

# Do Transformers know symbolic rules, and would we know if they did?

Tommi Buder-Gröndahl<sup>1</sup>, Yujia Guo<sup>2</sup>, and N. Asokan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Helsinki

<sup>2</sup>Aalto University

<sup>3</sup>University of Waterloo

## Abstract

To improve the explainability of leading Transformer networks used in NLP, it is important to tease apart genuine *symbolic* rules from merely *associative* input-output patterns. However, we identify several inconsistencies in how “symbolicity” has been construed in recent NLP literature. To mitigate this problem, we propose two criteria to be the most relevant, one pertaining to a system’s internal architecture and the other to the dissociation between abstract rules and specific input identities. From this perspective, we critically examine prior work on the symbolic capacities of Transformers, and deem the results to be fundamentally inconclusive for reasons inherent in experiment design. We further maintain that there is no simple fix to this problem, since it arises – to an extent – in all end-to-end settings. Nonetheless, we emphasize the need for more robust evaluation of whether *non-symbolic* explanations exist for success in seemingly symbolic tasks. To facilitate this, we experiment on four sequence modelling tasks on the T5 Transformer in two experiment settings: zero-shot generalization, and generalization across class-specific vocabularies flipped between the training and test set. We observe that T5’s generalization is markedly stronger in sequence-to-sequence tasks than in comparable classification tasks. Based on this, we propose a thus far overlooked analysis, where the Transformer itself does not need to be symbolic to be *part* of a symbolic architecture as the *processor*, operating on the input and output as external memory components.

## 1 Introduction

Present-day natural language processing (NLP) is dominated by fine-tuning large pre-trained deep neural networks (DNNs) on downstream tasks. Variants of the Transformer architecture (Vaswani

et al. 2017) – such as BERT (Devlin et al. 2019), GPT-3 (Brown et al. 2020), and T5 (Raffel et al. 2020) – have displayed impressive sequence modelling performance, including in few- and zero-shot settings (Brown et al. 2020, Duan et al. 2019, Gao et al. 2021, Wei et al. 2022). Concurrently, model *explainability* has been recognized as vital for tackling challenges that arise in standard end-to-end methodology (Church 2017, Church and Liberman 2020, Danilevsky et al. 2020, Angelov et al. 2021).

An essential part of model explanation is evaluating whether the model relies on *symbolic rules* beyond merely *associative* patterns (Marcus 2018, 2020, Kassner et al. 2020, Hupkes et al. 2020). However, we note major disparities in what has been considered “symbolic” across contemporary NLP literature. As reviewed in Section 2, proposed criteria encompass e.g. out-of-distribution generalization (Marcus 2020), discreteness (Cartuyvels et al. 2021), semantics (Santoro et al. 2022), the type of data (Lample and Charton 2020), and the use of information not explicitly seen during training (Kassner et al. 2020). Problematically, these do not converge to a unified conception of symbolicity.

To unravel the situation, in Section 3 we identify two notions of symbolicity that we consider the most apt for evaluating DNNs. The first builds on Turing (1937) in taking symbolic computation to involve read/write operations on stored representations (e.g. Gallistel and King 2010). The second treats a rule as symbolic if it is *abstract* in making no reference to specific input identities, and thereby bolsters *systematic generalization* (Fodor and Pylyshyn 1988, Aizawa 2003, McLaughlin 2009). The criteria are conjoined in prototypical symbolic systems, but the use of abstract rules is not guaranteed by the use of a read/write memory.

Given the two criteria, we critically examine prior results on the performance of Transformers in putatively symbolic tasks. We deem these to be fundamentally inconclusive due to an inherent ambiguity in experiment design. The dilemma boils down to the *the unfalsifiability of non-symbolic explanations* of model performance.

While we do not foresee simple fixes to the predicament, we stress the importance of considering possible non-symbolic solutions to seemingly “symbolic” tasks: it should be established whether observed performance could be attained in the absence of genuine symbolic rules. One way to advance this line of research is to examine multiple comparable experiment settings with minor modifications to pinpoint relevant loci of variation.

As case studies, Section 4 presents four sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) or sequence classification tasks applied to T5 (Raffel et al. 2020): copying/reversal, copy/reverse detection, palindrome detection, and repetition detection. We further distinguish between two experiment settings, both concerning model generalization beyond the fine-tuning vocabulary distribution. In the *zero-shot* setting, the model is fine-tuned on one vocabulary and tested on another. In the *vocabulary flip* setting, the model is fine-tuned with target class-specific vocabularies that are flipped in the test set.

We find three main divergencies in T5’s performance between the tasks, covered in Section 5:

1. Zero-shot performance significantly exceeds vocabulary flip performance across all tasks.
2. Generalization is substantially stronger in seq2seq tasks than in classification tasks.
3. When small (1% – 10%) ratios of datapoints from flipped vocabularies are added in fine-tuning, T5 continues to fail at repetition detection despite succeeding at other tasks.

As discussed in Section 6, these differences in task performance shed light on the presence of symbolic rules. In particular, T5’s marked difficulty to learn repetition detection indicates an underlying obstacle to internalizing genuinely abstract symbolic rules that shun associative heuristic solutions.

Furthermore, motivated by the initially puzzling contrast between the seq2seq and classification tasks, we propose a novel hypothesis concerning the symbolic capacities of Transformers. The architectural conception of symbolicity relies on the *memory-processor distinction*. Crucially, it is agnostic about the location of these components in the implementing system. This brings

about a third possibility between treating Transformers as either fully associative or fully symbolic: they can function as the *processor* component in a larger system with the input and output as external “memory” components. Specifically, we suggest that attention together with positional encoding can implement *location-based memory* for storing abstract rules. However, its use is severely limited in classification, where all input information must be processed model-internally in a single encoding step. This hypothesis thus predicts the observed divergence between seq2seq and classification performance in learning abstract rules.

In summary: even if the model alone is not symbolic, the full input-model-output pipeline might be. This indicates that recent successes with augmenting Transformer input (Borgeaud et al. 2021, Nakano et al. 2021) could have a fundamental computational basis: externalizing memory facilitates the learning of abstract rules.

The paper’s contributions are outlined below:

- We show the lack of a unified conception of “symbolic” in contemporary NLP (Section 2).
- We identify a deep-seated challenge in interpreting prior results on symbolic learning by DNNs, and propose the methodology of scrutinizing loci of variation across comparable *prima facie* symbolic tasks (Section 3).
- Experimenting on T5’s vocabulary generalization abilities across four tasks (Section 4), we highlight the following patterns (Section 5):
  - T5 struggles to learn abstract rules when associative heuristics are unavailable.
  - Generalization is significantly better in seq2seq tasks than in classification tasks.
- Instead of treating Transformers as fully symbolic or non-symbolic, we propose a third alternative where they can function as the processor in a larger symbolic architecture with external memory components (Section 6).

## 2 Background

Fodor and Pylyshyn (1988) originally raised the question of whether connectionist models display *systematicity*, where certain computational capacities are reliably linked with others. For example, a systematic cognitive system able to understand

*John saw Mary* could also understand *Mary saw John*. Controversially, Fodor and Pylyshyn further asserted that systematicity requires a Turing architecture that encodes symbolic rules, which at least simple connectionist systems (e.g. classical perceptrons) lack. The matter has remained a topic of long-lasting debate without a general consensus (Aizawa 2003, McLaughlin 2009, Kiefer 2019). Similar fundamental questions have arisen for state-of-the-art DNNs such as LSTMs (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber 1997), GRUs (Cho et al. 2014), and Transformers (Vaswani et al. 2017).

DNN-based NLP has largely followed an end-to-end approach that focuses on improving model performance rather than understanding it theoretically (Church 2017, Church and Liberman 2020). However, increasing emphasis has recently been placed on *model explainability* (Danilevsky et al. 2020, Angelov et al. 2021). This development is manifested by the common use of human-readable symbolic rules for analyzing the results of procedures like attention visualization (Thorne et al. 2019, Vig 2019) or structural probing (Hewitt and Manning 2019, Chen et al. 2021). For example, many studies have interpreted BERT as constructing classical linguistic representations such as syntax trees, dependency graphs, or semantic roles (Jawahar et al. 2019, Kovaleva et al. 2019, Tenney et al. 2019, Manning et al. 2020). These are paradigm examples of symbolic representations.

Symbolic interpretations of DNNs have also been challenged. Lake and Baroni (2018) illustrate the difficulties of LSTMs in tasks that require systematic inference. Goodwin et al. (2020) argue that LSTMs and GRUs encode input tokens in context-sensitive ways that discourage systematic generalization. Similar results are corroborated on Transformers by Talmor et al. (2020). Hupkes et al. (2020) evaluate LSTMs and Transformers on compositional inference, and deem that none of their models reliably exhibit it. Kassner et al. (2020) evaluate BERT’s abilities on six symbolic reasoning tasks, with only partial success.

DNNs have a general tendency to rely on surface heuristics (Gururangan et al. 2018, McCoy et al. 2019, Mickus et al. 2020), which can lead to biases (Kurita et al. 2019, Nadeem et al. 2021) and susceptibility to adversarial examples (Li et al. 2020). Such considerations indicate that models often prefer associative pattern matching to abstract rules. Still, this does not mean that they lack the capacity for understanding abstract rules *in principle*.

However, a deep-seated problem underlying prior research is that the notion of “symbolic” is rarely made explicit. Often the word is simply used without a proper explanation.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, suggested criteria for symbolicity vary significantly. Below, we briefly review seven characteristics commonly assigned to symbols.

**Human-readability.** Symbolic representations are often (at least potentially) understandable to a human interpreter. However, this is neither necessary nor sufficient for symbolicity, as associative models can also allow feature interpretation, and symbolic computation could exceed human comprehension.

**Manual programming.** A well-known drawback of rule-based AI is the need for human labor in programming (Bengio et al. 2021). However, this is not constitutive of symbolicity, which concerns the nature of the computation rather than its origin.

**Semantics.** In the field of semiotics, symbols are taken to be signs that bear an arbitrary relation to their referents, based on convention rather than on resemblance (as in iconic signs) or a factual relation (as in indexical signs) (Peirce 1868). While this conception has typically been distinct from the computational notion of “symbol”, it has recently been raised in NLP as well (Santoro et al. 2022). Alternatively, the word “symbol” can be used of anything that has a semantic interpretation, basically assimilating to the semiotic notion of sign. This reflects an influential view in classical cognitive science, according to which computation requires representational content (Fodor 1981). However, the necessity of semantic interpretation for computational symbols has also been challenged (Pylyshyn 1984, Egan 2010, Piccinini 2015). They indeed seem separable especially in an AI context: for example, our experiments use artificial tokens with no semantic interpretation attached (Section 4). The relationship between formal computation and semantic content deserves more scrutiny in NLP (cf. Bender and Koller 2020).

**Discreteness.** Symbols are sometimes assimilated to discrete/digital units or structures, set against the contiguous/analog representations used by DNNs (e.g. Bengio et al. 2021, Cartuyvels et al. 2021). However, this is problematic in both di-

---

<sup>1</sup>For instance, Hoehndorf and Queralt-Rosinach (2017) state that symbolic systems “represent things (...) through physical *symbols*, combine *symbols* into *symbol* expressions, and manipulate *symbols* and *symbol* expressions” (p. 27; our emphases).

reactions. Discrete representations and operations can also be used in non-symbolic systems, such as classical perceptrons (Rosenblatt 1958). Moreover, symbolic computation can be either digital or analog (Gallistel and King 2010, Piccinini 2015).

**Symbolic vs. numerical mathematics.** Mathematical expressions are symbolic if they contain variables instead of specific numerical values. Lample and Charton (2020) train a Transformer network on data representing symbolic equations, and treat success in this task as an indicator of symbolic computation by the model. A potential problem here is that the symbols are part of the input and output, and it is not evident whether mapping these to each other requires *model-internal* symbols. Furthermore, symbolic mathematics is clearly insufficient to define symbolic computation more broadly, which can apply beyond mathematical expressions.

**Model generalization.** The end-to-end focus of DNN applications has resulted in symbolicity being given mostly operational definitions. Kassner et al. (2020) consider the criterion for symbolic reasoning to be the ability to “infer knowledge not seen explicitly during pretraining” (p. 552). However, it is unclear why this could never arise in a non-symbolic model. A more specific idea is that the models should generalize beyond the training *distribution* (e.g. Marcus 2018, 2020). This, too, is inadequate without further elaboration, as non-symbolic associative processes could also generalize across certain aspects of training and test distributions. For example, Bengio (2019) specifically advocates the goal of increasing model generalizability *without* introducing symbolic computation.

**Memory-processor distinction.** Finally, a classical *architectural* criterion for symbolic systems is the presence of a *read-write memory* which is accessed by a separate *processor* that enacts read and write operations (e.g. Gallistel and King 2010). Here, symbols are units stored in the memory and manipulated by the processor. In Turing machines (Turing 1937) the memory-processor distinction corresponds to the division between the tape and the read/write head, and in von Neumann architectures (von Neumann 1945) to the division between the memory unit and the processor.

Most of the proposed criteria covered above are neither necessary nor sufficient for symbolicity, as they can be present in non-symbolic systems and absent from symbolic systems. At best, they pinpoint prototypical properties of systems/tasks commonly called “symbolic” in the literature, con-

stituting *family resemblance* (Wittgenstein 1953, Rosch 1975) rather than a definition. An important exception to this is the memory-processor distinction, which is a clearly delineated property of the implementing system’s architecture. In Section 3, we maintain that the most relevant notions of symbolicity for evaluating DNNs are this architectural conception on the one hand, and the learning of *abstract rules* on the other hand.

### 3 Problem statement

Based on the architectural conception of symbolic computation, Gallistel and King (2010) contend that neural networks are incapable of implementing it due to their *holistic* nature. Their internal states are highly entangled with respect to the information they hold: the information given by one part of the network typically depends on many (possibly all) other parts. Changes to the network thus have global consequences, which prevents their internal division into distinct memory and processor components. A related idea is expressed by Piccinini (2015: p. 143), who suggests that neural networks are *computationally primitive* in the same way as e.g. logic gates: while they can participate in computation, their own internal operations cannot be computationally decomposed.<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, such theoretical considerations alone are insufficient to rule out the possibility of a model-internal memory-processor distinction emerging in a DNN; especially given the success of Transformers in ostensibly “symbolic” tasks such as mathematical reasoning (Lample and Charton 2020) or linguistic inference (Tafjord et al. 2021). Experimental evaluation is also needed.

Symbolicity should further be connected to the internalization of *abstract rules*. This is the focus of much prior work (see Section 2), and ignoring it would significantly decrease the relevance of the topic for NLP. For present purposes, we consider a rule to be abstract if it *does not refer to specific input identities*. The implementation of any rule is always vocabulary-bound in the sense that concrete systems only recognize finite vocabularies. However, there is a crucial difference between this and the rule itself referring to specific inputs. As a toy example, the rule ‘map  $a$  to  $a$  and  $b$  to  $b$ ’ is

<sup>2</sup>Our proposal in Section 6 bears important similarity to this in distinguishing between model-internal symbolicity and the symbolicity of the full input-model-output pipeline.

input-specific; whereas the rule ‘map any input to itself’ is not – even if the system only recognized the input vocabulary  $\{a, b\}$ .

Abstract rules are especially manifested in *variable binding*, which is a crucial aspect of symbolic computation (Marcus 2001, 2018, 2020). This requires the system to implement *binding* relations that link *variables* to *instances*, and computational operations involving variables rather than only the instances. Both the variable and instance are symbols held in memory. In von Neumann architectures, variable binding is implemented via *location-based addressing* and *pointer architectures*.<sup>3</sup> Crucially, the memory-processor distinction allows the *indefinite maintenance* of the binding relation across changes to the rest of the system.

However, it is important to note that a memory-processor distinction does not as such require the system to learn abstract rules. Conversely, it is not obvious why an associative system could not learn anything “abstract” in some sense of the term. Hence, the link between symbolicity and abstract rules is less apparent than might initially seem.

We draw the connection by elaborating on Galistel and King’s (2010) observation discussed above: if a system is holistic in not admitting separation between its internal components, it also will not admit a distinction between the representations of abstract rules and input-specific information. Therefore, a genuinely abstract (i.e. input-independent) rule can only be represented by a system with an internal separation between a component for representing the rule in memory, and another component for representing input-specific information that interacts with the memorized abstract rule in determined ways without becoming fully “entangled” with it. Without a memory-processor distinction such entanglement would be unavoidable, since the input could only impact the system as a whole.

Despite this theoretical foundation for linking abstract rule learning to architectural symbolicity, we note a major dilemma in interpreting prior experimental results: the lack of baseline information on how a *non-symbolic* system would perform. This is illustrated by the quote below:

“It has been shown that such a language model [as BERT] *contains* certain de-

<sup>3</sup>Similar ideas have also been adopted in cognitive psychology (Green and Quilty-Dunn 2017, Quilty-Dunn 2020) and neuroscience (e.g. Kriete et al. 2013).

grees of syntactic (Goldberg 2019), semantic (Clark et al. 2019), common-sense (Cui et al. 2020) and logical reasoning (Clark et al. 2020) *knowledge*.” (Liu et al. 2021: p. 13392; our emphases; references reformatted by us)

The quote is ambiguous. It is unproblematic if “knowledge” is understood in the *procedural* sense of “knowing how” rather than the *propositional* sense of “knowing that” (Ryle 1949): the model has e.g. “logical knowledge” if it performs sufficiently well in end-to-end tasks that can be characterized as “logical reasoning”. In contrast, the shift from procedural to propositional knowledge requires the crucial additional assumption that procedural knowledge could *only* be achieved via propositional knowledge. Applied to AI, the inference from task performance to the internalization of symbolic rules relies on the assumption that such internalization is necessary for obtaining the performance. Summarized below, the argument from premises P1–P2 to the conclusion is only valid with the additional premise P3:

P1: Task T can be described by rule R

P2: Model M succeeds in T

**P3: M would fail in T without internalizing R**  
⇒ M has internalized R

Interpreting prior studies (see Section 2) as favoring/opposing symbolic computation in DNNs would require P3 as a background assumption, but baseline information in its support is lacking. Instead, model performance in tasks that can be *described* by a rule has readily been treated as direct evidence for/(against) the model having *internalized* the rule. This is insufficient in the absence of knowledge on how well the model could perform in the task *without* having internalized the rule.

Non-symbolic associative models can mimic abstract rules by responding in a similar way to different inputs, which can seem like abstracting away from the input. In contemporary DNNs the most apparent basis of this is *embedding similarity* between input tokens, which has been suggested to underlie e.g. generalization between languages in multilingual BERT (Cao et al. 2022). Unlike with genuinely abstract rules, here model performance is still embedding-specific: generalization arises from the similar embeddings of multiple tokens rather than abstract (input-independent) rules.

Therefore, to evaluate whether DNNs genuinely learn abstract rules, there should be a robust way to rule out model success via associative means based on e.g. embedding similarities. In end-to-end settings, there is currently no reliable method to achieve this. The dilemma is thus not a technical flaw in prior work, but instead reflects a fundamental challenge in model interpretation.

Despite the lack of simple solutions, we emphasize the need for more careful consideration of possible associative means for tackling seemingly “symbolic” tasks. Even if genuine proofs of either symbolic or non-symbolic interpretations of DNNs were unavailable, such evaluation is crucial especially for assessing the credibility of symbolic interpretations. In particular, we propose comparing multiple *prima facie* symbolic tasks across similar experiment settings to discover possible points of divergence in model performance, and creating a comprehensive taxonomy of the results to facilitate large-scale comparison between symbolic and associative interpretations.

## 4 Methodology

As case studies, we evaluate the T5 Transformer (Raffel et al. 2020) on four simple tasks that require generalizing rules across two disjoint subsets of the vocabulary:  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . Our source code for reproducing the experiments will be made available on GitHub, and is provided as supplementary material along with raw data.

**Tasks.** We experimented on a seq2seq task with two variations, a corresponding sequence pair classification task, and two sequence classification tasks, summarized below and in Table 1:<sup>4</sup>

- **Copy/reverse:** how to either repeat or reverse the input sequence?<sup>5</sup>
- **Copy/reverse detection:** are two sequences copies or reversals of each other?
- **Palindrome detection:** is a sequence identical with its reversal?
- **Repetition detection:** does a sequence contain more than one instance of any token?

**Data.** We used individual lowercase letters as input tokens, divided 50% – 50% into  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . In

<sup>4</sup>The task formulation is inspired by related experimental work conducted on MLPs in the 1990s (see Marcus 2001).

<sup>5</sup>To avoid ambiguity, we discarded palindromes in the fine-tuning and test data both here and in copy/reverse detection.

Task	Task class	Example	
		input	output
copy/reverse (seq2seq)	$C_1$	$a b$	$a b$
	$C_2$	$a b$	$b a$
copy/reverse detection	$C_1$	$a b </s> a b$	1
	$C_2$	$a b </s> b a$	0
palindrome detection	$C_1$	$a b a$	1
	$C_2$	$a b b$	0
repetition detection	$C_1$	$a b a$	1
	$C_2$	$a b c$	0

Table 1: Sequence modelling tasks experimented on.

the seq2seq task we distinguished task classes by the prefix “copy” or “reverse”. The simplicity of our vocabulary choice aims at minimizing collateral influence due to T5’s pre-training.

We adopted two experiment settings, titled *zero-shot* and *vocabulary flip*. These differ in how  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  relate in the fine-tuning and test data.

**Zero-shot.** In this setting, we fine-tuned T5 on  $V_1$  and tested it on  $V_2$ . This is made possible by both vocabularies being recognized by the pre-trained T5 tokenizer prior to fine-tuning.

**Vocabulary flip.** Here, we split inputs into two *task classes*:  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . In classification these correspond to distinct target classes, and in seq2seq they are separated by task prefixes. We used  $V_1$  for  $C_1$  and  $V_2$  for  $C_2$  during fine-tuning. The fine-tuned model was then tested with flipped vocabularies:  $V_2$  for  $C_1$  and  $V_1$  for  $C_2$ . We additionally introduced random mixing of vocabularies and task classes in the fine-tuning data, regulated by a *mix ratio* MIX. This is the probability of switching the vocabulary-task pairing in any datapoint. If  $MIX = 0$ , no such switching occurs. A low but non-zero MIX maintains the vocabulary bias but gives the model “hints” that the rule should be vocabulary-general.<sup>6</sup>

**Hyperparameters.** We fine-tuned the *t5-base* model,<sup>7</sup> using the vocabulary size of 10 for both  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ , 10000 as both the fine-tuning and test set size with a 80% evaluation split, and the batch size of 16. Training for 20 epochs, we applied the model checkpoint with the lowest evaluation loss to the test set. Further details on hyperparameters and implementation are provided in Appendix A.

<sup>6</sup>Mixing was not applied in the test set. Introducing test-like datapoints to the training set was also used by Lake and Baroni (2018) for LSTMs in systematic inference tasks. Here, low mixing did not significantly improve model performance.

<sup>7</sup><https://huggingface.co/t5-base>

## 5 Results

We cover T5’s performance in zero-shot settings (Section 5.1) and vocabulary flip settings with  $MIX \in \{0\%, 1\%, 10\%\}$  (Section 5.2). Training and evaluation accuracies were consistently high (0.91 – 1.00; see Appendix B), and Table 2 presents test set accuracies for each task class. We highlight the *discrepancy between seq2seq and classification tasks*, especially in the vocabulary flip setting. (All numbers are rounded to two decimal places.)

### 5.1 Zero-shot

T5 succeeded to a significant degree in all zero-shot settings, displaying strong generalization from  $V_1$  to  $V_2$  despite never seeing  $V_2$  during fine-tuning. Accuracy was the lowest for the reverse class in copy/reverse detection: only 0.88 in comparison to 1.00 for the copy class in the same task, and 0.97 for the reverse variant of the seq2seq task. Thus, while T5 learned both to reverse a string and detect if two strings are each others’ reversals, its performance on the latter was markedly lower.

### 5.2 Vocabulary flip

All three classification tasks completely failed with  $MIX = 0$ , only reaching accuracies in the range 0.00 – 0.10. Increasing  $MIX$  to 1% induced success in copy/reverse detection (0.94 – 1.00), and  $MIX = 10\%$  in palindrome detection (0.90 – 0.91). In contrast, repetition detection never exceeded 0.30 accuracy in either class, performing clearly below the chance level (0.50) even with  $MIX = 10\%$ .

As opposed to classification, the copy/reverse seq2seq task obtained 0.72–0.75 accuracy already with  $MIX = 0$ , increased to 1.00 with a higher  $MIX$ . Thus, while generalization from  $V_1$  to  $V_2$  was nonexistent in the classification tasks with  $MIX = 0$ , in seq2seq T5 learned to apply the correct rule the clear majority of time even here.

### 5.3 Summary

Zero-shot results establish T5’s ability to robustly extend across vocabularies in *prima facie* symbolic tasks. At the same time, the failure of repetition detection in the vocabulary flip setting illustrates that T5 still struggles with vocabulary bias in learning abstract rules, even when given explicit

counter-evidence via  $MIX$ . Vocabulary generalization was systematically stronger in seq2seq than in classification, especially in the vocabulary flip setting.

## 6 Discussion

It is possible to treat T5’s zero-shot success as corroborating its symbolic interpretation. According to this analysis, the model has internalized abstract rules (e.g. ‘copy/reverse the input’), stored using some kinds of placeholder symbols for input variables (e.g. ‘first/second/... element’). In contrast, a rival interpretation is that the results illustrate the aptitude of *associative* learning, and thus actually *cast doubt on the necessity of symbolicity* for achieving vocabulary generalization.

The difficulty of deciding between these contenders exemplifies the dilemma discussed in Section 3: the symbolic interpretation effectively relies on rejecting non-symbolic alternatives *a priori*. However, it is not ruled out that the detection of two identical input tokens could be based on e.g. the comparison between their corresponding embedding components.<sup>8</sup> Such non-symbolic analyses of our zero-shot results remain hypothetical at present, but provide an important venue for future research.

The lack of vocabulary flip generalization in classification tasks with  $MIX = 0\%$  is not particularly surprising as such: T5 gets caught on the vocabulary bias as a simple heuristic instead of learning the abstract rule. In contrast, the two main task discrepancies are less straight-forward to account for: (i) the particular failure at repetition detection even with  $MIX = 10\%$ ; and (ii) the success of seq2seq compared to classification. The former indicates a resistance to learning the abstract rule *even when explicit counter-evidence is provided* against the vocabulary heuristic. The difference between the three classification tasks is plausibly explained by task difficulty, allowing an increased  $MIX$  to induce learning the  $V_2$  variant for the two simpler tasks.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> As a simple example, vectors  $v_1 = (0, 1)$  and  $v_2 = (1, 0)$  share the range of component values. A model that compared pairs of corresponding components between two vectors would thus compare 0 to 0 and 1 to 1 *both* when comparing  $v_1$  to itself and when comparing  $v_2$  to itself. If the decision of whether two tokens are identical is based on the comparison of their corresponding embedding components, this could conceivably facilitate zero-shot success in detecting identical embeddings in different input positions.

<sup>9</sup>Both copy/reverse detection and palindrome detec-

Task	Task class	Zero-shot	Vocabulary flip		
			MIX = 0%	MIX = 1%	MIX = 10%
copy/reverse (seq2seq)	copy	1.00	<b>0.75</b>	1.00	1.00
	reverse	0.97	<b>0.72</b>	0.99	0.99
copy/reverse detection	copy	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
	reverse	<b>0.88</b>	0.00	0.94	1.00
palindrome detection	palindrome	1.00	0.07	0.09	0.90
	non-palindrome	0.90	0.00	0.02	0.91
repetition detection	repetition	0.96	0.08	0.27	<b>0.30</b>
	no repetition	1.00	0.10	0.12	<b>0.10</b>

Table 2: Test set accuracy per task class in zero-shot and vocabulary flip settings with  $MIX \in \{0\%, 1\%, 10\%\}$  (green:  $\geq 0.90$ ; red:  $\leq 0.10$ ; bold: deviation from the general pattern).

Crucially, however, vocabulary generalization is possible even with  $MIX = 0$ , as illustrated by the copying/reversal seq2seq task. To explain this, we propose that here the model can use input and output as *external memories*. Based on the architectural conception, this yields a *symbolic* interpretation of the input-Transformer-output pipeline.

Transformers apply *multi-head attention* to input positions for producing contextual embeddings of input tokens (Vaswani et al. 2017). At each copy/reverse step, the model first needs to attend to the input position of the relevant token, and then replicate this token in the output. Attention can be learned via the task marker token: the encoder should begin with the sequence-initial position and increase the position by one at each step when copying; and the converse when reversing. Token replication is a one-to-one mapping task learnt separately for each token. Zero-shot copy/reverse success further indicates that T5’s pre-training already facilitates token replication (possibly due to the paraphrasing pre-training task of *t5-base*).

A distinction thus arises between (i) attending to a certain input position; and (ii) replicating the token in the attended position. The first part bears important resemblance to *location-based memory addressing*, where a memory address is read *irrespective of its content*. Here, the input position corresponds to a memory location, the input token to the content of the location, and positional attention to the *read* operation. In token replication, decod-

tion rely on *position-specific* comparison between tokens; whereas repetition detection requires finding two instances in *any positions*. The former are thus expected to be easier to learn via positional attention. As of yet, we have no explanation of the difference between copy/reverse detection and palindrome detection with  $MIX = 1\%$ , and further research is required to evaluate whether similar effects reliably recur.




Figure 1: Architecturally symbolic interpretation of the full input-Transformer-output pipeline.

ing the token corresponds to a *write* operation on the output as an external memory component, and attending to prior decoder output to another *read* operation akin to reading the input. In other words, the Transformer functions as a *processor* within a larger symbolic architecture containing the input and output as external read/write memories. Figure 1 presents the overview of this analysis.

Unlike seq2seq, classification cannot rely on attention to different input positions at each encoding step, since there is *only one* step. Multi-step computation (such as repetition detection) would thus need to take place *model-internally*. This requires the model to rely on its own memory resources without being able to “externalize” location-addressable memory to the input/output.

Significant improvement in Transformer performance has recently been achieved with augmented input (Borgeaud et al. 2021, Nakano et al. 2021). Our analysis suggests a computational explanation of these findings: encouraging the use of external memory allows the model to focus fully on its tasks as the processor, which facilitates the architectural symbollicity of the full pipeline. This is further corroborated by theoretical work that highlights the importance of external input for reaching Turing-completeness in Transformers (Pérez et al. 2021).

## 7 Conclusions and future work

The question of whether Transformers internalize symbolic rules remains open, and will likely require algorithmic analysis beyond experimental work. The observed discrepancy between zero-shot and vocabulary flip generalization also invites further investigation. We stress the importance of evaluating (as of yet unfalsified) *non-symbolic* explanations before drawing conclusions on genuine model-internal symbollicity.

In contrast, we propose that the full input-Transformer-output pipeline satisfies the architectural requirement of symbollicity (memory-processor distinction): positional attention can implement location-based memory addressing with the input and output as external read/write memories. The potential of using Transformers for symbolic computation thus crucially depends on the *range of available input and computational steps*.

### Limitations

In order to facilitate the interpretability of results, our experimental setup is – by design – simple and formulated in artificial settings. This allows us to focus on the main research questions by minimizing confounding effects that may arise in more complex (and hence more realistic) NLP settings. Our vocabularies are artificial and maximally simple (single characters), and the model architecture is restricted to T5. Future work should examine the performance of tokens with more prevalent linguistic functions, as well as compare different linguistic classes (e.g. content vs. function words) and different languages in multi-lingual models. Our classification tasks are restricted to binary targets, and similar experiments could also be conducted in *multi-class* as well as *multi-label* settings. Experiments should also be expanded beyond T5 to cover more Transformer variants, evaluate the impact of model hyperparameters, and compare Transformers with a wider range of DNN architectures.

While we contend that non-symbolic associative analyses of zero-shot success on identical token detection have not been demonstrably falsified (Section 6, Footnote 8), this does not yet show such analyses to be correct. Additional research is needed to establish whether non-symbolic explanations of *prima facie* symbolic model performance are not only possible in principle but also plausible in practice.

## Ethics statement

This project involved no experiments on humans or non-human animals, and no privacy-sensitive data or offensive material was used or produced. The source code was built using open-source libraries, and a complete pipeline for replicating all experiments will be made available as open-source.

## References

- Ken Aizawa. *The Systematicity Arguments*. Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht, 2003. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-0275-3>.
- Plamen P. Angelov, Eduardo A. Soares, Richard Jiang, Nicholas I. Arnold, and Peter M. Atkinson. Explainable artificial intelligence: an analytical review. *WIREs Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 11(2):e1424, 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1424>.
- Emily M. Bender and Alexander Koller. Climbing towards NLU: On meaning, form, and understanding in the age of data. In *Proceedings of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5185–5198, 2020. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.463.
- Yoshua Bengio. From System 1 deep learning to System 2 deep learning. Presentation at the Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, 2019. URL <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FtUbMG3r1Fs>.
- Yoshua Bengio, Yann LeCun, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning for AI. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(7):58–65, 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448250>.
- Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Katie Millican, George van den Driessche, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Bogdan Damoc, Aidan Clark, Diego de Las Casas, Aurelia Guy, Jacob Menick, Roman Ring, Tom Hennigan, Saffron Huang, Loren Maggiore, Chris Jones, Albin Cassirer, Andy Brock, Michela Paganini, Geoffrey Irving, Oriol Vinyals, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Jack W. Rae, Erich Elsen, and Laurent Sifre. Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04426*, 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2112.04426>.

- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1877–1901, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf>.
- Steven Cao, Nikita Kitaev, and Dan Klein. Multilingual alignment of contextual word representations. In *The International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022. URL [http://nlp.cs.berkeley.edu/pubs/Cao-Kitaev-Klein\\_2020\\_MultilingualAlignment\\_paper.pdf](http://nlp.cs.berkeley.edu/pubs/Cao-Kitaev-Klein_2020_MultilingualAlignment_paper.pdf).
- Ruben Cartuyvels, Graham Spinks, and Marie-Francine Moens. Discrete and continuous representations and processing in deep learning: Looking forward. *AI Open*, 2:143–159, 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aiopen.2021.07.002>.
- Boli Chen, Yao Fu, Guangwei Xu, Pengjun Xie, Chuanqi Tan, Mosha Chen, and Liping Jing. Probing BERT in hyperbolic spaces. In *The International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=17VnwXYZyhH>.
- Kyunghyun Cho, Bart van Merriënboer, Dzmitry Bahdanau, and Yoshua Bengio. On the properties of neural machine translation: Encoder–decoder approaches. In *Proceedings of SSST-8, Eighth Workshop on Syntax, Semantics and Structure in Statistical Translation*, pages 103–111, 2014. doi: 10.3115/v1/W14-4012.
- Kenneth Ward Church. Emerging trends: I did it, I did it, I did it, but... *Natural Language Engineering*, 23(3):473–480, 2017. doi: [doi: 10.1017/S1351324917000067](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1351324917000067).
- Kenneth Ward Church and Mark Liberman. The future of computational linguistics: On beyond alchemy. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 4: 10, 2020. doi: [doi:10.3389/frai.2021.625341](https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2021.625341).
- Kevin Clark, Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, and Christopher D. Manning. What does BERT look at? An analysis of BERT’s attention. In *Proceedings of the Second BlackboxNLP Workshop on Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 276–286, 2019. doi: [10.18653/v1/W19-4828](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W19-4828).
- Peter Clark, Oyvind Tafjord, and Kyle Richardson. Transformers as soft reasoners over language. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-20)*, pages 3882–3890, 2020. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.5555/3491440.3491977>.
- Leyang Cui, Sijie Cheng, Yu Wu, and Yue Zhang. On commonsense cues in BERT for solving commonsense tasks. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.03945*, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2008.03945>.
- Marina Danilevsky, Kun Qian, Ranit Aharonov, Yannis Katsis, Ban Kawas, and Prithviraj Sen. A survey of the state of explainable AI for natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 10th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 447–459, 2020. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.aacl-main.46.pdf>.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4171–4186, 2019. doi: [10.18653/v1/N19-1423](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423).
- Xiangyu Duan, Mingming Yin, Min Zhang, Boxing Chen, and Weihua Luo. Zero-shot cross-lingual abstractive sentence summarization through teaching generation and attention. In *Proceedings of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3162–3172, 2019. doi: [10.18653/v1/P19-1305](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1305).
- Frances Egan. Computation models: a modest role for content. *Studies in History and Philosophy*

- of Science*, 41(3):253–259, 2010. doi: doi:10.1016/j.shpsa.2010.07.009.
- Jerry Fodor. The mind-body problem. *Scientific American*, 244, 1981. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0181-114>. Reprinted in John Heil (ed.). 2004. *Philosophy of Mind: A Guide and Anthology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pages 168–182.
- Jerry Fodor and Zenon Pylyshyn. Connectionism and cognitive architecture: a critical analysis. *Cognition*, 28(1–2):3–71, 1988. doi: 10.1016/0010-0277(88)90031-5.
- C. Randy Gallistel and Adam Philip King. *Memory and the Computational Brain: How Cognitive Science will Transform Neuroscience*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, 2010. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Memory-and-the-Computational-Brain%3A-Why-Cognitive-Gallistel-King/965a6451ba5eca2dc17d0bacac4cabb551edb050>.
- Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 3816–3830, 2021. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.295.
- Yoav Goldberg. Assessing BERT’s syntactic abilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1901.05287*, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1901.05287>.
- Emily Goodwin, Koustuv Sinha, and Timothy J. O’Donnell. Probing linguistic systematicity. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1958–1969, 2020. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.177.
- E. J. Green and Jake Quilty-Dunn. What is an object file? *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 72(3):665–699, 2017. doi: 10.1093/bjps/axx055.
- Suchin Gururangan, Swabha Swayamdipta, Omer Levy, Roy Schwartz, Samuel Bowman, and Noah A. Smith. Annotation artifacts in natural language inference data. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 107–112, 2018. doi: 10.18653/v1/N18-2017.
- John Hewitt and Christopher D. Manning. A structural probe for finding syntax in word representations. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4129–4138, 2019. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1419.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural Computation*, 9(8): 1735–1780, 1997. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735>.
- Robert Hoehndorf and Núúia Queralt-Rosinach. Data science and symbolic AI: Synergies, challenges and opportunities. *Data Science*, 1:27–38, 2017. doi: 10.3233/DS-170004.
- Dieuwke Hupkes, Verna Dankers, Mathijs Mul, and Elia Bruni. Compositionality decomposed: How do neural networks generalise? *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 67:757–795, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2020/708>.
- Ganesh Jawahar, Benoît Sagot, and Djamé Seddah. What does BERT learn about the structure of language? In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3651–3657, 2019. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1356.
- Nora Kassner, Benno Krojer, and Hinrich Schütze. Are pretrained language models symbolic reasoners over knowledge? In *Proceedings of the 24th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 552–564, 2020. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.conll-1.45.
- Alex B. Kiefer. *A Defense of Pure Connectionism*. PhD thesis, City University of New York, 2019. URL [https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc\\_etds/3036](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/3036).
- Olga Kovaleva, Alexey Romanov, Anna Rogers, and Anna Rumshisky. Revealing the dark secrets of BERT. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International*

- Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 4365–4374, 2019. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1445.
- Trenton Kriete, David C. Noelle, Jonathan D. Cohen, and Randall C. O’Reilly. Indirection and symbol-like processing in the prefrontal cortex and basal ganglia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(41):16390–16395, 2013. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1303547110. URL <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1303547110>.
- Keita Kurita, Nidhi Vyas, Ayush Pareek, Alan W. Black, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Measuring bias in contextualized word representations. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Gender Bias in Natural Language Processing*, pages 166–172, 2019. doi: 10.18653/v1/W19-3823.
- Brenden Lake and Marco Baroni. Generalization without systematicity: On the compositional skills of sequence-to-sequence recurrent networks. In *35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4487–4499, 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/lake18a.html>.
- Guillaume Lample and François Charton. Deep learning for symbolic mathematics. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.01412>.
- Linyang Li, Ruotian Ma, Qipeng Guo, Xiangyang Xue, and Xipeng Qiu. BERT-ATTACK: Adversarial attack against BERT using BERT. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6193–6202, 2020. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.500.
- Hanmeng Liu, Leyang Cui, Jian Liu, and Yue Zhang. Natural language inference in context – investigating contextual reasoning over long texts. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-21)*, pages 13388–13396, 2021. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/download/17580/17387>.
- Christopher D. Manning, Kevin Clark, John Hewitt, Urvashi Khandelwal, and Omer Levy. Emergent linguistic structure in artificial neural networks trained by self-supervision. *PNAS*, 117(48):30046–30054, 2020. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1907367117.
- Gary Marcus. *The Algebraic Mind: Integrating Connectionism and Cognitive Science*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2001. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Algebraic-Mind%3A-Integrating-Connectionism-and-Marcus/a6383f155fa9d3e9b15092bfebf613f982eb263>.
- Gary Marcus. Deep learning: A critical appraisal. In *ArXiv preprint ArXiv:1801.00631*, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1801.00631>.
- Gary Marcus. The next decade in AI: Four steps towards robust artificial intelligence. *ArXiv preprint ArXiv:2002.06177*, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2002.06177>.
- Tom McCoy, Ellie Pavlick, and Tal Linzen. Right for the wrong reasons: Diagnosing syntactic heuristics in natural language inference. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3428–3448, 2019. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1334.
- Brian McLaughlin. Systematicity redux. *Synthese*, 170(2):251–274, 2009. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-009-9582-0>.
- Timothee Mickus, Denis Paperno, Mathieu Constant, and Kees van Deemter. What do you mean, BERT? Assessing BERT as a distributional semantics model. In *Proceedings of the Society for Computation in Linguistics*, pages 350–361, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7275/t778-ja71>.
- Moin Nadeem, Anna Bethke, and Siva Reddy. StereoSet: Measuring stereotypical bias in pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5356–5371, 2021. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.416.
- Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, Xu Jiang, Karl Cobbe, Tyna Eloundou, Gretchen Krueger, Kevin Button, Matthew Knight, Benjamin Chess, and John Schulman. WebGPT: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09332*,

2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2112.09332>.
- Charles Sanders Peirce. On a new list of categories. *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 7:287–298, 1868. URL <http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/peirce--charles-list-categories.pdf>.
- Jorge Pérez, Pablo Barceló, and Javier Marinkovic. Attention is Turing complete. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22:1–35, 2021. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v22/20-302.html>.
- Gualtiero Piccinini. *Physical Computation: A Mechanistic Account*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2015. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199658855.001.0001.
- Zenon Pylyshyn. *Computation and Cognition*. MIT Press, Cambridge, 1984. URL <https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/computation-and-cognition>.
- Jake Quilty-Dunn. Polysemy and thought: Toward a generative theory of concepts. *Mind & Language*, 36(1):158–185, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.12328>.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, M. Matena, Yanqi Zhou, W. Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21:140:1–140:67, 2020. URL <https://jmlr.org/papers/volume21/20-074/20-074.pdf>.
- Eleanor Rosch. Cognitive representations of semantic categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 104(3):192–233, 1975. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.104.3.192>.
- Frank Rosenblatt. The perceptron: A probabilistic model for information storage and organization in the brain. *Psychological Review*, 65(6):586–408, 1958. doi: 10.1037/h0042519.
- Gilbert Ryle. *The Concept of Mind*. Hutchinson, London, 1949. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203875858>.
- Adam Santoro, Andrew Lampinen, Kory Mathewson, Timothy Lillicrap, and David Raposo. Symbolic behaviour in artificial intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.03406*, 2022. doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2102.03406>.
- Oyvind Tafjord, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, and Peter Clark. ProofWriter: Generating implications, proofs, and abductive statements over natural language. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 3621–3634, 2021. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.findings-acl.317.pdf>.
- Alon Talmor, Yanai Elazar, Yoav Goldberg, and Jonathan Berant. oLMpics-On what language model pre-training captures. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:743–758, 2020. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl\\_a\\_00342](https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00342).
- Ian Tenney, Dipanjan Das, and Ellie Pavlick. BERT rediscovers the classical NLP pipeline. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4593–4601, 2019. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1452.
- James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. Generating token-level explanations for natural language inference. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 963–969, 2019. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1101.
- Alan Turing. On computable numbers, with an application to the entscheidungsproblem. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 42(2):230–265, 1937. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1112/plms/s2-42.1.230>.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhins. Attention is all you need. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing*, pages 6000–6010, 2017. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf>.
- Jesse Vig. A multiscale visualization of attention in the transformer model. In *Proceedings of*

the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations, pages 37–42, 2019. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-3007.

John von Neumann. First draft of a report on the EDVAC. University of Pennsylvania, 1945. URL <http://abelgo.cn/cs101/papers/Neumann.pdf>.

Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *The International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=gEzrGCozdqR>.

Ludwig Wittgenstein. *Philosophical Investigations*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1953. URL <https://philpapers.org/rec/WITPI-4>.

## A Experiment hyperparameters

We used *Pytorch*<sup>10</sup> (1.7.0) as the deep learning framework, *simpletransformers*<sup>11</sup> (0.63.4) for obtaining T5, and *t5-base*<sup>12</sup> as the pre-trained model for fine-tuning. We conducted GPU computation on the Docs CSC computing platform with NVIDIA V100. The average training time for 20 epochs was 84 minutes.

Table 3 lists the hyperparameters.

<b>Pre-trained</b>	<b>model</b>	<i>t5-base</i>	
	<b>parameters</b>	220M	
	<b>vocabulary size</b>	32000	
	<b>attention heads</b>	12	
	<b><math>d_{\text{model}}</math></b>	768	
	<b><math>d_{\text{kv}}</math></b>	64	
	<b><math>d_{\text{ff}}</math></b>	3072	
<b>Fine-tuning</b>	<b><math>V_1</math></b>	abcdefghij	
	<b><math>V_2</math></b>	klmnopqrst	
	<b>dataset size</b>	train	8000
		eval	2000
		test	10000
	<b>datapoint length</b>	min.	1
max.		10	
<b>training</b>	batch size	16	
	epochs	20	

Table 3: Experiment hyperparameters.

$d_{\text{model}}$ : embedding/hidden layer dimensionality

$d_{\text{kv}}$ : key/value matrix dimensionality

$d_{\text{ff}}$ : output dimensionality of feed-forward layers

## B Training, evaluation, and test results

Table 4 shows training, evaluation, and test results across all fine-tuning tasks in both zero-shot and vocabulary flip settings. Accuracy is used as the performance metric, and task classes are always divided 50% – 50%.

<sup>10</sup><https://pytorch.org/>

<sup>11</sup><https://simpletransformers.ai/>

<sup>12</sup><https://huggingface.co/t5-base>

Task	Task class	Dataset	Zero-shot	Vocabulary flip		
				MIX = 0%	MIX = 1%	MIX = 10%
copy/reverse	copy	train	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
		eval	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
		test	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00
	reverse	train	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
		eval	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
		test	0.97	0.72	0.99	0.99
copy/reverse detection	copy	train	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
		eval	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
		test	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
	reverse	train	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
		eval	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
		test	0.88	0.00	0.94	1.00
palindrome detection	palindrome	train	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00
		eval	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00
		test	1.00	0.07	0.09	0.90
	non-palindrome	train	0.98	1.00	0.99	0.98
		eval	0.98	1.00	0.99	0.97
		test	0.90	0.00	0.02	0.91
repetition detection	repetition	train	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.93
		eval	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.93
		test	0.96	0.08	0.27	0.30
	no repetition	train	1.00	1.0	0.99	0.91
		eval	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.91
		test	1.00	0.10	0.12	0.10

Table 4: Training, evaluation, and test accuracy per task class in zero-shot and vocabulary flip settings.