

Language Generation in the Limit

Jon Kleinberg*

Sendhil Mullainathan†

April 2024

Abstract

Although current large language models are complex, the most basic specifications of the underlying language generation problem itself are simple to state: given a finite set of training samples from an unknown language, produce valid new strings from the language that don't already appear in the training data. Here we ask what we can conclude about language generation using only this specification, without further assumptions. In particular, suppose that an adversary enumerates the strings of an unknown target language L that is known only to come from one of a possibly infinite list of candidates. A computational agent is trying to learn to generate from this language; we say that the agent *generates from L in the limit* if after some finite point in the enumeration of L , the agent is able to produce new elements that come exclusively from L and that have not yet been presented by the adversary. Our main result is that there is an agent that is able to generate in the limit for every countable list of candidate languages. This contrasts dramatically with negative results due to Gold and Angluin in a well-studied model of language learning where the goal is to identify an unknown language from samples; the difference between these results suggests that identifying a language is a fundamentally different problem than generating from it.

1 Introduction

The recent advances in large language models (LLMs) have been remarkable, sparking active lines of theoretical work into their performance. These investigations implicitly revolve around two fundamental questions: how do we formally reason about the effectiveness of LLMs; and within such a framework, what are the core mathematical ideas that enable their performance?

Answers to these questions must begin by formalizing the specification for what a generative algorithm for language should be doing. Here, we propose starting from a very basic, assumption-free, statement for such a specification: there is an unknown target language L , over time the algorithm sees a sequence of strings from L , and eventually we would like the algorithm to generate new strings from L that it has not seen before.¹

Viewed this way, it is also clear why it seems so remarkable for LLMs to be doing well at such a problem. The fully general statement of the problem feels unsolvable: if we know nothing about the unknown target language L , then how can a generative algorithm reliably produce valid strings from L that it hasn't seen before?

*Departments of Computer Science and Information Science, Cornell University, Ithaca NY

†Booth School of Business, University of Chicago, Chicago IL

¹We will formalize the definition of a language more precisely below, but for now we can think of a language as simply any set of strings over a fixed alphabet; for example, the strings of the language could be the set of all grammatical sentences (or all well-formed expressions) according to a given grammar.

Language Learning in the Limit. In fact, there is a well-established formalism that allows us to phrase this point precisely: the classical model of language learning in the limit, formulated by Mark Gold in 1967 and fully characterized by Dana Angluin in 1980 [6, 2]. In this model, there is an unknown language K that is known only to be produced by one of a list of candidate representations R_1, R_2, R_3, \dots , where R_i produces some language L_i . We can think of this list of representations as the set of all possible context-free grammars, or the set of all possible finite automata, or the set of all Turing machines with a fixed space bound, or any other generative model that produces strings; in fact, the formal result is much more general than this, in that it is sufficient to suppose that the unknown language K simply comes from a countable list of candidate languages L_1, L_2, L_3, \dots , and we can dispense with explicit representations altogether.²

In the Gold-Angluin model, an adversary enumerates the strings of K one by one, and the algorithm is required after each new string to guess a language L_i from the list such that $L_i = K$. If there is some finite step t after which the algorithm’s guess is always correct, then we say the algorithm has *identified K in the limit*. Gold proved that this kind of language identification in the limit is impossible in general, even for simple language families such as the regular languages (i.e. those produced by finite automata), and Angluin characterized precisely those families for which it is possible, further establishing how limited they are [1, 2]. Note, crucially, that in the Gold-Angluin model, the adversary enumerates strings in K , but does not provide examples of strings that do not belong to K , nor does it allow the algorithm to ask questions about a string’s membership in K ; their point with this formalism was to focus on cases where an algorithm tries inferring a language purely from seeing a sufficient number of examples of strings that belong to the language.

Our Results: Language Generation in the Limit. These negative results of Gold and Angluin feel intuitive — how should we be able to identify a language from a finite sample when we are allowed to make essentially no assumptions about its structure? Because of this intuition, both via the Gold-Angluin model and for more informal reasons as well, the focus in language generation has naturally turned to distributional assumptions; one posits that large language models are so effective because they are able to exploit distributional probabilities of language, and from a finite set of samples they are able to estimate conditional probabilities of strings with increasing accuracy. In this way, the question moves from adversaries to probability distributions, and one seeks explanations for the effectiveness of LLMs through underlying probabilistic models.

In this paper, we offer a sharply different view: we show that in the Gold-Angluin model of adversarially produced examples, *language generation is always possible*. We will provide full details on the result and its proof beginning in the next section, but the key point at a high level is that even in an adversarial model with an unknown language K , language generation is a fundamentally different task than language identification: where identification asks an algorithm to eventually name a language $L_i = K$ after seeing a large enough finite sample S from K , generation instead asks an algorithm to eventually output strings in $K - S$ after seeing a large enough S from K . Our main result is that this difference in specifications leads to dramatic differences in what is possible in the limit; whereas the Gold-Angluin results establish that identification in the limit is impossible except in highly constrained cases, we show that generation in the limit is possible for *every* countable list of candidate languages.

²In this more general view, we will assume that the family of languages is presented simply via a black box that for a string w and an index i can answer the question, “Is $w \in L_i$?”

General Connections to Language Modeling. Clearly, methods to design large language models in practice make extensive use of the empirical distributional properties of language, as they should. Our results don’t question this design methodology; when there are genuine empirical regularities in the training data, there is no reason not to use them. Rather, our results argue that if we are looking for the essential reasons why language generation is tractable, we do not fundamentally require any empirical regularities, or indeed any probabilistic assumptions at all; there is instead a formal sense in which language generation — unlike broader learning tasks such as language identification — is possible even against an adversary presenting positive training examples in a worst-case fashion. In some crucial sense, the generation problem is therefore different from these other learning tasks in ways that more detailed formalisms may potentially obscure.

Despite the generality of the model, the generation algorithm that proves our main theorem makes use of subtle structural properties of the given list of candidate languages. Again, we defer detailed descriptions to subsequent sections, but the idea at a high level is to maintain a sequence of “provisional languages” that are consistent with the finite sample S from K seen so far, and to continually refine this sequence of provisional languages as the adversary adds strings to S . Since the Gold-Angluin results say that the algorithm can never be sure which is the true language K , there is a sense in which this refinement process may need to continue indefinitely, and in general it leads the algorithm to generate from provisional languages that may be increasingly “thin” subsets of K . This does not cause trouble for the specification of language generation, since it is acceptable to produce any unseen string from K , but it does mean that while the algorithm is able to eventually produce an infinite sequence of unseen strings all from K , it might do so from a narrow part of K .

This property of the solution in the presence of an adversary suggests interesting connections to the problem of generation in practice as well. First, and most directly, our basic model — viewed at a high level given the abstract setting — is engaging in the basic loop that essentially any method for language generation must perform: iterating over a sequence of possible representations for the target language, and repeatedly refining these representations in the presence of new examples so as to eventually achieve successful generation.

Beyond just this basic point, our model also encounters a key trade-off that appears in applications as well: specifically, that any method for generation has to deal with the tension between an underlying *validity problem* — producing valid outputs — and an underlying *breadth problem* — producing outputs that represent the full range of valid outputs in some reasonable way. The breadth problem is notoriously difficult, and it manifests itself in numerous ways in the methodology of machine learning and generative models.

The approach that proves our main result helps illustrate the tension between validity and breadth even in settings with worst-case assumptions rather than probabilistic ones, and this tension shows up in both the early phases of our algorithm’s execution and the later phases. In the early phases, before the algorithm has refined its provisional language sufficiently, it is generating too broadly and producing strings that are not part of the target language K — an analogue at a high level of a kind of hallucination in which the generated strings belong to some consistent candidate language, but not to the actual target language [7, 8, 10]. In the later phases, on the other hand, the algorithm continuously shrinks its range of possible outputs so as to ensure that they will be contained within K — sacrificing validity for breadth in a manner analogous to the issues that arise in the problem of mode collapse for generative models [3, 4]. Our model therefore suggests interesting questions about the fundamental trade-offs that may exist between validity and breadth even in settings without an underlying probabilistic model.

2 Formal Model and Results

We now provide a formal description of the model and the statement of our results. To begin with, we have a countable list of candidate languages $\mathcal{C} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, \dots\}$, where each L_i is a subset of some countable set U . All we assume about the list of languages is that it is specified through a black box that can answer questions of the form “Is $w \in L_i$?” for any string $w \in U$ and language $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$. (If the reader finds it helpful for concreteness, they can consider the results that follow in the context of a specific list of languages \mathcal{C} , such as the set of all context-free languages or the set of all regular languages; but everything we say applies to general collections of languages.) We will allow the collection \mathcal{C} to contain repetitions, in that we may have $L_i = L_j$ for different indices i and j . We will assume that all the languages L_i are infinite; while the original Gold-Angluin framework did not require this, it becomes important in specifying the generation problem: if we require an algorithm to output unseen strings forever, then this is not possible from a finite language, where the algorithm would eventually run out of new strings to generate.

An adversary and an algorithm now play the following game. The adversary chooses a language K from \mathcal{C} without revealing it to the algorithm, and it begins enumerating the strings of K one by one over a sequence of steps $t = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. The adversary can repeat strings in its enumeration, but the crucial point is that for every string $w \in K$, there must be at least one time step t in which it appears. Let S_t be the set of strings that the adversary has enumerated in steps 1 through t .

Identification and Generation. In this framework, we can now specify both the Gold-Angluin problem of identification and the contrasting problem of generation that we study in this paper.

- *Identification (from [6, 2]):* In each step, the algorithm observes S_t and must output an index i (its guess for the true language K). The algorithm *identifies* K *in the limit* if there is some t^* such that for all steps $t \geq t^*$, the algorithm’s guess in step t is an index i for which $L_i = K$.
- *Generation (from the present paper):* In each step, the algorithm observes S_t and must output a string a_t (its guess for an unseen string in K). The algorithm *generates from* K *in the limit* if there is some t^* such that for all steps $t \geq t^*$, the algorithm’s guess a_t belongs to $K - S_t$.

Recall that a key point about the Gold-Angluin framework is that the algorithm is not provided with feedback about whether its outputs are correct — in the case of identification it is not told if its guesses about the identity of the language are correct, and correspondingly our model of generation does not provide the algorithm with feedback about whether the string it generates in step t belongs to the target language K .

We know from the Gold-Angluin results that there is no algorithm that can achieve identification in the limit for an arbitrary countable collection \mathcal{C} of languages (or even for specific countable collections, like the set of all regular languages or the set of all context-free languages). In contrast, our main result is a dramatically different answer for language generation; it is possible for every countable collection:

(2.1) *There is an algorithm with the property that for any countable collection of languages $\mathcal{C} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, \dots\}$, and any enumeration of one of these languages K , the algorithm generates from K in the limit.*

We prove (2.1) in Sections 4 and 5.

A Result for Finite Collections. We prove a second result as well, focusing on the variant of the problem in which the collection of languages \mathcal{C} is finite. In this case, it follows from Angluin’s characterization that every finite collection \mathcal{C} allows for identification in the limit. Given this, what more might we ask for? A natural question is whether there is a *uniform* bound on the number of samples needed to ensure that the algorithm can correctly identify the true language K ; that is, for any finite collection \mathcal{C} , is there a bound $t(\mathcal{C})$ and an algorithm with the property that after seeing any $t(\mathcal{C})$ distinct strings from K , the algorithm is guaranteed to correctly report K as its guess for the true language?

It is easy to see that for the Gold-Angluin model of language identification, this is not possible. For example, suppose that \mathcal{C} is the collection consisting of two languages L_1 and L_2 : L_1 consists of all possible strings, and L_2 consists of all strings of even length. Suppose there were a bound $t(\mathcal{C})$ and an algorithm that was guaranteed to guess K correctly after seeing $t(\mathcal{C})$ distinct samples. Then an adversary could present $t(\mathcal{C})$ distinct strings of even length, and then ask the algorithm to guess whether the true language is L_1 or L_2 : if the algorithm guesses L_2 at this point, then the adversary could announce that the answer is L_1 , and conversely if the algorithm guesses L_1 . This does not prevent the algorithm from learning the true language in the limit, since the algorithm could simply keep guessing L_2 until the first time (if ever) when a string of odd length is presented, at which point it switches to L_1 . But there is no fixed bound $t(\mathcal{C})$ by which it can be guaranteed to output the correct guess.

However, for the problem of generation with a finite collection of candidate languages, it is possible to provide this much stronger type of uniform bound, via an algorithm that can generate correctly after seeing a finite sample $t(\mathcal{C})$ whose size is specified at the outset. In fact, we can achieve more: after seeing this finite sample, the algorithm can correctly generate an infinite sequence of unseen elements from the true language.

(2.2) *There is an algorithm with the property that for any finite collection of languages \mathcal{C} , there is a number $t(\mathcal{C})$, such that for any language K in \mathcal{C} , and any sequence S of at least $t(\mathcal{C})$ distinct elements from K , the algorithm given S can produce an infinite sequence of distinct strings from $K - S$.*

We prove (2.2) in Section 6.

Extensions and Generalizations. Following these two main results in our basic model of generation, we provide (in Section 7) some extensions in a generalization of the model. Specifically, a familiar issue from language generation applications is the role of the *prompt*: a user provides an input string p , and a generation algorithm is then supposed to produce a “continuation” string c to come after the prompt, so that the concatenation of p and c is a valid utterance. We offer a way of extending our model to incorporate the notion of prompting, while maintaining the general structure of the model, and we show how to formulate and prove a generalization of our first main result in a setting where at each time step the adversary is allowed to specify a prompt that must be completed.

3 Initial Observations

To begin with, we make a few additional notational points beyond what was spelled out in the introduction. First, the languages L_i we consider are all subsets of a countable set of elements U , and for our two main results (2.1) and (2.2), it is not important what U corresponds to — we

can choose to think of U as the natural numbers, or the collection of all finite strings over a fixed alphabet, or any other explicitly enumerated countable set. In particular, it will not be crucial for these results whether we talk about a set U of strings listed as $U = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, \dots, u_m, u_{m+1}, \dots\}$ or simply the natural numbers $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, m, m+1, \dots\}$. As a result, at different times in examples, for expositional simplicity we will take U to be different countable sets. (In contrast, when we consider extensions of our results to handle constructions like prompts, it will be necessary to focus on the case in which U is the set of all strings over a finite alphabet, so that the notion of string concatenation makes sense.)

Recall that we think of the algorithm as having knowledge of the sequence of languages $\mathcal{C} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, \dots\}$ in the following sense: given an index i and a string w , it can evaluate in finite time whether or not $w \in L_i$. We will refer to this evaluation of $w \in L_i$ as a *membership query*, and assume henceforth that our algorithms have the power to perform membership queries on the languages in \mathcal{C} . The true language K appears in the sequence $\mathcal{C} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, \dots\}$; suppose that $L_z = K$ for an index z . Going forward, we will often refer to K as L_z . We observe that because languages can appear more than once in the sequence \mathcal{C} , it is possible that K is also equal to L_i for one or more indices $i \neq z$. Finally, and crucially, we note that the algorithm does not have the power to pose queries about the membership of a string w in the true language K : since the algorithm can only pose membership queries of the form “ $w \in L_i$?” for strings w and indices i that it provides, it cannot ask “ $w \in K$?” because it does not know the index z for which $L_z = K$.

We prove our main results beginning in Section 4, but first we discuss a few points that provide useful background for thinking about the problem.

3.1 Review of Negative Results for Identification

The first point is a review of why language identification in the limit is not possible in general, adapting the exposition from [6, 9]. It is useful to go through the proof of this result, so as to get a better sense for the contrast with our positive results for generation.

There are many ways to show the negative result for language identification using very simple language families, and we choose one that highlights some intuitive contrasts with generation. For the argument, let U be the set of all integers, and let the collection of languages \mathcal{C} — each of which is a subset of U — be the set of all infinite arithmetic progressions of integers. (The choice of which countable ground set U we use is not crucial for any of these results, and examples are often easier to describe over the set of integers than over the set of finite strings.) Formally, for an arbitrary integer a and a positive integer b , let $P_{a,b}$ be the arithmetic progression consisting of all integers of the form $\{a + bi : i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$; and let $Q_{a,b}$ be the “bidirectional” arithmetic progression consisting of all integers of the form $\{a + bi : i = \dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Let the collection \mathcal{C} consist of all arithmetic progressions $P_{a,b}$ and $Q_{a,b}$.

Now, suppose by way of contradiction that there is an algorithm that can identify in the limit an adversarially chosen arithmetic progression $K \in \mathcal{C}$. We construct an enumeration of K that causes the algorithm to fail, as follows. First, for integers $a \leq b$, let $I[a, b]$ be the interval of all integers n for which $a \leq n \leq b$. We enumerate elements of U in stages, where each stage $s \geq 0$ consists of a set of consecutive steps. If by induction stage s has enumerated the elements of the interval $I[-s, j(s)]$ for some $j(s) \geq 0$, then stage $s + 1$ will enumerate additional elements so that by the end of the stage we have enumerated exactly $I[-(s + 1), j(s + 1)]$ for some $j(s + 1) > j(s)$. In particular, stage $s + 1$ first enumerates $-(s + 1)$ and $j(s) + 1$, and then it begins enumerating $j(s) + 2, j(s) + 3, \dots$ in increasing order. At some point during this process, the algorithm must output $P_{-(s+1),1}$ as its

guess for K , since we can continue in this way to produce a full enumeration of $P_{-(s+1),1}$, at which point the true language is $K = P_{-(s+1),1}$. Once the algorithm outputs $P_{-(s+1),1}$ as its guess during stage $s+1$, we end stage $s+1$, defining $j(s+1)$ to be largest integer we've enumerated up to that point, and we begin stage $s+2$.

In this way, the successive stages extend the interval $I[-s, j(s)]$ unboundedly in both directions. We are therefore enumerating $Q_{0,1} = U$, and so in fact $K = Q_{0,1}$. But we have also produced an unbounded sequence of steps $t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots$ such that the algorithm guesses $P_{-j,1}$ at step t_j . Thus, there is no time step t^* for which the algorithm outputs the (correct) guess $Q_{0,1}$ at every $t \geq t^*$.

3.2 Generation and Closure

In contrast, the particular collection \mathcal{C} defined above is easy for an algorithm attempting to perform generation in the limit. Once the algorithm has seen two elements $i < j$ from the true language K , then setting $b = j - i$, it knows that K must contain not just i and $j = i + b$, but also $i + 2b, i + 3b, \dots$ and in particular the entire arithmetic progression $P_{i,b}$. Therefore, for every step t from then on, it can always generate a string in $P_{i,b} - S_t$, since $P_{i,b}$ is infinite and S_t is finite. Given that $P_{i,b} \subseteq K$, this is guaranteed to be a string in $K - S_t$.

A key point in this example is that the algorithm never needs to find out the identity of the true language K in order to be able to generate an infinite sequence of strings from it (and by the argument above, we know that in fact it provably can't find out the identity of the true language). Rather, it just needs to answer the question, "What is a string that is guaranteed to belong to every language in \mathcal{C} consistent with what I've seen so far?"

This highlights a sense in which generation is closely related to a certain kind of *closure* operation on the languages in \mathcal{C} , which we define as follows. Given the set S_t of strings seen up to step t , we say that a language $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ is *consistent* with S_t if $S_t \subseteq L_i$. We now define the *closure* of S_t in \mathcal{C} , denoted $\langle S_t \rangle$, to be the intersection of all languages in \mathcal{C} that are consistent with S_t . We observe that $S_t \subseteq \langle S_t \rangle$, and so the closure is non-empty.

Now, the more general point to take away from our example here is that in any step t where $\langle S_t \rangle$ contains an element not in S_t , the algorithm can always safely output an element in $\langle S_t \rangle - S_t$ and be sure that it is outputting a new element in the true language K . This is simply because for every consistent language L_i , $\langle S_t \rangle - S_t \subseteq L_i - S_t$ by the definition of the closure operation, and in particular this holds for the true language K . This is what the algorithm did in our example: once S_t contained the elements i and $i + b$, then we could conclude that the full arithmetic progression $P_{i,b}$ was a subset of $\langle S_t \rangle$ and would be for all future steps t , so this provided an infinite set that the algorithm could safely output elements from.

We refer to $\langle S_t \rangle$ as the "closure" of S_t by analogy with other forms of "closure." For example, the convex hull of a set of points S in the plane follows a similar idea: it is simply the intersection of all convex sets that contain S . And although we won't attempt to define a formal contrast between learning and generation for convex sets here, it is clear informally that the contrast we've been discussing in this section has an analogue in this geometric setting as well. For example, suppose an adversary is thinking of a hidden convex set B , and it shows a finite set S of examples to an algorithm. From any finite set, the algorithm has no chance of identifying the true convex set that the adversary is thinking of; but the algorithm can correctly generate an infinite sequence of new points from B by simply enumerating points in the convex hull of S that do not already belong to S .

The insufficiency of closure. Closure is a first useful idea in designing an algorithm that can generate in the limit, and we will see in Section 6 that for the case of finite collections \mathcal{C} it is the main idea that we need. Unfortunately, it is insufficient on its own to achieve generation in the limit for arbitrary countable collections \mathcal{C} , for the simple reason that $\langle S_t \rangle - S_t$ can be empty in general, providing the algorithm with no guidance on which element to generate next.

To see how this can happen in a simple example, consider the following slightly more complicated collection of languages \mathcal{C} . U is still the integers, and now for every arithmetic progression $P_{a,b}$ and every finite set of integers V , we define the language $L(a,b,V) = P_{a,b} \cup V$. Our collection \mathcal{C} consists of every $L(a,b,V)$ for an arbitrary integer a , an arbitrary positive integer b , and an arbitrary finite set of integers V . (Think of $L(a,b,V)$ as a copy of the arithmetic progression $P_{a,b}$ that has been obscured by an arbitrarily large finite set V so that its structure is harder to discern.) We could also include the languages $Q_{a,b} \cup V$ in \mathcal{C} for every integer a , positive integer b , and finite set V , but this won't be crucial for our purposes in this example.

Now, suppose the adversary is enumerating a language $K = L(a,b,V) \in \mathcal{C}$, and consider the set S_t of samples after t steps. We claim that $\langle S_t \rangle = S_t$. Intuitively, this is because S_t might have come completely from the finite set V that is part of $L(a,b,V)$; more formally, there cannot be any element $j \in \langle S_t \rangle - S_t$ because $L(j+1,1,S_t)$ is consistent with S_t , and it does not contain j .

This example illustrates the sense in which we mean that closure by itself is insufficient to provide a strategy for generation in the limit; in this instance, the algorithm has to repeatedly output elements outside the closure of S_t and yet somehow eventually generate from K . To see how it does so in this current example, suppose that in any step t , the algorithm finds the two largest elements $i < j$ in S_t , and with $b = j - i$, it outputs $i + 2b$. The point is that if the true language K is $L(a,b,V)$, there will come a time when the adversary has enumerated every element of V , and within a finite number of steps after this, the two largest elements of S_t will have to come from $P_{a,b}$. From this step onward, the algorithm's strategy of outputting $i + 2b$ is guaranteed to produce an element in $K - S_t$. This particular strategy of course seems highly specific to the particular example we are discussing here, but at a very high level it does contain ideas that are more easily discernable in retrospect from the general solution, which we describe in the next two sections.

3.3 The Failure of Direct Hypothesis Enumeration

We now discuss a final point that is useful to highlight before turning to the main proof. In thinking about approaches to generation in the limit, there is a natural strategy that at first seems to solve the problem directly, but in fact does not work. Its failure is useful to discuss, since it motivates the more involved solution that follows.

The strategy is to move through the list of languages $\mathcal{C} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, \dots\}$ in order, treating each language L_i as a hypothesis for K until the sample S_t proves otherwise. That is, we start with L_1 , and we generate strings from $L_1 - S_t$ until we encounter (if ever) a step t in which $S_t \not\subseteq L_1$. At this point we know that L_1 cannot be the true language K , and so we continue the process with L_2 . The nice idea that underpins this strategy is that the true language K is equal to L_z for some index z . So if our process were to reach L_z at some step t^* , it would never move on from L_z , and so we would be generating from $K - S_t$ for all $t \geq t^*$. (Since \mathcal{C} can contain repetitions, K might appear several times, but we can take L_z as the first appearance.)

Unfortunately, there is a deep problem with this approach: there may be a language $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ with the property that L_i comes before L_z and L_i properly contains L_z (that is, $i < z$, and $L_z \subsetneq L_i$). In

this case, our procedure would stop at the first such L_i forever: since it is only ever shown samples in S_t that come from the language L_z , and since $L_z \subseteq L_i$, it would never encounter a string in S_t that didn't belong to L_i , and so it would never move on to L_{i+1} . And when this procedure generated from $L_i - S_t$, there is no guarantee that it would choose strings from L_z . (Recall that the algorithm is not provided with feedback about whether the string it generates in step t belongs to the target language L_z ; its only knowledge of L_z comes from the sample S_t that the adversary is enumerating.)

This problem is not easily avoided, since if this approach worked as written, it would also solve identification in the limit, which we know is impossible. So we need to extract some of the useful ideas from this failed approach — in particular, the point that K appears at some finite index in the list \mathcal{C} , as the language L_z — but add important further ideas as well. Specifically, if the algorithm is maintaining hypotheses for the true language K over time, it can provably never know whether its current hypothesis is correct; instead, it must be always moving further down the collection of languages, potentially considering languages that are not K , but in such a way that it is eventually always generating from $K - S_t$. This is what our proof beginning in the next section will have to accomplish.

4 Generation in the Limit via a Function

We prove our main result in two parts. We first give a method for language generation in the limit that is not concerned with the computational power required by the agent performing the generation. Thus, rather than an algorithm to generate the string, we ask whether we can construct a function $f_{\mathcal{C}}$ based on the given language collection that maps a finite set of strings to a new string; this function takes the strings S_t seen so far and outputs a string $f_{\mathcal{C}}(S_t)$ intended to be in $K - S_t$. We will prove the following:

(4.1) *For every countable collection of languages \mathcal{C} , there is a function $f_{\mathcal{C}}$ from finite subsets of U to elements of U , such that for every enumeration of a language $K \in \mathcal{C}$, there is a t^* such that for all $t \geq t^*$, we have $f_{\mathcal{C}}(S_t) \in K - S_t$.*

Note that while this positive result is not concerned with the computational power required to evaluate $f_{\mathcal{C}}$, it already contains the core contrast with language identification, which remains impossible even if we simply ask for a function $f_{\mathcal{C}}$, by the same argument given in Section 3.1. In the next section, we will then go on to prove (2.1) by using an algorithm that only performs standard computational steps and membership queries of the form “ $w \in L_i$?”

Minimal and critical languages. As before, we will suppose z is an index such that $L_z = K$. We say that a language L_i is *consistent* with the sample at step t if $S_t \subseteq L_i$. An important idea, which is implicit in our discussion of the failed approach at the end of Section 3, is that if $L_i \subseteq L_j$ are both consistent with S_t , then it is safer for an algorithm to generate from L_i than from L_j : if $w \in L_i - S_t$ then we must also have $w \in L_j - S_t$. This suggests that it would be useful to find consistent languages that are *minimal* with respect to inclusion: we say that L is *minimal* if $L \in \mathcal{C}$ is consistent with S_t , and there is no $L' \neq L$ such that L' is consistent with S_t and $L' \subseteq L$. Unfortunately, this is too much to ask for, since there exist instances of the problem for which there might not be any languages that are minimal with respect to inclusion. (In a finite collection of language there would need to be a minimal language, but it is easy to construct infinite collections without one.)

Therefore, we define a related concept that only involves examining the inclusion of a given language with respect to a finite set of other languages. Specifically, we look for languages L_n that are consistent with S_t in a given step t , such that L_n is a subset of every consistent language that *precedes* it in the indexing of \mathcal{C} . We will say that such a language is *critical* at step t . To define this formally, we first let \mathcal{C}_n denote the finite collection of languages $\{L_1, L_2, \dots, L_n\}$. We now have the following definition.

(4.2) *A language L_n is critical at step t if L_n is consistent with S_t , and for every language $L_i \in \mathcal{C}_n$ that is consistent with S_t , we have $L_n \subseteq L_i$.*

Finding critical languages. At any given step t , there is at least one language consistent with S_t , since the language $L_z = K$ is always consistent with S_t . It follows that there is also at least one critical language at any step t : for any t , the consistent language L_i with the lowest index i must be critical at step t , as it is the only consistent language in \mathcal{C}_i .

Note that there can be choices of t for which the language $L_z = K$ is not critical at step t . But a crucial fact is that L_z will eventually become critical at some step t and remain critical forever after that: We prove this next.

(4.3) *There exists a time step t^+ such that for all $t \geq t^+$, the language L_z is critical at step t .*

Proof. Let A be the indices $i < z$ for which $L_z \not\subseteq L_i$. For each $i \in A$, let v_i be an element of $L_z - L_i$. Let t_i be the step in which v_i first appears in the enumeration of L_z , and let $t^+ = \max_{i \in A} t_i$.

Now, suppose by way of contradiction that for some $t \geq t^+$, the language L_z is not critical at step t . In this case, there must be some $L_i \in \mathcal{C}_z$ such that L_i is consistent with S_t and $L_z \not\subseteq L_i$. But we know that $v_i \in S_t$ and $v_i \notin L_i$, contradicting the consistency of L_i with S_t . \square

There can be multiple critical languages at a given step t ; for example, if on the step t^+ in (4.3) the first consistent language L_i is not equal to L_z , then both L_i and L_z will be critical at step t^+ .³ Despite the potential multiplicity of critical languages, the collection of all critical languages at step t has a useful structure that follows directly from the definition of criticality.

(4.4) *Let $i < j$, and suppose that L_i and L_j are both critical at step t . Then $L_j \subseteq L_i$.*

Proof. L_i belongs to \mathcal{C}_j and is consistent with S_t , and L_j is critical at step t , so by definition (4.2), we have $L_j \subseteq L_i$. \square

A function for generation in the limit. At a given step t , suppose that the critical languages are $L_{n_1}, L_{n_2}, L_{n_3}, \dots$ where $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < \dots$. (This list of critical languages might be finite or infinite.) Then (4.4) tells us that this sequence is nested by inclusion: $L_{n_1} \supseteq L_{n_2} \supseteq L_{n_3} \supseteq \dots$.

By (4.3) we know that the language L_z will eventually appear on this nested list from some step t^+ onward, but even then we do not know which index n_i it corresponds to at any given step $t \geq t^+$. Indeed, to recall a point from earlier, the Gold-Angluin results for learning in the limit

³This is also a useful moment to recall that there can be multiple languages $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ that are equal to L_z . A direct analogue of the proof of (4.3) shows that for any i for which $L_i = L_z$, there is a step t_i^+ such that for all $t \geq t_i^+$, the language L_i is critical at step t . But these steps t_i^+ may be different for different i . In particular, if $i < j$ are indices with the property that $L_i = L_j = L_z$, then we must have $t_i^+ \leq t_j^+$, but it is possible that $t_i^+ < t_j^+$, simply because at a given time step $t \geq t_i^+$, there might be a language L_h with $i < h < j$ such that L_h is consistent with S_t and $L_j \not\subseteq L_h$. For our purposes in the arguments to follow, it is sufficient to consider the step at which a specific copy of the true language L_z first becomes critical forever; we do not need to worry about whether other copies are critical in this step or not.

tell us that we can never know for sure which index corresponds to L_z . But we now arrive at the crucial point, which is that beyond some finite index, all the critical languages are subsets of L_z , so it is safe to generate from any of them.

Given this, we are prepared to construct our function f_C .

(4.5) *$f_C(S_t)$ is defined as follows. We first identify all languages in \mathcal{C}_t that are critical at step t . (If no such languages exist — which can only happen if none of them are consistent with S_t — we define $f_C(S_t)$ arbitrarily.) Among these critical languages, let L_{n_t} be the one with the largest index $n_t \leq t$. We define $f_C(S_t)$ to be the lowest-indexed element of $L_{n_t} - S_t$.*

To prove our initial claim (4.1), it is sufficient to verify the following property of f_C .

(4.6) *For any language $L_z \in \mathcal{C}$ and any enumeration of L_z , there is a t^* such that for all $t \geq t^*$, we have $f_C(S_t) \in L_z - S_t$.*

Proof. In the given enumeration of L_z , (4.3) tells us that there will come a step t^+ such that for all $t \geq t^+$, the language L_z is critical at step t . Let $t^* = \max(z, t^+)$. In every step $t \geq t^*$, our construction of f_C will include L_z among its critical languages in \mathcal{C}_t . Therefore, the highest-indexed critical language $L_{n_t} \in \mathcal{C}_t$ satisfies $n_t \geq z$, and so by (4.4) we have $L_{n_t} \subseteq L_z$. Since $f_C(S_t) \in L_{n_t} - S_t$, we have $f_C(S_t) \in L_z - S_t$ as required. \square

As a final note, we observe that the current formulation of f_C allows it to generate the same string more than once, provided that this string is in $K - S_t$. However, it is not hard to modify f_C so that it generates a different string each time, essentially by defining it so that it generates the lowest-indexed element that it hasn't already generated.

The computational power required to produce f_C . Our plan was to construct f_C without worrying about the computational power required to do so (and recalling that for comparison, in the corresponding problem of identification in the limit, no function f_C achieving identification could exist regardless of the computational power required to produce it). Now that we've constructed an appropriate f_C , we can ask what was in fact required computationally.

In addition to standard computational steps and membership queries of the form “ $w \in L_i?$ ”, the definition of $f_C(S_t)$ requires that we identify the critical languages in \mathcal{C}_t . From the definition, we can do this provided we can answer a finite number of *subset queries* of the form “ $L_i \subseteq L_j?$ ”. So an algorithm augmented with the power to perform such subset queries can perform generation in the limit.

In the next section, we will show how to remove the necessity for subset queries, so that generation in the limit can be performed by an algorithm using only standard computational steps and membership queries.

5 Generation in the Limit via an Algorithm

We now prove (2.1) by giving an algorithm that generates in the limit for any countable collection of languages \mathcal{C} , using only standard computational steps and membership queries of the form “ $w \in L_i?$ ”

The set of possible strings U can be written as $U = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, \dots\}$, and for simplicity we will sometimes use the language of the positive integers to describe U , treating u_i as the number i . In an enumeration of the true language $L_z = K$, let the sequence of strings that are enumerated step by step be denoted w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots

Extending definitions to finite subsets of languages L_i . The notion of a critical language was crucial to our approach in the previous section, and since the direct approach to verifying whether a language is critical involves subset queries, an important part of designing an algorithm that avoids subset queries is to work with finite subsets of the languages in \mathcal{C} . Thus, for a language $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and a number m , we will use $L_i[m]$ to denote the finite set $L_i \cap \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m\}$. Note that deciding whether $L_i[m] \subseteq L_j[m]$ for a fixed value of m requires only that we make at most $2m$ membership queries: we simply ask whether $u_h \in L_i$ implies $u_h \in L_j$ for all $h \leq m$. This allows us to replace the definition of critical languages from (4.2) with a variation tailored to finite sets, and to be able to verify that this finite version is satisfied using only membership queries. By gradually expanding the value of m over the steps t of the algorithm, we will eventually get to large enough values of m and t for which this finite version of the definition is sufficient for generation.

Our extension of definition (4.2) for critical languages to finite sets is as follows.

(5.1) *Let t and m be positive integers. A language L_n is (t, m) -critical if L_n is consistent with S_t , and for every language $L_i \in \mathcal{C}_n$ such that L_i is consistent with S_t , we have $L_n[m] \subseteq L_i[m]$.*

Since $L_n \subseteq L_i$ implies $L_n[m] \subseteq L_i[m]$ for any $m \geq 1$, we have the following analogue of (4.3).

(5.2) *There exists a time step t^+ such that for all $t \geq t^+$ and all $m \geq 1$, the language L_z is (t, m) -critical.*

The analogue of (4.4) also still holds with this definition, using the same proof.

(5.3) *Let $i < j$ and suppose that L_i and L_j are both (t, m) -critical. Then $L_j[m] \subseteq L_i[m]$.*

Finally, there is a basic monotonicity property of (t, m) -criticality that is useful to write down.

(5.4) *Suppose that L_n is (t, m) -critical, and $m' < m$. Then L_n is (t, m') -critical.*

Proof. Since L_n is (t, m) -critical, we know it is consistent with S_t , and that $L_n[m] \subseteq L_i[m]$ for all languages $L_i \in \mathcal{C}_n$ such that L_i is consistent with S_t . Now, if L_i is a language in \mathcal{C}_n that is consistent with S_t , then since $L_n[m] \subseteq L_i[m]$ and $m' < m$, we have $L_n[m'] \subseteq L_i[m']$. It follows that $L_n[m'] \subseteq L_i[m']$ for all $L_i \in \mathcal{C}_n$ such that L_i is consistent with S_t , and so L_n is (t, m') -critical. \square

5.1 An algorithm for generation in the limit

We now describe an algorithm for generation in the limit. As before, $S_t = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_t\}$ is the subset of K enumerated through step t , treating the w_i as integers. We will consider the languages in \mathcal{C}_t in step t , and maintain an auxiliary variable m_t , roughly corresponding to how large a prefix $L_i[m]$ we consider from each language $L_i \in \mathcal{C}_t$.

At the start of step t , we set $m_t^{(0)} = \max(m_{t-1}, w_t)$; note that by induction this implies $m_t^{(0)} \geq \max_{t' < t} w_{t'}$. (At the end of step t , we will define m_t to be a number that is at least as large as $m_t^{(0)}$, via the process described below.) We then determine which $L_i \in \mathcal{C}_t$ are consistent with S_t ; note that by the definition of $m_t^{(0)}$, it is sufficient to perform membership queries for only the finite set of elements in $L_i[m_t^{(0)}]$ in order to do this. If there are no consistent languages in \mathcal{C}_t , then we output a string arbitrarily.

Otherwise, there is at least one language consistent with S_t , and so there is at least one (t, m) -critical language for any choice of m , since the first consistent language is (t, m) -critical for all m . Our goal is to imitate the plan from (4.5) and generate a new string from the highest-indexed critical language. But to do this, we have to find a new string, and this will in general require performing additional membership queries.

Generating a string. For any choice of m , let $n_t(m)$ be the maximum index of a (t, m) -critical language from \mathcal{C}_t ; as noted above, $n_t(m)$ is well-defined since we are in the case where at least one language in \mathcal{C}_t is consistent with S_t , and so the first consistent language is (t, m) -critical for all m . We now search for a string to generate as follows.

We maintain a counter m that begins at $m_t^{(0)}$ and gets incremented iteratively, with each iteration doing the following:

- (i) Increment m by 1.
- (ii) Perform membership queries to determine $L_i[m]$ for each $L_i \in \mathcal{C}_t$. Note that since $m \geq m_t^{(0)} \geq \max_{t' < t} w_{t'}$, the determination of which languages in \mathcal{C}_t are consistent with S_t does not change (relative to the initial iteration) when we do this.
- (iii) Determine which languages are (t, m) -critical, and from this determine $n_t(m)$. Note that this only requires consulting the results of membership queries already performed; also, since we are working with a value of t for which \mathcal{C}_t contains at least one consistent language, the value of $n_t(m)$ is well-defined.
- (iv) If there is any string u_i for $i \leq m$ such that $u_i \in L_{n_t(m)} - S_t$, then choose the minimum i with this property; output the string u_i and define $m_t = m$. If there is no such u_i , then continue to the next iteration.

It is useful to give an example of the step-by-step execution of this algorithm, and Figures 1 and 2 (which fill the next two pages) do this for a sample input. In the notation of these figures, each language L_i is a vertical column with a cell for each string u_j , and an “X” in the cell indicates that $u_j \in L_i$. Each vertical column only goes up to the height m_t in step t , indicating that by the end of step t , the algorithm has only considered finite prefixes of the form $L_i[m_t]$.

Analyzing the algorithm. As written, it is not immediately clear that the algorithm’s iterations in step t will come to an end with a string u_m , rather than running forever. We prove this now.

(5.5) *In step t , the algorithm outputs a string after a finite sequence of operations.*

Proof. We identify each iteration with the value of m after the initial increment of the iteration; so the iterations begin at $m_t^{(0)} + 1$ and continue upward from there. Suppose by way of contradiction that the algorithm performs an infinite sequence of iterations.

Let us call an iteration m *disruptive* if $n_t(m) \neq n_t(m - 1)$. Since $n_t(m - 1)$ is the maximum index of a $(t, m - 1)$ -critical language, and since our monotonicity property (5.4) implies that $L_{n_t(m)}$ is also $(t, m - 1)$ -critical, it follows that $n_t(m) < n_t(m - 1)$. Since $n_t(m)$ starts at a value upper-bounded by t and decreases by at least one with every disruptive iteration, there can be at most $t - 1$ disruptive iterations.

The sequence of iterations must therefore contain a last disruptive iteration m^* . For all iterations $m \geq m^*$, the language $L_{n_t(m)}$ does not change. If there is an index $i \leq m^*$ for which $u_i \in L_{n_t(m^*)} - S_t$, then the algorithm terminates in iteration m^* with the first such u_i . Otherwise, since the language $L_{n_t(m^*)}$ is infinite, we must eventually reach an iteration $m > m^*$ for which $u_m \in L_{n_t(m)}$, and the algorithm will stop and output u_m at this point. \square




Figure 1: This and the next figure show an example of the first five steps of the algorithm from Section 5 on a sample input. (It is useful to read the description of the algorithm before consulting this figure.) The strings produced by the adversary in order over the first five steps are $u_2, u_5, u_8, u_{10}, u_{12}$; in the notation of the figure, the steps of the algorithm are shown separately, each language considered in a given step is shown as a vertical column, and there is a row for each string considered at some point in the step. The string u_j belongs to L_i if and only if there is an “X” in the column for L_i and the row for u_j .

In step t , the rows corresponding to strings the adversary has already produced are shaded (so for example in Step 2, the row for u_8 is not shaded because the adversary hasn’t yet produced u_8 ; it only does so in Step 3). The algorithm considers the languages in $\mathcal{C}_t = \{L_1, L_2, \dots, L_t\}$ in step t , and it only considers a finite prefix of each language in step t , from an index $m_t^{(0)}$ at the start of the step to an index m_t at the end. The “heights” of the columns in each step go up to the final index m_t .

Recall that the algorithm starts with $m = m_t^{(0)}$, finds the highest-indexed (t, m) -critical language $L_{n_t(m)}$ among \mathcal{C}_t , and begins searching through strings of increasing index to find a new string in $L_{n_t(m)}$. During this search, as m increases, the identity of the highest-indexed (t, m) -critical language might change.

In Step $t = 1$, there is no consistent language in \mathcal{C}_t , so the algorithm can generate an arbitrary string. Step $t = 2$ starts with $m = m_t^{(0)} = 5$: L_2 is (t, m) -critical for all m , and so the algorithm tests u_m for membership in L_2 beginning at $m = 6$ until it finds the first new string in L_2 , which happens with $m = 7$; u_7 is therefore generated. Step $t = 3$ starts with $m = m_t^{(0)} = 8$: L_3 is the highest-indexed $(t, 8)$ -critical language in \mathcal{C}_t (since $L_3[8] \subseteq L_2[8]$), and so the algorithm begins searching for the next $u_m \in L_3$, as long as L_3 remains (t, m) -critical; this happens at $m = 10$, and so u_{10} is generated.




Figure 2: This is a continuation of the execution of the algorithm on the sample input from Figure 1. Step $t = 4$ starts with $m = m_t^{(0)} = 10$; L_4 is consistent but not $(t, 10)$ -critical (since $L_4[10] \not\subseteq L_3[10]$), and so L_3 remains the highest-indexed $(t, 10)$ -critical language. As before, the algorithm begins searching for the next $u_m \in L_3$, as long as L_3 remains (t, m) -critical; this happens at $m = 12$, and so u_{12} is generated.

Step $t = 5$ starts with $m = m_t^{(0)} = 12$: L_5 is the highest-indexed $(t, 12)$ -critical language (since $L_5[12]$ is a subset of both $L_3[12]$ and $L_2[12]$), and so the algorithm begins searching for the next $u_m \in L_5$, as long as L_5 remains (t, m) -critical. Once $m = 14$, however, the algorithm finds that L_5 is not $(t, 14)$ -critical (since $L_5[14] \not\subseteq L_3[14]$), and so L_3 is the highest-indexed $(t, 14)$ -critical language. The algorithm switches to searching for the next $u_m \in L_3$, as long as L_3 remains (t, m) -critical; this happens when $m = 15$, and so u_{15} is generated.

Given that (5.5) establishes that the algorithm outputs a string in step t , it is useful to record an additional property of the algorithm that follows directly from its construction.

(5.6) *In step t , if at least one language in \mathcal{C}_t is consistent with S_t , then there is an m_t and an n_t such that the algorithm outputs a string from $L_{n_t(m_t)}[m_t]$, where $L_{n_t(m_t)}$ is the (t, m_t) -critical language with maximum index in \mathcal{C}_t .*

We now prove an analogue of (4.6), from which our main result (2.1) directly follows.

(5.7) *For any language $L_z \in \mathcal{C}$ and any enumeration of L_z , there is a t^* such that for all $t \geq t^*$, the algorithm generates a string in $L_z - S_t$.*

Proof. In the given enumeration of L_z , (5.2) tells us that there is a t^+ such that for all $t \geq t^+$ and all $m \geq 1$, the language L_z is (t, m) -critical. Let $t^* = \max(z, t^+)$. In every step $t \geq t^*$, by (5.6) there is an m_t such that the algorithm generates a string from $L_{n_t(m_t)}[m_t]$, where $L_{n_t(m_t)}$ is the (t, m_t) -critical language with maximum index in \mathcal{C}_t . In each such step t , L_z is a (t, m_t) -critical language in \mathcal{C}_t , and so $n_t(m_t) \geq z$. From (5.3), it follows that $L_{n_t(m_t)}[m_t] \subseteq L_z[m_t] \subseteq L_z$. Since the algorithm's output comes from $L_{n_t(m_t)}[m_t] - S_t$, it follows that it comes from $L_z - S_t$ as well. \square

As in the discussion at the end of Section 4, it is straightforward to modify the algorithm so that it generates strings without repetition.

6 Generation for Finite Collections of Languages

We now turn to our second main result, (2.2), which derives a stronger conclusion for finite collections of languages.

The finite case illustrates the power of the closure operator described in Section 3; this turns out to be sufficient to obtain the result. To review the definition from Section 3, for a sequence of strings S_t from a language in \mathcal{C} , we define the *closure* of S_t in \mathcal{C} , denoted $\langle S_t \rangle$, to be the intersection of all languages in \mathcal{C} that are consistent with S_t . If there is a string in $\langle S_t \rangle - S_t$, then it is always safe to generate such a string; by definition, it must be an unseen string from the true language L_z . The challenge in the previous sections was that there are simple instances with infinite collections \mathcal{C} for which $\langle S_t \rangle = S_t$. But for finite collections \mathcal{C} , we will be able to make much more progress using the closure operator.

Informal version of the argument. We start by giving the basic idea behind the proof, and then the proof itself. Let us write the finite collection of candidate languages as $\mathcal{C} = \{L_1, L_2, \dots, L_n\}$, and suppose that after the adversary has enumerated a set S of strings, the languages consistent with S are $L_{i_1}, L_{i_2}, \dots, L_{i_k}$. Note that the true language K must be one of these k languages. Now, the closure $\langle S \rangle$ is equal to the mutual intersection $L_{i_1} \cap L_{i_2} \cap \dots \cap L_{i_k}$, and there are two possibilities: either $\langle S \rangle$ is infinite, or it is finite. If it is infinite, then the algorithm can safely generate all of the strings in $\langle S \rangle - S$, and thus achieve the goal specified by (2.2). On the other hand, if $\langle S \rangle$ is finite, then it has size equal to some natural number m ; in this case, after the adversary enumerates at most $m + 1$ more distinct strings, the algorithm will learn that at least one of $L_{i_1}, L_{i_2}, \dots, L_{i_k}$ is no longer consistent. We will then have a set of at most $k - 1$ consistent languages, and we can iterate this argument at most $k - 2$ more times until (i) there is only a single consistent language, which must be K , or (ii) more generally, the set of all consistent languages has a mutual intersection that is infinite, in which case the algorithm can safely generate from this infinite set.

This argument conveys the key point underlying the proof, that as the adversary enumerates strings from K , it cannot prevent itself from reaching a point where the set of strings it has enumerated has an infinite closure. To turn this into an argument that produces a uniform bound on how many strings are needed before the closure must become infinite, we replace the iterative argument in the previous paragraph with one that is shorter and more direct. Specifically, consider all sub-collections of languages from \mathcal{C} (where we think of a sub-collection as any way of choosing some of the languages from \mathcal{C} but not others). Note that since \mathcal{C} is finite, there are only finitely many possible sub-collections of languages from \mathcal{C} . For each sub-collection \mathcal{C}' , the mutual intersection of the languages in \mathcal{C}' is either finite or infinite. Consider the sub-collections that have a finite mutual intersection, and let m^* be the maximum size of such a mutual intersection. Now, suppose the adversary produces a set S of $m^* + 1$ distinct strings from K . If we consider the sub-collection of all languages in \mathcal{C} that are consistent with S , its mutual intersection must contain S and therefore it has cardinality greater than m^* . By the definition of m^* , this means that its cardinality must be infinite. So the closure $\langle S \rangle$ is infinite, and therefore the algorithm can safely generate all the strings in $\langle S \rangle - S$.

The proof. The argument above, in informal terms, is the complete proof of (2.2). We now formalize this argument in the remainder of the section.

Proof of (2.2). We begin with some additional definitions. For any subset A of the indices $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, let $D(A)$ be the intersection of the languages whose indices are in A ; in other words, $D(A) = \bigcap_{i \in A} L_i$. For any sequence S of strings from a language in \mathcal{C} , let $I(S)$ be the set of indices

of the languages in \mathcal{C} that contain S ; that is, $I(S) = \{i : S \subseteq L_i\}$. We observe that the closure operator can be written in terms of this notation, in that $\langle S \rangle = D(I(S))$.

If $D = D(\{1, 2, \dots, n\})$ is infinite, then the algorithm can generate arbitrary strings from D as its output without seeing any sample of strings at all; since $D \subseteq L_i$ for every language $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$, in particular $D \subseteq L_z$ for the true language L_z , and this satisfies the requirements of (2.2).

For the rest of the proof, we therefore suppose $D(\{1, 2, \dots, n\})$ is finite. Let \mathcal{F} be the collection of all sets of indices $A \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $D(A)$ finite. Finally, let $m^* = \max_{A \in \mathcal{F}} |D(A)|$; since $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2^n$, we observe that m^* is the maximum of a finite set of positive integers, and hence a positive integer.

We now define $t(\mathcal{C}) = m^* + 1$ and claim that this choice of $t(\mathcal{C})$ satisfies the required guarantee of (2.2). Indeed, consider the true language $L_z \in \mathcal{C}$ and any sequence S_t of $t(\mathcal{C})$ distinct elements from L_z . Recall that $I(S_t)$ denotes the set of indices of all languages in \mathcal{C} that contain S_t . We have $S_t \subseteq \langle S_t \rangle = D(I(S_t))$. If $D(I(S_t))$ were finite, then by the definition of m^* , the cardinality of $D(I(S_t))$ would be at most m^* . But this would contradict the fact that $D(I(S_t))$ contains S_t , which has cardinality $m^* + 1$.

Therefore $\langle S_t \rangle = D(I(S_t))$ is infinite, and it is a subset of the true language L_z . To conclude the proof, we therefore need only show that there is an algorithm that can enumerate all of $\langle S_t \rangle - S_t$ using only membership queries. To do this, the algorithm begins by querying whether each $w_i \in S_t$ belongs to each $L_j \in \mathcal{C}$. From this, it can determine the set $I(S_t)$ of indices of languages that contain S_t . Now, it enumerates every string $u_i \in U$ in ascending order, skipping the elements of S_t . For each such string u_i , it queries whether $u_i \in L_j$ for each $j \in I(S_t)$, and it outputs u_i if it belongs to each of these languages. In this way, the algorithm enumerates the infinite set $\langle S_t \rangle - S_t \subseteq L_z - S_t$ after seeing a sample of $t(\mathcal{C})$ strings in L_z . \square

7 Extensions and Generalizations

As discussed at the end of Section 2, a natural direction for generalization is to consider whether we can preserve the general structure of the model while adding in a notion of *prompting* — an idea familiar from language generation systems in practice, where the algorithm is provided with a prompt string and it must complete it to a valid output.

To explore how we might add prompts to our model, let's first recall that there is a countable collection of language $\mathcal{C} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, \dots\}$, the adversary chooses a true language K from \mathcal{C} , and it begins enumerating the strings of K one by one, over a sequence of steps $t = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. We continue to use S_t to denote the set of strings enumerated by the adversary up through step t , and z for an index such that $K = L_z$.

A model of prompting. The new feature of the problem in our generalization is that in every step t , the adversary provides the algorithm with two things: a string w_t from the true language K , and a string p_t that serves as a *prompt*. (The adversary is allowed use the same prompt in multiple steps.) The algorithm in step t must then produce a string c_t with the goal that the concatenation of p_t and c_t is a string belonging to $K - S_t$, where $S_t = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_t\}$ — that is, it should be an unseen string from K . In what follows, we will use $p_t \cdot c_t$ to denote the concatenation of p_t and c_t .

We observe that it leads to an equivalent problem whether we ask the algorithm to output c_t so that $p_t \cdot c_t \in K - S_t$, or whether we ask the algorithm to output the full concatenated string $a_t = p_t \cdot c_t$. In this latter formulation, we can phrase the algorithm's task as follows: given a prompt p_t , output a string a_t with the properties that p_t is a prefix of a_t , and $a_t \in K - S_t$. Because it makes the exposition slightly simpler, we will take this latter formulation as our default version of the problem — that the algorithm is supposed to output the full string a_t , with p_t as a prefix of a_t — but we will refer to both versions in our discussion.

To establish a positive result for prompted generation in the limit, we need to impose some type of restriction on the prompts the adversary can provide. For example, if the adversary were simply to provide an arbitrary string p_t and ask the algorithm if there exists a string c_t and a language $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ for which $p_t \cdot c_t \in L_i$, this is not a problem that could be solved by an algorithm that must terminate with a yes/no answer and whose only access to \mathcal{C} comes in the form of membership queries of the form “Is $w \in L_i$?” So as a minimal restriction on the adversary, we can at least require that its prompt p_t at step t must have the property that there exists a string c_t for which $p_t \cdot c_t \in K - S_t$. This weak assumption raises interesting open questions that we will consider later in this section. But first, we will establish a positive result with a stronger restriction on the adversary, as follows. We say that a prompt p is *robust* if for all languages $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$, there exist arbitrarily long strings c for which $p \cdot c \in L_i$. We will start by considering adversaries that only provide robust prompts.

We say that the algorithm achieves *prompted generation from K in the limit* if there is some t^* such that for all steps $t \geq t^*$, the algorithm's output a_t has the property that p_t is a prefix of a_t and $a_t \in K - S_t$. We now prove the following.

(7.1) *There is an algorithm with the property that for any countable collection of languages $\mathcal{C} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, \dots\}$, and any enumeration of one of these languages K accompanied by a sequence of robust prompts, the algorithm achieves prompted generation from K in the limit.*

We make two initial observations about this result. First, (7.1) is a strict generalization of our first main result (2.1), since if the adversary always provides the empty string as its prompt p_t ,

then the problem of finding continuations c_t for which $p_t \cdot c_t \in K - S_t$ is simply the problem of finding strings c_t in $K - S_t$, as in the original definition of generation in the limit. Moreover, the empty string is a robust prompt, since each of the languages $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ is infinite, and so there are arbitrarily long continuation strings that belong to L_i when concatenated to the empty string.

Second, we observe that there is no requirement that the algorithm has ever seen a string beginning with the prefix p_t among the adversary's examples $S_t \subseteq K$ before the first step t in which the adversary provides p_t . An important point to notice about (7.1) is that the algorithm can achieve prompted generation in the limit despite this challenge.

7.1 A First Result for Prompted Generation

We now describe how to prove our result (7.1). The proof is a direct adaptation of the proof of (2.1) from Section 5; as we will see, the structure of critical languages built up there is sufficiently strong that not much more is needed to handle the prompted version of the problem with robust prompts.

As in Section 5, we will work with a specific enumeration u_1, u_2, u_3, \dots of all strings in U , and work with finite subsets of the languages L_i , defined via the notation $L_i[m] = L_i \cap \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m\}$. The algorithm for prompted generation will closely follow the algorithm from Section 5, in that in every step t , it will increment a counter m and maintain knowledge of the maximum index $n_t(m)$ of a (t, m) -critical language from \mathcal{C}_t . Maintaining knowledge of $n_t(m)$ does not require knowledge of the prompts, and so this part of the algorithm is the same as before. What changes is the stopping condition for the algorithm in step t : rather than continue increasing m until any valid output is found — that is, until $u_m \in L_{n_t(m)}$ — the algorithm must increase m potentially even further, until it finds a string u_m for which p_t is a prefix of u_m , and $u_m \in L_{n_t(m)} - S_t$. However, since p_t is a robust prompt, the algorithm is guaranteed to eventually find such a string, and so we can be sure that its iterations in step t will terminate. If we let m_t be the value of m at the end of step t , then once t is large enough, we know that $L_{n_t(m_t)}[m_t] \subseteq L_z[m_t]$, where $L_z = K$ is the true language, and so the string u_{m_t} that it outputs has p_t as a prefix and belongs to $K - S_t$ as required.

Detailed analysis. The discussion above provides the entire set of modifications to the algorithm; for completeness we now describe these in more detail, together with a proof of correctness.

First, the facts (5.2) through (5.4) still hold in the prompted case, since they are structural properties of the language that are not affected by the adversary's use of prompts. The algorithm for generating an output string uses an iteration in step t for which parts (i), (ii), and (iii) of each iteration are the same as in Section 5. Step (iv) of each iteration is replaced by

- (iv') If there is any string u_i for $i \leq m$ such that u_i has p_t as a prefix and $u_i \in L_{n_t(m)} - S_t$, then choose the minimum i with this property; output the string u_i and define $m_t = m$. If there is no such u_i , then continue to the next iteration.

Now, the proof of termination works as before, by establishing that there are only finitely many *disruptive iterations* in which the identity of $n_t(m)$ changes; this part does not depend on the structure of prompts but only on the definition of a (t, m) -critical language, and so it uses (5.2) through (5.4) exactly as before. After the last disruptive iteration, either there is a string $u_i \in L_{n_t(m)} - S_t$ with $i \leq m$ for which p_t is a prefix, or else the algorithm will eventually reach one, since the prompt p_t is robust. It declares this u_{m_t} to be its output string. We therefore have

(7.2) In step t , if at least one language in \mathcal{C}_t is consistent with S_t , then there is an m_t and an n_t such that the algorithm terminates with a string a_t for which p_t is a prefix of a_t and $a_t \in L_{n_t(m_t)}[m_t] - S_t$, where $L_{n_t(m_t)}$ is the (t, m_t) -critical language with maximum index in \mathcal{C}_t .

Finally, we establish the basic correctness property of the algorithm, from which (7.1) follows directly.

(7.3) For any language $L_z \in \mathcal{C}$ and any enumeration of L_z with robust prompts p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots , there is a t^* such that for all $t \geq t^*$, the algorithm generates a string a_t for which p_t is a prefix of a_t and $a_t \in L_z - S_t$.

Proof. In the given enumeration of L_z , (5.2) tells us that there is a t^+ such that for all $t \geq t^+$ and all $m \geq 1$, the language L_z is (t, m) -critical. Let $t^* = \max(z, t^+)$. In every step $t \geq t^*$, by (7.2) there is an m_t such that the algorithm generates a string a_t such that p_t is a prefix of a_t , and $a_t \in L_{n_t(m_t)}[m_t] - S_t$, where $L_{n_t(m_t)}$ is the (t, m_t) -critical language with maximum index in \mathcal{C}_t . In each such step t , L_z is a (t, m_t) -critical language in \mathcal{C}_t , and so $n_t(m_t) \geq z$. From (5.3), it follows that $L_{n_t(m_t)}[m_t] \subseteq L_z[m_t] \subseteq L_z$. Since $a_t \in L_{n_t(m_t)}[m_t] - S_t$, it follows that $a_t \in L_z - S_t$ as well. \square

7.2 Prompted Generation with a More Powerful Adversary

Having proved (7.1), let us go back to the question of what we must require about the adversary's prompts in order to establish a positive result for prompted generation. Arguably the weakest requirement we might picture placing on the adversary — and therefore, the most power we could give the adversary — would be to require only that each of its prompts has at least one valid continuation at the time that it poses the prompt: that is, its prompt p_t in step t must have the property that there is at least one string c_t for which $p_t \cdot c_t \in K - S_t$. Let us call such a prompt *non-trivial*. While requiring non-trivial prompts is a weaker restriction than requiring robust prompts as in Section 7.1, we reiterate the point that even the assumption of robust prompts is sufficient to provide a strict generalization of our first main result (2.1), given that the empty string, when used as a prompt, is robust.

We now establish some results with this weaker restriction on the adversary, though we leave a fully general characterization of the power of this restriction as an open question. In particular, going back to the style of results from Section 4, where we allow algorithms with additional computational power, we will show that there is a positive result for non-trivial prompts via an algorithm that can ask not only membership queries of the form “Is $w \in L_i$?” but is also augmented with one extra form of computational power: if $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and R is a regular language (i.e. one that is accepted by a finite automaton), then the algorithm can correctly answer the query “Is $L_i \subseteq R$?”⁴ The fact that such an algorithm can perform prompted generation in the limit for any sequence of non-trivial prompts has an interesting implication: we can establish this same result without any augmentation of the algorithm by additional power — that is, using an algorithm that can only perform standard computational steps — in the case where \mathcal{C} is the set of all context-free languages. This is simply because the problem “Is $L \subseteq R$?” is decidable when L is context-free and R is regular, and so we don't need to augment the algorithm with any additional power to answer these queries when \mathcal{C} consists of the set of context-free languages.⁵

⁴Equivalently, we could say that the algorithm's added power is to answer questions of the form “Is $L_i \cap R'$ empty?” for a regular language R' , since R is a regular language if and only if its complement $U - R$ is, and L_i is a subset of R if and only if L_i is disjoint from $U - R$.

⁵To see why this is decidable, we begin with the point in the previous footnote, that for the algorithm to answer

Prompted generation using regular subset queries. To make the discussion above concrete, we write the added computational power of the algorithm as the following assumption.

(7.4) *Assumption: The algorithm is able to answer subset queries of the form “Is $L_i \subseteq R$?” where $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and R is a regular language.*

We will call the type of query specified in (7.4) a *regular subset query*, and again, we note that for some important families of languages — for example the context-free languages — an algorithm does not need to be augmented with anything additional in order to decide regular subset queries.

We will prove the following.

(7.5) *There is an algorithm, augmented with the power to perform regular subset queries of the form in Assumption (7.4), with the property that for any countable collection of languages $\mathcal{C} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, \dots\}$, and any enumeration of one of these languages K accompanied by a sequence of non-trivial prompts, the algorithm achieves prompted generation from K in the limit.*

As in Subsection 7.1, we prove this by adapting the algorithm from Section 5. However, this time the modifications need to be a bit more extensive. As a first new definition, we call a language $L_i \in \mathcal{C}$ *t-valid* if there exists a string c such that $p_t \cdot c \in L_i - S_t$. Observe that $K = L_z$ is *t-valid* for all t , by our requirement that the adversary has to provide non-trivial prompts.

An algorithm for generation with non-trivial prompts. We now give the algorithm that proves (7.5). As in Section 5, in step t we maintain a prefix size m_t and work with prefixes $L_i[m_t]$ for $i \leq t$. As before, we write the sequence of examples provided so far by the adversary as $S_t = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_t\}$.

We let $n_t(m)$ be the maximum index of a (t, m) -critical language in \mathcal{C}_t , if such an index exists. We let $r_t(m)$ be the maximum index of a language in \mathcal{C}_t that is both (t, m) -critical and *t-valid*, if such an index exists. We continue to use (5.2), which establishes that there is some time step t^+ such that for all $t \geq t^+$, and all $m \geq 1$, the language L_z is (t, m) -critical. If we set $t^* = \max(z, t^+)$, then for all $t \geq t^*$, the quantities $n_t(m)$ and $r_t(m)$ are both well-defined for all m , since when $t \geq t^*$, there is at least one language in \mathcal{C}_t (namely L_z) that is both (t, m) -critical for all m and also *t-valid*.

In step t , the algorithm is looking for a string $u \in U - S_t$ to output that has p_t as a prefix; we will call this an *acceptable* output. As a first phase of step t , the algorithm determines which languages in L_i are *t-valid*. To do this, it defines R_t to be the language consisting of all strings that have p_t as a prefix, and it then checks whether $L_i \cap (R_t - S_t)$ is empty. Since $R_t - S_t$ consists of all acceptable outputs, this check determines whether or not L_i is *t-valid*. Moreover, since $R_t - S_t$ is a regular language, this check can be done using the algorithm’s augmented power to determine whether L_i is a subset of a given regular language, or equivalently whether L_i has an empty intersection with a given regular language.

Operating by analogy with Section 5, the algorithm then defines a counter m that it initializes to $\max(m_{t-1}, w_t)$, where w_t is the most recent string in S_t . If \mathcal{C}_t fails to contain a language that is both (t, m) -critical and *t-valid*, then the algorithm can output an arbitrary string in step t . (This will not pose a problem, since as we have observed above (5.2) establishes that \mathcal{C}_t will always contain such languages once t is large enough.) Henceforth, let us assume we are at a step t for which \mathcal{C}_t contains at least one language that is both (t, m) -critical and *t-valid*, which means that $n_t(m)$ and

“Is $L \subseteq R$?” it can equivalently answer “Is $L \cap (U - R)$ empty?” The intersection of a context-free language with a regular language is context-free, and the question of whether a context-free language is empty is decidable.

$r_t(m)$ are well-defined. In this case, the algorithm performs a sequence of iterations to find a string to output, where each iteration consists of the following steps.

- (i) Increment m by 1.
- (ii) Perform membership queries to determine $L_i[m]$ for each $L_i \in \mathcal{C}_t$. Note that since $m > \max_{t' < t} w_{t'}$, the determination of which languages in \mathcal{C}_t are consistent with S_t does not change (relative to the initial iteration) when we do this.
- (iii) Determine which languages are (t, m) -critical, and from this determine $n_t(m)$ and $r_t(m)$. Note that this only requires consulting the results of membership queries already performed, together with earlier determination of which languages $L_i \in \mathcal{C}_t$ are t -valid.
- (iv) If there is any string u_i for $i \leq m$ such that u_i has p_t as a prefix and $u_i \in L_{r_t(m)} - S_t$, then choose the minimum i with this property; output the string u_i and define $m_t = m$. If there is no such u_i , then continue to the next iteration.

The proof that the iterations in step t terminate with an output string again follows the general structure of the proof of (5.5). In particular, we say that an iteration m is *disruptive* if $r_t(m) \neq r_t(m-1)$. Since (5.4) implies that the indices of (t, m) -critical languages form a subset of the indices of $(t, m-1)$ -critical languages, and since the identities of the t -valid languages do not depend on the value of m , we have $r_t(m) < r_t(m-1)$ after a disruptive iteration, and therefore there can be at most $t-1$ disruptive iterations. Now, consider the final disruptive iteration m . Step (iv) of this iteration m checks whether any string among u_1, \dots, u_m has p_t as a prefix and belongs to $L_{r_t(m)} - S_t$, and if so the iterations terminate with the earliest among these strings as output. If none of u_1, \dots, u_m has this property, then the fact that $L_{r_t(m)}$ is t -valid implies that there is some $u_{m'}$ with $m' > m$ that will have this property. Therefore, by the time iteration m' is reached, the algorithm will terminate with an acceptable output.

The following claim now establishes (7.5).

(7.6) *For any language $L_z \in \mathcal{C}$ and any enumeration of L_z with non-trivial prompts p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots , there is a t^* such that for all $t \geq t^*$, the algorithm generates a string a_t for which p_t is a prefix of a_t and $a_t \in L_z - S_t$.*

Proof. In the given enumeration of L_z , (5.2) tells us that there is a t^+ such that for all $t \geq t^+$ and all $m \geq 1$, the language L_z is (t, m) -critical. Let $t^* = \max(z, t^+)$. As argued above, $r_t(m)$ is well-defined in every step $t \geq t^*$, and the algorithm generates a string a_t such that p_t is a prefix of a_t and $a_t \in L_{r_t(m_t)}[m_t] - S_t$. In each such step t , L_z is a language in \mathcal{C}_t that is both (t, m_t) -critical and t -valid, and so $r_t(m_t) \geq z$. From (5.3), it follows that $L_{r_t(m_t)}[m_t] \subseteq L_z[m_t] \subseteq L_z$. Since $a_t \in L_{r_t(m_t)}[m_t] - S_t$, it follows that $a_t \in L_z - S_t$ as well. \square

7.3 Prompted Generation for a Finite Collection of Languages

When the collection \mathcal{C} of languages is finite, we can ask a final question, which is whether an analogue of our result (2.2) might hold for prompted generation: could there be an algorithm, together with some fixed bound $t(\mathcal{C})$, such that after seeing $t(\mathcal{C})$ strings from the true language K , the algorithm is able to achieve prompted generation?

There is a short argument that such a result cannot hold. To see why, suppose that \mathcal{C} is the collection of two languages L_1 and L_2 , each over the two-letter alphabet $\{a, b\}$, where L_1 consists

of all strings that begin with a and all odd-length strings that begin with b ; and L_2 consists of all strings that begin with a and all even-length strings that begin with b . Suppose there were a bound $t(\mathcal{C})$ and an algorithm that guaranteed correct prompted generation after seeing $t(\mathcal{C})$ distinct samples from the true language K . Then an adversary could present $t(\mathcal{C})$ distinct strings all beginning with a , and then provide the single-letter string b as a prompt: if the algorithm outputs an even-length string, then the adversary could declare this to be incorrect because the true language is L_1 , and conversely if the algorithm outputs an odd-length string.

This does not prevent the algorithm from achieving promoted generation in the limit, because the adversary must eventually output a string beginning with b , after which the algorithm knows whether to respond to prompts that begin with b using even-length or odd-length strings. But this guarantee cannot be achieved after any fixed number of samples $t(\mathcal{C})$ that must be specified in advance.

8 Concluding Remarks

Our results suggest that generating from a language based on observed samples is a fundamentally different, more tractable problem than identifying the language from observed samples. It is so tractable, in fact, that it can be accomplished provided only that we are told the samples come from a language in a known countable collection of candidate languages.

It is therefore interesting to ask what stylized conclusions we might draw from these general results about generation as a task, and its relation to other learning processes. In the case of finite collections of languages, the basic idea underlying the proof is that a large “core” to the language (the closure of the sample, in our terminology) emerges at a known time after a finite set of observations, and it is then enough to generate from this core even though there might always remain peripheral parts of the language — disjoint from this core — that we can never be sure about. In the case of infinite collections of languages, the task is more complex, because there is never a known time at which a core to the language emerges. Instead, the algorithm may need to continually shrink the set it is using for generation; through this infinite process of shrinkage, the algorithm can be sure that beyond a certain point, it is always generating from the true language K , even if it can not be sure when it has reached this point or what the true language is.

In this way, as noted earlier in the paper, the solutions we develop highlight some interesting tensions between the problem of producing *valid* strings that belong to the target language, and the problem of maintaining *breadth* by not restricting to only a limited subset of the target language. Our approaches achieve validity through a strategy that implicitly gives up on breadth as a goal, and it is interesting to ask whether this is essentially necessary for any method that achieves language generation in the limit.

This tension, as it arises in our solution, also creates an interesting echo of the human process by which people acquire the vernacular within a new community [5]: as with our solution in this abstract model, people encountering the dialect in a new community may similarly pass through a sequence of conceptually distinct phases: an initial phase in which they are generating too adventurously and producing invalid utterances; then a phase where the utterances are approximately aligned with the scope of the language; and finally a phase in which the range of utterances they are willing to generate shrinks further over their lifetime, as they become increasingly conservative in what they consider valid. Again, it is interesting to consider whether this type of structure is inherent in any solution to the task of generation in the limit.

Acknowledgements. We thank Bobby Kleinberg, Lillian Lee, Marios Papachristou, and Kenny Peng for helpful discussions on these questions and on early drafts of this paper. The work has been supported in part by a Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship, a Simons Collaboration grant, a grant from the MacArthur Foundation, and the Center for Applied AI at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business.

References

- [1] Dana Angluin. Finding patterns common to a set of strings. In *Proceedings of the 11th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 130–141, 1979.
- [2] Dana Angluin. Inductive inference of formal languages from positive data. *Information and Control*, 45(2):117–135, 1980.
- [3] Martín Arjovsky and Léon Bottou. Towards principled methods for training generative adversarial networks. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2017.
- [4] Martín Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 214–223. PMLR, 2017.
- [5] Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, Robert West, Dan Jurafsky, Jure Leskovec, and Christopher Potts. No country for old members: User lifecycle and linguistic change in online communities. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 307–318, 2013.
- [6] E Mark Gold. Language identification in the limit. *Information and Control*, 10(5):447–474, 1967.
- [7] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38, 2023.
- [8] Adam Tauman Kalai and Santosh S Vempala. Calibrated language models must hallucinate. In *Proceedings of the 56th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2024.
- [9] Lillian Lee. Learning of context-free languages: A survey of the literature. Technical Report TR-12-96, Harvard University, 1996. Available via ftp, <ftp://deas-ftp.harvard.edu/techreports/tr-12-96.ps.gz>.
- [10] Ziwei Xu, Sanjay Jain, and Mohan Kankanhalli. Hallucination is inevitable: An innate limitation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11817*, 2024.