

# Why Are Positional Encodings Nonessential for Deep Autoregressive Transformers? Revisiting a Petroglyph

Kazuki Irie

Center for Brain Science  
Harvard University, Cambridge MA, USA  
kirie@g.harvard.edu

## Abstract

Do autoregressive Transformer language models *require* explicit positional encodings (PEs)? The answer is ‘no’ as long as they have more than one layer—they can distinguish sequences with permuted tokens without requiring explicit PEs. This property has been known since early efforts (those contemporary with GPT-2) adopting the Transformer for language modeling (Irie et al., 2019). However, this result does not appear to have been well disseminated and was even rediscovered recently. This may be partially due to a sudden growth of the language modeling community *after* the advent of GPT-2, but perhaps also due to the lack of a clear explanation in prior publications, despite being commonly understood by practitioners in the past. Here we review this long-forgotten explanation why explicit PEs are nonessential for *multi-layer* autoregressive Transformers (in contrast, *one-layer* models require PEs to discern order information of their input tokens). We also review the origin of this result, and hope to re-establish it as a common knowledge.

## 1 Introduction

The field of language modeling has seen new waves of interest after the promising results of GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019), impressive capabilities of GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), and unprecedented versatility of ChatGPT and GPT-4 (Bubeck et al., 2023; Achiam et al., 2023), manipulating human languages in a way no machine has ever before.

About a decade before the current “Large Language Model era” or LLM-era<sup>1</sup>, neural language

modeling research had also seen a smaller but significant growth after Tomáš Mikolov’s breakthrough results with recurrent neural network language models (Mikolov et al., 2010, 2011). This had made neural language modeling (Nakamura and Shikano, 1989; Elman, 1989; Schmidhuber and Heil, 1994; Bengio et al., 2000) a popular research topic, particularly among speech recognition and machine translation researchers as these two fields used to be the major application areas at the time when language models were not yet a standalone system—they were merely a component in a larger system with a specialized application (Jelinek et al., 1975; Brown et al., 1988), except in certain visionary work (Sutskever et al., 2011).

When the Transformer encoder-decoder architecture was shown to be successful for machine translation (Vaswani et al., 2017), several works investigated its application to build conventional (i.e., autoregressive) *language models* using the decoder, e.g., Liu et al. (2018); Radford et al. (2018); Al-Rfou et al. (2019); Dai et al. (2019); Baevski and Auli (2019), or non-autoregressive *models of language* using the encoder, e.g., Devlin et al. (2019); producing many methods and practical knowledge for optimizing Transformers to language modeling, concurrently to GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019).

While the recent surge of interest in language modeling has been very exciting for the field, it has also led to some discontinuities, e.g., certain common knowledge and results from pre-LLM studies appear to have been lost amid this rapid growth.

This short review focuses on one of such results, namely the property that *explicit positional encodings are nonessential for multi-layer autoregressive Transformer language models* (Irie et al., 2019). We provide a simple explanation of this result, which, despite being known to language modeling practitioners of the pre-LLM era, was never published to the best of our knowledge. We also trace back to related work on this property.

<sup>1</sup>Here by “LLM-era” we roughly refer to the time after GPT-2/3. “Petroglyph” in the title is a hyperbole that carries a double meaning: firstly, it emphasizes that results from the pre-LLM era are now largely regarded as “prehistoric” and are often overlooked; and secondly, more specifically for the positional encoding result discussed here, figures similar to Figure 1 have been drawn on various occasions in old notes and during whiteboard discussions from that time, but it was not included in the 4-page Interspeech paper (Irie et al., 2019).




Figure 1: *Cascaded set processors can behave as a sequence processor.* An illustration of autoregressive Transformers without explicit positional encodings for two input sequences: (a, b, c) and its permutation (b, a, c). The color in the right diagram highlights the differences in terms of context seen by each layer at each position (expressed as a set). With two (or more) layers, as soon as an input is different at one position (here at the first position), autoregressive Transformers see different contexts for all later positions at the top layer. In contrast, *one-layer* models can not distinguish between these two input sequences (in this example, as soon as the second token is fed) even though they are strictly speaking not permutation invariant (since the context at the first position is different). Here we only swap the two first tokens; with a more “complex” permutation, one-layer models may see different contexts at more positions but in all cases, they systematically fail to do so in the last step.

## 2 Background: Self-Attention

Following the original definition (Vaswani et al., 2017), one Transformer “layer” consists of two sub-layers: a self-attention layer and a feedforward block. Given that a typical feedforward block processes information at each position/time step exclusively, the self-attention layer is the only sequence processing component of the Transformer layer.

**Autoregressive Self-Attention.** Let  $d$  and  $T$  denote positive integers. An autoregressive self-attention layer transforms an input sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$  to an output sequence  $\{\mathbf{y}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ ,  $\mathbf{y}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$  as follows:

$$\mathbf{q}_t, \mathbf{k}_t, \mathbf{v}_t = \mathbf{W}_q \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{W}_v \mathbf{x}_t \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{K}_t = [\mathbf{K}_{t-1}, \mathbf{k}_t] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times t} \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{V}_t = [\mathbf{V}_{t-1}, \mathbf{v}_t] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times t} \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{V}_t \text{softmax}(\mathbf{K}_t^\top \mathbf{q}_t) \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{W}_q, \mathbf{W}_k, \mathbf{W}_v \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  are trainable weight matrices,  $[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}]$  denotes the concatenation of vector  $\mathbf{a}$  to matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  which increments the time dimension ( $\mathbf{K}_0$  and  $\mathbf{V}_0$  are initially empty), and softmax is along the time dimension. We omit the  $1/\sqrt{d}$  scaling inside softmax, as well as the output projection, which are irrelevant for our discussion.

While the equations above accurately describe the model conceptually, self-attention is also often expressed in the following *matrix form* that better reflects the possibility to parallelize computation over the time axis during training. By denoting the input as  $\mathbf{X} = [x_1, \dots, x_T] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times T}$  ( $\mathbf{X}_i = x_i$ ) and

the output as  $\mathbf{Y} = [y_1, \dots, y_T] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times T}$ , it yields:

$$\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{W}_q \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{W}_v \mathbf{X} \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{V} \text{softmax}(\mathbf{M} \odot (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{Q})) \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$  is the so-called *attention mask*. For these equations to be equivalent to Eqs. 1-4 above, i.e., for autoregressive self-attention,  $\mathbf{M}$  is set to be the upper triangular matrix, i.e.,  $M_{i,j} = 1$  if  $i \leq j$  and  $M_{i,j} = -\infty$  otherwise.

We also denote by  $\mathbf{Y} = \text{SelfAttn}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{M})$  the overall self-attention operation given input  $\mathbf{X}$  and mask  $\mathbf{M}$ , grouping Eqs. 5-6.

**Non-Autoregressive Self-Attention.** The same equations (Eqs. 5-6) can also express *non-autoregressive* self-attention by removing the mask  $\mathbf{M}$ , i.e., by setting  $M_{i,j} = 1$  for all  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . We denote such  $\mathbf{M}$  as  $\mathbf{M} = \mathbb{1}$ .

**Positional Encodings.** When positional encodings (Gehring et al., 2017; Vaswani et al., 2017) are used, a vector representing discrete position  $t$  is added to input token  $x_t$ . The exact choice of PE design is irrelevant to our discussion.

## 3 Main Results on Positional Encodings

The goal of this short review is to provide a summary of results on the necessity/needlessness of positional encodings for Transformers with comprehensible explanations; and to discuss the original references (Sec. 5).

**Definitions.** We first define two key properties:

(1) A sequence processor  $f : \mathbb{R}^{d \times T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times T}$  is said to be *permutation invariant* when for any input

$\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times T}$ , and its arbitrary permutation along the time/token axis  $\mathbf{X}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times T}$ ,  $f(\mathbf{X}) = f(\mathbf{X}')$ .

(2)  $f$  is *fully position-sensitive* when for any inputs  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times T}$ , if  $\mathbf{X}_i \neq \mathbf{X}'_i$ , then  $f(\mathbf{X})_j \neq f(\mathbf{X}')_j$  for all  $j \in \{i, \dots, T\}$ ; meaning that as soon as one input is different at position  $i$ ,  $f$  produces different outputs at all the “future” positions  $j \geq i$ .

**Necessity vs. needlessness of explicit PEs** is tied to the model’s capability to distinguish between permuted sequences<sup>2</sup>, which can be characterized using the definitions above. (1) If a sequence processor  $f$  is *permutation invariant*, positional encodings are needed. (2) If  $f$  is *fully position-sensitive*, positional encodings are not needed. (3, Remark) Not *permutation invariant* is not enough to conclude on the necessity of positional encodings (as all positions matters).

We present the main results in the form of question/answer pairs as follows.

**Question 1** (Back to basics). *Why are positional encodings needed for non-autoregressive Transformers?*

This is because non-autoregressive self-attention is *permutation invariant*, i.e., for any input  $\mathbf{X}$ , and its arbitrary permutation along the time/token axis  $\mathbf{X}'$ ,  $\text{SelfAttn}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbb{1}) = \text{SelfAttn}(\mathbf{X}', \mathbb{1})$ .

We can straightforwardly check this by directly looking at Eqs. 5-6. Without the mask, i.e.,  $\mathbf{M} = \mathbb{1}$ , keys and queries from all positions interact regardless of their positions to yield attention scores (i.e.,  $\text{softmax}(\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{Q}) \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$  in Eq. 6), which are used to compute weighted average, which is commutative, of values.

**Question 2** (Knowledge Bias). *Why are positional encodings believed to be crucial for “self-attention” by “default” in the first place?*

This is partly because without specification of being autoregressive or non-autoregressive, the default self-attention is often (somehow) assumed to be non-autoregressive (as in the encoder for machine translation (Vaswani et al., 2017)) which requires positional encodings as discussed above.

Secondly, the explanation for the necessity of positional encodings in the original paper was the fact that the “*model contains no recurrence and no convolution*” (Vaswani et al., 2017). As we’ll see

<sup>2</sup>Once it is clear that the model can distinguish between permuted sequences, there is no reason to introduce extra explicit PEs. A common wisdom is to let the model learn to exploit the positional signals on its own. For example, it is rather unnatural to add extra PEs to recurrent neural networks.

below, this explanation is incomplete, but if one assumed this to be true, it would imply that the autoregressive self-attention also requires positional encodings (we emphasize that this is not true).

**Question 3.** *Why are positional encodings nonessential for multi-layer autoregressive Transformers?*

This is because multi-layer autoregressive Transformers are *fully position-sensitive*.

A simple method to check this is to compare the model outputs when we feed two sequences which are permutations of each other. While we could also provide a mathematical proof here, this can better be visualized as in Figure 1: even for this extreme case where we feed two sequences that only differ from each other by a permutation of their two first tokens, the autoregressive model sees different contexts at all positions at the top layer.

**Question 4.** *Does the multi-layer autoregressive Transformer language models effectively learn to use positional signals in practice?*

For this question, we refer to Irie et al. (2019) which demonstrated good general performance of multi-layer autoregressive Transformer language models without PEs and provided visualization of attention weights (see figures in Irie et al. (2019)). They report that, interestingly, the first attention layer mainly attends to the new input, while the second layer uniformly attends to the context. Uniform attention in early layers is intuitively good as it allows the model to grasp all the available context, which is crucial to distinguish similar sequences (as illustrated in Figure 1).

Finally, being nonessential does not mean that some sophisticated extra positional encodings may not improve Transformer language models, we discuss corresponding references in Sec. 5.

**Question 5.** *Why are positional encodings needed for one-layer autoregressive self-attention?*

This is also well illustrated in Figure 1 by looking at the first layer. Depending on the specific permutation, one-layer model’s outputs at some positions are sensitive to the input permutation, but the output at the last position (when the entire sequence is seen) is the same for any permutations; implying that they are not *fully position-sensitive*.

## 4 An Intriguing Linear Transformer Case

Here we discuss an *intriguing* case of linear Transformers (Katharopoulos et al., 2020; Schmidhuber,

1992; Schlag et al., 2021). One representative example of linear Transformers can be obtained by simply removing softmax in Eq. 4. The resulting model can be equivalently expressed as the following fast weight programmer (see Appendix B):

$$\mathbf{q}_t, \mathbf{k}_t, \mathbf{v}_t = \mathbf{W}_q \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{W}_v \mathbf{x}_t \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_t = \mathbf{W}_{t-1} + \mathbf{v}_t \otimes \mathbf{k}_t \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{W}_t \mathbf{q}_t \quad (8)$$

where  $\otimes$  denotes outer product and  $\mathbf{W}_0 = 0$ . Because of the state update rule of Eq. 7 giving an impression of “recurrence” (as in the title of Katharopoulos et al. (2020)), it may not be immediately clear if this model requires PEs. In reality this is not true recurrence (for further discussions, we refer to Irie et al. (2021, 2023); Merrill et al. (2024)). Since this model is equivalent to the autoregressive self-attention layer discussed in Sec. 3, it inherits the same properties, i.e., PEs are needed for one-layer models, while they are nonessential for multi-layer models.

## 5 Literature Review

To the best of our knowledge, Shen et al. (2018) were the first to use non-symmetric “attention masks” (Eq. 6) to encode positional information for neural networks whose sequence processing ability solely relies on the attention mechanism. While the above work does not specifically discuss autoregressive language models (LMs), their insights about masking could have been directly extended to answer the question whether positional encodings are needed for autoregressive Transformer LMs.

Irie et al. (2019) demonstrated that multi-layer autoregressive Transformer LMs perform well without positional encodings. To be more specific, the corresponding ablation study was conducted for 12, 24, and 42 layer models; while other deeper models (up to 112 layers) were also trained without PEs. This result was later rediscovered/confirmed by Haviv et al. (2022) and Kazemnejad et al. (2023)<sup>3</sup>. Irie et al. (2019) argued that the autoregressive setting itself encodes the positional information due to increasing context over time, which directly connects to Shen et al. (2018)’s argument (while Irie et al. (2019) failed to cite it). Also, while they specifically state that the results are valid for the *multi-layer* models, they did

<sup>3</sup>Many recent papers inaccurately attribute the origin of this result (see Appendix A for examples).

not explicitly discuss the *one-layer* case. This non-positional encoding scheme has been immediately adopted in other works on speech recognition; e.g., Zeyer et al. (2019) removed PEs from the decoder of their encoder-decoder speech recognizer. A popular open-source speech toolkit, ESPnet (Watanabe et al., 2018) also integrated Transformer LMs without PEs as part of their recipe.

Lee et al. (2019) discussed permutation invariance of non-autoregressive self-attention; Tsai et al. (2019) extended this discussion and showed that autoregressive self-attention is not permutation invariant. However, as discussed above, permutation invariance alone is not enough to conclude on the necessity of PEs (as shown in Sec. 3, one-layer autoregressive models are not *permutation invariant* but also not *fully position-sensitive* and require PEs).

**Length Generalization.** Empirically, whether removal of PEs yields performance improvements depends on the specific setting. Irie et al. (2019) reported general performance gain by removing PEs for Transformer LMs trained on books, for various numbers of layers. In contrast, Haviv et al. (2022) and Scao et al. (2022) reported slight degradation.

Nevertheless, one of the common benefits of removing PEs is the improved length generalization. Bhattamishra et al. (2020) showed that Transformer LMs without PEs can generalize on certain formal languages with test sequences that are longer than the training ones. Kazemnejad et al. (2023) showed that LMs without PEs yields the best length generalization performance on reasoning-related tasks compared to sophisticated positional encoding methods. Schlag et al. (2021) successfully trained deep linear Transformers without PEs (Sec. 4) by carrying context across training batches to enable them to process arbitrarily long sequences.

Regarding length generalization of Transformers with *non*-autoregressive self-attention, we refer to, e.g., Csordás et al. (2021, 2022).

## 6 Conclusion

We provide a didactic explanation of why positional encodings are nonessential for multi-layer autoregressive Transformers—an explanation that was well-known among pre-LLM language modeling practitioners but has never been published before. We also review the literature related to this result in the hope of correcting potential misconceptions and enhancing our collective knowledge.

## Limitations

Our literature review reflects the authors’ best knowledge. It is not impossible that there is prior work discussing the nonessentiality of positional encodings in autoregressive Transformers.

Also, here we only focused on the specific topic of positional encodings for autoregressive Transformer language models. There are other similar cases, including the discussion on methods to manage/reduce the size of key-value memory storage (the so-called “KV-cache”) in autoregressive Transformers (c.f., Irie et al. (2020) and Liu et al. (2023); Ge et al. (2024)); or the multi-stage strategy to build mixture-of-experts language models by pre-training component/expert language models independently in parallel (c.f., Irie et al. (2018) and Li et al. (2022); Sukhbaatar et al. (2024)). Further discussion is beyond the scope of this work.

## References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. GPT-4 technical report. *Preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Mark A. Aizerman, Emmanuil M. Braverman, and Lev I. Rozonoer. 1964. Theoretical foundations of potential function method in pattern recognition. *Automation and Remote Control*, 25(6):917–936.
- Rami Al-Rfou, Dokook Choe, Noah Constant, Mandy Guo, and Llion Jones. 2019. Character-level language modeling with deeper self-attention. In *Proc. Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 3159–3166, Honolulu, HI, USA.
- Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. 2022. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Jimmy Ba, Geoffrey E Hinton, Volodymyr Mnih, Joel Z Leibo, and Catalin Ionescu. 2016. Using fast weights to attend to the recent past. In *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 4331–4339, Barcelona, Spain.
- Alexei Baevski and Michael Auli. 2019. Adaptive input representations for neural language modeling. In *Int. Conf. on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, New Orleans, LA, USA.
- Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, and Pascal Vincent. 2000. A neural probabilistic language model. In *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 932–938, Denver, CO, USA.
- Satwik Bhattamishra, Kabir Ahuja, and Navin Goyal. 2020. On the ability and limitations of transformers to recognize formal languages. In *Proc. Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7096–7116, Virtual only.
- Peter F. Brown, John Cocke, Stephan A. Della Pietra, Vincent J. Della Pietra, Fredrick Jelinek, John D. Lafferty, Robert L. Mercer, and Paul S. Rossin. 1988. A statistical approach to language translation. In *Int. Conf. on Computational Linguistics*, pages 71–76, Buffalo, NY, USA.
- Tom B Brown et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, Virtual only.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. 2023. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4. *Preprint arXiv:2303.12712*.
- Róbert Csordás, Kazuki Irie, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2021. The devil is in the detail: Simple tricks improve systematic generalization of transformers. In *Proc. Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic.
- Róbert Csordás, Kazuki Irie, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2022. The Neural Data Router: Adaptive control flow in Transformers improves systematic generalization. In *Int. Conf. on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, Virtual only.
- Hugo Cui, Freya Behrens, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová. 2024. A phase transition between positional and semantic learning in a solvable model of dot-product attention. *Preprint arXiv:2402.03902*.
- Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, William W Cohen, Jaime Carbonell, Quoc V Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. Transformer-XL: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context. In *Proc. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 2978–2988, Florence, Italy.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proc. North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics on Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, MN, USA.
- Jeffrey L Elman. 1989. Structured representations and connectionist models. In *Proc. Conference of Cognitive Science Society (CogSci)*, pages 17–25, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.
- Suyu Ge, Yunan Zhang, Liyuan Liu, Minjia Zhang, Jiawei Han, and Jianfeng Gao. 2024. Model tells you what to discard: Adaptive kv cache compression for llms. In *Int. Conf. on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, Vienna, Austria.

- Jonas Gehring, Michael Auli, David Grangier, Denis Yarats, and Yann N. Dauphin. 2017. Convolutional sequence to sequence learning. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, Sydney, Australia.
- Adi Haviv, Ori Ram, Ofir Press, Peter Izsak, and Omer Levy. 2022. Transformer language models without positional encodings still learn positional information. In *Proc. Findings of Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-Findings)*, pages 1382–1390, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates.
- Kazuki Irie, Róbert Csordás, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2022. The dual form of neural networks revisited: Connecting test time predictions to training patterns via spotlights of attention. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, Baltimore, MD, USA.
- Kazuki Irie, Róbert Csordás, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2023. Practical computational power of linear transformers and their recurrent and self-referential extensions. In *Proc. Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Sentosa, Singapore.
- Kazuki Irie, Alexander Gerstenberger, Ralf Schlüter, and Hermann Ney. 2020. How much self-attention do we need? Trading attention for feed-forward layers. In *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6154–6158.
- Kazuki Irie, Shankar Kumar, Michael Nirschl, and Hank Liao. 2018. RADMM: Recurrent adaptive mixture model with applications to domain robust language modeling. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6079–6083, Calgary, Canada.
- Kazuki Irie, Imanol Schlag, Róbert Csordás, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2021. Going beyond linear transformers with recurrent fast weight programmers. In *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, Virtual only.
- Kazuki Irie, Albert Zeyer, Ralf Schlüter, and Hermann Ney. 2019. Language modeling with deep Transformers. In *Proc. Interspeech*, pages 3905–3909, Graz, Austria.
- Frederick Jelinek, Lalit Bahl, and Robert Mercer. 1975. Design of a linguistic statistical decoder for the recognition of continuous speech. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 21(3):250–256.
- Jean Kaddour, Joshua Harris, Maximilian Mozes, Herbie Bradley, Roberta Raileanu, and Robert McHardy. 2023. Challenges and applications of large language models. *Preprint arXiv:2307.10169*.
- Angelos Katharopoulos, Apoorv Vyas, Nikolaos Pappas, and François Fleuret. 2020. Transformers are RNNs: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, Virtual only.
- Amirhossein Kazemnejad, Inkit Padhi, Karthikeyan Natesan Ramamurthy, Payel Das, and Siva Reddy. 2023. The impact of positional encoding on length generalization in transformers. In *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, New Orleans, LA, USA.
- Juho Lee, Yoonho Lee, Jungtaek Kim, Adam R. Kosiosek, Seungjin Choi, and Yee Whye Teh. 2019. Set transformer: A framework for attention-based permutation-invariant neural networks. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 3744–3753, Long Beach, CA.
- Margaret Li, Suchin Gururangan, Tim Dettmers, Mike Lewis, Tim Althoff, Noah A Smith, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Branch-train-merge: Embarrassingly parallel training of expert language models. *Preprint arXiv:2208.03306*.
- Bingbin Liu, Jordan T Ash, Surbhi Goel, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Cyril Zhang. 2022. Transformers learn shortcuts to automata. *Preprint arXiv:2210.10749*.
- Peter J Liu, Mohammad Saleh, Etienne Pot, Ben Goodrich, Ryan Sepassi, Łukasz Kaiser, and Noam Shazeer. 2018. Generating wikipedia by summarizing long sequences. In *Int. Conf. on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, Vancouver, Canada.
- Zichang Liu, Aditya Desai, Fangshuo Liao, Weitao Wang, Victor Xie, Zhaozhuo Xu, Anastasios Kyrillidis, and Anshumali Shrivastava. 2023. Scissorhands: Exploiting the persistence of importance hypothesis for LLM KV cache compression at test time. In *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, New Orleans, LA, USA.
- William Merrill, Jackson Petty, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2024. The illusion of state in state-space models. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, Vienna, Austria.
- Tomás Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukás Burget, Jan Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. 2010. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *Proc. Interspeech*, pages 1045–1048, Makuhari, Japan.
- Tomas Mikolov, Stefan Kombrink, Lukas Burget, Jan H Cernocky, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. 2011. Extensions of recurrent neural network language model. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5528–5531, Prague, Czech Republic.
- Masami Nakamura and Kiyohiro Shikano. 1989. A study of english word category prediction based on neural networks. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 731–734, Glasglow, UK.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. [Available Online] : <https://>

- [s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/openai-assets/research-covers/language-unsupervised/language\\_understanding\\_paper.pdf](https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/openai-assets/research-covers/language-unsupervised/language_understanding_paper.pdf).
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. [Available Online]: <https://openai.com/index/better-language-models/>.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, et al. 2023. Code Llama: Open foundation models for code. *Preprint arXiv:2308.12950*.
- Tevan Le Scao, Thomas Wang, Daniel Hesslow, Stas Bekman, M. Saiful Bari, Stella Biderman, Hady Elsahar, Niklas Muennighoff, Jason Phang, Ofir Press, Colin Raffel, Victor Sanh, Sheng Shen, Lintang Sutawika, Jaesung Tae, Zheng Xin Yong, Julien Luanay, and Iz Beltagy. 2022. What language model to train if you have one million GPU hours? In *Proc. Findings of Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-Findings)*, pages 765–782, Abu Dhabi, UAE.
- Imanol Schlag, Kazuki Irie, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2021. Linear Transformers are secretly fast weight programmers. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, Virtual only.
- Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1992. Learning to control fast-weight memories: An alternative to dynamic recurrent networks. *Neural Computation*, 4(1):131–139.
- Jürgen Schmidhuber and Stefan Heil. 1994. Predictive coding with neural nets: Application to text compression. In *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 1047–1054, Denver, CO, USA.
- Tao Shen, Tianyi Zhou, Guodong Long, Jing Jiang, Shirui Pan, and Chengqi Zhang. 2018. DiSAN: Directional self-attention network for RNN/CNN-free language understanding. In *Proc. AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 5446–5455, New Orleans, LA, USA.
- Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Olga Golovneva, Vasu Sharma, Hu Xu, Xi Victoria Lin, Baptiste Rozière, Jacob Kahn, Daniel Li, Wen-tau Yih, Jason Weston, et al. 2024. Branch-train-MiX: Mixing expert llms into a mixture-of-experts llm. *Preprint arXiv:2403.07816*.
- Ilya Sutskever, James Martens, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2011. Generating text with recurrent neural networks. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1017–1024, Bellevue, WA, USA.
- Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Shaojie Bai, Makoto Yamada, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. Transformer dissection: An unified understanding for transformer’s attention via the lens of kernel. In *Proc. Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4344–4353, Hong Kong, China.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 5998–6008, Long Beach, CA, USA.
- Shinji Watanabe, Takaaki Hori, Shigeki Karita, Tomoki Hayashi, Jiro Nishitoba, Yuya Unno, Nelson Enrique Yalta Soplín, Jahn Heymann, Matthew Wiesner, Nanxin Chen, Adithya Renduchintala, and Tsubasa Ochiai. 2018. ESPnet: End-to-end speech processing toolkit. In *Proc. Interspeech*, pages 2207–2211.
- Albert Zeyer, Parnia Bahar, Kazuki Irie, Ralf Schlüter, and Hermann Ney. 2019. A comparison of transformer and LSTM encoder decoder models for asr. In *Proc. IEEE Automatic Speech Recog. and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, Sentosa, Singapore.

## A Metascience perspectives

From a metascientific viewpoint, it is interesting to see how widespread the misconception about the origin of the “no-positional encoding” result has propagated in the machine learning community. Many recent papers refer to this result as “recent” findings (c.f. the references we provided in Sec. 5). Here are some example quotes for illustration:

- Transformers Learn Shortcuts to Automata (Liu et al., 2022): “Note that removing positional encoding does not mean having no position information, since the use of the causal mask implicitly encodes the position, which is also noted in Bhattamishra et al. (2020) and concurrent work by Haviv et al. (2022).”
- Code Llama: Open Foundation Models for Code (Roziere et al., 2023): “Recent work suggests that causal models do not require an explicit encoding of position information (Haviv et al., 2022; Kazemnejad et al., 2023)”
- Flamingo: a Visual Language Model for Few-Shot Learning (Alayrac et al., 2022): “recent work has shown that such disambiguation is still possible implicitly through the causal attention mechanism [36].” ([36] is Haviv et al. 2022).
- A Phase Transition between Positional and Semantic Learning in a Solvable Model of Dot-Product Attention (Cui et al., 2024): “While some transformers can leverage implicit positional information through causal masks in training (Haviv et al., 2022; Sinha et al., 2022; Kazemnejad et al., 2023)”
- Challenges and Applications of Large Language Models (Kaddour et al., 2023): “Surprisingly, Haviv et al. [192] find that causal LLMs without positional encodings are competitive compared to models with positional encodings and accredit this success to the causal attention mask leaking positional information into the model.”

## B Reminder: Derivation of the dual form of linear Transformers

Here we briefly review the derivation (Katharopoulos et al., 2020; Schlag et al., 2021; Ba et al., 2016) connecting the fast weight programmer of Sec. 4 and its attention form (Eqs. 1-4). Starting from

Eq. 8, and by using the definition of  $W_t$  from Eq. 7, we obtain:

$$\mathbf{y}_t = W_t \mathbf{q}_t \quad (9)$$

$$= \left( \sum_{\tau=1}^t \mathbf{v}_\tau \otimes \mathbf{k}_\tau \right) \mathbf{q}_t \quad (10)$$

$$= \sum_{\tau=1}^t \mathbf{v}_\tau \mathbf{k}_\tau^\top \mathbf{q}_t \quad (11)$$

$$= \mathbf{V}_t \mathbf{K}_t^\top \mathbf{q}_t \quad (12)$$

where the definitions of  $\mathbf{K}_t$  and  $\mathbf{V}_t$  are as in Sec. 2.

The last equation is effectively Eq. 4 without softmax.

Note that this relation is analogous to the famous *duality* that connects the perceptron to kernel machines (Aizerman et al., 1964; Irie et al., 2022).