = \lim_{d\to\infty} W^d \boldsymbol{\pi}^0$ of the Markov chain, defined by W, contributes to π in the limit $D \to \infty$, resulting in $\pi_A = v_A$. As a consequence, it turns out that in the case with p = 0, it is sufficient to find the maximum eigenvector \boldsymbol{v} of the transition probability matrix W for the analysis of the "order parameter" Q_{ABC} of a given grammar M. This makes the analysis greatly easier. For $\epsilon_M > 0$, we can define set $\mathcal{M}(\pi_A) \equiv \{ \widehat{M} > 0 \mid v_A(\widehat{M}) = \pi_A \} \text{ for each } \pi_A \in [0, 1],$ where $\tilde{M} > 0$ means that $\tilde{M}_{ABC} > 0$ in $M = \{M_{ABC}\}$ for any (A, B, C). The probability density of π_A is expressed as $P(\pi_A | \epsilon_M, p = 0) = \int_{\mathcal{M}(\pi_A)} dM P_M(M)$. Because the measure $P_M(\tilde{M})$ is an analytic function of ϵ_M defined by Eq. (1), $P(\pi_A | \epsilon_M, p = 0)$ is also analytic with ϵ_M . This means that a phase transition detected by "order parameter" Q_{ABC} cannot exist.

How does the distribution of π_A for 0 behave $when <math>\epsilon_M$ changes? As p increases, $f_d^{(D)}(p)$ for small d increases while that for large d decreases. This means that $W^d \mathbf{v}^{(0)}$ for smaller d gets closer to $\mathbf{v}^{(0)}$ and thus $P(\pi_A)$ crosses over to $(1/N) \sum_A \delta(\pi_A - \pi_A^{(0)})$. It is unlikely that this effect causes singularity. This implies that no phase transition exists not only for p = 0, but also for general p.

To confirm the above argument quantitatively, we measured numerically the Binder parameter of π_A , difined as

$$U \equiv 1 - \frac{\left[\left(\Delta \pi_A \right)^4 \right]_{\epsilon_M}}{3 \left[\left(\Delta \pi_A \right)^2 \right]_{\epsilon_M}^2},\tag{6}$$

where $\Delta \pi_A \equiv \pi_A - [\pi_A]_{\epsilon_M} = \pi_A - 1/N$. This parameter has been used to numerically detect the transition temperature of first- and second-order transitions in various statistical-mechanical models [17, 18]. For all previously known cases of phase transitions detected by this parameter, a discontinuous jump from zero implying a Gaussian distribution, to a finite value determined by a multimodal distribution is found at the transition temperature in the thermodynamic limit.

Fig. 2 (a) shows the Binder parameters of π_A for N = 2 with several values of the emission probability p. For



FIG. 2. (a) ϵ_M dependence of the Binder parameter of π_A for N = 2 and $p = 0, 0.125, \cdots, 0.875$. Results are computed by eigenvalue analysis for p = 0, and by numerical simulations with a maximum depth D = 7 for $0 . (b) Binder parameters of <math>\pi_A$ for $N = 2, \cdots, 10$ and p = 0 computed through eigenvalue analysis. In both (a) and (b), error bars are evaluated by the bootstrap method with 5×10^2 bootstrap sets[19].

p = 0, we directly calculated π_A for the drivations of the maximum depth $D \to \infty$, i.e., those of infinite sizes, using the solution of the maximum eigenvector problem of transition probability matrix W. This is a significant advantage of the fact that $\pi_A = v_A$. For 0 ,we measured π_A by implementing the RLM. Because it is impossible to generate a derivation of infinite size, we measured π_A with the maximum depth D = 7 instead, which was sufficient to approximate the Binder parameter for $D \to \infty$. We chose $\pi_A^{(0)} = 1/N$ for any symbol A as the distribution of starting symbols, thus the Binder parameter of $\pi_A^{(0)}$ is zero. The number of grammars M generated for each ϵ_M was 4×10^5 for both p = 0 and $0 . In addition, <math>10^3$ derivations were generated for each grammar M for 0 . In this figure, theBinder parameter for p = 0 is shown to be analytic in ϵ_M , which is predicted from the above analysis concluding that the distribution $P(\pi_A | \epsilon_M, p = 0)$ is analytic. We should emphasize that this plot is calulated directly in terms of eigenvalue analysis, not approximated by generating derivations of finite sizes. This plot means that the Binder parameter at p = 0 is truly analytic for an infinite system, not that it appears to be analytic because of finite system. From this figure, we can also see that the Binder parameter crosses over to zero as p becomes closer to 1. This is consistent with the above argument that there is no phase transition for 0 . We alsoshow the numerical results of the distribution $P(\pi_A)$ itself in SM.

Note that the distribution $P(\pi_A)$ may have a singularity with respect to p at p = 1/2, caused by percolation transition[20]. However, even if this transition exists, it can only be explained as a probabilistic branching of the trees, and this singularity has no relation to the weights M which is the essential element of PCFG. This phenomenon would not reflect any nature of PCFG.

It is revealed that there is no phase transition for finite N. We now consider the possibility of existence of phase transition in the limit $N \to \infty$. If we agree with the concept of the so-called *infinite use of finite means*, the



FIG. 3. (a) A possibile behavior of Binder parameter with singularity in the limit $N \to \infty$. (b) Local minimum point ϵ_M^* of the Binder parameter as a function of N in log-log plot. (c) Absolute value of the local minimum U^* of the Binder parameter as a function of N in log-log plot. In both (b) and (c), the straight lines represent linear regression using the least squares method, and the error bars are evaluated by the bootstrap method with 5×10^2 bootstrap sets[19].

essential characteristic of language is that it can express infinite meanings with finite symbols [1, 21]. From this viewpoint, it is not clear what property of language this limit explains. Still, this limit is interesting as a physical model, since PCFG is used as a model for various phenomena other than language. As we have shown, it is sufficient to deal with the case with p = 0. Fig. 2(b) shows the Binder parameters of π_A for $N = 2, \dots, 10$ and p = 0. For each ϵ_M , 4×10^5 grammars for $N = 2, \cdots, 7$ and 1.6×10^6 grammars for N = 8, 9, 10 were generated. As seen in Fig. 2(b), the dip of the Binder parameter gets deeper as N increases. In the limit $N \to \infty$, this point might become singular at finite ϵ_M s shown in Fig. 3(a), which can be a phase transition as seen in a three-dimensional Heisenberg spin glass [22]. To study whether this phenomenon occurs, we observed numerically the dependence of the local minimum point of the Binder parameter on N by generating 4×10^5 grammars for each N and ϵ_M . As Fig. 3(b) and (c) show, the results suggest that ϵ_M^* converges to zero algebraically in N and U^* also diverges to $-\infty$ algebraically. Thus, no evidences imply the existence of singularity as in Fig. 3(a) in the limit $N \to \infty$.

Our analysis for finite N holds even if the weights M are not generated from a lognormal distribution. As long

as the distribution is an analytic function of ϵ_M , the analyticity of $P(\pi_A|\epsilon_M, p)$ can be shown theoretically in the same way. Our numerical analysis for inifinite N also suggests that no phase transition exists even in the limit $N \to \infty$. This conclusion might be different if the distribution of M is not the lognormal distribution. For example, if M_{ABC} 's are not i.i.d., but dependent on each other, then $P(\pi_A|\epsilon_M, p)$ might have a singularity with ϵ_M in the limit $N \to \infty$. In [13], DeGiuli also claimed that Shannon entropy has a singularity. However, an argument similar to that for "order parameter" Q_{ABC} can be developed to show the analyticity of Shannon entropy. The detailed explanation is present in SM.

In terms of both the "order parameter" Q_{ABC} and Shannon entropy, the RLM does not have a singularity. As seen from the overall analysis, the most fundamental reason for the absence of singularity relies on the fact that the distribution on a node depends only on the weights M and the distribution on their parent nodes. To see nontrivial physical phenomena such as a phase transition, we might need to consider more complex models in which the distribution on a node is determined by more factors. One possible model is probabilistic context-sensitive grammar (PCSG), that is, an extension of context-sensitive grammar (CSG) by assigning probabilistic weights to the rules. CSG is one level higher than CFG in the Chomsky hierarchy[3], where a resulting string in each rule depend not on a single symbol, but on a substring. Thanks to this property, the behavior of the distribution of symbols can no longer be computed in the same manner as in PCFG.

We conclude that, in the RLM, the model for the typical evaluation of PCFG, there does not exist a phase transition as has been suggested because the PCFG and the RLM are too simple. This fact, however, does not deny the significance of the study of the probabilistic extension of grammars in the Chomsky hierarchy as an approach for natural language from mathematical sciences. The typical properties of PCSG should be analyzed in the future to search for the nontrivial physical phenomena that are different from those in the RLM.

We would like to thank K. Kaneko, A. Ikeda, and A. Morihata for useful discussions. This work was partly supported by the World-leading Innovative Graduate Study Program for Advanced Basic Science Course at the University of Tokyo.

- [1] N. Chomsky, Syntactic Structures (Mouton & Co., 1957).
- [2] N. Chomsky, Three models for the description of language, IRE Transactions on information theory 2, 113 (1956).
- [3] N. Chomsky, On certain formal properties of grammars, Information and control 2, 137 (1959).
- [4] J. G. Escudero, Formal languages for quasicrystals, in Symmetries in Science IX (Springer, 1997) pp. 139–152.
- [5] H. Kajino, Molecular hypergraph grammar with its appli-

cation to molecular optimization, in *International Con*ference on Machine Learning (PMLR, 2019) pp. 3183– 3191.

- [6] F. Jelinek, J. D. Lafferty, and R. Mercer, Basic methods of probabilistic context free grammars, in *Speech Recognition and Understanding* (Springer, 1992) pp. 345–360.
- [7] D. Harlow, S. H. Shenker, D. Stanford, and L. Susskind, Tree-like structure of eternal inflation: A solvable model, Phys. Rev. D 85, 063516 (2012).

- [8] H. W. Lin and M. Tegmark, Critical behavior in physics and probabilistic formal languages, Entropy 19, 299 (2017).
- [9] B. Knudsen and J. Hein, Rna secondary structure prediction using stochastic context-free grammars and evolutionary history., Bioinformatics 15, 446 (1999).
- [10] D. Klein and C. D. Manning, Corpus-based induction of syntactic structure: Models of dependency and constituency, in *Proceedings of the 42nd annual meeting of* the association for computational linguistics (ACL-04) (2004) pp. 478–485.
- [11] H. Noji, Statistical models to induce latent syntactic structures, Proceedings of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics 64, 145 (2016).
- [12] H. Ney, Dynamic programming parsing for context-free grammars in continuous speech recognition, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing **39**, 336 (1991).
- [13] E. DeGiuli, Random language model, Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, 128301 (2019).
- [14] E. DeGiuli, Emergence of order in random languages, J. Phys. A 52, 504001 (2019).
- [15] J. E. Hopcroft, R. Motwani, and J. Ullman, Introduction

to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation, 3rd ed. (Pearson, 2007).

- [16] D. J. Gross, I. Kanter, and H. Sompolinsky, Mean-field theory of the potts glass, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 304 (1985).
- [17] K. Binder, Finite size scaling analysis of ising model block distribution functions, Z. Phys. B 43, 119 (1981).
- [18] K. Binder and D.P.Landau, Finite-size scaling at firstorder phase transitions, Phys. Rev. B 30, 1477 (1984).
- [19] P. Young, Everything you wanted to know about data analysis and fitting but were afraid to ask, e-print arXiv:1210.3781 (2012).
- [20] D. Stauffer and A. Aharony, Introduction to Percolation Theory (CRC press, 2018).
- [21] C. Yang, S. Crain, R. C. Berwick, N. Chomsky, and J. J. Bolhuis, The growth of language: Universal grammar, experience, and principles of computation, Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev. 81, 103 (2017).
- [22] D. Imagawa and H. Kawamura, Monte carlo studies of the ordering of the three-dimensional isotropic heisenberg spin glass in magnetic fields, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn..