

# Between Circuits and Chomsky: Pre-pretraining on Formal Languages Imparts Linguistic Biases

Michael Y. Hu<sup>1</sup> Jackson Petty<sup>2</sup> Chuan Shi<sup>1</sup> William Merrill<sup>1</sup> Tal Linzen<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for Data Science <sup>2</sup>Department of Linguistics  
New York University  
{michael.hu, petty, cs5526, willm, linzen}@nyu.edu

## Abstract

Pretraining language models on formal languages can improve their acquisition of natural language, but it is unclear which features of the formal language impart an inductive bias that leads to effective transfer. Drawing on insights from linguistics and complexity theory, we hypothesize that effective transfer occurs when the formal language both captures dependency structures in natural language and remains within the computational limitations of the model architecture. Focusing on transformers, we find that formal languages with both these properties enable language models to achieve lower loss on natural language and better linguistic generalization compared to other languages. In fact, *pre-pretraining*, or training on formal-then-natural language, reduces loss more efficiently than the same amount of natural language. For a 1B-parameter language model trained on roughly 1.6B tokens of natural language, pre-pretraining achieves the same loss and better linguistic generalization with a 33% smaller token budget. We also give mechanistic evidence of cross-task transfer from formal to natural language: attention heads acquired during formal language pretraining remain crucial for the model’s performance on syntactic evaluations.

## 1 Introduction

Language models have achieved impressive performance on many tasks, but they remain data-hungry, requiring five to six orders of magnitude more data than humans to achieve human-level performance (Warstadt et al., 2023; Gilkerson et al., 2017). This high data requirement presents challenges for training models in low-resource settings (Zhong et al., 2024; Hettiarachchi et al., 2024), understanding how models can generalize given more human-like data constraints (Wilcox et al., 2024), and improving models as original data becomes scarce (Villalobos et al., 2022). Thus, an important frontier for language models is making training more data-efficient.

A recently-explored approach for increasing data efficiency teaches models useful inductive biases by

	Context-free	Context-sensitive
C-RASP	1-Dyck	$k$ -Shuffle Dyck
FO(M)	$k$ -Dyck	$ww$




Figure 1: The intersection of Chomsky and circuit hierarchies (top), where  $C-RASP \subset FO(M)$  and context-free  $\subset$  context-sensitive. Within this  $2 \times 2$ , we find that pre-pretraining on  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck, a context-sensitive language definable in C-RASP, lets 1B-parameter models match the final baseline performance of no pre-pretraining with 33% fewer training tokens (bottom). See §3.2.

“pre-pretraining” them on formal languages before training on natural language (Chiang and Lee, 2021; McCoy and Griffiths, 2023). In particular, Papadimitriou and Jurafsky (2023) show that within the Chomsky hierarchy, context-sensitive languages transfer best to natural language. However, results from circuit complexity show that transformers cannot learn next-token prediction for all context-sensitive languages, both in theory and practice (Strobl et al., 2024; Merrill and Sabharwal, 2023). Within all levels of the Chomsky hierarchy, some languages are harder for transformers to learn than others, if not impossible (Merrill et al., 2023, 2024). These results call into question how positive transfer occurs, if a generalizing solution cannot always be learned. Which characteristics of formal languages make them effective for pre-pretraining?

In this work, we propose that optimal transfer from formal to natural language occurs at the intersection

of two theoretical hierarchies: the Chomsky hierarchy of formal languages and the circuit complexity hierarchy that bounds transformer computational power (§3). Specifically, we hypothesize that effective pre-pretraining languages should be:

1. expressive enough to capture hierarchical natural language dependencies, and
2. learnable by transformers in a length-generalizing way.

Our empirical results support this hypothesis (§4): pre-pretraining on languages with both the above properties outperforms pre-pretraining on either natural language or any of the other formal languages that we tested. Next, we show that when positive transfer occurs, the model reuses attention heads it learned during pre-pretraining, suggesting that mechanisms from pre-pretraining transfer to natural language (§5). We conclude by demonstrating our pre-pretraining method generalizes to 1B-parameter language model pretraining, increasing token efficiency by 33% (§6). In summary, our contributions are three-fold:

1. We propose a taxonomy of formal languages for pre-pretraining transformers (§3.2). Our framework reconciles constraints on formal languages from linguistic theory, as captured by the Chomsky hierarchy, and constraints from circuit complexity theory, as captured by the nascent circuit hierarchy (Yang and Chiang, 2024).
2. The best pre-pretraining languages we observe contain hierarchical structure and are learnable by transformers in a length-generalizing way (§4). We demonstrate that attention heads learned during pre-pretraining continue to be used after transfer to natural language (§5).
3. Finally, ablations reveal that hierarchical dependency structures are crucial for positive transfer. We also show that the benefit of pre-pretraining persists for 1B-parameter models (§6).

## 2 Background

### 2.1 The Chomsky Hierarchy

The Chomsky hierarchy (Chomsky, 1959) is a nested classification of increasingly complex formal languages. This classification clarifies the kinds of computations needed to process formal structures resembling those found in human language. For example, regular languages, the least complex, can be recognized by finite-state automata; most phenomena in natural language phonology and morphology can be captured by regular languages. Regular languages are insufficient for syntax, however, as representing the

hierarchical structure of natural language with a finite-state automaton would require infinitely many states (Chomsky, 1956). Subsequent works showed that compactly modeling natural-language syntax requires not only context-free but also context-sensitive grammars (Shieber, 1985). That said, only a select few phenomena in natural language require context sensitivity; those include cross-serial dependencies in Swiss German (Bresnan et al., 1982) or anaphora; the rest can be modeled using context-free grammars (Gazdar, 1982).

**Dyck Languages.** A classic context-free language is  $k$ -Dyck: the language of well-balanced parentheses with  $k$  bracket types. For example,  $([ ] [ ]$  is a valid 2-Dyck string, where rounded and square parentheses are the two bracket types.  $k$ -Dyck is often taken as a canonical example of context-free hierarchical structure because any context-free language can be reduced to Dyck via one transformation (inverse homomorphism) and intersection with a regular language (Chomsky and Schützenberger, 1959).

**Shuffle Dyck.** Removing the constraint that Dyck braces must be well-nested (but enforcing that every opening brace must be closed and vice versa) yields  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck,<sup>1</sup> a minimal relaxation of  $k$ -Dyck that is strictly context-sensitive rather than context-free (Suzgun et al., 2019; Strobl et al., 2024). Crossing braces in  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck can be thought of as a formal model of the cross-serial dependencies underlying aspects of language argued to be context-sensitive (Papadimitriou and Jurafsky, 2023).

### 2.2 The Circuit Hierarchy

Our focus in this work is on transformer language models. At each level of the Chomsky hierarchy, there are languages that a transformer cannot recognize (Merrill and Sabharwal, 2023; Liu et al., 2024; Strobl et al., 2024). Thus, the Chomsky hierarchy alone does not precisely capture how difficult a language is for transformers to learn: for instance, transformers can learn some context-free languages (Butoi et al., 2025) and yet fail to learn other regular languages (Merrill et al., 2024). To better understand the expressive power of transformers, recent work has analyzed formal languages within a circuit complexity hierarchy, native to what transformers can and cannot express (Hao et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2024). Here, we will focus on two logics that emerge from this circuit

---

<sup>1</sup>The name “Shuffle” comes from the fact that  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck can be defined by interleaving  $k$  Dyck strings with different braces (Suzgun et al., 2019), as if by riffle shuffling.

complexity viewpoint: FO(M) (Merrill and Sabharwal, 2023) and C-RASP (Yang and Chiang, 2024).

**FO(M).** First-order logic with majority, or FO(M), is a provable *upper bound* on the languages that transformers can express: that is, any transformer can be converted into an FO(M) program that defines (or recognizes) the same language (Merrill and Sabharwal, 2023). FO(M) programs operate by computing counts over the number of indices in an input string that satisfy certain predicates. For example,  $Q_a(i)$  is a basic predicate that checks whether input token  $i$  is an  $a$ . The following FO(M) program uses  $Q_a(i)$  to define the language of strings with exactly 3  $a$ 's:

$$\#i \leq n[Q_a(i)] = 3 \quad (1)$$

Beyond this example, FO(M) can implement a rich variety of programs by nesting quantifiers and building complex predicates out of logical ( $\wedge, \vee, \neg$ ) and arithmetic operators ( $+, =, <$ ). In particular, FO(M) can define the  $k$ -Dyck language for any  $k \geq 1$  (Proposition A.6). For example, the following program defines 1-Dyck:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{depth}(i) &\equiv \#j \leq i[Q_1(i)] - \#j \leq i[Q_2(i)] \\ [\text{depth}(n) = 0] \wedge \#i \leq n[\text{depth}(i) < 0] &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

To define 2-Dyck, this can be extended by modifying depth to track two bracket types and computing the following depth index:

$$\text{dindex}(i) \equiv \#j \leq i[\text{depth}(i) = \text{depth}(j)] \quad (3)$$

To finish the definition, we add a condition to enforce that any open and close brace paired by depth and dindex also match in their type (i.e., parenthesis or square brace). See Proposition A.7 for further details.

**C-RASP.** While any transformer can be compiled into FO(M), it is not necessarily the case that *any* FO(M) program can be implemented by a transformer. C-RASP is a restriction of FO(M) designed to be a *lower bound* on what transformers can express: that is, if a language is definable in C-RASP, then there exists a transformer that recognizes it (Yang and Chiang, 2024).<sup>2</sup> C-RASP works similarly to FO(M), but with a couple of restrictions. Most crucially, in C-RASP each predicate can only refer to one index variable  $i$ , whereas in FO(M), predicates can refer to two (or more) indices  $i, j$  introduced by different quantifiers (for more detail,

<sup>2</sup>C-RASP is a fully well-defined variant of the Restricted Access Sequence Processing programming language (RASP; Weiss et al., 2021; Lindner et al., 2023).

see Yang and Chiang, 2024). This means C-RASP can define (1) or (2) above, but not  $k$ -Dyck for  $k \geq 2$ , as C-RASP cannot express the dindex in (3).

Recent work has also suggested a connection between C-RASP and length generalization of transformers (Zhou et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2025): the definability of a language  $L$  in C-RASP predicts whether transformers can reliably length-generalize when trained on strings from  $L$ . One interpretation of this finding is that mechanisms expressible in C-RASP may be more robustly learnable for transformers. We thus hypothesize that it is better to pre-pretrain on formal languages that can be defined in C-RASP so that the learned representations can transfer reliably.

### 3 Methods

Context-free and context-sensitive languages serve as formal models of the hierarchical structure of natural language. Similarly, circuit complexity classes like FO(M) and restricted programming languages like C-RASP provide theoretical upper and lower bounds on transformer capabilities. We explore the intersection of these two hierarchies to identify optimal pre-pretraining languages. In this section, we discuss how we define pre-pretraining (§3.1) and how we create formal language pre-pretraining data (§3.2).

#### 3.1 Defining Pre-pretraining

Formally, we train a language model using an optimizer  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, t, \theta_{\text{init}})$  which returns parameters  $\theta_t$  after  $t$  timesteps. We apply  $\mathcal{A}$  sequentially:

1. Pre-pretrain for  $t_0$  steps on dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ppt}}$  to obtain model parameters  $\theta_{t_0}$ .
2. Pretrain for  $t_1$  steps on dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}$  to obtain  $\theta_{t_1}$ .

Our objective is to minimize the expected loss on the pretraining dataset:  $\text{argmin}_{\theta_{t_1}} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}, \theta_{t_1})]$ .

We hold  $\mathcal{A}$ 's hyperparameters,  $t_1$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}$  fixed, and we transfer model parameters directly from pre-pretraining to pretraining. So to minimize  $\ell(\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}, \theta_{t_1})$ , we can only change the pre-pretraining dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ppt}}$  and duration  $t_0$ . We compare pre-pretraining on our proposed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ppt}}$  datasets (§3.2) against several baselines:

- No pre-pretraining ( $t_0 = 0$ )
- Random binary strings
- Random strings of  $k$  integers
- Held-out natural language data from the same distribution as  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}$

Aside from no pre-pretraining, we pre-pretrained the baselines for  $t_0 = 500$  steps, for a clear comparison against the  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck results (see §4). The held-out natural language baseline is different from

training on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}$  for longer, because we use learning rate warmup in both pre-pretraining and pretraining.

Lower validation loss compared to the no pre-pretraining baseline would indicate that pre-pretraining on formal languages is beneficial. The random baselines help establish whether this effect is specific to the particular formal languages we study. Finally, outperforming pre-pretraining on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}$  would suggest that formal languages provide better inductive biases than the pretraining data itself.

**Evaluation.** In addition to validation loss, we evaluate models on BLiMP and verbatim retrieval. BLiMP compares the likelihood assigned by the model to minimal pairs of sentences that differ only in their grammaticality (e.g., *Only Bill would ever complain* is grammatical, but *Even Bill would ever complain* is not). Accuracy is measured as the proportion of examples where the grammatical sentence is assigned higher likelihood than the ungrammatical one (Warstadt et al., 2020a). Verbatim retrieval tests language modeling on text passages with repeated lists (Armeni et al., 2022, 2024); the model is expected to assign a very high likelihood to the words in the second repetition of the list, such that lower loss indicates better performance. Both tasks assess models’ ability to learn and apply consistent patterns—a capability that structured formal languages might strengthen. For examples of these tasks, see Tables 3 and 4 in the Appendix.

**Efficiency.** In the regime with plentiful pretraining data, an ideal pre-pretraining language should minimize the number of pre-pretraining steps  $t_0$  required: if a formal language requires very large  $t_0$ , then only pre-training on natural language would be more practical. To help quantify efficiency, we calculate the marginal rate of substitution (MRS) between formal and natural language at 10,000 steps of natural language pretraining. In other words, if we train on 500 steps of the formal language, how many more steps does it take for the natural language-only baseline to catch up?

Formally, let  $x$  be the number of pre-pretraining steps and  $y$  be the number of pretraining steps, and suppose the following two pairs  $(x, y)$  of training steps achieve the same final loss:  $(0, 10,000)$  and  $(500, 6,000)$ . Then the marginal rate of substitution is

$$\frac{|y_1 - y_2|}{|x_1 - x_2|} = \frac{|10,000 - 6,000|}{|0 - 500|} = 8.$$

Similarly, the gain in token efficiency would be  $1 - \frac{6,000 + 500}{10,000} = 35\%$ . For a visualization, see Figure 8.

In our setting, a good pre-pretraining language would (1) minimize the amount of pre-pretraining

steps  $t_0$  (**efficiency**), and (2) increase the evaluation **performance** of the language model. We discuss efficiency for the low-resource setting in §9.

### 3.2 Between Circuits and Chomsky

We hypothesize that a good pre-pretraining language should both encapsulate the complexity of natural language and be robustly learnable by transformers in a way that length generalizes. Because natural language is hierarchically structured and C-RASP has been suggested as a formal model of what transformers can learn robustly, this motivates the following hypothesis:

**Expressivity hypothesis:** A formal language that confers a helpful inductive bias should be hierarchically structured (either context-free or context-sensitive) and definable in C-RASP.

To test this hypothesis, we pre-pretrain language models on the following formal languages:

1. 1-Dyck: the nested parentheses language. Context-free, in C-RASP.
2.  $k$ -Dyck: contains  $k$  different types of parentheses. Context-free, in  $\text{FO}(M) \setminus \text{C-RASP}$ .
3.  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck:  $k$ -Dyck with cross-serial dependencies. Context-sensitive, in C-RASP.
4.  $ww$ : The copy language. Context-sensitive, in  $\text{FO}(M) \setminus \text{C-RASP}$ .

The three variants of Dyck languages model hierarchical structure, while  $ww$ , like the act of copying, has a fixed dependency structure. For examples of these languages, see Table 1. Full proofs of where these languages lie on the Chomsky and circuit hierarchies can be found in Appendix A.<sup>3</sup>

Language	Example
1-Dyck	(( ( ) ))
$k$ -Dyck	( [ { } ] )
$k$ -Shuffle Dyck	( [ { } ] ) }
$ww$	1 2 3 1 2 3

Table 1: Examples of our pre-pretraining languages.

We deliberately chose languages that are similar to each other.  $k$ -Dyck and  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck can be seen as different extensions of 1-Dyck:  $k$ -Dyck swaps out paired parentheses in valid 1-Dyck strings with new parentheses pairs, while  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck effectively

<sup>3</sup>The languages NEST and CROSS from Papadimitriou and Jurafsky (2023) are instances of  $k$ -Dyck and  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck, respectively. Their results align with our hypothesis.




Figure 2: Evaluating models at the optimal amount of pre-pretraining  $t_0^*$  for each formal language. *k*-Shuffle Dyck performs the best overall on our evaluation metrics.

interleaves several 1-Dyck sequences (Suzgun et al., 2019). Finally, *ww* contrasts with *k*-Shuffle Dyck as a maximally context-sensitive language, since *all* the dependencies in *ww* are cross-serial.

To reduce confounds, we construct 1-Dyck, *k*-Dyck, and *k*-Shuffle Dyck corpora with matching depth distributions. We do so during corpus generation by randomly opening or closing parentheses with probability  $p = 0.5$ , which yields a harmonic distribution over depths. Similarly, the *k*-Dyck, *k*-Shuffle Dyck, and *ww* corpora each have 128 unique tokens, or 64 unique parentheses pairs ( $k = 64$ ) for Dyck. All language models are pre-trained on the same number of tokens with sequence packing.

#### 4 Testing the Expressivity Hypothesis

For natural language ( $\mathcal{D}_{pt}$ ), we trained Pythia 160M models (Biderman et al., 2023) for 10,000 steps, or roughly 665 million tokens. We use C4 as the natural language dataset (Raffel et al., 2019). All training hyperparameter details can be found in Appendix B. For BLiMP accuracies by category, see Figure 9.

**Efficiency.** We find that the optimal amount of pre-pretraining  $t_0^*$  differs between formal languages. To estimate  $t_0^*$ , we sweep four pre-pretraining durations  $t_0$ . Figure 3 shows validation loss on natural language after pre-pretraining for 30 to 260 million tokens of formal language (500 to 4000 gradient updates).

The most efficient formal language is *k*-Shuffle Dyck, with  $t_0^* = 500$ . Both *k*-Shuffle Dyck and *k*-Dyck outperform natural language pre-pretraining, but *k*-Dyck’s optimum is achieved around  $t_0^* = 1000$ . *ww* pre-pretraining is unhelpful at all durations. The other languages, which positively transfer to natural language, exhibit a roughly u-shaped scaling pattern:




Figure 3: Validation loss on C4 as a function of pre-pretraining tokens. For the formal languages that improve validation loss over no pre-pretraining, performance is *u-shaped* with respect to pre-pretraining tokens, indicating that pre-pretraining is harmful after a certain point.

after reaching the optimal training duration, training more on formal language is harmful for natural language learning. Shuffle Dyck has the highest MRS, indicating that it replaces tokens on natural language most efficiently. Furthermore, the MRS for 1-Dyck, *k*-Dyck, and *k*-Shuffle Dyck are all greater than 1, indicating that exchanging natural language for these formal languages is **compute-optimal** in our setting. See Table 5 in the Appendix for MRS values.

**Performance.** *k*-Shuffle Dyck is the best-performing formal language on the validation set of C4, followed by *k*-Dyck (Figure 2). Interestingly, pre-pretraining on all four formal languages improves accuracy in grammaticality, but pre-pretraining on natural language (C4) does not. This indicates that formal language pre-pretraining also changes models’ generalization properties, in addition to driving the language mod-

eling loss lower. We hypothesize this is because pre-training induces representations useful for modeling hierarchical structure, and we revisit this point in §5.

Pre-training on either random binary strings or  $k$ -integer strings has a negative effect: it results in higher validation loss than no pre-training. This rules out the hypothesis that any pre-training is helpful, regardless of the data being pre-trained on.

## 5 Pruning

What is the mechanism by which pre-training facilitates the learning of natural language? We hypothesize that the model implements next-token prediction on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ppt}}$  using a sparse subnetwork, or some subset of the total parameters  $\mathcal{M}(\theta_{t_0}) \subset \theta_{t_0}$  ( $\mathcal{M}$  for short). Once we transfer  $\theta_{t_0}$  to learn  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}$ , this subnetwork  $\mathcal{M}$  continues to drive the performance of language modeling on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}$ .

**Subnetworks hypothesis:** Subnetworks established during formal language pre-training are later used to represent the hierarchical structure of natural language.

We test this hypothesis by ablating attention heads of the pre-training subnetwork and comparing the drop in performance against random attention head ablations. Concretely, we pre-train on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ppt}}$  and prune the model to find the sparse subnetwork  $\mathcal{M}(\theta_{t_0})$ . We use the heuristic core pruning algorithm from Bhaskar et al. (2024), which iteratively removes attention heads from the transformer using structured pruning (Xia et al., 2022) while minimizing the tradeoff between sparsity and language modeling loss on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ppt}}$ . After transfer and training on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}$ , we evaluate the masked model  $\mathcal{M}(\theta_{t_1})$  against networks with the same number of attention heads, randomly ablated ( $\mathcal{M}_{\text{null}}(\theta_{t_1})$ ).

Positive transfer from  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ppt}}$  to  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}$  could occur for reasons unrelated to subnetworks. In this case, the masked model  $\mathcal{M}$  should perform no better than random masks  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{null}}$  when applied to  $\theta_{t_1}$ . However, if pre-training does induce useful inductive biases, we would expect  $\mathcal{M}$  to be an important subnetwork even after training on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pt}}$ . So in the alternative hypothesis,  $\mathcal{M}$  should significantly outperform  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{null}}$  in validation loss and zero-shot tasks.

**Results.** After pre-training on  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck, we ablate 50% of the attention heads using structured pruning to create the sparse subnetwork  $\mathcal{M}$ . Following previous work (Bhaskar et al., 2024; Zhang and Nanda, 2024), we replace an ablated head with its mean activation. In addition to random masked subnetworks




Figure 4: Language modeling and grammaticality performance for the learned subnetwork  $\mathcal{M}$ , its complement  $\mathcal{M}^c$ , and randomly sampled masks  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{null}}$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  outperforms  $\mathcal{M}^c$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{null}}$ , indicating that the subnetwork learned during pre-training continues to play a critical role after training on natural language. Dashed lines indicate performance of the base model without pruning.

$\mathcal{M}_{\text{null}}$ , we also compare  $\mathcal{M}$  against its complement subnetwork  $\mathcal{M}^c$  on our evaluation metrics.

In Figure 4, we find that  $\mathcal{M}$  outperforms random masking and  $\mathcal{M}^c$ . We reject the null hypothesis that the subnetwork  $\mathcal{M}$  established during pre-training has the same performance as a randomly sampled subnetwork ( $p \ll 0.001$ ). With  $\mathcal{M}^c$  performing poorly, this suggests that the subnetwork learned during pre-training is indeed being reused in natural language modeling. We also note that  $\mathcal{M}$  does not achieve the performance of the full network, indicating that attention heads outside of  $\mathcal{M}$  are also useful for natural language.

**A Syntactic Subnetwork.** Last, we provide evidence that the subnetwork  $\mathcal{M}$  mostly implements syntax, but that pre-training also helps models learn non-syntactic knowledge like morphology, or word structure. To observe this, we first compare  $\mathcal{M}$ 's performance on BLiMP against that of the full network, aggregated by the classification of linguistic phenomena as reflecting morphology (27% of BLiMP examples) versus syntax and semantics (73%). In Figure 7 (left), we see that morphology declines in performance from full to  $\mathcal{M}$  much more than syntax and semantics. This suggests the attention heads driving performance on morphology lie outside of  $\mathcal{M}$ , aligning with the intuition that pre-training on formal languages should form a subnetwork attending mainly to structure. However, when we examine the performance gain over no pre-training (Figure 7 right), we find that morphology also benefits from pre-training. We conclude




Figure 5: Pre-pretraining on  $n$ -gram metamers (Kumar et al., 2022) of  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck performs worse than pre-pretraining on  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck itself. The best vocabulary size for  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck we observe is  $k = 128$ .




Figure 6: Pre-pretraining Pythia-1B on  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck continues to outperform baselines, even after 1.6B pretraining tokens.

that **pre-pretraining has second-order effects**. In addition to syntactic benefits, pre-pretraining can improve performance on non-syntactic tasks.

However, pre-pretraining is also not a free lunch. Figure 9, which shows BLiMP accuracies by subtask, includes some subtasks where no pre-pretraining outperforms  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck pre-pretraining. Thus, pre-pretraining, mediated through the subnetwork  $\mathcal{M}$ , **can also hinder performance**. Understanding how to tailor the improvements of pre-pretraining to one’s use case is an exciting area for future work.

## 6 Analyzing Shuffle Dyck

In §4, we observed that pre-pretraining on  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck helps models learn natural language. We now perform some additional analyses that help qualify this result. First, we examine whether the rule-based structure of  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck is truly necessary, over a facsimile dataset with the same statistical properties. Next, we study the impact that varying the vocabulary size  $k$  of  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck has on performance. Finally, we perform a larger scale training run with Pythia 1B and find that pre-pretraining on  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck helps in this setting as well. Results for this section are in Figures 5 and 6.




Figure 7: Pruning the model to  $\mathcal{M}$  decreases morphological performance more than performance on syntax and semantics in BLiMP (left), but pre-pretraining itself still has a positive impact on morphological performance (right).

**Order statistics.** We seek to understand whether some low-level statistical properties of  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck explain its success, instead of its dependency structure. Indeed, neural networks can exhibit **distributional simplicity bias** (DSB)—they learn simpler statistical patterns, such as the mean and covariance of their representations, before progressing to higher-order relationships (Saxe et al., 2013; LeCun et al., 1991).

Belrose et al. (2024) also demonstrate this phenomenon in transformer language models, which learn  $n$ -gram statistics in order of increasing complexity.

Accordingly, we ablate the rule-based structure of  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck by training unigram, bigram, and trigram models on our pre-pretraining corpus. We then generate from these  $n$ -gram models to produce metamer datasets (Kumar et al., 2022) of equivalent size. These metamers match  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck up to some  $n$ -gram statistic, but do not capture its rule.

We find that pre-pretraining on metamer datasets is strictly worse than pre-pretraining on  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck. However, the results follow a predictable pattern—pre-pretraining on the unigram metamer performs the worst, followed by bigram and trigram. This indicates that DSB might also apply within pre-pretraining.

**Vocabulary size.** To check whether better hyperparameters exist for  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck, we sweep its vocabulary size, trying  $k = 32, 128$  and  $256$  in addition to our previous experiments with  $k = 64$ . We find that  $k = 128$  has the best performance across all metrics instead of  $k = 64$ , suggesting there likely do exist better hyperparameters.

Finding good ways to optimize these hyperparameters is an interesting area for future work. The hyperparameter tuning process for pre-pretraining is expensive, as evaluating the hyperparameters requires pretraining a language model. Nevertheless, various approximations such as early truncation exist in the hyperparameter tuning literature (Li et al., 2017; Swersky et al., 2013), and one can also use scaling laws to experiment at a smaller scale first (Yang et al., 2022).

**Larger scale.** Finally, we examine whether our results generalize to larger settings by training Pythia-1B for 1.63B tokens on C4 (25,000 steps). In this setting, pre-pretraining on  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck continues to outperform on all evaluation metrics (Figure 6) and achieves the final loss of no pre-pretraining in 1.10B total tokens. This equates to a token efficiency gain of 33%  $\left(1 - \frac{1.10\text{B}}{1.63\text{B}}\right)$ , or an MRS of 17.3  $\left(\frac{1.63\text{B} - 1.10\text{B}}{0.03\text{B}}\right)$ .  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck’s MRS is  $\gg 1$  for both 160M and 1B training runs, suggesting that pre-pretraining could increase the efficiency of large-scale pretraining as well.

## 7 Related Work

**Efficient Learning.** The goal of pre-pretraining is similar to that of optimization-based meta-learning, which aims to create a weight initialization that allows the model to rapidly learn new tasks (Finn et al., 2017; Nichol et al., 2018). McCoy and Griffiths (2023) use

meta-learning over procedurally-generated context-free languages to rapidly learn formal linguistic patterns. Positive transfer in NLP also occurs across both domains and languages (Ruder et al., 2019; Pruksachatkun et al., 2020; Deshpande et al., 2022).

**Linguistic Generalization.** In addition to formal languages, various other datasets can also change the generalization properties of neural networks. Mueller and Linzen (2023) show that pretraining on child-directed speech gives a better inductive bias for learning hierarchical syntactic features than standard pretraining corpora. Furthermore, introducing a small amount of synthetic, disambiguating data into pretraining can induce a language model to change its generalization strategy (Warstadt et al., 2020b). Algorithmic synthetic data (sampled from a formal language) is often used to test the generalization properties of neural networks (McCoy et al., 2019; Kim and Linzen, 2020; Li et al., 2023).

**Curriculum Learning.** Pre-pretraining can be seen as curriculum learning (Bengio et al., 2009), where data increases in difficulty during training. Many language model training recipes have several different stages of data mixtures (Allal et al., 2025; OLMo et al., 2025; Ouyang et al., 2022). Recent work has also attempted to create algorithms that automate the discovery of language modeling curricula (Chen et al., 2025; Jiang et al., 2025).

## 8 Discussion

Our results suggest that pre-pretraining on formal languages with hierarchical dependencies representable in C-RASP can improve the downstream loss and linguistic generalization of transformers. As we conjectured in the introduction, context-sensitivity alone is not sufficient for positive transfer. The copy language  $ww$  contains cross-serial dependencies, but it contains no notion of hierarchy and is not definable in C-RASP, and pre-pretraining on it hurts natural language performance. Conversely,  $k$ -Dyck and  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck both model hierarchical dependencies and confer a better inductive bias than natural language.  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck, the language implementable in C-RASP of the two, leads to the largest pre-pretraining gains.

As shown in §5, learning structure also has downstream effects. The main subnetwork identified in pre-pretraining does not contain the attention heads important for morphological acceptability judgments. Nevertheless, pre-pretraining does have a positive effect on models learning morphology. Thus, pre-pretraining may have the potential to



improve models beyond their performance on hierarchical, rule-based tasks. At the same time, although the overall trend is positive, performance does decrease on some of the individual BLiMP tasks. So pre-pretraining has downstream tradeoffs as well.

We found pre-pretraining on formal languages to be beneficial even for the 1B parameter training setting. Furthermore, the MRS between formal and natural language is greater than one (Table 5), meaning that one token of formal language in pre-pretraining substitutes for more than one token of natural language in pretraining. This is a surprising result from the perspective of statistical learning theory (Vapnik, 2000), in that we observe faster convergence by swapping in data from a *different task*. Initializations affect learning dynamics (McCoy et al., 2020; Sellam et al., 2022), and the better initialization from pre-pretraining materially speeds up natural language pretraining.

## 9 Limitations

In this work, we considered blocked training, where we first train on formal language followed by natural language. We chose blocked training because a good initialization from formal language can be easily plugged into existing pretraining pipelines, but mixing formal and natural language during training could lead to better performance (Korbak et al., 2023). We also evaluated efficiency in a setting where pretraining data is plentiful, and one can train without running several epochs over the same data. A low-resource setting would also be interesting, and may yield different scaling properties with respect to pre-pretraining data (Muennighoff et al., 2023). This would be particularly relevant for non-English languages (Samuel et al., 2023; Martin et al., 2020). Finally, our work only considers transformers. Circuit complexity has also quantified the expressive power of neural networks like RNNs and state-space models (Merrill et al., 2020, 2024), and it would be interesting to extend our results to these architectures.

## Acknowledgments

Many thanks to Andy Yang, Angelica Chen, Dan Friedman, Isabel Papadimitriou, Lindia Tjautja, Mayee Chen, Qingyang Zhu, and the NYU Computation and Psycholinguistics Lab for feedback and discussion. This work was supported in part through the NYU IT High Performance Computing resources, services, and staff expertise. This project is supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under grant NRT-HDR: FUTURE as well as Grant

No. IIS-2239862. MYH is supported by the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship. WM is supported by the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship as well as the Two Sigma PhD Fellowship.

## References

- Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, Elie Bakouch, Gabriel Martín Blázquez, Guilherme Penedo, Lewis Tunstall, Andrés Marafioti, Hynek Kydliček, Agustín Piñeres Lajarín, Vaibhav Srivastav, Joshua Lochner, Caleb Fahlgren, Xuan-Son Nguyen, Clémentine Fourrier, Ben Burtenshaw, Hugo Larcher, Haojun Zhao, Cyril Zarka, Mathieu Morlon, Colin Raffel, Leandro von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. 2025. *Smolm2: When smol goes big – data-centric training of a small language model*. Preprint, arXiv:2502.02737.
- Kristijan Armeni, Christopher Honey, and Tal Linzen. 2022. *Characterizing verbatim short-term memory in neural language models*. In *Proceedings of the 26th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*, pages 405–424, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kristijan Armeni, Marko Pranjic, and Senja Pollak. 2024. *Transformer verbatim in-context retrieval across time and scale*. In *Proceedings of the 28th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 56–68, Miami, FL, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Y Bar-Hillel, M Perles, and E Shamir. 1961. *On formal properties of simple phrase structure grammars*. 14:143–172.
- Nora Belrose, Quintin Pope, Lucia Quirke, Alex Troy Mullen, and Xiaoli Fern. 2024. *Neural networks learn statistics of increasing complexity*. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. 2009. *Curriculum learning*. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML ’09*, page 41–48, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Adithya Bhaskar, Dan Friedman, and Danqi Chen. 2024. *The heuristic core: Understanding subnetwork generalization in pretrained language models*. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14351–14368, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Anthony, Herbie Bradley, Kyle O’Brien, Eric Hallahan, Mohammad Aflah Khan, Shivanshu Purohit, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Edward Raff, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, and Oskar Van Der Wal. 2023. *Pythia: a suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling*. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023*. JMLR.org.

- Joan Bresnan, Ronald M. Kaplan, Stanley Peters, and Annie Zaenen. 1982. [Cross-serial dependencies in dutch](#).
- Alexandra Butoi, Ghazal Khalighinejad, Anej Svete, Josef Valvoda, Ryan Cotterell, and Brian DuSell. 2025. [Training neural networks as recognizers of formal languages](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Mayee F Chen, Michael Y. Hu, Nicholas Lourie, Kyunghyun Cho, and Christopher Re. 2025. [Aioli: A unified optimization framework for language model data mixing](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Cheng-Han Chiang and Hungyi Lee. 2021. [On the transferability of pre-trained language models: A study from artificial datasets](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2109.03537.
- N. Chomsky. 1956. [Three models for the description of language](#). *IRE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2(3):113–124.
- N. Chomsky and M.P. Schützenberger. 1959. [The algebraic theory of context-free languages](#). In P. Braffort and D. Hirschberg, editors, *Computer Programming and Formal Systems*, volume 26 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, pages 118–161. Elsevier.
- Noam Chomsky. 1959. [On certain formal properties of grammars](#). *Inf. Control.*, 2:137–167.
- Ameet Deshpande, Partha Talukdar, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2022. [When is BERT multilingual? isolating crucial ingredients for cross-lingual transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3610–3623, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. 2017. [Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70*, ICML’17, page 1126–1135. JMLR.org.
- Gerald Gazdar. 1982. [Phrase structure grammar](#).
- Jill Gilkerson, Jeffrey A. Richards, Steven F. Warren, Judy K. Montgomery, Charles R. Greenwood, D Kimbrough Oller, John H. L. Hansen, and Terrance D. Paul. 2017. [Mapping the early language environment using all-day recordings and automated analysis](#). *American journal of speech-language pathology*, 26 2:248–265.
- Sophie Hao, Dana Angluin, and Roberta Frank. 2022. [Formal language recognition by hard attention transformers: Perspectives from circuit complexity](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:800–810.
- Hansi Hettiarachchi, Tharindu Ranasinghe, Paul Rayson, Ruslan Mitkov, Mohamed Gaber, Damith Premasiri, Fiona Anting Tan, and Lasitha Uyangodage. 2024. [Overview of the first workshop on language models for low-resource languages \(loreslm 2025\)](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2412.16365.
- John E Hopcroft, Rajeev Motwani, and Jeffrey D Ullman. 2006. *Introduction to automata theory, languages, and computation*, 3 edition. Pearson.
- Xinting Huang, Andy Yang, Satwik Bhattamishra, Yash Sarrof, Andreas Krebs, Hattie Zhou, Preetum Nakkiran, and Michael Hahn. 2025. [A formal framework for understanding length generalization in transformers](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yiding Jiang, Allan Zhou, Zhili Feng, Sadhika Malladi, and J Zico Kolter. 2025. [Adaptive data optimization: Dynamic sample selection with scaling laws](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Najoung Kim and Tal Linzen. 2020. [COGS: A compositional generalization challenge based on semantic interpretation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9087–9105, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tomasz Korbak, Kejian Shi, Angelica Chen, Rasika Bhalerao, Christopher L. Buckley, Jason Phang, Samuel R. Bowman, and Ethan Perez. 2023. [Pretraining language models with human preferences](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’23*. JMLR.org.
- Sreejan Kumar, Ishita Dasgupta, Raja Marjieh, Nathaniel D. Daw, Jonathan D. Cohen, and Thomas L. Griffiths. 2022. [Disentangling abstraction from statistical pattern matching in human and machine learning](#). *PLOS Computational Biology*, 19.
- S.-Y. Kuroda. 1964. [Classes of languages and linear-bounded automata](#). *Information and Control*, 7(2):207–223.
- Yann LeCun, Ido Kanter, and Sara A. Solla. 1991. [Eigenvalues of covariance matrices: Application to neural-network learning](#). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 66:2396–2399.
- Bingzhi Li, Lucia Donatelli, Alexander Koller, Tal Linzen, Yuekun Yao, and Najoung Kim. 2023. [SLOG: A structural generalization benchmark for semantic parsing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3213–3232, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lisha Li, Kevin Jamieson, Giulia DeSalvo, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. 2017. [Hyperband: a novel bandit-based approach to hyperparameter optimization](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 18(1):6765–6816.
- David Lindner, Janos Kramar, Sebastian Farquhar, Matthew Rahtz, Thomas McGrath, and Vladimir Mikulik. 2023. [Tracr: Compiled transformers as a laboratory for interpretability](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Qin Liu, Fei Wang, Chaowei Xiao, and Muhao Chen. 2024. [From shortcuts to triggers: Backdoor defense with denoised PoE](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of*

- the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 483–496, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Louis Martin, Benjamin Muller, Pedro Javier Ortiz Suárez, Yoann Dupont, Laurent Romary, Éric de la Clergerie, Djamé Seddah, and Benoît Sagot. 2020. [CamemBERT: a tasty French language model](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7203–7219, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- R. Thomas McCoy and Thomas L. Griffiths. 2023. [Modeling rapid language learning by distilling bayesian priors into artificial neural networks](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.14701.
- R. Thomas McCoy, Junghyun Min, and Tal Linzen. 2020. [BERTs of a feather do not generalize together: Large variability in generalization across models with similar test set performance](#). In *Proceedings of the Third BlackboxNLP Workshop on Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 217–227, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom McCoy, Ellie Pavlick, and Tal Linzen. 2019. [Right for the wrong reasons: Diagnosing syntactic heuristics in natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3428–3448, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- William Merrill, Jackson Petty, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2024. [The illusion of state in state-space models](#). In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- William Merrill and Ashish Sabharwal. 2023. [A logic for expressing log-precision transformers](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- William Merrill, Nikolaos Tsilivis, and Aman Shukla. 2023. [A tale of two circuits: Grokking as competition of sparse and dense subnetworks](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.11873.
- William Merrill, Gail Weiss, Yoav Goldberg, Roy Schwartz, Noah A. Smith, and Eran Yahav. 2020. [A formal hierarchy of RNN architectures](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 443–459, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David A. Mix Barrington, Neil Immerman, and Howard Straubing. 1990. [On uniformity within nc1](#). *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 41(3):274–306.
- Aaron Mueller and Tal Linzen. 2023. [How to plant trees in language models: Data and architectural effects on the emergence of syntactic inductive biases](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11237–11252, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Alexander M. Rush, Boaz Barak, Teven Le Scao, Aleksandra Piktus, Nouamane Tazi, Sampo Pyysalo, Thomas Wolf, and Colin Raffel. 2023. [Scaling data-constrained language models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2305.16264.
- Alex Nichol, Joshua Achiam, and John Schulman. 2018. [On first-order meta-learning algorithms](#). *ArXiv*, abs/1803.02999.
- Team OLMo, Pete Walsh, Luca Soldaini, Dirk Groeneveld, Kyle Lo, Shane Arora, Akshita Bhagia, Yuling Gu, Shengyi Huang, Matt Jordan, Nathan Lambert, Dustin Schwenk, Oyvind Tafjord, Taira Anderson, David Atkinson, Faeze Brahman, Christopher Clark, Pradeep Dasigi, Nouha Dziri, Michal Guerquin, Hamish Ivison, Pang Wei Koh, Jiacheng Liu, Saumya Malik, William Merrill, Lester James V. Miranda, Jacob Morrison, Tyler Murray, Crystal Nam, Valentina Pyatkin, Aman Rangapur, Michael Schmitz, Sam Skjonsberg, David Wadden, Christopher Wilhelm, Michael Wilson, Luke Zettlemoyer, Ali Farhadi, Noah A. Smith, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2025. [2 olmo 2 furious](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.00656.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NeurIPS 2022, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Isabel Papadimitriou and Dan Jurafsky. 2023. [Injecting structural hints: Using language models to study inductive biases in language learning](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 8402–8413, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yada Pruksachatkun, Jason Phang, Haokun Liu, Phu Mon Htut, Xiaoyi Zhang, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Clara Vania, Katharina Kann, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2020. [Intermediate-task transfer learning with pretrained language models: When and why does it work?](#) In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5231–5247, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam M. Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2019. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:140:1–140:67.
- Sebastian Ruder, Matthew E. Peters, Swabha Swayamdipta, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. [Transfer learning in natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Tutorials*, pages 15–18, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- David Samuel, Andrey Kutuzov, Samia Touileb, Erik Velldal, Lilja Øvrelid, Egil Rønningstad, Elina Sigdel, and Anna Palatkina. 2023. [NorBench – a benchmark for Norwegian language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 24th Nordic Conference on Computational Linguistics (NoDaLiDa)*, pages 618–633, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands. University of Tartu Library.
- Andrew M. Saxe, James L. McClelland, and Surya Ganguli. 2013. [Exact solutions to the nonlinear dynamics of learning in deep linear neural networks](#). *CoRR*, abs/1312.6120.
- Thibault Sellam, Steve Yadlowsky, Ian Tenney, Jason Wei, Naomi Saphra, Alexander D’Amour, Tal Linzen, Jasmijn Bastings, Iulia Raluca Turc, Jacob Eisenstein, Dipanjan Das, and Ellie Pavlick. 2022. [The multiBERTs: BERT reproductions for robustness analysis](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Stuart M. Shieber. 1985. [Evidence against the context-freeness of natural language](#). *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 8:333–343.
- Lena Strobl, William Merrill, Gail Weiss, David Chiang, and Dana Angluin. 2024. [What formal languages can transformers express? a survey](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:543–561.
- Mirac Suzgun, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yonatan Belinkov, and Stuart M. Shieber. 2019. [Lstm networks can perform dynamic counting](#). *ArXiv*, abs/1906.03648.
- Kevin Swersky, Jasper Snoek, and Ryan P. Adams. 2013. [Multi-task bayesian optimization](#). In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Vladimir Naumovich Vapnik. 2000. [The nature of statistical learning theory](#). In *Statistics for Engineering and Information Science*.
- Pablo Villalobos, Jaime Sevilla, Lennart Heim, Tamay Besiroglu, Marius Hobbhahn, and An Chang Ho. 2022. [Will we run out of data? limits of llm scaling based on human-generated data](#).
- Alex Warstadt, Aaron Mueller, Leshem Choshen, Ethan Wilcox, Chengxu Zhuang, Juan Ciro, Rafael Mosquera, Bhargavi Paranjabe, Adina Williams, Tal Linzen, and Ryan Cotterell. 2023. [Findings of the BabyLM challenge: Sample-efficient pretraining on developmentally plausible corpora](#). In *Proceedings of the BabyLM Challenge at the 27th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 1–34, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Warstadt, Alicia Parrish, Haokun Liu, Anhad Mohanane, Wei Peng, Sheng-Fu Wang, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2020a. [BLiMP: The benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs for English](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:377–392.
- Alex Warstadt, Yian Zhang, Xiaocheng Li, Haokun Liu, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2020b. [Learning which features matter: RoBERTa acquires a preference for linguistic generalizations \(eventually\)](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 217–235, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gail Weiss, Yoav Goldberg, and Eran Yahav. 2021. [Thinking like transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 11080–11090. PMLR.
- Ethan Gotlieb Wilcox, Michael Y. Hu, Aaron Mueller, Tal Linzen, Alex Warstadt, Leshem Choshen, Chengxu Zhuang, Ryan Cotterell, and Adina Williams. 2024. [Bigger is not always better: The importance of human-scale language modeling for psycholinguistics](#). *PsyArXiv*.
- Mengzhou Xia, Zexuan Zhong, and Danqi Chen. 2022. [Structured pruning learns compact and accurate models](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1513–1528, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andy Yang and David Chiang. 2024. [Counting like transformers: Compiling temporal counting logic into softmax transformers](#). In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Andy Yang, David Chiang, and Dana Angluin. 2024. [Masked hard-attention transformers recognize exactly the star-free languages](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Greg Yang, J. Edward Hu, Igor Babuschkin, Szymon Sidor, Xiaodong Liu, David Farhi, Nick Ryder, Jakub W. Pachocki, Weizhu Chen, and Jianfeng Gao. 2022. [Tensor programs v: Tuning large neural networks via zero-shot hyperparameter transfer](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2203.03466.
- Fred Zhang and Neel Nanda. 2024. [Towards best practices of activation patching in language models: Metrics and methods](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Tianyang Zhong, Zhenyuan Yang, Zheng Liu, Ruidong Zhang, Yiheng Liu, Haiyang Sun, Yi Pan, Yiwei Li, Yifan Zhou, Hanqi Jiang, Junhao Chen, and Tianming Liu. 2024. [Opportunities and challenges of large language models for low-resource languages in humanities research](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2412.04497.
- Hattie Zhou, Arwen Bradley, Etai Littwin, Noam Razin, Omid Saremi, Joshua M. Susskind, Samy Bengio, and Preetum Nakkiran. 2024. [What algorithms can transformers learn? a study in length generalization](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

## A Proofs

We make use of the following to establish that all languages we consider are context-sensitive.

**Lemma A.1.** *Any language definable in FO(M) can be recognized by a context-sensitive grammar.*

*Proof.* Mix Barrington et al. (1990) show that the class of languages definable in FO(M) is LOGTIME-uniform  $TC^0$ , which is a subset of  $L = SPACE(\log n)$ . On the other hand, the context-sensitive languages are those languages recognizable by linear-bounded automata (Kuroda, 1964). That is,  $CSL = NSPACE(n)$ . Putting these characterizations together, we see that

$$TC^0 \subseteq SPACE(\log n) \subseteq NSPACE(n) = CSL.$$

Therefore we can conclude that any language definable in FO(M) is context-sensitive.  $\square$

We will make use of the classical pumping lemma to establish that some specific languages considered are *strictly* context-sensitive, i.e., not context-free.

**Lemma A.2** (Pumping Lemma, Bar-Hillel et al., 1961). *Let  $L$  be a context-free language. Then there exists a pumping constant  $p > 0$  such that any string  $s \in L$  of length  $|s| \geq p$  can be written as  $s = uvwxy$  where*

1.  $|vwx| \leq p$ ;
2.  $|vx| \geq 1$ ; and
3.  $uv^nwx^ny \in L$  for all  $n \geq 0$ .

Additionally, we will leverage the following communication complexity result to prove that certain languages are undefinable in C-RASP:

**Lemma A.3** (Huang et al., 2025, Theorem 12). *Let  $L$  be a language definable in C-RASP. Fix  $w \in L$  and  $1 \leq i \leq |w|$ . Let Alice have access to  $w_{1:i}$  and Bob have access to  $w_{i+1:|w|}$ . Then there exists a protocol where Alice sends at most  $O(\log n)$  bits to Bob and Bob can recognize whether  $w \in L$ .*

Crucially, if some  $L$  requires Alice to send Bob  $\omega(\log n)$  bits, then it cannot be defined in C-RASP.

We will also use the equivalence between C-RASP and the Temporal Counting Logic  $K_t[\#]$  to show that languages are definable in C-RASP.

**Lemma A.4** (Yang and Chiang, 2024, Theorem 4.3). *A C-RASP program recognizes language  $L$  if and only if a  $K_t[\#]$  formula defines  $L$ .*

### A.1 Language Characterizations

**Proposition A.5.** *1-Dyck is context-free and definable in C-RASP.*

*Proof.* That 1-Dyck is context-free follows from the fact that it can be generated by the following context-free grammar:

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow (S)S, \\ S &\rightarrow \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

1-Dyck is defined by the following  $K_t[\#]$  formula

$$(\#[Q_{(]} = \#[Q_{)}]) \wedge (\#[\#[Q_{)}] > \#[Q_{(]}] = 0),$$

and so is implementable in C-RASP by Lemma A.4.  $\square$

**Proposition A.6.** *For  $k \geq 2$ ,  $k$ -Dyck is context-free and not definable in C-RASP.*

*Proof.* That  $k$ -Dyck is context-free follows from the fact that it can be generated by a context-free grammar: for any fixed value of  $k$ ,  $k$ -Dyck is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow ({}_i S)_i S, \quad \text{where } i \in [k] \\ S &\rightarrow \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

To see that  $k$ -Dyck is not definable in C-RASP, consider Dyck strings of length  $2n$  where tokens 1 to  $n$  are opening braces, and tokens  $n+1$  to  $2n$  are closing braces. If Alice receives the first  $n$  tokens, she must send  $\Omega(n)$  bits to Bob if Bob is to correctly recognize the input string, because each prefix has a different unique suffix that closes it. So  $k$ -Dyck is not in C-RASP by Lemma A.3.  $\square$

On the other hand,  $k$ -Dyck can be defined in FO(M).

**Proposition A.7.** *For  $k \geq 1$ ,  $k$ -Dyck is definable in FO(M).*

*Proof.* Let  $Q_{(}(i)$  check whether token  $i$  is any of the  $k$  opening parentheses, and  $Q_{)}(i)$  check whether token  $i$  is the  $\kappa$ th opening parenthesis out of  $k$ . Continuing the definition from Section 2.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{depth}(i) &\equiv \#j \leq i [Q_{(}(i)] - \#j \leq i [Q_{)}(i)] \\ \text{dindex}(i) &\equiv \#j \leq i [\text{depth}(i) = \text{depth}(j)] \\ \text{paired}(j, i) &\equiv [\text{depth}(j) = \text{depth}(i) + 1] \wedge \\ &\quad [\text{dindex}(i) = \text{dindex}(j)] \\ \text{match}(j, i) &\equiv \bigvee_{\kappa} [Q_{)}(j) \wedge Q_{)}(i)] \\ \text{closed}(i) &\equiv \exists j \leq i [\text{paired}(j, i) \wedge \text{match}(j, i)] \end{aligned}$$

Having defined these macros, we are now ready to write the recognizer for  $k$ -Dyck:

$$\begin{aligned} &[\text{depth}(n) = 0] \wedge [\#i \leq n [\text{depth}(i) < 0] = 0] \wedge \\ &\quad \forall i \leq n [\text{closed}(i)] \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

To understand why this construction cannot be implemented in C-RASP, observe that  $\text{paired}(j,i)$  and  $\text{match}(j,i)$  are binary predicates, which are not allowed in C-RASP.

**Lemma A.8.** *For  $k \geq 2$ ,  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck is strictly context-sensitive and definable in C-RASP.*

*Proof.* See Ex. 7.20 in Hopcroft et al. (2006). Consider the case when  $k=2$ . Assume that 2-shuffle Dyck is context-free. Then  $L = ({}^n[{}^m]{}^n)^m$  is context-free since it is the intersection of  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck with  $([*][*])^*$  and CFLs are closed under intersection with regular languages.

Assume by way of contradiction that  $L$  is context-free and so has pumping constant  $p$ . Let  $s = ({}^p[{}^p]{}^p)^p$ , which by hypothesis can be written as  $uvwxy$ . Since  $|vwx| \leq p$ , it either (a) lies entirely inside one of the blocks of  $p$  symbols or (b) lies partially in one block of  $p$  symbols and lies partially in at most one adjacent block. In the case of (a), suppose for clarity that  $vwx$  lies entirely in the  $({}^p$  block. Since  $vx$  is not empty,  $uv^0wx^0y \equiv uwy$  contains fewer  $($ 's than  $)$ 's, and hence is not in  $L$ , a contradiction. In the case of (b), suppose for clarity that  $vwx$  straddles the  $({}^p$  and  $[{}^p$  blocks. Since  $vx$  is not empty,  $uv^0wx^0y \equiv uwy$  contains either fewer  $($ 's than  $)$ 's or fewer  $[$ 's than  $]$ 's, and hence is not in  $L$ , a contradiction. Since  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck for  $k > 2$  contains 2-Shuffle Dyck, proving the  $k=2$  case is sufficient to establish that  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck is not context free (but still context-sensitive by Lemma A.1).

Similar to the 1-Dyck case, we can exhibit a  $K_t[\#]$  formula to define  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck:

$$\bigwedge_{\kappa} (\#[Q_{(\kappa)}] = \#[Q_{\kappa})] \wedge (\#[\#[Q_{(\kappa)}] > \#[Q_{(\kappa)}]) = 0)$$

So  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck is likewise definable in C-RASP by Lemma A.4.  $\square$

**Proposition A.9.**  *$ww$  is strictly context-sensitive and not definable in C-RASP.*

*Proof.* See Ex. 7.21 in Hopcroft et al. (2006). Suppose by way of contradiction that  $ww$  is context-free, and so has a pumping constant  $p$ . Let  $s = a^p b^p a^p b^p$ , which can be written as  $uvwxy$  by hypothesis. Consider then the string  $uv^0wx^0y \equiv uwy \in L$ . We examine two cases depending on the position of  $vwx$  in  $s$ .

In the first case, suppose  $vx$  is contained entirely within the first block of  $a^p$ . If  $|vx| = k$  then  $uwy$  has length  $4p - k$  and begins with the substring  $a^{(p-k)}b^p \dots$  of length  $2p - k$ . By assumption  $uwy = tt$  for some  $t$  of length  $2p - k/2$ , and since  $k \geq 1$  it

follows that  $|t| > 2p - k$ . Then the final symbol of  $t$  must lie within the *second* block of  $a$ 's; yet since  $s$  ends in  $b$ ,  $tt$  must also end in  $b$ , a contradiction.

In the second case, suppose  $vx$  contains some  $a$ 's and some  $b$ 's. Since  $|uvwxy| = 4p$  and  $|vwx| \leq p$  it must be that  $|uwy| \geq 3p$  and so  $|t| = 3p/2$ . Since  $vwx$  is too short to straddle more than two adjacent blocks of symbols and  $3p/2 > p$  it must be the case that  $t$  must end in  $b^p$ . Yet there since  $|vx| \geq 1$ , there is only a single block of  $b^p$  within  $|uwy|$ , so the  $b^p$  block cannot be repeated, a contradiction.

By symmetry, these two cases straightforwardly extend to the cases when  $vx$  is contained entirely within the first block of  $b$ 's, the second block of  $a$ 's, or the second block of  $b$ 's (analogous to case 1); or when it is split between the blocks of  $a$ 's and  $b$ 's (case 2). Then  $ww$  is not context-free, but still context-sensitive by Lemma A.1.

From a communication complexity perspective, if Alice has the first half of some string, and Bob has the second half, Alice must send Bob  $\Omega(n)$  bits to verify whether the string is of the form  $ww$ . Thus, by Lemma A.3,  $ww$  cannot be defined in C-RASP.  $\square$




Figure 8: The indifference curve contains points with equal training loss. Marginal rate of substitution is the ratio between the red and black lines  $\left(\frac{|y_1 - y_2|}{|x_1 - x_2|}\right)$ . The token efficiency increase from applying pre-pretraining can be calculated as  $1 - \frac{x_2 + y_2}{y_1}$ .

## B Hyperparameters

All experiments were done on NVIDIA A100 or H100 80GB GPUs. We warm up the learning rate both during pre-pretraining and pretraining. The below hyperparameters hold for both pre-pretraining and pretraining. That is, for simplicity, even if we only pre-pretrain for 500 steps, we still keep the

learning rate warmup at 1,000 steps. To achieve 50% attention head sparsity when pruning, we set the target sparsity to 70%. We used Huggingface `transformers==4.47.0` and `datasets==3.2.0`.

Hyperparameter	Value
<i>Training Configuration</i>	
Batch size	16
Gradient accumulation	2
Effective bsz	32
Sequence length	2048 tokens
Learning rate	$5 \times 10^{-4}$
LR schedule	Cosine w/ warmup
Min. LR	$5 \times 10^{-5}$
Warmup Steps	1000
Weight Decay	0.1
Gradient Clipping	1.0
<i>Optimization</i>	
Optimizer	AdamW
$\beta_1, \beta_2$	0.9, 0.999
$\epsilon$	1e-6
Mixed Precision	bf16
<i>Pruning (see <a href="#">Bhaskar et al. (2024)</a>)</i>	
Learning rate	0.1
Regularization LR	1
Target sparsity	0.7
Warmup steps	1000

Table 2: Training hyperparameters.

Positive Example	Negative Example
✓ Only Bill would ever complain.	✗ Even Bill would ever complain.
✓ Diane watched Alan.	✗ Diane screamed Alan.
✓ Who should Derek hug after shocking Richard?	✗ Who should Derek hug Richard after shocking?

Table 3: BLiMP (Warstadt et al., 2020a) dataset examples showing grammatical (positive) and ungrammatical (negative) sentence pairs

Examples
Before the meeting, Mary wrote down the following list of words: <b>window, door, roof</b> . After the meeting, she took a break and had a cup of coffee. When she got back, she read the list again: <b>window, door, roof</b> .
Before the meeting, John wrote down the following list of words: <b>nothing, riches, paper</b> . After the meeting, he took a break and had a cup of coffee. When he got back, he read the list again: <b>nothing, riches, paper</b> .

Table 4: Verbatim in-context retrieval (Armeni et al., 2022, 2024) examples. A good language model should recognize from context that the list is repeated.

	Overall	ANA. AGR	ARG. STR	BINDING	CTRL. RAIS.	D-N AGR	ELLIPSIS	FILLER. GAP	IRREGULAR	ISLAND	NPI	QUANTIFIERS	S-SELECTION	S-V AGR
<i>k</i> -Shuffle Dyck	71.8	86.7	72.3	73.6	71.6	86.8	73.5	68.9	92.1	57.1	58.3	72.1	77.5	75.8
<i>k</i> -Dyck	71.9	86.7	73.2	71.8	73.2	85.5	79.2	70.4	92.8	54.6	58.6	68.3	77.9	75.8
1-Dyck	71.7	82.8	73.8	71.0	73.3	88.8	75.5	70.3	90.0	53.1	58.4	68.1	77.3	75.2
<i>ww</i>	71.4	83.2	72.6	73.2	73.8	88.0	77.0	71.2	90.0	52.7	56.8	64.1	76.1	75.5
No pre-pretraining	71.0	83.3	72.1	74.0	72.7	86.8	72.4	70.5	87.9	54.7	51.7	70.4	75.3	74.5
C4 pre-pretraining	71.0	84.0	72.6	71.7	74.6	88.2	77.2	71.3	90.7	53.1	52.9	65.9	77.4	75.0

Figure 9: Grammaticality judgment (BLiMP) accuracies by task.

	Language	LM Loss	Documents ↓	MRS	Grammaticality	Retrieval
Formal	1-Dyck	3.760 ±0.016	0.978 ±0.021	3.01	0.717 ±0.004	3.373 ±0.014
	<i>k</i> -Dyck	3.743 ±0.016	<b>0.998 ±0.001</b>	3.57	<b>0.719 ±0.003</b>	3.338 ±0.019
	<i>k</i> -Shuffle Dyck	<b>3.741 ±0.014</b>	<b>0.998 ±0.001</b>	<b>7.15</b>	0.718 ±0.007	<b>3.297 ±0.012</b>
	<i>ww</i>	3.792 ±0.018	0.557 ±0.247	-0.25	0.714 ±0.003	3.341 ±0.021
Controls	No pre-pretraining	3.780 ±0.018	—	—	0.710 ±0.011	3.393 ±0.003
	C4 pre-pretraining	3.754 ±0.017	0.992 ±0.007	6.65	0.710 ±0.003	3.354 ±0.005
	Random binary	3.810 ±0.015	0 ±0	-6.60	0.712 ±0.004	3.416 ±0.016
	Random ints	3.798 ±0.015	0.042 ±0.041	-5.97	0.712 ±0.006	3.409 ±0.006

Table 5: Evaluating models at the optimal amount of pre-pretraining  $t_0^*$  for each formal language. “Documents ↓” is the proportion of documents in the C4 validation set with lower loss than the model trained without pre-pretraining. 1-Dyck, *k*-Dyck, and *k*-Shuffle-Dyck all have marginal rates of substitution (MRS) greater than 1, indicating that pre-pretraining is more efficient than not pre-pretraining. *k*-Shuffle-Dyck performs the best overall on our evaluation metrics.



Code 1: Implementation of a  $k$ -Shuffle Dyck sequence generator.

```

1 import random
2
3
4 def generate_shuff_dyck(k, max_length=2048, p_open=0.5, max_depth=16):
5     """
6     Generate a k-shuffle Dyck sequence, truncated at max_length.
7     When max depth is reached, close one bracket and continue.
8
9     Args:
10        k (int): Number of different types of brackets
11        max_length (int): Target maximum length of the sequence
12        p_open (float): Probability of opening a new bracket
13        max_depth (int): Maximum nesting depth allowed
14
15    Returns:
16        list: Generated sequence where i represents opening bracket i
17              and i+k represents closing bracket i
18
19    Note: the final Dyck word may be invalid due to truncation, but
20    we didn't find this to be an issue in practice.
21    """
22    sequence = []
23    counts = [0] * k # Track open brackets of each type
24
25    while len(sequence) < max_length:
26        depth = sum(counts)
27
28        # Must open if all brackets are closed
29        if depth == 0:
30            bracket = random.randint(0, k - 1)
31            sequence.append(bracket)
32            counts[bracket] += 1
33            continue
34
35        # If at max depth, force a close
36        if depth >= max_depth:
37            open_brackets = [i for i, count in enumerate(counts) if count > 0]
38            bracket = random.choice(open_brackets)
39            sequence.append(bracket + k)
40            counts[bracket] -= 1
41            continue
42
43        # Randomly choose to open or close
44        if random.random() < p_open and depth < max_depth:
45            bracket = random.randint(0, k - 1)
46            sequence.append(bracket)
47            counts[bracket] += 1
48        else:
49            # Close an existing bracket
50            open_brackets = [i for i, count in enumerate(counts) if count > 0]
51            bracket = random.choice(open_brackets)
52            sequence.append(bracket + k)
53            counts[bracket] -= 1
54
55    return sequence

```