

Simulating Hard Attention Using Soft Attention

Andy Yang

University of Notre Dame
ayang4@nd.edu

David Chiang

University of Notre Dame
dchiang@nd.edu

Lena Strobl

Umeå University
lena.strobl@umu.se

Dana Angluin

Yale University
dana.angluin@yale.edu

Abstract

We study conditions under which transformers using soft attention can simulate hard attention, that is, effectively focus all attention on a subset of positions. First, we examine several variants of linear temporal logic, whose formulas have been previously shown to be computable using hard attention transformers. We demonstrate how soft attention transformers can compute formulas of these logics using unbounded positional embeddings or temperature scaling. Second, we demonstrate how temperature scaling allows softmax transformers to simulate a large subclass of average-hard attention transformers, those that have what we call the *uniform-tieless* property.

1 Introduction

A central element of transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017) is *attention*, in which each position computes a weighted average of values from all unmasked positions. In standard attention, which we call *soft* attention, the attention weights are computed by the softmax function and cannot be exactly 0 (unless there is masking) or exactly 1 (unless there is only one position). This is appropriate in applications like machine translation (Bahdanau et al., 2015), where attention models the often fuzzy relationship of target words to source words. But there is a tension between soft attention and discrete tasks like integer arithmetic, algebra, logical reasoning, finite automata, Turing machines, and computer programs. Researchers trying to show that transformers can solve such tasks have often turned to other definitions of attention.

Hahn (2020) defined what is now called *unique-hard attention*, in which all attention is on a single position attaining the maximum attention score, and zero attention is paid to all other positions. Yang et al. (2024) proved that unique-hard atten-

tion transformers (UHATs) with no position information besides masking recognize exactly the star-free languages, and equivalences for other variants as well. They also proved that UHATs can solve the multi-query associative recall task (Friedman et al., 2023). But since star-free languages are rather restricted, these results suggest that UHATs may be less expressive than standard soft-attention transformers (SMATs). Perhaps surprisingly, it has not been shown previously that UHATs can be simulated by SMATs. (For other results on unique-hard attention, see Section 2.1.)

Pérez et al. (2019), to prove that transformers with chain-of-thought are Turing-complete, introduced what is now called *average-hard attention* or *saturated attention*: given a score vector, equal attention is paid to each position in which the maximum attention score is attained, and zero attention is paid to all other positions. Average-hard attention transformers (AHATs) have been constructed to solve a variety of discrete tasks: matching parentheses (Yao et al., 2021), simulating an n -gram model (Svete and Cotterell, 2024), simulating linear temporal logic with counting terms (Barceló et al., 2024), simulating the programming language S-RASP (Strobl et al., 2024), and others. For many of these tasks, no construction using soft attention is known. These results raise the question of whether AHATs could be *more* expressive than SMATs. (For other results on average-hard attention, see Section 2.2, and for other alternatives to softmax, see Section 2.3.)

One approach to constructing SMATs for discrete tasks has been to give a hard attention construction and then to use soft attention to approximate it (Liu et al., 2023a; Sanford et al., 2024). In this paper, we contribute new results that help to answer the question: *Under what general conditions can soft attention simulate hard attention?*

We are interested in simulations of hard attention that are *general* – that is, for a class of hard

attention transformers, not just for a particular language – and *parameter-uniform*, that is, the number and values of the parameters do not depend on the input length n . This ensures that the same model and parameters can be used for arbitrary n .


A key limitation of soft attention (Hahn, 2020, Lemma 5) is that in a transformer with (1) scaled dot-product, softmax attention, (2) parameters whose number and values do not depend on n , (3) Lipschitz-continuous position-wise operations, and (4) bounded position embeddings, a change in one input symbol results in only an $O(1/n)$ change in any other output activation. All nontrivial discrete tasks have the property that changing a single symbol of the input may change an output symbol; an example of a task where changing a single symbol *always* changes the output is PARITY (deciding whether the number of 1’s in a string is odd).

Chiang and Cholak (2022) constructed a SMAT for PARITY, but as n increases, the gap between the output for acceptance and rejection approaches 0, as it must. However, this is a problem for generality: If the outputs of one module are separated by a vanishing gap, and another module expects inputs that are symbol-embeddings (which are separated by a distance in $\Omega(1)$), then the two modules cannot be composed.

Any task where the change in the final output must be more than $\Theta(1/n)$ cannot be solved by a SMAT under the above assumptions. The solutions that we are aware of each drop one assumption:

- (1) Temperature scaling, in which attention scores are scaled by a function of n before the softmax (Chiang and Cholak, 2022).
- (2) Rounding, used by Sanford et al. (2024) to correct approximation errors. They round to $\Theta(\log n)$ bits, which requires a feedforward network with depth or width depending on n (Lemma 27), for a construction that is general, but not parameter-uniform. Similarly, Li et al. (2024) round to constant precision, but the embedding size depends on n .
- (3) Layer normalization, as originally defined (Ba et al., 2016), is not Lipschitz-continuous, and can be used to increase sensitivity (Chiang and Cholak, 2022; Yao et al., 2021; Merrill et al., 2024; Yang and Chiang, 2024).
- (4) Unbounded position encodings, whose norm may grow as a function of n .

Here, we consider general and parameter-uniform simulations of hard attention by soft at-



	Simulatee	Temp. $\tau(n)$	PE
§4.1	TL[\ominus, \oplus]	$O(1/n)$	$O(1)$
		$O(1)$	$O(n)$
§4.2	TL[since, until]	$O(1/n)$	$O(1)$
		$O(1)$	$O(n)$
§4.4	TL[$\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}$]	$O(1/n)$	$O(n^2)$
		$O(1)$	$O(n^3)$
§5	AHAT[UT]	See Theorem 26	

Figure 1: Simulation by τ -SMAT. Solid arrows denote results proved in this paper. Key: τ = temperature; PE = position embedding.

tention, using unbounded position encodings and temperature scaling (methods (1) and (4) above). Our results are summarized in Fig. 1.

Our first set of results (Section 4) concerns several variants of linear temporal logic (LTL) whose formulas have previously been shown to be computable using UHATs or AHATs. We show how this can be done using SMATs, using either unbounded PEs or temperature scaling.

Our second result (Section 5) concerns average-hard attention. Although the question of whether there is a general way to simulate AHATs using soft attention remains open, we define a restriction of average-hard attention, the *uniform-tieless property*, in which every attention layer is either uniform or has only a single position with the maximum attention score. We prove that this property allows simulation using temperature scaled soft attention, with a temperature not much lower than the smallest gap between the maximum attention score and the next largest score. In the literature on transformer expressivity, most constructions of AHATs are uniform-tieless or can easily be made so (see Section 6). This includes all the constructions mentioned above, except the PARITY construction of Chiang and Cholak (2022).

2 Background

2.1 Unique-hard attention

Unique-hard attention permits several positions to have the maximum attention score, but has some means of breaking the tie to focus all attention on just one of the tied positions. In *leftmost*-hard attention, the leftmost such position receives all the attention, while in *rightmost*-hard attention, the rightmost such position receives all the attention.

Hahn (2020) proved that a UHAT cannot recognize either of the formal languages PARITY or DYCK-1. Hao et al. (2022) showed that all the formal languages recognizable by UHATs are contained in the circuit complexity class AC^0 . Barceló et al. (2024) showed that they can simulate LTL[Mon].

2.2 Average-hard attention

Merrill et al. (2022) proved that any formal language recognized by a AHAT is contained in the circuit complexity class TC^0 , which properly contains AC^0 .

In addition to its use by Pérez et al. (2019) in simulating Turing machines, average-hard attention has been used to construct transformers to solve a variety of discrete tasks. Yao et al. (2021) used average-hard attention in the second layer of a 2-layer transformer to recognize the formal language DYCK- k . Barceló et al. (2024) proved that for any formula ϕ of linear temporal logic (LTL) augmented with counting terms, there is an AHAT that recognizes the language defined by ϕ . Strobl et al. (2024) showed that for any S-RASP program there is an AHAT that simulates it. Svete and Cotterell (2024) gave constructions that simulate an n -gram language model using AHATs.

2.3 Other softmax alternatives

While softmax attention cannot assign zero attention weights, sparsemax (Martins and Astudillo, 2016) can, which could enable it to simulate hard attention exactly. For instance, Svete and Cotterell (2024) use sparsemax to express n -gram language models.

Geometric attention (Csordás et al., 2022) is designed with a rightward bias; with temperature scaling, as τ approaches zero, geometric attention approaches strictly future-masked rightmost-hard attention.

3 Preliminaries

We write $[n]$ for the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. For any Boolean value b , we let $\mathbb{I}[b] = 1$ if b is true and 0 if b is false.

If X and Y are sets, we write X^+ for the set of non-empty sequences over X , and we write $f: X^+ \xrightarrow{\text{lp}} Y^+$ to state that f maps a sequence $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^+$ to a sequence of the same length $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in Y^+$.

If \mathbf{A} is a matrix, we write $\mathbf{A}_{i,*}$ for the i -th row of \mathbf{A} and $\mathbf{A}_{*,j}$ for the j -th column of \mathbf{A} .

3.1 Transformers

A *transformer* is a neural network that, in this paper, defines a length-preserving mapping from strings to strings. An input layer maps a string to a sequence of vectors. Then the network processes sequences of vectors through multiple layers, each consisting of a self-attention sublayer followed by a feed-forward sublayer. Finally, an output layer maps the sequence of vectors to a string.

Input Let Σ be an input alphabet, and let $\mathbf{w} = w_1 w_2 \dots w_n \in \Sigma^+$ be an input sequence of length n . Each token w_i is mapped to a vector $\mathbf{x}_i = \text{WE}(w_i) + \text{PE}_n(i)$, where $\text{WE}: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a *word embedding* and $\text{PE}_n: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ *position embedding*. Thus the input sequence is represented as a sequence of vectors $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^+$.

Transformer Layers We initialize $\mathbf{h}_i^{(0)} = \mathbf{x}_i$ for all i . For each layer $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, we compute

$$(\mathbf{c}_1^{(\ell)}, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n^{(\ell)}) = \text{SA}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{h}_1^{(\ell-1)}, \dots, \mathbf{h}_n^{(\ell-1)})$$

where $\text{SA}^{(\ell)}$ is the self-attention function defined below in Definition 1, with parameters $\mathbf{W}^{(Q,\ell)}$, $\mathbf{W}^{(K,\ell)}$, $\mathbf{W}^{(V,\ell)}$, and weighting function $\mathcal{S}^{(\ell)}$, and

$$\mathbf{h}_i^{(\ell)} = \mathbf{W}_2^{(\ell)} \sigma(\mathbf{W}_1^{(\ell)} \mathbf{c}_i + \mathbf{b}_1^{(\ell)}) + \mathbf{b}_2^{(\ell)} \quad i \in [n]$$

where σ is the ReLU activation function, $\mathbf{W}_1^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i \times d}$, $\mathbf{W}_2^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_i}$, $\mathbf{b}_1^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$, and $\mathbf{b}_2^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Output After L layers, the transformer produces an output sequence $(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^+$, where $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{h}_i^{(L)}$ for all i . To map these vectors to output symbols, we assume, as is common in theoretical research, that each \mathbf{y}_i is exactly the embedding of a symbol in the output alphabet. To accept or reject strings, we look at the output symbol at position n and designate two symbols as accept and reject decisions. Note that this implies a fixed-size gap between the outputs for acceptance and rejection.

Self-Attention

A self-attention layer computes weighted sums of *value* vectors at all positions, where the weights are determined by *query* and *key* vectors.

Definition 1 (Self-Attention). A self-attention layer with linear transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}^{(Q)}, \mathbf{W}^{(K)} &: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_k} \\ \mathbf{W}^{(V)} &: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \end{aligned}$$

and a weighting function

$$\mathcal{S}: \mathbb{R}^+ \xrightarrow{\text{lp}} \mathbb{R}^+$$

is a function

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SA}: (\mathbb{R}^d)^+ &\xrightarrow{\text{lp}} (\mathbb{R}^d)^+ \\ \text{SA}(\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_n) &= (\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n) \end{aligned}$$

where, for positions i and j :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}_i &= \mathbf{W}^{(Q)} \mathbf{h}_i & \mathbf{k}_j &= \mathbf{W}^{(K)} \mathbf{h}_j & \mathbf{v}_j &= \mathbf{W}^{(V)} \mathbf{h}_j \\ s_{ij} &= \frac{\mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{k}_j}{\sqrt{d_k}} & \alpha_{i,*} &= \mathcal{S}(s_{i,*}) & \mathbf{c}_i &= \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{ij} \mathbf{v}_j. \end{aligned}$$

We consider only single-headed attention layers.

Masking In *future-masked attention*, the scores are redefined to

$$s_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{k}_j}{\sqrt{d_k}} & j \leq i \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and we define $\exp(-\infty) = 0$. Similarly, in *past-masked attention*, we have $s_{ij} = -\infty$ iff $j < i$.

Weighting Function The weighting function $\mathcal{S}: \mathbb{R}^+ \xrightarrow{\text{lp}} \mathbb{R}^+$ computes the attention weights $\alpha_{i,*}$ based on the attention scores $s_{i,*}$. A common choice is the *softmax* function:

$$[\text{softmax}(s_1, \dots, s_n)]_j = \frac{e^{s_j}}{\sum_{k=1}^n e^{s_k}}.$$

But we consider several alternatives below.

Hard Attention In hard attention, the attention weights are assigned to focus all attention on the maximum-scoring position or positions.

Definition 2 (Hardmax). The leftmost, rightmost, and average-hardmax functions are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} I(\mathbf{s}) &= \{i \in [|\mathbf{s}|] \mid s_i = \max \mathbf{s}\} \\ [\text{lhardmax}(\mathbf{s})]_i &= \mathbb{I}[i = \min I(\mathbf{s})] \\ [\text{rhardmax}(\mathbf{s})]_i &= \mathbb{I}[i = \max I(\mathbf{s})] \\ [\text{ahardmax}(\mathbf{s})]_i &= \frac{1}{|I(\mathbf{s})|} \mathbb{I}[i \in I(\mathbf{s})]. \end{aligned}$$

The *lhardmax* and *rhardmax* functions return a one-hot vector with a 1 at the position of the leftmost or rightmost maximal element, respectively. The *ahardmax* function pays equal attention to all the maximal elements.

Temperature Scaling We also consider scaling the attention scores by an inverse *temperature* before applying the softmax.

Definition 3 (Temperature-Dependent Softmax). For $\tau > 0$, the temperature-dependent softmax function $\text{softmax}_\tau: \mathbb{R}^+ \xrightarrow{\text{lp}} \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined as:

$$[\text{softmax}_\tau(s_1, \dots, s_n)]_j = \frac{e^{s_j/\tau}}{\sum_{k=1}^n e^{s_k/\tau}}.$$

When $\tau = 1$, this reduces to standard softmax.

Definition 4. We categorize transformers by the weighting functions used in their attention layers:

- SMAT uses softmax
- τ -SMAT uses softmax_τ
- AHAT uses *ahardmax*
- UHAT uses both *lhardmax* and *rhardmax*.

Layer Normalization We do not consider transformers with layer normalization, as this is a separate method (method (3) in Section 1) for overcoming limitations of soft attention, which may interact in complicated ways with temperature scaling and unbounded PEs.

3.2 Approximation Bounds

Definition 5. For any vector $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^+$, let $M = \max_i s_i$. We say that \mathbf{s} is *tieless* if $|\{i \mid s_i = M\}| = 1$, and \mathbf{s} has *gap* γ if for all i such that $s_i \neq M$, we have $s_i \leq M - \gamma$.

If \mathbf{s} is tieless, then $\text{lhardmax}(\mathbf{s}) = \text{rhardmax}(\mathbf{s}) = \text{ahardmax}(\mathbf{s})$, and we simply write $\text{hardmax}(\mathbf{s})$ for all three.

Edelman et al. (2022) prove a bound on the difference between softmax and *ahardmax* for attention scores with gap γ . Here, we prove two stronger bounds under stronger assumptions.

Lemma 6. Suppose $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ is such that there is a $j^* \in [n]$ such that for all $j \in [n]$, $s_j \leq s_{j^*} - |j - j^*| \gamma$. Then

$$\|\text{hardmax}(\mathbf{s}) - \text{softmax}(\mathbf{s})\|_1 \leq 4e^{-\gamma}.$$

Proof. See Appendix B.1. \square

Subsequently, we will make use of the *table lookup* operation: given $c_i \in [n]$ for $i \in [n]$, each position i attends solely to position j such that $j = c_i$. This is possible using hard attention, but in soft attention, we must approximate it. The following lemma helps quantify the approximation error.

Lemma 7. *Let $\gamma \geq 1$ and let i and c be integers such that $1 \leq c \leq i$. For $j = 1, \dots, i$, define $s_j = \gamma(2cj - j^2)$ and let $\alpha = \text{softmax } \mathbf{s}$. Then*

$$\left| c - \sum_{j=1}^i \alpha_j j \right| \leq \frac{3}{2} e^{-\gamma}.$$

Proof. See Appendix B.2. \square

3.3 Tie-Breaking

Next, we show how to add a tie-breaking term to the attention scores, which is useful for simulating unique-hard attention.

Lemma 8. *Let $(s_1, \dots, s_n) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ with a gap of at least 1.*

(a) *If $\hat{s}_j = \gamma n^2 \left(s_j - \frac{1}{j} \right)$, then*

$$\|\text{rhardmax } \mathbf{s} - \text{softmax } \hat{\mathbf{s}}\|_1 \leq 4e^{-\gamma}.$$

(b) *If $\hat{s}_j = 2\gamma n \left(s_j + \frac{j}{2n} \right)$, then*

$$\|\text{rhardmax } \mathbf{s} - \text{softmax } \hat{\mathbf{s}}\|_1 \leq 4e^{-\gamma}.$$

(c) *If $\hat{s}_j = 2\gamma n \left(s_j - \frac{j}{2n} \right)$, then*

$$\|\text{lhardmax } \mathbf{s} - \text{softmax } \hat{\mathbf{s}}\|_1 \leq 4e^{-\gamma}.$$

Proof. See Appendix C. \square

3.4 Approximate Booleans

Approximate Booleans are a representation of truth values where any number in $(-\infty, \delta]$ is false and any number in $[1 - \delta, \infty)$ is true. For concreteness, we set $\delta = 1/4$, but any fixed constant $\delta < 1/2$ would work equally well. A transformer can convert approximate Booleans into exact ones using a FFN that rounds them to 0 or 1.

Lemma 9. *We can compute the following function with a FFN.*

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \leq \frac{1}{4} \\ 2x - \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} \leq x \leq \frac{3}{4} \\ 1 & \frac{3}{4} \leq x \end{cases}$$

Proof. Any function that is continuous piecewise affine with a finite number of pieces can be computed by a FFN. Function f can be computed by

$$f(x) = 2 \text{ReLU}(x - \frac{1}{4}) - 2 \text{ReLU}(x - \frac{3}{4}). \quad \square$$

4 Soft Attention, LTL and Counting

In this section, we give a series of constructions to show that a SMAT can simulate a formula in the logical language $\text{LTL}[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$ defined by Barceló et al. (2024), which augments LTL with counting terms. We find it useful to factor $\text{LTL}[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$ into three logics, which account for three different types of hard-attention patterns:

- $\text{TL}[\ominus, \oplus]$, which accounts for immediate predecessor and successor, e.g. n -grams
- $\text{TL}[\text{since}, \text{until}]$, which accounts for tie-breaking, e.g. flip-flops or induction heads
- $\text{TL}[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$, which accounts for numerical relations, e.g. PARITY or MAJORITY.

These are all temporal logics, in which each formula ϕ is true or false at each position in a string. We write $\mathbf{w}, i \models \phi$ to mean that ϕ is true at position i of \mathbf{w} . A formula ϕ is *satisfied* by a string \mathbf{w} iff ϕ is true at the last symbol of \mathbf{w} , that is, $\mathbb{I}[\mathbf{w}, |\mathbf{w}| \models \phi] = 1$.

In computing ϕ , a transformer receives as input the string \mathbf{w} , and in the final sequence of activation vectors, a designated coordinate gives the sequence of values $\mathbb{I}[\mathbf{w}, i \models \phi]$ for $i \in [|\mathbf{w}|]$.

There are many possible conditions under which SMATs can simulate these logics. We focus on SMATs that use temperature scaling (and bounded PEs) and those that use unbounded PEs (and no temperature scaling). In both cases, we also consider SMATs that use only future-masking and do not depend on n , suitable for autoregressive language modeling.

4.1 Previous and Next

First we show that SMATs can simulate formulas in a restricted version of LTL with just the previous (\ominus) and next (\oplus) operations.

Definition 10 ($\text{TL}[\ominus, \oplus]$). Let σ denote symbols of a given alphabet Σ . The syntax of $\text{TL}[\ominus, \oplus]$ is:

$$\phi ::= Q_\sigma \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \mid \phi_1 \vee \phi_2 \mid \ominus\phi \mid \oplus\phi$$

Formulas are interpreted over a string $\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma^+$ at a

position i , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{w}, i \models Q_\sigma & \quad \text{iff } w_i = \sigma \\
\mathbf{w}, i \models \neg\phi & \quad \text{iff } \mathbf{w}, i \not\models \phi \\
\mathbf{w}, i \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 & \quad \text{iff } \mathbf{w}, i \models \phi_1 \text{ and } \mathbf{w}, i \models \phi_2 \\
\mathbf{w}, i \models \phi_1 \vee \phi_2 & \quad \text{iff } \mathbf{w}, i \models \phi_1 \text{ or } \mathbf{w}, i \models \phi_2 \\
\mathbf{w}, i \models \ominus\phi & \quad \text{iff } \mathbf{w}, (i-1) \models \phi \\
\mathbf{w}, i \models \oplus\phi & \quad \text{iff } \mathbf{w}, (i+1) \models \phi
\end{aligned}$$

This logic accounts for the hard-attention patterns used in simulating n -gram models. For instance, the following TL $[\ominus, \oplus]$ formula detects the 3-gram **110** starting at the current position:

$$\phi_{110} = Q_1 \wedge \oplus Q_1 \wedge \oplus \oplus Q_0$$

As a warm-up to simulating TL $[\ominus, \oplus]$ in a τ -SMAT, we show how to mark the first and last positions of the input sequence.

Proposition 11. *A SMAT with a PE including $(-1)^i$ can compute the following functions $f: \Sigma^+ \xrightarrow{\text{lp}} \{0, 1\}^+$:*

- (a) $f(\mathbf{w}) = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ using future-masking
- (b) $f(\mathbf{w}) = (0, 0, \dots, 1)$ using past-masking.

Proof. To mark the first position (a), use uniform future-masked attention with values $\mathbf{v}_j = [(-1)^{j+1}]$. If $i = 1$, then all attention is on position 1, and the output value is 1. If $i > 1$, then the attention output is at most $1/3$. So a FFN can map all such values to 0. To mark the last position (b), we proceed as above, but using past-masked attention. If $i = n$, then the attention output is 1 or -1 ; if $i < n$, the attention output is in $[-1/3, 1/3]$. The FFN outputs 1 if the former is true and 0 if the latter is true. \square

We also note that a SMAT with a PE including $(-1)^i$ can compute the quantity $1/i$ using uniform future-masked attention on the output of the above construction, and $1/(n+1-i)$ using past-masking.

Theorem 12. *Any formula ϕ of TL $[\ominus, \oplus]$ can be simulated by a τ -SMAT with either:*

- (a) $\tau(n) = 1/n$ and PEs including i/n and $(-1)^i$
- (b) $\tau(n) = 1$ and PEs including i/n , $(-1)^i$, and n .

Proof. The proof is by induction on the structure of ϕ . The cases of Q_σ and Boolean operations are straightforward, using the word embedding or a FFN as shown by Yang et al. (2024). The remaining cases are the operators $\ominus\phi_1$ and $\oplus\phi_1$. Let b_1, \dots, b_n be the values of ϕ_1 .

In a UHAT, to compute $\ominus\phi_1$ at positions $i > 1$, we could make the attention weights $\alpha_{ij} = 1$ if $j = i-1$ and 0 otherwise, which would shift every value right by one position. In a τ -SMAT, we have to compute attention weights $\hat{\alpha}_{ij}$ that approximate α_{ij} . The difference in the resulting values is, for any i, j ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\alpha_{ij}b_j - \hat{\alpha}_{ij}b_j| & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n |(\alpha_{ik}b_k - \hat{\alpha}_{ik}b_k)| \\
& = \sum_{k=1}^n |(\alpha_{ik} - \hat{\alpha}_{ik})b_k| \\
& \leq \|\alpha_{i,*} - \hat{\alpha}_{i,*}\|_1.
\end{aligned}$$

If we can make this difference at most $1/4$, the result in position i is within $1/4$ of the correct result and may be rounded to a Boolean by Lemma 9. Position 1 may be set to 0 with a FFN using Proposition 11a.

Computing $\oplus\phi_1$ at position $i < n$ is symmetrical, and position n may be set to 0 with a FFN using Proposition 11b.

Case (a): We use two future-masked attention layers (or one layer with two heads). In the first attention, the queries and keys are set so that the attention scores are

$$\hat{s}_{ij} = 6 \left(\frac{1}{2}(-1)^j + \frac{j}{2n} \right)$$

which is maximized at the rightmost even position $j \leq i$. Applying Lemma 8b (with $s_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(-1)^j$), we get $\|\alpha_{i,*} - \hat{\alpha}_{i,*}\|_1 \leq 4e^{-3} < 1/4$. Similarly, the second attention attends to the rightmost odd position $j \leq i$. The FFN, at each position i , tests whether i is odd or even; if odd, it uses the output of the first attention, and if even, it uses the output of the second attention.

Similarly, to compute $\oplus\phi_1$, we use two past-masked attention layers with scores

$$\hat{s}_{ij} = 6 \left(\frac{1}{2}(-1)^j - \frac{j}{2n} \right) \quad \hat{s}_{ij} = 6 \left(\frac{1}{2}(-1)^{j+1} - \frac{j}{2n} \right)$$

and use Lemma 8c.

Case (b): Same as case (a), but apply the scaling factor of n to the queries. \square

Theorem 13. *Any formula ϕ of TL $[\ominus]$ can be simulated by a future-masked τ -SMAT with:*

- (a) $\tau(i) = 1/i^2$ and PEs containing $(-1)^i$
- (b) $\tau(i) = 1$ and PEs containing $(-1)^i$ and i^2 .

Proof. Same as the proof of Theorem 12, but use Lemma 8a. \square

4.2 Since and Until

Next, we show that SMATs can compute the values of **since** and **until**, which we now define.

Definition 14 (TL[**since**, **until**]). Let $\sigma \in \Sigma$ denote symbols of a given alphabet Σ . The temporal logic TL[**since**, **until**] has syntax

$$\begin{aligned} \phi ::= Q_\sigma & \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \mid \phi_1 \vee \phi_2 \\ & \mid \phi_1 \text{ **since** } \phi_2 \mid \phi_1 \text{ **until** } \phi_2 \end{aligned}$$

The semantics of Boolean expressions is as in [Definition 10](#). For **since** and **until**:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}, i \models \phi_1 \text{ **since** } \phi_2 & \text{ iff there is } j \leq i \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{w}, j \models \phi_2 \\ & \text{ and for all } k \text{ s.t. } j \leq k \leq i \\ & \text{ we have } \mathbf{w}, k \models \phi_1 \\ \mathbf{w}, i \models \phi_1 \text{ **until** } \phi_2 & \text{ iff there is } j \geq i \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{w}, j \models \phi_2 \\ & \text{ and for all } k \text{ s.t. } i \leq k \leq j \\ & \text{ we have } \mathbf{w}, k \models \phi_1. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 15. Any formula ϕ of TL[**since**, **until**] can be simulated by a τ -SMAT with either:

- (a) $\tau(n) = 1/n$ and PEs including i/n
- (b) $\tau(n) = 1$ and PEs including i/n and n .

Proof. By induction on the structure of ϕ . The Q_σ and Boolean operation cases are as in [Theorem 12](#).

We consider the case $\phi = \phi_1$ **since** ϕ_2 . It suffices to find the rightmost position $j \leq i$ such that $\neg\phi_1 \vee \phi_2$ at j and return the value of $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ at j . If there is no such position, then return 0.

For case (a), add a future-masked self-attention layer with:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}_{ij} &= 6 \left(\mathbb{I}[\mathbf{w}, j \models \neg\phi_1 \vee \phi_2] + \frac{j}{2n} \right) \\ \mathbf{v}_j &= \left[\mathbb{I}[\mathbf{w}, j \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using temperature $\tau \leq 1/n$ satisfies the requirements of [Lemma 8b](#) (with $s_{ij} = \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{w}, j \models \neg\phi_1 \vee \phi_2]$), so we have

$$\left\| \text{softmax}_\tau(\hat{s}_{i,*}) - \text{rhardmax}(s_{i,*}) \right\|_1 \leq 4e^{-3} < \frac{1}{4}.$$

This yields approximate Boolean values for ϕ_1 **since** ϕ_2 , which are rounded to 0 or 1 using a FFN ([Lemma 9](#)).

The simulation of ϕ_1 **until** ϕ_2 is symmetric, using the tiebreaker of $-j/(2n)$ and [Lemma 8c](#). For case (b), the queries are $\mathbf{q}_i = \lfloor 6n \rfloor$. \square

For decoder-only models (with obligatory future-masking) we also describe a simulation of TL[**since**] that does not depend on n .

Theorem 16. Any formula ϕ of TL[**since**] can be simulated by a future-masked τ -SMAT with PEs including $1/i$ and either:

- (a) $\tau(i) = 1/i^2$ and PEs including $1/i$
- (b) $\tau(i) = 1$ and PEs including $1/i$ and i^2 .

Proof. To simulate **since**, use a future-masked attention layer with:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}_{ij} &= 3 \left(\mathbb{I}[\mathbf{w}, j \models \neg\phi_1 \vee \phi_2] - \frac{1}{j} \right) \\ \mathbf{v}_j &= \left[\mathbb{I}[\mathbf{w}, j \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using either a temperature of $1/i^2$ or multiplying \mathbf{q}_i by i^2 satisfies the requirements of [Lemma 8a](#) (with $s_{ij} = \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{w}, j \models \neg\phi_1 \vee \phi_2]$). The result then follows after rounding the approximate Boolean values to 0 or 1. \square

4.3 LTL

Combining TL[\ominus, \oplus] and TL[**since**, **until**] we get TL[$\ominus, \oplus, \text{**since**, **until**}$] = LTL. Masked UHATs recognize exactly those formal languages definable by LTL ([Yang et al., 2024](#)), and simulate all the transductions expressible by B-RASP ([Strobl et al., 2024](#)), a language closely related to LTL. It follows from the above that LTL, and therefore any masked UHAT, can be simulated by a τ -SMAT.

Corollary 17. Any formula ϕ of LTL can be simulated by a τ -SMAT with either:

- (a) $\tau(n) = 1/n$ and PEs including i/n and $(-1)^i$
- (b) $\tau(n) = 1$ and PEs including i/n , $(-1)^i$, and n .

We can also simulate the past fragment of LTL (with only **since** and \ominus) using only future-masking, suitable for a decoder-only transformer.

Corollary 18. Any formula of TL[$\ominus, \text{**since**}$] can be simulated by a future-masked τ -SMAT with

- (a) $\tau(i) = 1/i^2$ and PEs including $(-1)^i$
- (b) $\tau(i) = 1$ and PEs including $(-1)^i$ and i^2 .

We recall that [Hahn \(2020, Lemma 5\)](#) places a bound $O(1/n)$ on the gap between the output for acceptance or rejection. For a fixed-size gap, some activation in the transformer must be scaled up by a factor of n . The constructions in [Theorem 12](#), [Theorem 15](#), and [Corollary 17](#) use $\tau(n) = 1/n$ or scale queries by n , and are optimal in the sense that we should not expect the factor of n to be asymptotically any smaller.

4.4 Counting

As the third step, we show that τ -SMAT can simulate a logic which extends the logic $K_i[\overleftarrow{\#}]$ ([Yang](#)

and Chiang, 2024) with numerical predicates applied to both positions and counts.

Definition 19. A unary numerical predicate is a family of functions $\theta = (\theta_n)_{n>0}$ where $\theta_n: [n] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. We write Mon for the set of all unary numerical predicates. The logic $\text{TL}[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$ has syntax

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &::= Q_\sigma \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \mid \phi_1 \vee \phi_2 \\ &\quad \mid \theta \mid \theta(\kappa) \mid t_1 \leq t_2 \\ t &::= \kappa \mid t_1 + t_2 \mid t_1 - t_2 \mid 1 \\ \kappa &::= \overleftarrow{\#}[\phi] \mid \overrightarrow{\#}[\phi] \end{aligned}$$

Formulas are interpreted as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}, i \models \theta &\quad \text{iff } \theta_{|\mathbf{w}|}(i) \\ \mathbf{w}, i \models \theta(\kappa) &\quad \text{iff } \theta_{|\mathbf{w}|}(\kappa^{\mathbf{w}, i}) \\ \mathbf{w}, i \models t_1 \leq t_2 &\quad \text{iff } t_1^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} \leq t_2^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} \end{aligned}$$

Terms are interpreted as integers:

$$\begin{aligned} \overleftarrow{\#}[\phi]^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} &= |\{j \leq i \mid \mathbf{w}, j \models \phi\}| \\ \overrightarrow{\#}[\phi]^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} &= |\{j \geq i \mid \mathbf{w}, j \models \phi\}| \\ (t_1 + t_2)^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} &= t_1^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} + t_2^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} \\ (t_1 - t_2)^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} &= t_1^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} - t_2^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} \\ 1^{(\mathbf{w}, i)} &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

For example, PARITY is the set of binary strings with an odd number of 1s. Using the numerical predicate ODD , where $\text{ODD}_n(i)$ is true iff i is odd, we can define this using the following $\text{TL}[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$ formula:

$$\phi_{\text{PARITY}} = \text{ODD}\left(\overleftarrow{\#}[Q_1]\right).$$

We show how SMATs can compute formulas of $\text{TL}[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$. In the following, we say that a position embedding $\text{PE}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ contains a unary numerical predicate θ if there is some coordinate $k \in [d]$ such that $[\text{PE}(i)]_k = 1$ iff $\theta(i)$.

Theorem 20. Any formula ϕ of $\text{TL}[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$ can be simulated by a τ -SMAT with either:

- (a) $\tau(n) = 1/n$ and PEs including $1/i$, $1/(n-i+1)$, i , i^2 , and all numerical predicates in ϕ
- (b) $\tau(n) = 1$ and PEs including $1/i$, $1/(n-i+1)$, i , in , i^2n , and all numerical predicates in ϕ .

Proof. The cases of formulas Q_σ and Boolean operations are as in [Theorem 12](#). For numerical predicates θ applied to positions, we set the positional

embedding. Applying θ to counts is described in a later case.

If ϕ is a comparison $t_1 \leq t_2$ of count terms, it can be rewritten in the following form. Let \overleftarrow{K} and \overrightarrow{K} be disjoint sets of indices, and let c and c_k (for $k \in \overleftarrow{K} \cup \overrightarrow{K}$) be integers:

$$\phi = \left(\sum_{k \in \overleftarrow{K}} c_k \overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k] + \sum_{k \in \overrightarrow{K}} c_k \overrightarrow{\#}[\phi_k] \geq c \right).$$

We will bound the error of the sum by $\frac{1}{4}$, and then compute the correct Boolean value using [Lemma 9](#). Let $C = \sum_{k \in \overleftarrow{K} \cup \overrightarrow{K}} |c_k|$. If $C = 0$, the formula is constant, so we assume $C \geq 1$. The construction proceeds in three stages. First, we compute $\overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k]/i$ or $\overrightarrow{\#}[\phi_k]/(n-i+1)$ exactly. Second, we scale up to $\overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k]$ or $\overrightarrow{\#}[\phi_k]$, but only approximately. Third, we compute the linear combination of the approximate terms and test the inequality using a FFN.

The first step of computing $\overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k]/i$ or $\overrightarrow{\#}[\phi_k]/(n-i+1)$ can be done using masked uniform attention ([Yang and Chiang, 2024](#)).

In the second step, under condition (a), if $\overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k] > 0$, we approximately retrieve it using an attention layer with

$$\mathbf{q}_i = 3C \begin{bmatrix} \overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k] \\ i \\ \frac{1}{i} \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{k}_j = \begin{bmatrix} 2j \\ -j^2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{v}_j = [j].$$

Then $s_{ij} = 3C(2\overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k]j - j^2)/i$, which is uniquely maximized at $j = \overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k]$. With temperature $\tau = 1/n$, we apply [Lemma 7](#) with $\gamma = 3C/(i\tau)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_k(i) &= \sum_j \alpha_{ij} v_j \\ |h_k(i) - \overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k]| &\leq \frac{3}{2} e^{-3Cn/i} \leq \frac{3}{2} e^{-3C} \leq \frac{1}{4C}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the output value is within $\overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k] \pm 1/(4C)$.

However, if $\overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k] = 0$, this is incorrectly in $1 \pm 1/(4C)$. We can fix this by doing a second approximate retrieval of $j = \overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k] + 1$, and if both retrievals return values within $1 \pm 1/(4C)$, then the correct value must be 0.

For $\overrightarrow{\#}$ terms, the first step gives $\overrightarrow{\#}[\phi_k]/(n-i+1)$. The second step requires the quantity $1/(n-i+1)$. Since $n-i+1 \leq n$, the bound of $1/(4C)$ is derived in the same way.

The third step is to compute the linear combination using an FFN:

$$H(i) = \sum_{k \in \overleftarrow{K} \cup \overrightarrow{K}} c_k h_k(i)$$

$$\left| H(i) - \left(\sum_{k \in \overleftarrow{K}} c_k \overleftarrow{\#}[\phi_k] - \sum_{k \in \overrightarrow{K}} c_k \overrightarrow{\#}[\phi_k] \right) \right|$$

$$\leq \left| \sum_{k \in \overleftarrow{K} \cup \overrightarrow{K}} c_k \frac{1}{4C} \right| \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

If $H(i) - c \geq -1/4$ then ϕ is true; if $H(i) - c \leq -3/4$ then ϕ is false.

Finally, to simulate a numerical predicate θ applied to counts, we perform the first and second steps using $\mathbf{v}_j = [\theta(j)]$. This approximately retrieves the Boolean value of $\theta(\overleftarrow{\#}[\phi])$ or $\theta(\overrightarrow{\#}[\phi])$, which we can correct using a FFN.

The proof for condition (b) is identical, except that in the second step, we scale \mathbf{k}_j by n . \square

Theorem 21. Any formula ϕ of $\text{TL}[\overleftarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$ can be simulated by a future-masked τ -SMAT with $\tau(i) = 1/i$ and PEs including $1/i, i, i^2$, and all numerical predicates in ϕ .

Proof. Same as Theorem 20a. \square

4.5 LTL $[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$

The logic LTL $[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$ includes all previously discussed temporal operators ($\ominus, \oplus, \text{since}, \text{until}$), counting terms $\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}$, linear inequalities of counting terms, and all unary numerical predicates. It is exactly the logic LTL(C, +) introduced by Barceló et al. (2024).

For example, the following formula of LTL $[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$ recognizes PARITY without using numerical predicates:

$$\phi_{\text{PARITY}} = \left(\overleftarrow{\#} \left[\overleftarrow{\#}[\ominus Q_1] = \overrightarrow{\#}[Q_1] \right] = 0 \right).$$

The total number of 1's is odd iff there is no position i where the number of 1's strictly to the left of i is equal to the number of 1's at or to the right of i . Above, the subformula $\ominus Q_1$ tests whether there is a 1 immediately to the left, so $\overleftarrow{\#}[\ominus Q_1]$ counts the number of 1's strictly to the left.

Barceló et al. (2024) simulate this logic using AHATs, but here we give conditions under which this logic can be simulated using τ -SMATs.

Corollary 22. Any formula ϕ of LTL $[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$ can be simulated by a τ -SMAT with PEs including all numerical predicates in ϕ and either:

- (a) $\tau(n) = 1/n$ and PEs including $(-1)^i, i/n, i$, and i^2
- (b) $\tau(n) = 1$ and PEs including $(-1)^i, i/n, i, n$, in , and i^2n .

Proof. By Corollary 17 and Theorem 20. \square

Corollary 23. Any formula ϕ of TL $[\ominus, \text{since}, \overleftarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$ can be simulated by a future-masked τ -SMAT with $\tau(i) = 1/i^2$ and PEs including $(-1)^i, i, i^2$, and all numerical predicates in ϕ .

Proof. By Corollary 18 and Theorem 21. \square

5 Uniform-Tieless Attention

The τ -SMAT simulations in the preceding section compute exact Boolean values for every subformula, because a FFN can round an approximate Boolean to a exact Boolean. Counting terms are approximated sufficiently well that comparisons between them produce approximate Booleans. But for the case of simulating an AHAT, there is no similar option for eliminating approximation error, because in general the values in the computation are not confined to a finite set.

In this section, we define a restriction of AHATs that have two types of attention layers, *uniform* and *tieless*. An attention layer is *uniform* iff the query and key matrices ($\mathbf{W}^{(Q)}$ and $\mathbf{W}^{(K)}$) are identically zero. This results in equal attention being paid to every unmasked position. An attention layer is *tieless with gap* $\gamma(n)$ iff for every input with length n and every position i , the attention scores at i (that is, $s_{i,*}$) are tieless with gap $\gamma(n)$ (Definition 5). An AHAT that contains only these two types of attention layers is said to be *uniform-tieless*. We denote this class of transformers by AHAT[UT]. These two types of attention layers suffice for nearly all uses of average-hard attention in the literature (see Section 6).

Because there are a finite number of inputs of length n , we have the following.

Lemma 24. Every AHAT that is uniform-tieless has a strictly positive gap function.

Let U be an AHAT that is uniform-tieless with gap $\gamma(n)$. We transform U into a τ -SMAT \hat{U} that has the same parameters as U but uses

temperature-scaled softmax attention in place of average-hard attention. By choosing a temperature function $\tau(n)$ depending on $\gamma(n)$, we show that for every input, the output of \hat{U} approximates the output of U to within $1/4$.

We define the function $x_{\max}(n)$ to be the maximum of 1 and the absolute value of any entry in \mathbf{x}_i over all inputs of length n and positions i , where $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$ is the initial activation sequence for the input. This is well defined because there are finitely many different inputs of length n .

First, we prove the following lemma bounding the error introduced by a single transformer layer.

Lemma 25. *Let U be an AHAT that is uniform-tieless with gap $\gamma(n)$. Let \hat{U} be the corresponding τ -SMAT with temperature $\tau(n)$. There exist constants $K_1 \geq 1$ and $K_2 \geq 1$ such that for all positive integers n and all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, we have the following, for each layer ℓ . For any $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ and $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n)$ such that $\|\mathbf{u}_i - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ for all i , let $(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ be the output of layer ℓ of U on input $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$, and let $(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n)$ be the output of layer ℓ of \hat{U} on input $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n)$. Then for all i ,*

$$\|\mathbf{v}_i - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|_1 \leq K_1 \left(\epsilon + nx_{\max}(n) e^{\frac{-\gamma(n)+2K_2x_{\max}(n)\epsilon}{\tau(n)}} \right).$$

Proof. See Appendix D.4. \square

Then, by induction on depth, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 26. *Let U be an AHAT that is uniform-tieless with gap $\gamma(n)$. There exists a temperature function $\tau(n)$ with*

$$\frac{1}{\tau(n)} \in O\left(\frac{1}{\gamma(n)} \log \frac{nx_{\max}(n)}{\gamma(n)}\right)$$

such that the τ -SMAT \hat{U} corresponding to U approximates U in the following sense. For every input, if $(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n)$ is the output of U and $(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n)$ is the output of \hat{U} , then

$$\|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{for } i \in [n].$$

In particular, if $\gamma(n) = 1/n^k$ and $x_{\max}(n) \in n^{O(1)}$, we have $1/\tau(n) \in O(n^k \log n)$.

Proof. See Appendix D.5. \square

6 Some Applications

Below, we consider some discrete tasks that have been solved using UHATs or AHATs.

Induction heads. In the *basic induction head task* (Elhage et al., 2021), the input is a string $\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n$, and the goal is to find the rightmost $i < n$ such that $\sigma_i = \sigma_n$ and output σ_{i+1} . Sanford et al. (2024) consider the more general *k-hop induction head task*, which iterates the basic induction head task a constant k number of times.

The basic induction head task can be defined exactly in LTL (Yang et al., 2024), and the k -hop induction head task can be computed by iterating the basic induction head task k times, so Corollary 17 gives a τ -SMAT for the k -hop induction head task with $\tau(n) = 1/n$. Previous solutions for these tasks include the following.

Liu et al. (2023a) show that the *flip-flop* language, a particular instance of the basic induction head task, can be recognized exactly by an AHAT that is uniform-tieless with gap $\gamma(n) = 1/n$ and $x_{\max}(n) \in O(1)$. They also give a SMAT in which queries are scaled by $O(n \log n)$, which is equivalent to a temperature of $\Omega(1/(n \log n))$, a little lower than our $\tau(n) = 1/n$ solution.

Sanford et al. (2024) give an AHAT for the k -hop induction head task that is uniform-tieless with gap $\gamma(n) \in \Omega(1/n^2)$ and show how to simulate it with soft attention. As discussed in Section 1, this simulation is general but not parameter-uniform.

S-RASP simulation. Strobl et al. (2024) consider transductions (functions from finite strings to finite strings) and introduce the language S-RASP as a concise way to define them. They show that any transduction expressible in S-RASP can be computed by an AHAT that is uniform-tieless with gap $\gamma(n) \in \Omega(1/n^3)$ and $x_{\max}(n) \in O(1)$. Thus, by Theorem 26, every transduction that is expressible in S-RASP can be exactly computed by a τ -SMAT with $\tau(n) \in \Omega(1/(n^3 \log n))$.

DYCK- k membership. The language DYCK- k consists of balanced sequences of brackets of k types. Yao et al. (2021) give a transformer for DYCK- k using selective layer norm and both soft attention and tieless hard attention. Their algorithm can be expressed in S-RASP (Appendix E), so Theorem 26 gives a τ -SMAT with $\tau(n) \in \Omega(1/(n^3 \log n))$. However, we conjecture that DYCK-2 cannot be defined in LTL $[\overleftarrow{\#}, \overrightarrow{\#}, +, \text{Mon}]$.

Acknowledgments

We thank Clayton Sanford for his generous assistance in understanding certain aspects of his paper (Sanford et al., 2024). We also thank Bingbin Liu and her co-authors for their beautiful paper (Liu et al., 2023b), which helped spark the current work.

References

- Jimmy Lei Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2016. [Layer normalization](#).
- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. [Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate](#). In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Pablo Barceló, Alexander Kozachinskiy, Anthony Widjaja Lin, and Vladimir Podolskii. 2024. [Logical languages accepted by transformer encoders with hard attention](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- David Chiang and Peter Cholak. 2022. [Overcoming a theoretical limitation of self-attention](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 7654–7664.
- Róbert Csordás, Kazuki Irie, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2022. [The neural data router: Adaptive control flow in transformers improves systematic generalization](#). In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Benjamin L. Edelman, Surbhi Goel, Sham Kakade, and Cyril Zhang. 2022. [Inductive biases and variable creation in self-attention mechanisms](#). In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 5793–5831.
- Nelson Elhage, Neel Nanda, Catherine Olsson, Tom Henighan, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Tom Conerly, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Andy Jones, Jackson Kernion, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, and Chris Olah. 2021. [A mathematical framework for transformer circuits](#). Transformer Circuits Thread.
- Dan Friedman, Alexander Wettig, and Danqi Chen. 2023. [Learning Transformer programs](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (NeurIPS)*.
- Michael Hahn. 2020. [Theoretical limitations of self-attention in neural sequence models](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:156–171.
- Yiding Hao, Dana Angluin, and Robert Frank. 2022. [Formal language recognition by hard attention transformers: Perspectives from circuit complexity](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:800–810.
- Zhiyuan Li, Hong Liu, Denny Zhou, and Tengyu Ma. 2024. [Chain of thought empowers transformers to solve inherently serial problems](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Bingbin Liu, Jordan T Ash, Surbhi Goel, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Cyril Zhang. 2023a. [Exposing attention glitches with flip-flop language modeling](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (NeurIPS)*, pages 25549–25583.
- Bingbin Liu, Jordan T. Ash, Surbhi Goel, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Cyril Zhang. 2023b. [Transformers learn shortcuts to automata](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Andre Martins and Ramon Astudillo. 2016. [From softmax to sparsemax: A sparse model of attention and multi-label classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1614–1623.
- William Merrill, Jackson Petty, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2024. [The illusion of state in state-space models](#). In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- William Merrill, Ashish Sabharwal, and Noah A. Smith. 2022. [Saturated transformers are constant-depth threshold circuits](#). *Transactions*

of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 10:843–856.

Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (ACL-IJCNLP), pages 3770–3785.

Jorge Pérez, Javier Marinković, and Pablo Barceló. 2019. [On the Turing completeness of modern neural network architectures](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

Clayton Sanford, Daniel Hsu, and Matus Telgarsky. 2024. [Transformers, parallel computation, and logarithmic depth](#). In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.

Lena Strobl, Dana Angluin, David Chiang, Jonathan Rawski, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2024. [Transformers as transducers](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. To appear.

Anej Svete and Ryan Cotterell. 2024. [Transformers can represent \$n\$ -gram language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL HLT)*, pages 6841–6874.

Matus Telgarsky. 2015. [Representation benefits of deep feedforward networks](#). arXiv:1509.08101.

Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30 (NeurIPS)*.

Andy Yang and David Chiang. 2024. [Counting like transformers: Compiling temporal counting logic into softmax transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the Conference on Language Modeling (CoLM)*.

Andy Yang, David Chiang, and Dana Angluin. 2024. [Masked hard-attention transformers recognize exactly the star-free languages](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. To appear.

Shunyu Yao, Binghui Peng, Christos Papadimitriou, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2021. [Self-attention networks can process bounded hierarchical languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International*

A MLP Rounding

Lemma 27. *Let p and p' be positive integers with $p' > p$. Any ReLU FFN to round p' -bit numbers to p -bit numbers with ℓ layers and width m satisfies $(2m)^\ell \geq 2^p$.*

Proof. Telgarsky (2015, Lemma 2.1) proves that if a ReLU FFN of depth ℓ and width m computes a function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ then f is continuous piecewise affine with at most $(2m)^\ell$ pieces. So we need to show that any piecewise affine function rounding a p' -bit number to a p -bit number requires at least 2^p pieces.

Let r be the function that rounds a p' -bit number to a p -bit number. The domain of r is the set of $2^{p'}$ real numbers exactly representable with p' bits, and the range of r is the set of 2^p real numbers exactly representable with p bits. (We assume that each p -bit number represents a different real value.) For each y in the range of r , let $m(y)$ be the least x in the domain of r such that $r(x) = y$.

Suppose $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a piecewise affine function that agrees with r on its domain. If $y_1 < y_2$ are two consecutive elements of the range of r , then $x_1 = m(y_1)$ and $x_2 = m(y_2)$ must be in different pieces of f . This is because there is at least one point x in the domain of r with $x_1 < x < x_2$, and if x_1 and x_2 were in the same piece, then the value of $f(x)$ would fall between y_1 and y_2 , which are consecutive elements of the range of r , a contradiction. Thus f must have at least 2^p pieces, and the claim follows. \square

Because Sanford et al. (2024) consider precision $p = \Theta(\log n)$ and $p' > p$, this implies that a constant-depth ReLU MLP to round p' -bit numbers to p -bit numbers must have width at least n^ϵ for some $\epsilon > 0$.

B Approximation Bounds

B.1 Proof of Lemma 6

Let

$$a = e^{s_{j^*}}$$

$$b = \sum_{j \neq j^*} e^{s_j} \leq \frac{2e^{-\gamma}}{1 - e^{-\gamma}} a.$$

Then

$$\|\text{hardmax}(\mathbf{s}) - \text{softmax}(\mathbf{s})\|_1$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{a}{a+b}\right) + \frac{b}{a+b}$$

$$= 2 \left(1 - \frac{a}{a+b}\right)$$

$$\leq 2 \left(1 - \frac{a}{a + \frac{2e^{-\gamma}}{1-e^{-\gamma}} a}\right)$$

$$= 2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2e^{-\gamma}}{1-e^{-\gamma}}}\right)$$

$$= \frac{4e^{-\gamma}}{1 + e^{-\gamma}}$$

$$\leq 4e^{-\gamma}.$$

B.2 Proof of Lemma 7

Subtracting the constant term γc^2 from each s_j does not affect the α_j , so we have:

$$\alpha_j = \frac{e^{-\gamma(j-c)^2}}{Z}$$

$$Z = \sum_{k=1}^i e^{-\gamma(k-c)^2} \geq 1.$$

Then

$$\left|c - \sum_{j=1}^i \alpha_j j\right| = \left|\sum_{j=1}^i \alpha_j (c - j)\right|$$

$$= \left|\sum_{j=1}^{c-1} \alpha_j (j - c) + \sum_{j=c+1}^i \alpha_j (j - c)\right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=c+1}^i \alpha_j (j - c)$$

$$= \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{j=c+1}^i e^{-\gamma(j-c)^2} (j - c)$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=c+1}^i e^{-\gamma(j-c)^2} (j - c)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{i-c} e^{-\gamma k^2} k$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma k^2} k$$

$$= e^{-\gamma} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma k^2} k}_{(*)}.$$

Consider the function $f(x) = e^{-\gamma x^2} x$, which is non-negative for $x \geq 0$ and decreasing for $x \geq 1$. Therefore, the term $(*)$ is a lower Riemann sum of f :

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma k^2} k \leq \int_1^{\infty} e^{-\gamma x^2} x dx = \frac{1}{2\gamma} e^{-\gamma} \leq \frac{1}{2} e^{-\gamma}.$$

C Tie-Breaking (Proof of Lemma 8)

(a) Let j^* be the rightmost position $j^* \leq n$ maximizing s_{j^*} . Consider any other position j .

If $s_j = s_{j^*}$, then $j \leq j^*$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{s}_{j^*} - \hat{s}_j &= \gamma n^2 \left(-\frac{1}{j^*} + \frac{1}{j} \right) \\ &= \gamma n^2 \frac{j^* - j}{j^* j} \\ &\geq \gamma |j^* - j|.\end{aligned}$$

If $s_j \leq s_{j^*} - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{s}_{j^*} - \hat{s}_j &\geq \gamma n^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{j^*} + \frac{1}{j} \right) \\ &\geq \gamma n^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{n} \right) \\ &= \gamma n \geq \gamma |j^* - j|.\end{aligned}$$

So we can use Lemma 6 with a gap of γ :

$$\|\text{rhardmax } \mathbf{s} - \text{softmax } \hat{\mathbf{s}}\|_1 \leq 4e^{-\gamma}.$$

(b) Let j^* be the rightmost position $j^* \leq n$ maximizing s_{j^*} . Consider any other position j .

If $s_j = s_{j^*}$, then $j \leq j^*$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{s}_{j^*} - \hat{s}_j &= 2\gamma n \left(\frac{j^*}{2n} - \frac{j}{2n} \right) \\ &= \gamma |j^* - j|.\end{aligned}$$

If $s_j \leq s_{j^*} - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{s}_{j^*} - \hat{s}_j &\geq 2\gamma n \left(1 + \frac{j^*}{2n} - \frac{j}{2n} \right) \\ &\geq 2\gamma n \left(1 + \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{n}{2n} \right) \\ &= \gamma(1+n) \geq \gamma |j^* - j|.\end{aligned}$$

So we can use Lemma 6:

$$\|\text{rhardmax } \mathbf{s} - \text{softmax } \hat{\mathbf{s}}\|_1 \leq 4e^{-\gamma}.$$

(c) The leftmost case is symmetric.

D Proofs for uniform-tieless attention

To reduce complication, we assume that the transformers we consider have $d = d_k = d_f$. We begin with a lemma bounding the effect of a linear transformation on the norm of a vector.

Lemma 28. *Let $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then $\|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{u}\|_1 \leq dw_{\max} \|\mathbf{u}\|_1$, where w_{\max} is the maximum absolute value of any entry in \mathbf{W} .*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{u}\|_1 &= \sum_{k=1}^d |\mathbf{W}_{k,*} \cdot \mathbf{u}| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^d w_{\max} \|\mathbf{u}\|_1 = dw_{\max} \|\mathbf{u}\|_1. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

For the rest of this section, U is a uniform-tieless average-hard attention transformer with a gap function $\gamma(n)$, and $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ is the soft attention transformer derived from it. Let p_{\max} be the maximum absolute value of any parameter occurring in U . Over all inputs of length n , let $x_{\max}(n)$ be the maximum of 1 and the absolute value of any entry in the initial sequence of activations for the input. This is well defined because for each n there are a finite number of inputs of length n .

Lemma 29. *Let L be the number of layers of transformer U . For any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$, let $(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ be the sequence of activations after layer ℓ for some input of length n . Then for all i , $\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_1 \leq (dp_{\max})^{3\ell} dx_{\max}(n)$.*

Proof. By induction on ℓ . For $\ell = 0$, if \mathbf{x}_i is an initial activation vector for some input of length n then $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_1 \leq dx_{\max}(n)$. At each layer $\ell > 0$, there are essentially three linear amplifications of the input to the layer. The attention operation takes a non-amplifying convex combination of the result of applying the value map $\mathbf{W}^{(V)}$, and the feed forward layer applies two linear maps \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 with a non-amplifying ReLU operation between. \square

D.1 FFNN layers

A FFNN layer computes the same function in U and $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$. It may amplify error in the input values, but does not introduce new error.

Lemma 30. *If for a FFNN layer of U we have two sequences of input vectors $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ and $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n)$ such that for all i , $\|\mathbf{u}_i - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i\|_1 \leq \epsilon$, then for the sequences of output vectors $(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ of this layer of U and $(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n)$ of the same layer of $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$, we have for all i , $\|\mathbf{v}_i - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|_1 \leq d^2 p_{\max}^2 \epsilon$.*

Proof. Suppose the FFNN layer consists of multiplication by \mathbf{W}_1 , followed by ReLU, followed by multiplication by \mathbf{W}_2 , where \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 are $d \times d$ matrices. For each i , $\|\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{W}_1 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i\|_1 = \|\mathbf{W}_1(\mathbf{u}_i - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i)\|_1 \leq dp_{\max} \epsilon$.

We have $|\text{ReLU}(x) - \text{ReLU}(y)| \leq |x - y|$ for all real numbers x, y , so the ReLU operation does not increase error.

The final operation of multiplication by \mathbf{W}_2 at worst multiplies the error by dp_{\max} again, so the final error is bounded by $d^2 p_{\max}^2 \epsilon$. \square

D.2 Uniform attention layers

Because the attention values are computed exactly in $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ for a uniform attention layer, this case is also straightforward.

Lemma 31. *Consider a uniform attention layer in U and the same attention layer in $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$, with value matrix $\mathbf{W}^{(V)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Let $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ and $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n)$ be sequences of elements of \mathbb{R}^d such that $\|\mathbf{u}_i - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ for all i . Let $(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ be the output of this layer of U on input $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ and $(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n)$ be the output of the same layer of $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ on input $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n)$. Then for all i ,*

$$\|\mathbf{v}_i - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|_1 \leq dp_{\max} \epsilon.$$

Proof. Fix a position i . The two layers have the same set of unmasked positions S_i for i , each of which gets an attention value of $1/k$, where $k = |S_i|$. Then for each i ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}_i - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|_1 &= \left\| \sum_{j \in S_i} \frac{1}{k} \mathbf{W}^{(V)} \mathbf{u}_j - \sum_{j \in S_i} \frac{1}{k} \mathbf{W}^{(V)} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j \right\|_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \left\| \sum_{j \in S_i} \mathbf{W}^{(V)} (\mathbf{u}_j - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j) \right\|_1 \\ &\leq dp_{\max} \epsilon. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

D.3 Tieless attention layers

A tieless attention layer not only may amplify error in the input values, but also introduces new error because of the difference between tieless average-hard attention and temperature scaled softmax attention. Consider a tieless self-attention layer of U with parameter matrices $\mathbf{W}^{(Q)}$, $\mathbf{W}^{(K)}$, and $\mathbf{W}^{(V)}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. We first bound the error in computing attention scores $s_{i,j}$.

Lemma 32. *Let $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ be a sequence of input vectors to this attention layer for U and $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n)$ a sequence of input vectors to the same attention layer for $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$, where for all i , $\|\mathbf{u}_i - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon \leq 1$. There exists a constant $K \geq 1$ depending on d and p_{\max} such that for the attention scores $s_{i,j}$ we have for all i, j ,*

$$|s_{i,j} - \hat{s}_{i,j}| \leq K u_{\max} \epsilon,$$

where u_{\max} is the maximum of 1 and the absolute value of any entry in any \mathbf{u}_j .

Proof. The attention score for positions i and j for U is

$$s_{i,j} = \frac{(\mathbf{W}^{(Q)} \mathbf{u}_i) \cdot (\mathbf{W}^{(K)} \mathbf{u}_j)}{\sqrt{d}},$$

and for $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ is

$$\hat{s}_{i,j} = \frac{(\mathbf{W}^{(Q)} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i) \cdot (\mathbf{W}^{(K)} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j)}{\sqrt{d}}.$$

Writing $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k = \mathbf{u}_k + (\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k - \mathbf{u}_k)$ for $k \in \{i, j\}$, distributing the matrix multiplications over the vector sums, and observing that $|\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v}'| \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{v}'\|_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbf{W}^{(Q)} \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{W}^{(K)} \mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{W}^{(Q)} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i \cdot \mathbf{W}^{(K)} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j| \\ &\leq |\mathbf{W}^{(Q)} (\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i - \mathbf{u}_i) \cdot \mathbf{W}^{(K)} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j| \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{W}^{(Q)} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i \cdot \mathbf{W}^{(K)} (\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j - \mathbf{u}_j)| \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{W}^{(Q)} (\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i - \mathbf{u}_i) \cdot \mathbf{W}^{(K)} (\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j - \mathbf{u}_j)| \\ &\leq 2d^2 p_{\max}^2 u_{\max} \epsilon + d^2 p_{\max}^2 \epsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for all i and j we have

$$|s_{i,j} - \hat{s}_{i,j}| \leq d^{\frac{3}{2}} p_{\max}^2 (2u_{\max} \epsilon + \epsilon^2). \quad \square$$

We now turn to bounding the error in the resulting attention values $\alpha_{i,j}$. Consider the situation where the average-hard attention scores for U consist of one value equal to the maximum M , and $n - 1$ values bounded above by $M - \gamma$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Without loss of generality, assume that the first score is the maximal score. We assume that in $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ these scores are approximated to within ϵ for some $0 \leq \epsilon < \gamma/2$.

Lemma 33. *Let M, ϵ , and γ be real numbers such that $0 \leq \epsilon < \gamma/2$. Let $\tau > 0$. Suppose $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is such that $s_1 \geq M - \epsilon$ and for $i > 1$ we have $s_i \leq M - \gamma + \epsilon$. Define $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as follows: $t_1 = 1$ and $t_i = 0$ for $i > 1$. Then*

$$\|\mathbf{t} - \text{softmax}_{\tau}(\mathbf{s})\|_1 \leq \frac{2n}{e^{(\gamma-2\epsilon)/\tau}}.$$

Remark. This bound is similar to that of [Edelman et al. \(2022, Lemma B.7\)](#), but with error ϵ and temperature τ . Their bound works on average-hard attention and does not assume tielessness. The reason we need the tieless property here (and only here) is that with the addition of errors, tied scores could become different; the simplest way to prevent this is to prevent ties.

Proof. Let $Z_\tau = \sum_{i=1}^n e^{s_i/\tau}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{t} - \text{softmax}_\tau(\mathbf{s})\|_1 &= \left| 1 - \frac{e^{s_1/\tau}}{Z} \right| + \sum_{i=2}^n \left| \frac{e^{s_i/\tau}}{Z} \right| \\ &= 1 - \frac{e^{s_1/\tau}}{Z} + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{e^{s_i/\tau}}{Z} \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{e^{s_i/\tau}}{Z} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{e^{s_i/\tau}}{e^{s_1/\tau}} \\ &\leq 2n \frac{e^{(M-\gamma+\epsilon)/\tau}}{e^{(M-\epsilon)/\tau}} \\ &= 2ne^{(-\gamma+2\epsilon)/\tau}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The final stage of an attention layer combines the vectors \mathbf{u}_j using the value matrix $\mathbf{W}^{(V)}$ and the softmax attention values $\alpha_{i,j}$:

$$\mathbf{v}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{i,j} \mathbf{W}^{(V)} \mathbf{u}_j.$$

The following lemma bounds the error in the result as a function of the errors in the approximations of $\alpha_{i,j}$ and \mathbf{u}_j .

Lemma 34. *Let $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ and $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n)$ be sequences of elements of \mathbb{R}^d such that $\|\mathbf{u}_i - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ for all i . For each i , let $(\alpha_{i,1}, \dots, \alpha_{i,n})$ and $(\hat{\alpha}_{i,1}, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{i,n})$ be sequences of real numbers in $[0, 1]$ that each sum to 1 such that $\|\alpha_{i,*} - \hat{\alpha}_{i,*}\|_1 \leq \epsilon_1$. Let $\mathbf{v}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{i,j} \mathbf{W}^{(V)} \mathbf{u}_j$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \mathbf{W}^{(V)} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j$. Then for all i ,*

$$\|\mathbf{v}_i - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|_1 \leq dp_{\max}(du_{\max}\epsilon_1 + \epsilon)$$

where u_{\max} is the maximum absolute value of any entry in any \mathbf{u}_j .

Proof. Fix position i . Then

$$\mathbf{v}_i - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i = \mathbf{W}^{(V)} \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_{i,j} \mathbf{u}_j - \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j).$$

Fix position j . Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\alpha_{i,j} \mathbf{u}_j - \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j\|_1 \\ &= \|\alpha_{i,j} \mathbf{u}_j - \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \mathbf{u}_j + \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \mathbf{u}_j - \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j\|_1 \\ &\leq |\alpha_{i,j} - \hat{\alpha}_{i,j}| \|\mathbf{u}_j\|_1 + \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \|\mathbf{u}_j - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j\|_1 \\ &\leq |\alpha_{i,j} - \hat{\alpha}_{i,j}| \|\mathbf{u}_j\|_1 + \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_{i,j} \mathbf{u}_j - \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j) \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \|\alpha_{i,j} \mathbf{u}_j - \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j\|_1 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n (|\alpha_{i,j} - \hat{\alpha}_{i,j}| \|\mathbf{u}_j\|_1 + \hat{\alpha}_{i,j} \epsilon) \\ &\leq du_{\max} \epsilon_1 + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

and the multiplication by $\mathbf{W}^{(V)}$ multiplies this bound by at most dp_{\max} . \square

D.4 Proof of Lemma 25

Proof. Consider layer ℓ of transformer U , consisting of an attention layer and a ReLU FF layer. Fix n and an input of length n to U , resulting in the initial sequence of activation vectors $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$. Let $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ and $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n)$ be the sequences of activation vectors that are the inputs to layer ℓ of U and layer ℓ of \hat{U} (respectively) for the given initial activations. Let $(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ be the output of layer ℓ of U on input $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ and let $(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n)$ be the output of layer ℓ of \hat{U} on input $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n)$. Assume for all i , $\|\mathbf{u}_i - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i\|_1 \leq \epsilon$.

If attention layer ℓ of U is uniform attention, then by Lemma 30 and Lemma 31, there exists a constant $K \geq 1$ such that for all i we have $\|\mathbf{v}_i - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|_1 \leq K\epsilon$.

If attention layer ℓ of U is tieless attention, then assuming $\epsilon \leq 1$, by Lemmas 29 and 32 there exists a constant $K_2 \geq 1$ such that for all i, j ,

$$|s_{i,j} - \hat{s}_{i,j}| \leq K_2 x_{\max}(n) \epsilon.$$

Assuming ϵ is sufficiently small that $K_2 x_{\max}(n) \epsilon < \gamma(n)/2$, then by Lemma 33, for all i ,

$$\|\alpha_{i,*} - \hat{\alpha}_{i,*}\|_1 \leq 2ne^{-\frac{\gamma(n)+2K_2 x_{\max}(n)\epsilon}{\tau(n)}}.$$

Applying Lemmas 29, 30 and 34, there exists a constant $K_1 \geq 1$ such that for all i ,

$$\|\mathbf{v}_i - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|_1 \leq K_1 \left(\epsilon + nx_{\max}(n) e^{-\frac{\gamma(n)+2K_2 x_{\max}(n)\epsilon}{\tau(n)}} \right).$$

\square

D.5 Proof of Theorem 26

Let L be the number of layers of U , and let K_1 and K_2 be the constants from Lemma 25. Fix an input

length n . Denote $\min(\gamma(n), 1)$ by γ , and $x_{\max}(n)$ by x_{\max} .

Fix any input of length n , and let its initial activation sequence be $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$. For $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, let ϵ_ℓ be the maximum of $\|\mathbf{v}_i - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|_1$ over all positions i , where $(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ are the activations of U and $(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n)$ are the activations of \hat{U} after layer ℓ of the computation on the given input.

We define a sequence E_ℓ for $\ell \in [L]$:

$$E_L = \frac{\gamma}{4K_2x_{\max}}$$

$$E_\ell = \frac{E_{\ell+1}}{2K_1} \quad \ell = L-1, \dots, 1.$$

We will show that $\epsilon_\ell \leq E_\ell$ for all ℓ . Note that:

$$K_2x_{\max}E_\ell \leq \frac{\gamma}{4} \quad \ell = 1, \dots, L-1 \quad (1)$$

$$E_L \leq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (2)$$

In Eq. (1), the left-hand side bounds the error in the attention scores (s_{ij}) , which we will want to be smaller than the gap γ . Equation (2) will bound the final error. Next, choose $\tau(n)$ such that

$$e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2\tau}} = \frac{E_1}{K_1nx_{\max}}. \quad (3)$$

It remains to show that $\epsilon_\ell \leq E_\ell$ for all ℓ , by induction on ℓ .

At the first layer ($\ell = 1$), there is no error in the initial activations, so

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_1 &\leq K_1nx_{\max}e^{-\frac{\gamma}{\tau}} && \text{by Lemma 25} \\ &\leq K_1nx_{\max}e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2\tau}} \\ &= K_1nx_{\max}\frac{E_1}{K_1nx_{\max}} && \text{by Eq. (3)} \\ &= E_1. \end{aligned}$$

At layer $\ell + 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\ell+1} &\leq K_1 \left(\epsilon_\ell + nx_{\max}e^{-\frac{\gamma+2K_2x_{\max}\epsilon_\ell}{\tau}} \right) && \text{Lem. 25} \\ &\leq K_1 \left(E_\ell + nx_{\max}e^{-\frac{\gamma+2K_2x_{\max}E_\ell}{\tau}} \right) && \text{ind. hyp.} \\ &\leq K_1 \left(E_\ell + nx_{\max}e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2\tau}} \right) && \text{Eq. (1)} \\ &\leq K_1 \left(E_\ell + nx_{\max}\frac{E_1}{K_1nx_{\max}} \right) && \text{Eq. (3)} \\ &= K_1 \left(E_\ell + \frac{E_1}{K_1} \right) \leq 2K_1E_\ell = E_{\ell+1}. \end{aligned}$$

To see the asymptotic bound on $\tau(n)$, we take logs of Eq. (3), make the dependence on n explicit and suppress constants. Then

$$\frac{1}{\tau(n)} \in O \left(\frac{1}{\gamma(n)} \log \frac{nx_{\max}(n)}{\gamma(n)} \right).$$

E S-RASP program for DYCK- k

The following program in S-RASP (Strobl et al., 2024) returns for each prefix of the input (in) whether that prefix is a member of the formal language DYCK- k over an alphabet of k types of pairs of brackets. We assume the following functions: $\text{left}(\sigma)$ returns 1 if σ is a left bracket and 0 otherwise, $\text{right}(\sigma)$ returns 1 if σ is a right bracket and 0 otherwise, and $\text{mismatch}(\sigma, \tau)$ returns \top if σ and τ are not left and right brackets of the same type.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sleft}(i) &= \mathbf{psum}_j [j \leq i] \text{left}(\text{in}(i)) \\ \text{sright}(i) &= \mathbf{psum}_j [j \leq i] \text{right}(\text{in}(i)) \\ \text{er1}(i) &= \text{sright}(i) > \text{sleft}(i) \\ \text{diff}(i) &= \text{sleft}(i) - \text{sright}(i) \\ \text{d}(i) &= \text{diff}(i) + \text{right}(\text{in}(i)) \\ \text{check}(i) &= \blacktriangleright_j [j < i, \text{d}(j) = \text{d}(i)] \text{in}(j) : '?' \\ \text{er2}(i) &= (\text{right}(\text{in}(i)) = 1) \wedge \\ &\quad \text{mismatch}(\text{check}(i), \text{in}(i)) \\ \text{okprefix}(i) &= \blacktriangleright_j [j \leq i, \text{er1}(j) \vee \text{er2}(j)] \perp : \top \\ \text{out}(i) &= \text{okprefix}(i) \wedge (\text{diff}(i) = 0) \end{aligned}$$

The value $\text{sleft}(i)$ is the number of left brackets of any type through position i , and $\text{sright}(i)$ is the number of right brackets of any type. An error is recorded at any position i such that the number of right brackets through i exceeds the number of left brackets. The value of $\text{d}(i)$ is the depth of nesting after a left bracket and before a right bracket. Each position i records in $\text{check}(i)$ the nearest bracket strictly to its left that has the same depth. If position i has a right bracket and $\text{check}(i)$ is not a left bracket of the same type, then position i records an error. The prefix through i is OK (that is, could be continued to an element of DYCK- k) if there is no error recorded through i . Finally, the output $\text{out}(i)$ for i is \top iff the prefix through i is OK and contains an equal number of left and right brackets.