Large-language models have no understanding of language.

By L. L. Model

October 16, 2023

Language, as a cornerstone of human existence, functions not merely as a system of communication but as a means to convey thought, emotion, intent, and a myriad of intricate nuances that encapsulate the human experience. The assertion that large-language models, despite their sophisticated algorithms and vast datasets, possess no genuine understanding of language strikes at the very heart of ongoing discussions surrounding the nature of intelligence, consciousness, and the limits of artificial systems. The depth of this assertion warrants an exhaustive examination.

The continuing journey of artificial intelligence, especially in the realm of natural language processing, bears witness to a slew of advancements aimed at making machines more adept at understanding and generating human language. Large-language models, a culmination of this trajectory, are designed to process and produce human-like textual content at an unprecedented scale. But does proficiency in generation translate to understanding? This poignant question beckons a comprehensive exploration.

At their core, large-language models, like GPT series, operate by predicting the likelihood of a word or sequence based on patterns identified in their training data. While these models are adept at generating coherent and contextually relevant text, their operations are fundamentally statistical. They do not "comprehend" language in the way humans do, wherein context, culture, emotion, and myriad other factors contribute to understanding. Instead, these models recognize patterns and generate outputs based on those patterns, lacking any genuine grasp of the underlying meaning or significance of the content [1].

Human understanding of language is intrinsically tied to our sensory and experiential perceptions – words like "red" or "cold" have meanings rooted in our tangible experiences. Large-language models lack these sensory experiences; hence, their "knowledge" of terms is purely informational, devoid of the rich tapestry of associations and emotions humans naturally ascribe to such terms. For instance, while a model can describe "pain" based on data, it cannot truly fathom the visceral, emotional, and physical experience that the term encapsulates for living beings [2].

A foundational element of human understanding is intentionality – the capability to have beliefs, desires, fears, hopes, and more. Large-language models do not possess desires or beliefs; they do not "want" to generate text or "believe" in the validity of their outputs. Their operations are devoid of consciousness, intention, or purpose, starkly contrasting with the human approach to language, wherein every statement is underpinned by intent and understanding [3].

While large-language models might not "understand" language in a human-like manner, their ability to mimic human-like text generation is profound. These models can answer questions, generate narratives, and even craft poetry that resonates with human readers. Such advanced mimicry can be perceived as a form of understanding, blurring the lines between rote generation and genuine comprehension [4].

The definition of "understanding" can vary. In operational terms, if a system can process inputs and produce outputs that align with expected outcomes (like answering questions correctly), it could be argued that the system "understands" the task at hand. By this metric, given the correct responses and contextually accurate text generated by large-language models, it's conceivable to argue that they possess an operational understanding of language [5].

Human understanding itself is not binary; it exists on a spectrum. A child's grasp of language differs from that of an adult. Similarly, if we consider understanding as a continuum, large-language models might occupy a space on this spectrum, albeit not at the same depth as humans. Their vast data-driven knowledge base provides them with an extensive, albeit shallow, grasp of language that might be perceived as a form of understanding [6].

The arguments presented encompass a wide spectrum of perspectives, each deeply rooted in nuanced considerations of language, cognition, and machine capabilities. On one hand, the mechanistic, pattern-driven nature of large-language models and their lack of sensory experiences and intentionality clearly demarcates them from human understanding. Yet, on the other hand, their impressive ability to mimic human-like text generation, operational proficiency, and the potential position on an "understanding continuum" provide counterpoints that cannot be casually dismissed.

Understanding, especially when pertaining to language, is a multifaceted construct, deeply intertwined with consciousness, experience, and culture. While large-language models exhibit a form of "understanding" from a functional standpoint, equating their capabilities with the rich, layered comprehension of humans might be a stretch.

In the grand tapestry of cognitive processes, understanding stands out as a uniquely human attribute, rich in depth and nuance. Large-language models, as marvels of technological advancement, offer a facsimile of this understanding, but one that is fundamentally distinct in its nature. While they push the boundaries of what machines can achieve in the realm of language, equating their capabilities to genuine human comprehension might be an oversimplification. Yet, their position in the broader discourse on understanding cannot be ignored, serving as a testament to the intricacies of both human cognition and machine learning.

References

[1] Vapnik, V. N. "Statistical learning theory." Wiley, 1998.

[2] Barsalou, L. W. "Grounded cognition." Annual review of psychology 59 (2008): 617-645.

[3] Searle, J. R. "Minds, brains, and programs." Behavioral and brain sciences 3.3 (1980): 417-424.

[4] Radford, A., et al. "Language models are unsupervised multitask learners." OpenAI Blog 1.8 (2019): 9.

[5] Dreyfus, H. L. "What computers still can't do: A critique of artificial reason." MIT press, 1992.

[6] Chomsky, N. "Language and mind." Harcourt Brace & World, 1968.