

The Vocabulary of Grammar-Based Codes and the Logical Consistency of Texts

Łukasz Dębowski
ldebowsk@ipipan.waw.pl



Institute of Computer Science
Polish Academy of Sciences

Herdan's law (an integrated version of Zipf's law)

Consider texts in a natural language (such as English):

- **V** — the number of different words in the text,
- **n** — the length of the text.

We observe the relationship

$$V \propto n^\beta,$$

where β is between **0.5** a **1** depending on a text.

- *Władysław Kuraszkiewicz, Józef Łukaszewicz (1951),*
- *Pierre Guiraud (1954),*
- *Gustav Herdan (1964),*
- *H. S. Heaps (1978).*

Is Herdan's law evidence of "an animate process" ?

*If a Martian scientist sitting before his radio in Mars accidentally received from Earth the broadcast of an extensive speech [...], what criteria would he have to determine whether the reception represented the effect of animate process [...]? It seems that [...] the only clue to the animate origin would be this: **the arrangement of the occurrences would be neither of rigidly fixed regularity such as frequently found in wave emissions of purely physical origin nor yet a completely random scattering of the same.***

— George Kingsley Zipf (1965:187)

The monkey-typing explanation



Zipf's and Herdan's law are observed if the **letters** and **spaces** in the text are obtained by pressing keys **at random**.

- Benoit B. Mandelbrot (1953),
- George A. Miller (1957).

The new explanation of Herdan's law

We will prove a theorem which can be stated informally in this way, for $\beta \in (0, 1)$:

If a **text** of length n describes $\geq n^\beta$ independent **facts** in a repetitive way then the text contains $\geq n^\beta / \log n$ distinct **words**.

For the formal statement, we shall adopt two postulates:

- 1 **Words** are understood as nonterminal symbols in the shortest grammar-based encoding of the text.
- 2 **Texts** are emitted by a finite-energy strongly nonergodic source.
- 3 **Facts** are independent binary variables which can be predicted from the text in a shift-invariant way.

A context-free grammar that generates one text

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{A_1} \rightarrow \mathbf{A_2A_4A_5dear_childrenA_5A_3all.} \\ \mathbf{A_2} \rightarrow \mathbf{A_3youA_5} \\ \mathbf{A_3} \rightarrow \mathbf{A_4_to_} \\ \mathbf{A_4} \rightarrow \mathbf{Good_morning} \\ \mathbf{A_5} \rightarrow \mathbf{, -} \end{array} \right\} .$$

*Good morning to you,
 Good morning to you,
 Good morning, dear children,
 Good morning to all.*

The vocabulary size and grammar-based codes

The **vocabulary size** of a grammar:

$$\mathbb{V}[\mathbf{G}] := n, \quad \text{jezeli} \quad \mathbf{G} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{A}_1 \rightarrow \alpha_1, \\ \mathbf{A}_2 \rightarrow \alpha_2, \\ \dots, \\ \mathbf{A}_n \rightarrow \alpha_n \end{array} \right\}.$$

A **grammar-based code** is a function of form $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{B}(\Gamma(\cdot))$, where

- 1 a **grammar transform** $\Gamma : \mathbb{X}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, for each string $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{X}^+$, returns a grammar $\Gamma(\mathbf{w})$ that generates this string.
 - 2 a **grammar encoder** $\mathbf{B} : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}^+$ codes the grammar as (another) string.
- John C. Kieffer, En-hui Yang (2000),
 - Moses Charikar, Eric Lehman, ..., Abhi Shelat (2005).

Admissibly minimal codes

Let $\mathbb{X} = \{0, 1, \dots, D - 1\}$. A grammar transform Γ and the code $\mathbf{B}(\Gamma(\cdot))$ are called **admissibly minimal** if

- ① $|\mathbf{B}(\Gamma(\mathbf{w}))| \leq |\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{G})|$ for each grammar \mathbf{G} that generates \mathbf{w} ,
- ② the encoder has the form $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{B}_S^*(\mathbf{B}_N(\mathbf{G}))$,
- ③ \mathbf{B}_N encodes the grammar

$$\mathbf{G} = \{\mathbf{A}_1 \rightarrow \alpha_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \rightarrow \alpha_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}_n \rightarrow \alpha_n\}$$

as a string of integers

$$\mathbf{B}_N(\mathbf{G}) := \mathbf{F}_1^*(\alpha_1)\mathbf{D}\mathbf{F}_2^*(\alpha_2)\mathbf{D}\dots\mathbf{D}\mathbf{F}_n^*(\alpha_n)(\mathbf{D} + 1),$$

using $\mathbf{F}_i(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{x}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\mathbf{F}_i(\mathbf{A}_j) := \mathbf{D} + 1 + j - i$,

- ④ $\mathbf{B}_S : \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}^+$ is an injection, the set $\mathbf{B}_S(\{0\} \cup \mathbb{N})$ is prefix-free, $|\mathbf{B}_S(\cdot)|$ is non-decreasing and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbf{B}_S(n)| / \log_D n = 1.$$

Two classes of stochastic processes

Let $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a stochastic process on the space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbf{P})$, where $\mathbf{X}_i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ for a countable alphabet \mathbb{X} . Denote blocks as $\mathbf{X}_{m:n} := (\mathbf{X}_i)_{m \leq k \leq n}$.

The process $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is called **strongly nonergodic** if there exist variables $(\mathbf{Z}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \text{IID}$, $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Z}_k = \mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Z}_k = \mathbf{1}) = \frac{1}{2}$, and functions $\mathbf{s}_k : \mathbb{X}^* \rightarrow \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{s}_k(\mathbf{X}_{t+1:t+n}) = \mathbf{Z}_k) = 1, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

$\mathbf{Y} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-k} \mathbf{Z}_k$ is measurable against the shift-invariant σ -field.

The process $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is called a **finite-energy** process if

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{X}_{t+1:t+m} = \mathbf{u} | \mathbf{X}_{t-n:t} = \mathbf{w}) \leq \mathbf{K} c^m, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The main result

$$\mathbf{U}_\delta(\mathbf{n}) := \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N} : \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{s}_\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{X}_{1:\mathbf{n}}) = \mathbf{Z}_\mathbf{k}) \geq \delta\}.$$

Theorem 1

Let $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a stationary finite-energy strongly nonergodic process over a finite alphabet \mathbb{X} . Suppose that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{card } \mathbf{U}_\delta(\mathbf{n})}{n^\beta} > 0$$

for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\mathbb{V}[\Gamma(\mathbf{X}_{1:n})]}{n^\beta (\log n)^{-1}} \right)^p > 0, \quad p > 1,$$

for any admissibly minimal grammar transform Γ .

The first associated result

Denote the mutual information between n -blocks

$$\mathbf{E}(n) := I(\mathbf{X}_{1:n}; \mathbf{X}_{n+1:2n}) = \mathbb{E} \log \frac{P(\mathbf{X}_{1:2n})}{P(\mathbf{X}_{1:n})P(\mathbf{X}_{n+1:2n})}.$$

Theorem 2

Let $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a stationary strongly nonergodic process over a finite alphabet \mathbb{X} . Suppose that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{card } \mathbf{U}_\delta(n)}{n^\beta} > 0$$

for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E}(n)}{n^\beta} > 0.$$

The second associated result

Theorem 3

Let $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a stationary finite-energy process over a finite alphabet \mathbb{X} . Suppose that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(n)}{n^\beta} > 0$$

for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\mathbb{V}[\Gamma(\mathbf{X}_{1:n})]}{n^\beta (\log n)^{-1}} \right)^p > 0, \quad p > 1,$$

for any admissibly minimal grammar transform Γ .

Mutual information for natural language

Basing on Shannon's (1950) estimates of conditional entropy of printed English, Hilberg (1990) conjectured that mutual information between two n -blocks drawn from natural language satisfies

$$E(n) \asymp n^\beta, \quad \beta \approx 1/2.$$

- Theorem 2 – a rational motivation of Hilberg's conjecture
- Theorem 3 – Hilberg's conjecture implies Herdan's law

Besides that, Theorem 1 indicates

- why Herdan's law may be observed for the same text translated into different languages,
- why certain variation of the exponent in Herdan's law may be expected depending on a text.

- 1 Problem statement
- 2 Sketch of the proof
- 3 Examples of processes
- 4 Conclusion

Entropy, pseudoentropy, and code length

Denote the entropy of the \mathbf{n} -block and entropy rate as:

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{n}) := \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{X}_{1:\mathbf{n}}) = -\mathbb{E} \log \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{X}_{1:\mathbf{n}}), \quad \mathbf{h} := \lim_{\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{n})/\mathbf{n}.$$

Define also “pseudoentropy”

$$\mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{n}) := \mathbf{h}\mathbf{n} + [\log 2 - \eta(\delta)] \cdot \text{card } \mathbf{U}_{\delta}(\mathbf{n}).$$

Let $\mathbb{X} = \{0, 1, \dots, D - 1\}$ and $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{B}(\Gamma(\cdot))$ be an admissibly minimal codes. Put its expected length

$$\mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{n}) := \mathbb{E} |\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{X}_{1:\mathbf{n}})| \log D.$$

We have inequality

$$\mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{n}) \geq \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{n}) \geq \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{n})$$

and equality of rates

$$\lim_{\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{n})/\mathbf{n} = \lim_{\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{n})/\mathbf{n} = \lim_{\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{n})/\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{h}.$$

The lower bound for the excess code length $E^C(n)$

Let a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $\lim_k f(k)/k = 0$
and $f(n) \geq 0$ for all but finitely many n .
Then we have $2f(n) - f(2n) \geq 0$ for infinitely many n .

The equalities and inequalities on the previous slide yield

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{card } U_\delta(n)}{n^\beta} > 0 \implies \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E^C(n)}{n^\beta} > 0, \quad (\text{Th. 1})$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{card } U_\delta(n)}{n^\beta} > 0 \implies \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(n)}{n^\beta} > 0, \quad (\text{Th. 2})$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(n)}{n^\beta} > 0 \implies \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E^C(n)}{n^\beta} > 0. \quad (\text{Th. 3})$$

for $E(n) = 2H(n) - H(2n)$ and $E^C(n) = 2H^C(n) - H^C(2n)$.

The upper bound for the excess code length $E^C(n)$

$$E^C(n) = \mathbb{E} [|C(\mathbf{X}_{1:n})| + |C(\mathbf{X}_{n+1:2n})| - |C(\mathbf{X}_{1:2n})|] \log D.$$

For an admissibly minimal code $C = B(\Gamma(\cdot))$, we have

$$|C(\mathbf{u})| + |C(\mathbf{v})| - |C(\mathbf{w})| \leq W_0 \mathbb{V}[\Gamma(\mathbf{w})] (1 + L(\mathbf{w})),$$

where $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{uv}$ for $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}^+$, $L(\mathbf{w})$ denotes the maximal length of a repeat in \mathbf{w} , and $W_0 = |B_S(D + 1)|$.

For a finite-energy process $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$,

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{L(\mathbf{X}_{1:n})}{\log n} \right)^q < \infty, \quad q > 0.$$

- 1 Problem statement
- 2 Sketch of the proof
- 3 Examples of processes
- 4 Conclusion

The binary exchangeable process

Consider a family of binary IID processes

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{X}_{1:n} = \mathbf{x}_{1:n} | \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \theta^{x_i} (1 - \theta)^{1-x_i}.$$

Construct such a process $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ that

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{X}_{1:n} = \mathbf{x}_{1:n}) = \int_0^1 \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{X}_{1:n} = \mathbf{x}_{1:n} | \theta) \pi(\theta) d\theta$$

for a prior $\pi(\theta) > 0$. For $\mathbf{Y} = \lim_n n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i$ we have

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Y} \leq \mathbf{y}) = \int_0^{\mathbf{y}} \pi(\theta) d\theta.$$

Process $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is **strongly nonergodic**, because \mathbf{Y} has a continuous distribution. However, block $\mathbf{X}_{1:n}$ is conditionally independent from $\mathbf{X}_{n+1:2n}$ given the sum $\mathbf{S}_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i$. Thus

$$\mathbf{E}(n) = \mathbf{I}(\mathbf{X}_{1:n}; \mathbf{X}_{n+1:2n}) = \mathbf{I}(\mathbf{S}_n; \mathbf{X}_{n+1:2n}) \leq \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{S}_n) \leq \log(n + 1).$$

The process which I invented at Santa Fe Institute

Let a process $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ have the form

$$\mathbf{X}_i := (\mathbf{K}_i, \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{K}_i}),$$

where $(\mathbf{K}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(\mathbf{Z}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are independent IID processes,

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{K}_i = \mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{k}^{-1/\beta} / \zeta(\beta^{-1}), \quad \beta \in (0, 1),$$

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Z}_k = \mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}.$$

A linguistic interpretation

Process $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a sequence of random statements **consistently** describing the state of an “earlier drawn” random object $(\mathbf{Z}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. $\mathbf{X}_i = (\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{z})$ asserts that the \mathbf{k} -th bit of $(\mathbf{Z}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ has value $\mathbf{Z}_k = \mathbf{z}$.

- We have $\text{card } \mathbf{U}_\delta(\mathbf{n}) \geq \mathbf{A} \mathbf{n}^\beta$.
- Unfortunately, the alphabet $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{N} \times \{0, 1\}$ is infinite.

Stationary (variable-length) coding of this process

A function $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}^+$ is extended to a function $f^{\mathbb{Z}} : \mathbb{X}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$,

$$f^{\mathbb{Z}}((x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) := \dots f(x_{-1})f(x_0).f(x_1)f(x_2)\dots, \quad x_i \in \mathbb{X}.$$

For a measure ν on $(\mathbb{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathfrak{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}})$ we define its stationary mean $\bar{\nu}$ as

$$\bar{\nu}(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \nu \circ T^{-i}(A),$$

where $T((y_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) := (y_{i+1})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is the shift.

Theorem 4

Let $\mu = \mathbf{P}((X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \cdot)$ for the process from the previous slide.
 Put $\mathbb{Y} = \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $f(k, z) := \mathbf{b}(k)z^2$, where
 $\mathbf{1b}(k) \in \{0, 1\}^+$ is the binary expansion of k . A process with
 measure $\mu \circ (f^{\mathbb{Z}})^{-1}$ satisfies the hypothesis of Th. 1 for $\beta > 0.78$.

A mixing process

Let a process $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ have the form

$$\mathbf{X}_i := (\mathbf{K}_i, \mathbf{Z}_{i, \mathbf{K}_i}),$$

where $(\mathbf{K}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(\mathbf{Z}_{ik})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}$, are independent,

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{K}_i = \mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{k}^{-1/\beta} / \zeta(\beta^{-1}), \quad (\mathbf{K}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \sim \text{IID},$$

whereas $(\mathbf{Z}_{ik})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are Markov chains with

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Z}_{ik} = \mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{2},$$

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Z}_{ik} = \mathbf{z} | \mathbf{Z}_{i-1, \mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{z}) = 1 - \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{k}}.$$

Object $(\mathbf{Z}_{ik})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}}$ described by text $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a function of time i .

- We have $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(n) / n^\beta > 0$ for $\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{k}} \leq \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{K}_i = \mathbf{k})$.
- The stationary coding of this process is an ergodic process and also satisfies $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(n) / n^\beta > 0$.

- 1 Problem statement
- 2 Sketch of the proof
- 3 Examples of processes
- 4 Conclusion

Can we check which explanation is better?

Monkey-typing explanation

Zipf's and Herdan's law are observed if the **letters** and **spaces** in the text are obtained by pressing keys **at random**.

vs.

New explanation

If a **text** of length **n** describes $\geq n^\beta$ independent **facts** in a repetitive way then the text contains $\geq n^\beta / \log n$ distinct **words**.

Can we estimate mutual information well?

- ① Can we strengthen Theorems 1, 2, and 3?
 - Consider **asymptotically mean stationary** (AMS) processes.
 - Infer **almost sure** growth of vocabulary.
 - Replace $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ with $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty}$.
- ② Let $\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{u})$ be the shortest program that generates \mathbf{u} .
 Then $\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{n})$ is the **algorithmic information** between blocks.
 - Let $(\omega_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an **algorithmically random** real in $(0, 1)$.
 Mind that $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{n}) = \mathbf{0}$ but $\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{n}) \asymp n^\beta$ for $\mathbf{X}_i := (\mathbf{K}_i, \omega_{\mathbf{K}_i})$.
 - Can we use some **universal** codes to distinguish between **some** AMS sources with little vs. large $\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{n})$?
 - Can we use vocabulary of **grammar-based** codes to distinguish between **some** AMS sources with little vs. large $\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{n})$?
- ③ Do there exist **admissibly minimal codes** that are computable in **polynomial time**? (Or sufficiently similar codes?)
 - Let $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a binary IID process. Then

$$\mathbb{V}[\Gamma(\mathbf{X}_{1:n})] = \Omega \left(\sqrt{\frac{hn}{\log n}} \right)$$
 for **irreducible** grammar transforms.

My work

- Ł. Dębowski, (2012). *Mixing, Ergodic, and Nonergodic Processes with Rapidly Growing Information between Blocks*. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol. 58, pp. 3392-3401.
- Ł. Dębowski, (2011). *On the Vocabulary of Grammar-Based Codes and the Logical Consistency of Texts*. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol. 57, pp. 4589–4599.
- Ł. Dębowski, (2010). *Variable-Length Coding of Two-Sided Asymptotically Mean Stationary Measures*. Journal of Theoretical Probability, 23:237–256.
- Ł. Dębowski, (2007). *Menzerath's law for the smallest grammars*. In: P. Grzybek, R. Koehler, eds., Exact Methods in the Study of Language and Text. Mouton de Gruyter. (77–85)