

# In-Context Algorithm Emulation in Fixed-Weight Transformers

Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu<sup>†‡\*</sup> <sup>1</sup>   Hude Liu<sup>\*2</sup>   Jennifer Yuntong Zhang<sup>‡\*3</sup>   Han Liu<sup>†§4</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Center for Foundation Models and Generative AI, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA  
 Department of Computer Science, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA

<sup>‡</sup> Ensemble AI, San Francisco, CA 94133, USA

<sup>‡</sup> Engineering Science, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S 1A4, CA

<sup>§</sup> Department of Statistics and Data Science, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA

We prove that a minimal Transformer architecture with frozen weights is capable of emulating a broad class of algorithms by in-context prompting. In particular, for any algorithm implementable by a fixed-weight attention head (e.g. one-step gradient descent or linear/ridge regression), there exists a prompt that drives a two-layer softmax attention module to reproduce the algorithm’s output with arbitrary precision. This guarantee extends even to a single-head attention layer (using longer prompts if necessary), achieving architectural minimality. Our key idea is to construct prompts that encode an algorithm’s parameters into token representations, creating sharp dot-product gaps that force the softmax attention to follow the intended computation. This construction requires no feed-forward layers and no parameter updates. All adaptation happens through the prompt alone. These findings forge a direct link between in-context learning and algorithmic emulation, and offer a simple mechanism for large Transformers to serve as prompt-programmable libraries of algorithms. They illuminate how GPT-style foundation models may swap algorithms via prompts alone, establishing a form of algorithmic universality in modern Transformer models.

**Keywords:** Foundation Model, Transformer Expressiveness, In-Context Learning, In-Context Universality, Algorithm Emulation, Algorithm Swapping, Universal Approximation

---

<sup>1</sup> [jhu@northwestern.edu](mailto:jhu@northwestern.edu); [jhu@ensemblecore.ai](mailto:jhu@ensemblecore.ai)

<sup>2</sup> [hudeliu0208@gmail.com](mailto:hudeliu0208@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> [jenniferyt.zhang@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:jenniferyt.zhang@mail.utoronto.ca)

<sup>4</sup> [hanliu@northwestern.edu](mailto:hanliu@northwestern.edu)

\*These authors contributed equally to this work. Part of the work done during JH’s internship at Ensemble AI. Code is available at [https://github.com/MAGICS-LAB/algo\\_emu](https://github.com/MAGICS-LAB/algo_emu).

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	In-Context Emulation Examples . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Main Theory</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	In-Context Emulation of Attention . . . . .	8
3.2	In-Context Emulation of Statistical Models . . . . .	9
3.3	Attention Makes Every Network In-Context . . . . .	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Proof Sketches</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1	Proof Sketch for <b>Theorem 3.1</b> . . . . .	11
4.2	Proof Sketch for <b>Theorem 3.2</b> . . . . .	13
<b>5</b>	<b>Numerical Studies</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1	Proof-of-Concept Experiment on <b>Theorem 2.1</b> . . . . .	15
5.2	Proof-of-Concept Experiment on Emulating Attention Heads . . . . .	16
5.3	Proof-of-Concept Experiment on Emulating Statistical Models . . . . .	17
5.4	Real-World Experiment on Emulating Statistical Models . . . . .	18
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion and Conclusion</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Related Work</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Proofs of Main Text</b>	<b>22</b>
B.1	Proof of <b>Theorem 2.1</b> . . . . .	37
B.2	Proof of <b>Corollary 2.1.2</b> . . . . .	42
B.3	Proof of <b>Theorem 2.2</b> . . . . .	43
B.4	Proof of <b>Theorem 2.3</b> . . . . .	43
B.5	Proof of <b>Theorem 3.1</b> . . . . .	44
B.6	Proof of <b>Theorem 3.2</b> . . . . .	50
B.7	Proof of <b>Corollary 3.2.1</b> . . . . .	61
<b>C</b>	<b>In-Context Application of Statistical Methods by Modern Hopfield Network</b>	<b>62</b>

# 1 Introduction

We show that a minimal Transformer architecture with frozen weights is capable of emulating a library of algorithms when prompted appropriately, i.e., as an *in-context algorithm emulator*. Specifically,

**Theorem 1.1** (Informal Version of [Theorems 3.1](#) and [3.2](#)). For any algorithm implementable by a fixed-weight attention head (e.g., gradient descent, linear regression, or ridge regression, as in [\[Bai et al., 2023\]](#)), there exists a prompt that drives a *stack of two softmax attention mechanism* with frozen weights to reproduce that algorithm’s output to arbitrary precision.

This ability extends to even a minimal, single-head Transformer block with static parameters. Our work offers a rigorous basis for in-context *task* learning<sup>1</sup>, supplies a simple mechanism for large Transformers to act as prompt-programmable algorithm libraries, and shows how GPT-style models may swap algorithms via prompts alone, shedding light on their general-purpose capabilities.

Large Transformer models exhibit ability to adapt to a new task by conditioning on examples or instructions provided in the prompt without any gradient updates. This is referred to as in-context learning (ICL). ICL emerges as a key driver behind generality of foundation models [\[Min et al., 2022, Brown et al., 2020\]](#). Based on the model’s ability to learn tasks on-the-fly, we propose ICL as a form of prompt-based algorithm emulator. We suggest that by injecting the parameters of an algorithm in the prompt, we program a model to emulate concrete algorithms — such as linear regression, lasso, ridge, and gradient descent — within its forward pass.

Recent work has begun to formalize this perspective. Under suitable conditions, Transformers approximate arbitrary sequence-to-sequence functions [\[Yun et al., 2020, Kajitsuka and Sato, 2024\]](#) and perform gradient descent in context [\[Garg et al., 2022\]](#). In particular, [Bai et al. \[2023\]](#) demonstrate that *task-specific* attention heads — attention mechanisms with weights designed for a given task — implement a variety of algorithms without gradient updates. For example, a single Transformer with fixed, task-tailored attention weights achieves near-optimal performance on algorithms such as least-squares regression, ridge regression, lasso, and gradient descent [\[Bai et al., 2023\]](#). These results suggest that Transformers are capable of *in-context algorithm emulation*. However, current work constructs designed attention heads suitable for specific tasks. This is problematic because it requires either handcrafted weights or retraining for every new task.

In this work, we advance this line of research by omitting the need for designing a new attention head for every algorithm. We propose a frozen Transformer architecture to emulate a library of attention-based algorithms in context without weight updates. We achieve this by embedding algorithm-specific information into input prompts. Specifically, we prove that a frozen two-layer softmax-attention architecture is capable of emulating any fixed target attention head (and hence any algorithm that such a head implements) via an appropriate prompt. Moreover, even a single-layer attention module with fixed weights suffices to emulate certain algorithm families (e.g. one-step gradient descent or linear/ridge regression) by encoding the algorithm’s parameters in its

---

<sup>1</sup>We use “task” to highlight algorithm-level adaptation, not mere pattern completion.




Figure 1: **In-Context Algorithm Emulation Overview.**  $X$  represents the data input, and  $W^*$  represents the true weights of the each algorithm we aim to emulate. We show that even a softmax attention layer suffices to emulate a broad class of algorithms by changing prompt, i.e., the  $W^*$  in the prompt.

prompt. Thus, we go beyond standard ICL: we demonstrate a minimalist theoretical model of internal algorithm swapping, where prompts serve as the context carrying algorithmic instructions.

**Contributions.** We establish a new form of in-context learning universality *for algorithm emulation*, limited to *attention-implementable algorithms*. Our contributions are four-fold:

- **General Result (Theorem 3.1).** A *two-layer attention-only* stack with frozen softmax self-attention emulates any *fixed, target algorithm-encoding attention head* via a suitably designed prompt, to arbitrary precision and without weight updates.
- **Architectural Minimality (Theorem 3.2).** A *single-layer, single-head attention* module with frozen weights suffices for specific algorithm families (e.g., one-step gradient descent, and linear/ridge regression) under longer prompts.
- **Constructive, Interpretable Prompt Design for Algorithm Emulation.** We give an explicit prompt design strategy that encodes the target head’s parameters and induces large query–key margins so softmax follows the intended pattern, furnishing an interpretable, verifiable recipe for prompt-programming a fixed attention-only module.
- **A Simple Mechanism for Internal Algorithm Swapping of Transformer Models.** Changing only the prompt-encoded algorithm weights *swaps* the algorithm executed by the fixed attention-only module, without retraining. Theory (finite libraries) and experiments (e.g., Lasso, ridge, linear regression) confirm high-fidelity swapping. Altogether, these results shed light on the general-purpose capability of GPT-style *Transformer* models to select and swap internal routines via prompts (our formal proofs concern attention-only modules).

In conclusion, we show a minimalist transformer architecture serve as a general-purpose algorithm emulator in context through prompt design. Our findings contribute to a sharp theoretical foundation for viewing in-context learning as in-context algorithm emulation. They suggest that large pretrained attention-based models (such as GPT-style Transformers) encode a library of algorithms, and swap among them based on prompts. This is achieved within a unified attention architecture and without any parameter updates. We believe this perspective opens new opportunities for understanding the emulation ability of attention modules.

**Organization.** [Section 2](#) presents ideas we build on and illustrative examples of learning statistical models in-context with *task-specific* attention heads. [Section 3](#) presents our main results. [Section 4](#) presents our proof strategies. [Section 5](#) presents numerical validations.

## Related Work

Our results diverge from prior findings on Transformer universality and in-context learning.

**Universal Approximation.** Prior studies establish that Transformers approximate arbitrary sequence-to-sequence functions, but they do not address in-context learning and often assume complex architectures. For example, [Yun et al. \[2020\]](#) prove that deep multi-head Transformers with feed-forward layers are universal approximators of continuous sequence-to-sequence functions. Subsequent advances tighten this finding: [Kajitsuka and Sato \[2024\]](#), [Hu et al. \[2025b\]](#) show that even a single-layer Transformer realizes any continuous sequence function. However, these results treat Transformers as parametric function approximators. The model requires re-training and re-prompting to adapt to a new target function instead of handling multiple tasks through context. In contrast, we prove that a minimal Transformer architecture, even a single-layer, single-head attention module with no feed-forward network, emulates a broad class of algorithms without weight updates by varying its prompt. This result achieves a new level of generality through context alone (i.e. prompt-based conditioning) despite a fixed minimalist model.

**In-Context Learning and Algorithm Emulation.** Another line of recent theory bridges Transformers with in-context learning by designing model components to carry out specific algorithms. For example, [Bai et al. \[2023\]](#) show that Transformers execute a broad range of standard algorithms in-context, but each algorithm requires a distinct, tailored attention head. In comparison, we extend this approach by showing that one fixed attention mechanism emulates any specialized attention head via prompt encoding. Rather than crafting a different attention module for each algorithm, a single frozen softmax-based attention layer takes its instructions from the prompt to perform all tasks in context. This minimal model thus becomes a unified and compact in-context algorithm emulator. It switches behaviors by changing only its input prompt, setting it apart from earlier approaches that required per-task reparameterization.

Given the necessary related work discussion above, we provide more details in [Appendix A](#).

## 2 Preliminaries

**Notations.** We use upper-case letters (e.g.,  $M$ ) to represent matrices. The vector  $e_j^{(n)}$  is a one-hot vector with a 1 in the  $j$ -th position and 0 elsewhere in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  denote the input sequence, where  $d$  is the token dimension and  $n$  is the sequence length. We denote the number of heads in attention module as  $H$ . We write  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  (or  $\|\cdot\|_2$ ) for the vector  $\infty$ -norm (resp., 2-norm).

**Softmax Attention.** We define multi-layer self-attention with softmax function as follow.

**Definition 2.1** (Softmax Attention Layer). Let  $H$  denote the number of heads of the self-attention block. For any input sequence  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ , we define the multi-head self-attention layer as

$$\text{Attn}_m(X) = \sum_{h=1}^H \underbrace{W_V^{(h)} X}_{d_o \times n} \text{Softmax}\left(\underbrace{(W_K^{(h)} X)^\top W_Q^{(h)} X}_{n \times n}\right) \underbrace{W_O^{(h)}}_{n \times n_o} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_o \times n_o},$$

where  $W_K^{(h)}, W_Q^{(h)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d}$ ,  $W_V^{(h)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_o \times d}$ , and  $W_O^{(h)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_o}$  for  $h \in [H]$ . We use  $\text{Attn}_s$  to denote *single-head* self-attention.

Following the notation of [Hu et al., 2025a], we pick non-identical dimensions for weight matrices  $W_K, W_Q, W_V$  for generality of our analysis.

In the  $K := W_K X, Q := W_Q X, V := W_V X$  notation, a single-layer softmax attention unit takes a set of key vectors  $K = \{k_1, \dots, k_n\}$ , their corresponding value vectors  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ , and a query vector  $q$ , to produce an output as a weighted sum of the value vectors. The weights are given by  $\text{Softmax}(k_i^\top q)$ , emphasizing keys most similar to the query. That is, softmax attention uses the query as a cue to retrieve the most relevant value from memory (i.e., keys).

**In-Context Learning Setup.** In the standard in-context learning setup, we ask a model to approximate an unknown function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  not seen during training.

At inference time, we construct the input prompt consisting of

$$X := \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times n} \quad \text{and} \quad x_q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1},$$

where  $X$  is the sample input-output pairs and  $x_q$  is a new query.

The goal is for the model to infer the task from the exemplars  $X$  and apply it to the new input  $x_q$  without parameter updates.

**Task-Specific Attention Head.** We define a *task-specific attention head* as an attention mechanism that incorporates the parameters of a specific task. We embed task-relevant linear transformations into the attention structure, guiding it to emphasize the input tokens most relevant to the task. This parameterization enables the attention head to select and combine contextual information based on the input and to approximate diverse functions without weight updates.

## 2.1 In-Context Emulation Examples

We present multiple examples demonstrating how softmax attention modules mimic behaviors of various in-context statistical models including gradient descent and regression algorithms.

We begin by showing a general result: a fixed, single-layer single-head softmax attention module approximates *any* continuous function of the form  $f(w^\top x - y)x$ .

**Theorem 2.1** (In-Context Emulation of  $f(w^\top x - y)x$ ). Define

$$X := \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times n} \quad \text{and} \quad W := [w \ w \ \cdots \ w] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}.$$

Define the input as:

$$Z := \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_n \\ w & w & \cdots & w \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  are the input-output pairs.  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the linear coefficient to optimize. Suppose  $X$  and  $W$  are bounded by  $B$  in infinite norm. For any continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a single-layer attention  $\text{Attn}_s$  with linear connection such that:

$$\|\text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Linear}(Z) - [f(w^\top x_1 - y_1)x_1 \ \cdots \ f(w^\top x_n - y_n)x_n]\|_\infty \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{for any } \epsilon > 0.$$

*Proof.* See [Appendix B.1](#) for a detailed proof.  $\square$

We establish that even the simplest softmax attention alone suffices to encode any continuous function by incorporating weights in the prompt. An important application is by replacing  $f$  with the derivative of a differentiable loss function as shown below.

**In-Context Emulation of Single-Step GD.** Building on [Theorem 2.1](#), we show that a softmax attention layer emulates in-context gradient descent (GD).

We replace the continuous function  $f$  in [Theorem 2.1](#) with  $\nabla \ell$ , where  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is any differentiable loss function. We show that the softmax attention computes *per-sample* gradient descent.

**Corollary 2.1.1** (In-Context Emulation of GD). Define

$$X := \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times n} \quad \text{and} \quad W := [w \ w \ \cdots \ w] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}.$$

Define the input as:

$$Z := \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_n \\ w & w & \cdots & w \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  are the input-output pairs.  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the linear coefficient to optimize. For any differentiable loss function  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a single-layer Attention layer  $\text{Attn}_s$  with linear connections such that:

$$\|\text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Linear}(Z) - [\nabla \ell(w^\top x_1 - y_1)x_1 \ \cdots \ \nabla \ell(w^\top x_n - y_n)x_n]\|_\infty \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{for any } \epsilon > 0.$$

Thus, [Corollary 2.1.1](#) shows that a single-layer single-head softmax attention with linear transformation extracts individual (*per-sample*) gradient terms.

We extend [Corollary 2.1.1](#) to show that a fixed attention layer implements the entire gradient-step update across all samples in-context. In other words, we establish that a single-layer single-head softmax attention emulates  $w - \eta \nabla L$ , where  $L$  is the average model loss across all samples, to within any arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$  via constructed prompt as shown below.

**Corollary 2.1.2** (In-Context Emulation of Single Step GD). Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable loss function. Define  $\ell_i := \ell(w^\top x_i - y_i)$  for all  $i \in [n]$ , and  $\widehat{L}_n(w) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i$ . Then, for any  $\epsilon' > 0$ , there exists a single-layer Attention layer  $\text{Attn}_s$  with linear connection such that it gives output  $\widehat{w}$ , where  $\|\widehat{w} - (w - \eta \nabla \widehat{L}_n(w))\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$  and  $\eta$  is the learning rate.

*Proof.* See [Appendix B.2](#) for a detailed proof. □

**In-Context Emulation of Multi-Step GD.** We further deduce that multi-layer softmax attention emulates multi-step gradient descent. We show that an  $(L + 1)$ -layer transformer approximates  $L$  steps of gradient descent below.

From [Corollary 2.1.2](#),  $\|\widehat{w} - (w - \eta \nabla \widehat{L}_n(w))\|_\infty = \|\widehat{w} - w_{\text{GD}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ . Consider the  $L$ -layer transformer  $\text{Attn}$ , which stacks the same single-layer attention  $L$  times. Each layer  $l \in [L]$  outputs  $\widehat{w}^l$ . By induction, we show that  $\|\widehat{w}^l - w_{\text{GD}}^l\|_\infty \leq l\epsilon$  for all  $l \in [L]$ : The base case of  $l = 0$  is trivial. Suppose the claim holds for  $l$ . Then for  $l + 1 \leq L$ , the sequences  $\{\widehat{w}^i\}_{i \leq l+1}$  and  $\{w_{\text{GD}}^i\}_{i \leq l+1}$  satisfy the precondition of [Lemma B.4](#). Therefore, applying [Lemma B.4](#) and using  $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq \|\cdot\|_2$ , we obtain  $\|\widehat{w}^{l+1} - w_{\text{GD}}^{l+1}\|_\infty \leq (l + 1)\epsilon$ . This finishes the induction.

**In-Context Emulation of Linear Regression.** We show that a single-layer softmax attention emulates linear regression in-context.

**Theorem 2.2** (In-Context Emulation of Linear Regression). For any input-output pair  $(x_i, y_i)$ , where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_i \in \mathbb{R}, i \in [n]$ , and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a single-layer Attention network with linear connection  $\text{Attn}$  such that:

$$\|\text{Attn} - w_{\text{linear}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon,$$

where  $w_{\text{linear}} := \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\langle w, x_i \rangle - y_i)^2$ .

*Proof.* See [Appendix B.3](#) for detailed proof. □

**In-Context Emulation of Ridge Regression.** We add regularization term and show that a single-layer softmax attention emulates ridge regression with  $L_2$  penalty.

**Theorem 2.3** (In-Context Emulation of Ridge Regression). For any input-output pair  $(x_i, y_i)$ , where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_i \in \mathbb{R}, i \in [n]$ , and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a single-layer Attention network with

linear connection Attn such that:

$$\|\text{Attn} - w_{\text{ridge}}\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon,$$

where  $w_{\text{ridge}} := \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\langle w, x_i \rangle - y_i)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|_2^2$  with regularization term  $\lambda \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* See [Appendix B.4](#) for detailed proof.  $\square$

Adding  $L_2$  regularizer into the prompt encoding enables attention implementing penalized learning in-context without weight updates.

The above examples show that a fixed attention module approximates various algorithms in-context. Thus we benchmark the transformer’s ability to execute algorithm emulations.

### 3 Main Theory

This section presents our main results: softmax attention is capable of (i) emulating *task-specific attention heads* in-context ([Section 3.1](#)), (ii) emulating statistical models in-context ([Section 3.2](#)), and (iii) emulating any network (with linear projections) in-context ([Section 3.3](#)).

#### 3.1 In-Context Emulation of Attention

We first define the input prompt with weight encoding.

**Definition 3.1** (Input of In-Context Emulation of Attention). Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ , and  $W_K, W_Q, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d}$  denote the parameter matrices of the target attention we wish to emulate in-context. Define  $k, q, v$  as the flatten version of  $W_K, W_V, W_Q$  respectively:

$$k := \operatorname{vec}(W_K) \in \mathbb{R}^{dd_h}, \quad q := \operatorname{vec}(W_Q) \in \mathbb{R}^{dd_h}, \quad v := \operatorname{vec}(W_V) \in \mathbb{R}^{dd_h}.$$

Define  $w$  as the concatenation of  $k, q, v$ , written as

$$w := \begin{bmatrix} k \\ q \\ v \end{bmatrix} = [k; q; v] \in \mathbb{R}^{3dd_h}.$$

Finally, we define the input of in-context emulation of a attention head specified by  $W_K, W_Q, W_V$ :

$$X_p = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad W := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \cdot w & 1 \cdot w & 2 \cdot w & \cdots & (n-1) \cdot w \\ w & w & w & \cdots & w \end{bmatrix}.$$

We then propose multi-head attention network approximating attention in-context with input in the form of [Definition 3.1](#).

**Theorem 3.1 (In-Context Emulation of Attention).** Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  denote the input sequence. Let  $W_K \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d}$ ,  $W_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d}$ ,  $W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  denote the parameter matrix of the *target* attention we wish to emulate in-context. Let  $X_p$  be as defined in [Definition 3.1](#). There exists a layer of multi-head attention  $\text{Attn}_m$  connected with a layer of single-head attention  $\text{Attn}_s$  such that

$$\|\text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Attn}_m(X_p) - W_V X \text{Softmax}((W_K X)^\top W_Q X)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{for any } \epsilon > 0.$$

*Proof.* See [Section 4.1](#) for the proof sketch and [Appendix B.5](#) for a detailed proof.  $\square$

We formulate [Theorem 3.1](#) in an alternative form, single-head attention followed by multi-head attention with sequence-wise linear connections approximating attention in-context as follow.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  denote the input sequence. Let  $W_K, W_Q, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  denote the parameter matrices of the *target* attention we wish to emulate in-context, bounded in infinite norm. For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a self-attention  $\text{Attn}_s$  followed by multi-head attention with linear connections that satisfies:

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{3n} \text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) - \underbrace{W_V X}_{n \times n} \text{Softmax} \left( \underbrace{(W_K X)^\top W_Q X}_{n \times n} \right) \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon.$$

*Proof.* See [Section 4.2](#) for the proof sketch and [Appendix B.6](#) for a detailed proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.1.** [Theorem 3.1](#) and [Theorem 3.2](#) both establish the existence of a multi-head attention network capable of approximating attention in-context. We present both results in distinct mathematical formulations and we prove them using different analytical techniques. In particular, [Theorem 3.1](#) embeds task information into the token representation, keeping the sequence length fixed. [Theorem 3.2](#) provides an alternative version of the result by applying linear transformation to the input sequence while maintaining a reasonable token dimension.

**Remark 3.2.** Our constructions may contain non-standard choices, including context along embedding space and  $3n$  attention heads. We emphasize that the methods apply to approximate a more realistic attention with fewer hidden dimensions and number of heads in practice. [Section 5](#) provides further details.

**Extension: Modern Hopfield Networks.** We extend our results to in-context optimization ability of dense associative memory models [[Ramsauer et al., 2021](#)] in [Appendix C](#).

## 3.2 In-Context Emulation of Statistical Models

[Theorem 3.2](#) forms the basis for the following [Corollary 3.2.1](#) by showing that an attention mechanism approximates attention in-context when the weights of the target attention head are embedded in the input prompt. We extend the formulation by replacing the embedded attention weights with the weights of an arbitrary statistical algorithm we aim to emulate. This substitution applies

the same principles to enable the attention network to emulate the behavior of diverse statistical models within the in-context learning framework.

**Corollary 3.2.1** (In-Context Emulation of Statistical Methods). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the set of all the in-context algorithms that a single-layer attention is able to approximate. For an  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  (that is, a specific algorithm), let  $W_K^a, W_Q^a, W_V^a$  denote the weights of the attention that implements this algorithm. For any  $\epsilon > 0$  and any finite set  $\mathcal{A}_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ , there exists a 2-layer attention  $\text{Attn} \circ \text{Attn}_m$  such that:

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{3n} \text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W^a \end{bmatrix} \right) - a(X) \right\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}_0,$$

where  $W^a$  is the  $W$  defined as [Definition 3.1](#) using  $W_K^a, W_Q^a, W_V^a$ .

*Proof.* See [Appendix B.7](#) for detailed proof. □

We show that a fixed attention module emulates an arbitrary finite library of in-context algorithms by varying its prompt. This construction highlights the flexibility of softmax attention: unlike previous work that requires re-training or fine-tuning of the model [[Bai et al., 2023](#)], we adjust the prompt alone to switch among *any* number of algorithms to within precision  $\epsilon$ . This ability to emulate statistical models through prompt construction implies that a Transformer model learns from a small group of methods but deploy them over a large space of data. Because there are far fewer distinct algorithms than there are possible data distributions, a model internalizes the procedures and applies them to synthesize representations for various new inputs.

### 3.3 Attention Makes Every Network In-Context

We extend the above observation to softmax attention emulating every network with linear transformation in-context. We argue that for any linear transformation in a network, there exists an attention module that approximate this linear transformation in-context.

**Remark 3.3** (In-Context Emulation of Linear Layers). Consider any linear map  $x \mapsto \theta x$  with coefficient  $\theta$ . Our main result implies that if  $\theta$  is provided as part of the input sequence, a fixed softmax attention module approximates this linear transformation to arbitrary precision in-context. Thus, in architectures that rely on trainable linear projections, we replace selected linear layers with attention mechanisms and thereby parameterize those layers via the input rather than via learned weights. This modification allows the network to be capable of in-context learning.

## 4 Proof Sketches

We present our proof strategies here.




Figure 2: **Visualization of Proof Sketch for Theorem 3.1.** We visualize our proof technique. We combine input data, weight encoding, and position encoding into  $X_p$  as input to the multi-head attention  $\text{Attn}_m$  to recover approximate key, query, and value representations. We then compare the single-head attention  $\text{Attn}_s$  outputs from approximate values with ground truth values to obtain approximation error.

#### 4.1 Proof Sketch for Theorem 3.1

We construct a two-layer Transformer (single-head layer  $\text{Attn}_s$  followed by multi-head layer  $\text{Attn}_m$ ) that replicates the target attention to within any error  $\epsilon > 0$ . Recall from Theorem 3.1:

$$\| \underbrace{\text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Attn}_m}_{\text{Step 2}}(X_p) - W_V X \text{Softmax}((W_K X)^\top W_Q X) \|_\infty \leq \epsilon. \quad \begin{matrix} \text{Step 3} \\ \text{Step 1} \end{matrix}$$

The high-level idea is: **(Step 1)** augment the input with a prompt encoding of the target weights  $W_K, W_Q, W_V$ , **(Step 2)** use groups of heads in  $\text{Attn}_m$  to recover the matrices  $K = W_K X, Q = W_Q X, V = W_V X$  in-context (up to small error), and **(Step 3)** apply  $\text{Attn}_s$  with fixed weights to assemble the attention output using these reconstructed  $K, Q, V$ . We then argue in **(Step 4)** the approximation error can be made  $< \epsilon$  via a stability bound on softmax attention.

**Step 1: In-Context Weight Encoding.** Augment the input  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  by appending special tokens encoding the matrices  $W_K, W_Q, W_V$ ; denote the augmented input as  $X_p$ . This lets the transformer “read” the relevant weight parameters in its attention heads.

Explicitly, embed both the data sequence and the target head into the input:

$$X_p = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad W := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \cdot w & 1 \cdot w & 2 \cdot w & \cdots & (n-1) \cdot w \\ w & w & w & \cdots & w \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $w = [k^\top, q^\top, v^\top]^\top$  concatenates every row of  $W_K, W_Q, W_V$  following [Definition 3.1](#). The block  $I_n$  provides token-position codes that our construction will exploit.

**Step 2: Multi-Head Decomposition for In-Context Recovery of  $K, Q, V$ .** We devote the first attention layer ( $\text{Attn}_m$ ) to recovering the key, query, and value matrices that the target attention would compute. This layer has a fixed number of heads partitioned into *three groups*, corresponding to  $K, Q$ , and  $V$  respectively. The goal is to produce, for each data token  $x_i$  (the  $i$ -th column of  $X$ ), an embedding that contains the vectors  $k_i := W_K x_i$ ,  $q_i := W_Q x_i$ , and  $v_i := W_V x_i$ . We achieve this by constructing each head to output part of a linear mapping  $A_h$ , and then combining head outputs within each group. Explicitly, in the first multi-head layer  $\text{Attn}_m$ , split the heads so that:

- A group of heads jointly approximates  $W_K X$ . By [\[Hu et al., 2025a, Theorem 3.2\]](#), each head can be constructed to output linear transformations of  $X$  and the appended tokens, simulating  $k_i^\top x$  for columns  $k_i$  of  $W_K$ .
- Another group of heads approximates  $W_Q X$  in a similar manner.
- A final group approximates  $W_V X$ .

Concatenate or combine these head outputs so that the final embedding from  $\text{Attn}_m(X_p)$  contains (up to small error) the blocks  $[K; Q; V]$  for all positions in  $X$ .

Explicitly, for each hidden row  $k_j$  of  $W_K$  (similarly  $q_j, v_j$ ) we prepend a token-wise linear map  $A_h$  that pulls out this row from  $w$  and repeats it  $n$  times. The resulting sub-prompt has the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ k_j \mathbb{1}_{1 \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix},$$

so a softmax head can learn a piecewise-constant mapping that returns  $k_j^\top X$  up to any error  $\epsilon_0$  by the truncated-linear interpolation lemma ([Theorem B.1](#)). With  $H = \lceil 2(b-a)/((n-2)\epsilon_0) \rceil$  heads per group we cover all  $d_h$  rows; altogether the  $3N = 3d_h H$  heads satisfy

$$\underbrace{\left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \text{Attn}_j^K(X_p) - K \right\|_\infty}_{:=K'} \leq \epsilon_0, \quad \underbrace{\left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \text{Attn}_j^Q(X_p) - Q \right\|_\infty}_{:=Q'} \leq \epsilon_0, \quad \underbrace{\left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \text{Attn}_j^V(X_p) - V \right\|_\infty}_{:=V'} \leq \epsilon_0.$$

We collect these outputs column-wise into

$$\begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_0.$$

**Step 3: Single-Head Assembly for Emulated Map.** We consider the second layer  $\text{Attn}_s$  as a single-head attention with fixed weights chosen to “read” the  $K', Q', V'$  triples from  $Z :=$

$\text{Attn}_m(X_p)$  and perform the attention formula. Explicitly, apply a single-head attention layer  $\text{Attn}_s$  whose parameters are set to read off the  $K$ ,  $Q$ , and  $V$  sub-blocks in each token embedding:

$$\text{Attn}_s(Z) := W_V^{(s)} Z \text{Softmax}((W_K^{(s)} Z)^\top (W_Q^{(s)} Z)).$$

For  $Z := \text{Attn}_m(X_p)$ , we choose fixed weights

$$W_K^{(s)} = [0_{n \times 2n} \quad I_n], \quad W_Q^{(s)} = [I_n \quad 0_{n \times 2n}], \quad W_V^{(s)} = [0_{n \times n} \quad I_n \quad 0_{n \times n}],$$

so that

$$W_K^{(s)} Z \approx W_K X, \quad W_Q^{(s)} Z \approx W_Q X, \quad W_V^{(s)} Z \approx W_V X.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Attn}_s(\text{Attn}_m([Z])) &= \text{Attn}_s\left(\begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix}\right) = V' X \text{Softmax}((K' X)^\top Q' X) \\ &\approx W_V X \text{Softmax}((W_K X)^\top W_Q X). \end{aligned}$$

To be precise, because  $K', Q', V'$  differ from  $K, Q, V$  by at most  $\epsilon_0$ , a first-order perturbation argument for softmax (uniform Lipschitz in sup-norm) shows

$$\left\| \text{Attn}_s\left(\begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix}\right) - \text{Attn}_s\left(\begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix}\right) \right\| \leq \epsilon + n B_{KQV} \epsilon_1,$$

where  $B_{KQV}$  bounds  $X, W_K, W_Q, W_V$  and  $\epsilon_1 = O(\epsilon_0)$ .

**Step 4: Error Bound.** Finally, we argue that the approximation can be made arbitrarily precise. Because each head's linear approximation can be made arbitrarily close, we can ensure

$$\left\| \text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Attn}_m([X; W]) - W_V X \text{Softmax}((W_K X)^\top W_Q X) \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon,$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . This completes the construction, proving in-context emulation of the target attention. Please see [Appendix B.5](#) for a detailed proof and [Figure 2](#) for proof visualization.

## 4.2 Proof Sketch for [Theorem 3.2](#)

We outline how to emulate the desired attention step-by-step with a fixed two-layer transformer. Similar to [Theorem 3.1](#) (and [Theorem B.1](#)), our construction ensures each token's representation in the intermediate layer carries an approximate copy of its key, query, and value vectors, which the final layer uses to perform the softmax attention. All necessary components (including the weight matrices  $W_K, W_Q, W_V$  themselves) are encoded into the input, so the network's weights remain untrained and generic.




Figure 3: **Visualization of Proof Sketch for Theorem 3.2.** We visualize our proof technique. We combine input data and weight encoding as input. Each key, query, and value has a unique set of linear transformation of input (Linear) and multi-head attention ( $\text{Attn}_m$ ). We feed the input into each set to attain the approximate key, query, and value representations, respectively. We then compare the single-head attention  $\text{Attn}_s$  outputs from approximate values with ground truth values to obtain approximation error.

**Step 1: Encoding Weights into the Input.** Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  be the input tokens. Append a “weight encoding” matrix  $W$  that contained the rows of  $W_K, W_Q, W_V$  (the weight matrices of the target attention head). This forms an extended input  $[X; W]$ . The entries of  $X$  and  $W$  stay in a bounded range  $[a, b]$ . This bound ensures all inner products remain finite.

**Step 2: Multi-Head Approximation of  $K, Q, V$ .** The first layer,  $\text{Attn}_m$ , has many heads. Partition them into three groups. One group approximates  $K = W_K X$ , one approximates  $Q = W_Q X$ , and one approximates  $V = W_V X$ . Then

- **Simulating Dot Products on a 1D Grid.** Consider a single coordinate  $k_j^\top x_c$ . We create reference tokens in  $W$  for grid points  $t_0 < \dots < t_M$  covering  $[a, b]$ . We fix the head’s query so it places softmax weight on the reference token whose  $t_i$  is closest to  $k_j^\top x_c$ . We set the value vector at that token to encode  $t_i$ . Thus, the head output for token  $x_c$  approximates  $k_j^\top x_c$ . Fine grids reduce the error.
- **Reconstructing Full  $K, Q, V$ .** Repeat this idea for every coordinate in  $K, Q, V$ . Each coordinate uses one or more heads to approximate  $k_j^\top x_c, q_j^\top x_c$  or  $v_j^\top x_c$ . Combine these approximations to get matrices  $K', Q', V'$ . The sup norm

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty, \quad \text{can be made arbitrarily small.}$$

**Step 3: Single-Head Assembly of the Attention Output.** The second layer,  $\text{Attn}_s$ , has one head.

We set its weight matrices  $W_K^{(s)}, W_Q^{(s)}, W_V^{(s)}$  to pick out  $K', Q', V'$  from each token’s embedding. Then,  $\text{Attn}_s$  computes

$$V' \text{Softmax}((K')^\top Q') \approx W_V X \text{Softmax}((W_K X)^\top W_Q X),$$

since  $K' \approx K, Q' \approx Q$  and  $V' \approx V$ .

**Step 4: Error Bound.** Softmax and matrix multiplication are continuous. Small errors in  $K', Q', V'$  cause a small error in the final output. By refining the grid (and using enough heads), we make the sup norm error below any  $\epsilon > 0$ . Please see [Appendix B.6](#) for a detailed proof and [Figure 3](#) for proof visualization.

## 5 Numerical Studies

This section provides numerical results to back up our theory. We validate that the frozen softmax attention approximates (i) continuous functions ([Section 5.1](#)), (ii) attention heads ([Section 5.2](#)), and (iii) statistical algorithms ([Section 5.3](#)) using synthetic data. Moreover, in [Section 5.4](#), we show that the attention model approximates statistical models with low approximation error using real-world dataset where the model does not have access to true algorithm weights. It illustrates the approximation capabilities of a Transformer in practice.

We conduct all experiments using NVIDIA RTX 2080 GPU. Our code is based on standard PyTorch modules.

### 5.1 Proof-of-Concept Experiment on [Theorem 2.1](#)

**Objective: Verifying Attention Approximates  $f(w^\top x - y)x$ .** We investigate accuracy of softmax attention approximating  $f(w^\top x - y)x$  by training a single-head softmax attention with linear connection.

**Data Generation.** We randomly generate  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  drawn from a normal distribution,  $X \sim 10 \cdot N(0, 1) - 5$ . We also generate weight matrix  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , both randomly drawn from a standard normal distribution,  $N(0, 1)$ . Here,  $n$  represents the sequence length and  $d$  represents input dimension. The true label is  $f(w^\top x - y)x$ , where we choose  $f(\cdot) = \tanh(\cdot)$ .

**Model Architecture.** We train a single-head attention network with linear transformation to approximate  $\tanh(w^\top x - y)x$ . We first apply linear transformation to both  $[X; y]$  and  $W$ . We then




Figure 4: **Train and Test Loss.** We report loss (MSE) of the model. We use synthetic data of 50000 data points with sequence length being 20 and input dimension being 24. We set batch size to be 32, hidden dimension to be 64, and interpolation point to be 60. The optimizer used is Adam with learning rate 0.001. The result shows that only after 19 epochs of training, both the training and testing loss reduces to almost 0, i.e. train loss is 0.0028 and test loss is 0.0003.

train the single-head attention model with the linear transformations to approximate our target function as shown in the proof of [Theorem 2.1](#).

**Results.** As shown in [Figure 4](#), evaluated on Mean Square Error loss, the model approximates the target  $\tanh(w^\top x - y)x$  with minimal error. This experiment proves our theory.

## 5.2 Proof-of-Concept Experiment on Emulating Attention Heads

**Objective: Verifying Approximation Rates.** We investigate the affect of the number of attention heads  $H$  on the accuracy of softmax attention approximating softmax attention head.

**Data Generation.** We randomly generate a sequence of tokens  $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ , where each entry  $x_i$  is drawn independently from a normal distribution,

$$X \sim 2 \cdot N(0, 1) - 1.$$

We also generate weight matrices  $K = W_K X^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times n}$ ,  $Q = W_Q X^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times n}$ , and  $V = W_V X^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ . Each parameter matrix is randomly drawn from a standard normal distribution,  $N(0, 1)$ . Here,  $n$  represents the sequence length,  $d$  represents token dimension, and  $h$  represents hidden dimension. The true label  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  results from applying a single-layer softmax attention mechanism on inputs  $X$ ,  $K$ ,  $Q$ , and  $V$ .

**Model Architecture.** We train a multi-layer attention network to approximate softmax attention function. We first train separate multi-head models with linear transformation to approximate  $K$ ,  $Q$ , and  $V$ . Then, we use a single-head softmax attention layer to approximate softmax attention function as in the proof.

**Results.** As shown in [Figure 5](#) and [Table 1](#), the result validates our claim that a multi-head softmax attention mimics a target softmax attention head to arbitrary precision. Moreover, it demonstrates the convergence of multi-head softmax attention emulating softmax-based attention mapping as the number of heads increases. The approximation rate is in the trend of  $O(1/H)$  where  $H$  is the number of heads. The small and decreasing MSE error indicates that the simple softmax attention model approximates softmax attention head with stability.




Figure 5: **Sensitivity of Attention Emulation to the Number of Heads.** We report loss (MSE) as the mean and one standard deviation (shaded region) over 10 random seed runs. We use synthetic data of 50000 data points with sequence length being 20 and input dimension being 24. We set batch size to be 32 and hidden dimension to be 48. Each multi-head model and the single-head softmax attention layer is trained for 50 epochs. The optimizer used is Adam with learning rate 0.001. We visualize the performance (MSE  $\pm$  Std) for 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12 heads.

Table 1: **Sensitivity to the Number of Heads.** Emulation MSE (mean  $\pm$  std) for multi-head softmax attention with 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 12 heads.

Heads	1	2	4	6	8	12
MSE	3.469	2.802	1.222	1.012	0.793	0.686
Std	0.381	0.413	0.603	0.204	0.127	0.171

### 5.3 Proof-of-Concept Experiment on Emulating Statistical Models

**Objective: Emulation of Statistical Models.** We investigate the accuracy of a frozen softmax attention approximating statistical models including Lasso, Ridge and linear regression by only varying the input prompts.

**Data Generation.** We simulate an in-context dataset by randomly generating a sequence of input tokens  $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ , where each  $x_i$  is independently drawn from a scaled standard normal distribution,

$$x_i \sim 2 \cdot N(0, 1) - 1.$$

A task-specific prompt vector  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times 1}$  is sampled from  $N(0, 1)$ . In the case of Lasso, we randomly zero out entries in  $w$  with probability 0.5 to induce sparsity. We generate the output sequence  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$  via a noisy linear projection:  $Y = Xw + \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$  is Gaussian noise. For Ridge, we calculate weights using  $(X^\top X + \lambda I_d)^{-1} X^\top Y$  with  $\lambda = 5$ .

**Model Architecture and Training.** We use a mixture of statistical data to train a single-layer attention network with linear transformation. Each input sample consists of  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and algorithm-specific prompt  $w \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . We replicate  $w$  across the sequence length and concatenate it with  $X$  along the feature dimension to obtain an augmented input  $[X; w] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (d+p)}$ . We pass it through a multi-head attention layer. We train the model for 300 epochs using the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001. We use 6 attention heads, a hidden dimension of 48, an input dimension of 24, a batch size of 32, and 50000 synthetic samples. After training, we freeze the attention weights, resulting in a fixed softmax attention layer. We evaluate the frozen model on its ability to emulate various statistical algorithms using test data.

**Baseline Architecture.** We train three separate attention models for Lasso, Ridge, and linear regression. That is, each attention model weights are adaptive to its corresponding algorithm. We use these models as baselines for comparison with the frozen attention model we propose. All baseline models use the same hyper-parameters as the frozen model.

**Results.** As shown in [Table 2](#), we compare mean MSE and standard deviation over 5 random seed runs for the frozen attention model against baseline for Lasso, Ridge, and linear regression on the synthetic data. The frozen attention model performs as well as the baseline models trained individually on each algorithm. It achieves lower MSE on Lasso and linear regression tasks compared to their corresponding baselines. It shows that a frozen attention mechanism generalizes across these tasks given task-specific prompts. Moreover, the frozen model exhibits lower variance across all tasks, suggesting increased stability and robustness. These results support our claim that a frozen softmax attention layer, when conditioned on task-specific prompts, emulates statistical algorithms in context without much performance degradation.

Table 2: **Comparison Between Baseline and Frozen Attention Layer on Synthetic Dataset.** We compare loss (MSE) as the mean and one standard deviation over 5 random seed runs for baseline vs. frozen model on different algorithms. We train on 50000 training data points evaluate on 10000 testing data points for each algorithm.

Model	Lasso	Ridge Regression	Linear Regression
Baseline	0.068±0.015	0.004±0.0003	0.147±0.067
Frozen Attention	0.059±0.001	0.071±0.0002	0.120±0.003

## 5.4 Real-World Experiment on Emulating Statistical Models

**Objective: Real-World Emulation of Statistical Models.** Building on Section 5.3, we use real-world data to investigate the accuracy of a frozen softmax attention emulating algorithms.

**Data Collection and Processing.** We collect data from Ames Housing Dataset [De Cock, 2011]. This dataset consists of 2930 observations and 79 features. We process the data by log-transforming the target variable, encoding categorical variables with one-hot vectors, replacing missing entries with median values, and standardizing numerical features. The resulting data consists of 262 features. We fit the processed data to Lasso, Ridge, and linear regression models to obtain algorithm weights as part of the input.

**Model Architecture and Training.** We use a mixture of statistical data to train a single-layer attention network with linear transformation. The input is passed through a multi-head attention layer with a linear transformation. We train the model for 300 epochs using the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001. We use 8 attention heads, a hidden dimension of 524, and a batch size of 32. After training, we freeze the attention weights, resulting in a fixed softmax attention layer. The frozen model is then evaluated on its ability to emulate various statistical algorithms using test data. We train the baseline models the same way as the synthetic experiment.

Table 3: **Comparison Between Baseline and Frozen Attention Layer on Ames Housing Dataset.** We compare loss (MSE) as the mean and one standard deviation over 5 random seed runs for baseline vs. frozen model on different algorithms. We train on 80% training data and evaluate on 20% testing data for each algorithm.

Model	Lasso	Ridge Regression	Linear Regression
Baseline	0.0354±0.0000	0.0132±0.0000	0.0288±0.0000
Frozen Attention	0.0322±0.0000	0.0252±0.0000	0.0250±0.0000

**Results.** As shown in Table 3, we compare mean MSE and standard deviation over 5 random seed runs for the frozen attention model against baseline for Lasso, Ridge, and linear regression on Ames Housing Data. The results shows the frozen attention model performs as well as the baseline models trained individually. We use an auxiliary network to approximate the required weight

encoding. Our experiment validates that the mechanism works even when the exact weights are not supplied in real world scenarios.

## 6 Discussion and Conclusion

We build a tight theoretical connection between in-context learning and algorithmic emulation in transformer models. We show that a multi-head attention-only architecture with two frozen layers emulates a broad class of algorithms by embedding the algorithm’s weights into the input prompt. We then prove that even a single-layer, single-head frozen attention module suffices to emulate certain task-specific attention maps, achieving architectural minimality with no feed-forward networks, no additional parameters, and one attention head. This view explains how Transformers swap algorithms during in-context learning: rather than retraining or storing separate weights for each task, large pretrained models function as universal algorithm libraries, programmed through the prompt. Viewing prompts as callable subroutines may guide better prompt engineering, simplify pretraining objectives, and clarify how foundation models select algorithms. This view explains the breadth of in-context generalization in practice and informs better prompt design. Moving forward, we expect viewing prompts as callable subroutines to inform better prompt engineering, simplify pretraining objectives, and clarify how foundation models internally select algorithms.

### Impact Statement

We prove that a single frozen softmax attention head emulates a broad library of attention-implementable algorithms via prompt design, establishing pretrained Transformers as universal algorithm stores and reducing the need for task-specific fine-tuning. This sharpens the theoretical basis of in-context learning, offers a principled recipe for prompt engineering, and equips auditors with a clear test for hidden prompt-encoded behaviors, all without releasing new models or data. Therefore, the work advances foundational understanding, lowers compute and energy demands, and introduces minimal societal risk.

### Limitations and Future Direction

Prompt length grows linearly with the weight dimension, which limits practicality. The proofs assume exact real-valued softmax and ignore token discretizations or numerical noise. Prompts are hand-crafted. Learning them automatically is open. Language and vision inputs are untested. Weight encoding happens along embedding dimension. The construction is not permutation invariant, but permutation equivariant of the input data. Lastly, we leave tighter constants, shorter prompts, and extensions to deeper models to future work.

## Acknowledgments

JH would like to thank Alex Reneau, Yingyu Liang, Mimi Gallagher, Sara Sanchez, T.Y. Ball, Dino Feng and Andrew Chen for valuable conversations; Hong-Yu Chen, Maojiang Su, Weimin Wu, Zhao Song and Pin-Yu Chen for collaborations on related topics; the Red Maple Family for support; and Jiayi Wang for facilitating experimental deployments. The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and program chairs for constructive comments.

JH is partially supported by Ensemble AI and Northwestern University. Han Liu is partially supported by NIH R01LM1372201, NSF AST-2421845, Simons Foundation MPS-AI-00010513, AbbVie and Dolby. This research was supported in part through the computational resources and staff contributions provided for the Quest high performance computing facility at Northwestern University which is jointly supported by the Office of the Provost, the Office for Research, and Northwestern University Information Technology. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the funding agencies.

Typeset with a modified LaTeX template of 1712.09542 [hep-th] by Yuji Tachikawa [[Tachikawa, 2020](#)].

# Appendix

<b>A</b>	<b>Related Work</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Proofs of Main Text</b>	<b>22</b>
B.1	Proof of <a href="#">Theorem 2.1</a>	37
B.2	Proof of <a href="#">Corollary 2.1.2</a>	42
B.3	Proof of <a href="#">Theorem 2.2</a>	43
B.4	Proof of <a href="#">Theorem 2.3</a>	43
B.5	Proof of <a href="#">Theorem 3.1</a>	44
B.6	Proof of <a href="#">Theorem 3.2</a>	50
B.7	Proof of <a href="#">Corollary 3.2.1</a>	61
<b>C</b>	<b>In-Context Application of Statistical Methods by Modern Hopfield Network</b>	<b>62</b>

## A Related Work

**Universal Approximation and Expressivity of Transformers.** Transformers exhibit strong expressive power as sequence models. Recent theory shows even minimal Transformer architectures approximate broad classes of functions. [Kajitsuka and Sato \[2024\]](#), [Hu et al. \[2025b\]](#) prove a single-layer, single-head Transformer can memorize any finite dataset perfectly. [Kajitsuka and Sato \[2024\]](#) achieve this with low-rank attention matrices, while [Hu et al. \[2025b\]](#) use attention matrices of any rank. Adding two small feed-forward layers makes it a universal approximator for continuous sequence functions under permutation-equivariance. More recently, [Hu et al. \[2025a\]](#) show self-attention layers alone are universal approximators. Specifically, two attention-only layers approximate continuous sequence-to-sequence mappings, and even a single softmax-attention layer suffices for universal approximation. Similarly, [Liu et al. \[2025\]](#) also demonstrate that one single-head attention connected with linear transformations is sufficient to approximate any continuous function in  $L_\infty$  norm. These results eliminate the need for feed-forward networks, improving on earlier constructions. Overall, these findings highlight the inherent expressiveness of minimal attention mechanisms.

**Transformers as In-Context Learners and Algorithm Emulators.** Large Transformers also learn in-context by conditioning on examples in their prompts, without updating weights [[Brown et al., 2020](#)]. Recent work formally explains this by showing attention-based models implement standard learning algorithms internally. [Bai et al. \[2023\]](#) construct Transformer heads executing algorithms such as linear regression, ridge regression, Lasso, and gradient descent steps, achieving near-optimal predictions. [Wu et al. \[2025\]](#) further build Transformers explicitly simulating multiple gradient descent iterations for training deep neural networks, with provable convergence guarantees. Empirical and theoretical studies confirm Transformers internalize learning algorithms when meta-trained on task families. [Garg et al. \[2022\]](#) show meta-trained Transformers mimic classical algorithms, such as ordinary least squares regression, in-context. Similarly, [Akyürek](#)

et al. [2023], Von Oswald et al. [2023], Zhang et al. [2024] analyze Transformers trained on linear regression tasks and demonstrate their outputs mimic gradient descent steps precisely. Overall, existing literature shows that sufficiently trained or carefully designed Transformers emulate step-by-step computations of standard algorithms through prompt conditioning.

**Prompt Tuning.** Prompt-tuning adapts frozen models by learning a short continuous prefix [Lester et al., 2021, Li and Liang, 2021, Liu et al., 2022]. It keeps backbone weights fixed and updates only prompt embeddings. Our setting is stricter: prompts are hand-designed, not learned, and we give exact approximation bounds. Thus we expose the theoretical limit of prompt control: a single frozen softmax head can mimic any task-specific head.

**Encoding Context Along Embedding Dimension.** Recent work in in-context learning explores encoding and manipulating context in the embedding space rather than sequence dimension. For example, Liu et al. [2024] propose In-Context Vectors for steering the model’s behavior by adding task-specific vectors along the embedding space. Zhuang et al. [2025] extend this idea by showing that manipulating embedding vectors such as interpolation makes in-context learning more controllable. Abernethy et al. [2024] showcase that appending additional information along the embedding dimension allows the model to perform sample-efficient in-context learning.

**Comparison to Our Work.** The above results demonstrate the versatility of Transformer networks, but they require task-specific weights, training, or learned prompts. For instance, Bai et al. [2023] design a different task-specific head for each algorithm of interest, raising the question of whether a single fixed attention mechanism could instead serve as a universal emulator for any algorithm given the right prompt. Our work directly addresses this question. In contrast, we prove one fixed softmax head emulates any specialized head through prompt encoding alone. No additional weights or training are required. Even the simplest attention (one layer, one head) acts as a universal algorithm emulator when given the right prompt, shifting focus from architecture to prompt design.

## B Proofs of Main Text

To prepare our proofs, we state the following axillary definitions and lemmas.

**Definition B.1** (Truncated Linear Function). We define the truncated linear function as follows:

$$\text{Range}_{[a,b]}(x) = \begin{cases} a & x \leq a, \\ x & a \leq x \leq b, \\ b & b \leq x. \end{cases}$$

Intuitively,  $\text{Range}_{[a,b]}(\cdot)$  is the part of a linear function whose value is in  $[a, b]$ .

We then define the interpolation points in  $[a, b]$  that are used in later proofs.

**Definition B.2** (Interpolation). Let  $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an interval with  $a \leq b$  and let  $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$  be a positive integer. We define

$$\tilde{L}_0^{[a,b]} := a, \quad \tilde{L}_p^{[a,b]} := b, \quad \tilde{L}_i^{[a,b]} := a + \frac{i}{p}(b-a), \quad i = [p-1].$$

Hence,  $\tilde{L}_0 < \tilde{L}_1 < \dots < \tilde{L}_p$  forms a uniform partition of  $[a, b]$ . We also write

$$\Delta L := \tilde{L}_i^{[a,b]} - \tilde{L}_{i-1}^{[a,b]}, \quad i \in [p].$$

We often omit the superscript  $[a, b]$  when the context is clear.

We also propose the following lemma to show Hardmax property that is capable of being approximated by Softmax.

**Lemma B.1** (Lemma E.1 in [Hu et al., 2025a]: Approximating Hardmax with Finite-Temperature Softmax). Let  $x = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ . The following statements hold:

- **Case of a Unique Largest Entry.** Assume  $x_1 = \max_{i \in [n]} x_i$  is unique, and  $x_2 = \max_{i \in [n] \setminus \{1\}} x_i$ . Then, if  $\beta \geq (\ln(n-1) - \ln(\epsilon))/(x_1 - x_2)$ , we have

$$\left\| \text{Softmax}_{\beta}(x) - e_1 \right\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon,$$

where  $e_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the one-hot vector corresponding to the maximal entry of  $x$  (i.e.,  $x_1$ ).

- **Case of Two Largest Entries (Tied or Separated by  $\delta$ ).** Assume  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are the first and second largest entries, respectively, with  $\delta = x_1 - x_2 \geq 0$ . Let  $x_3$  be the third largest entry. Then, if  $\beta \geq (\ln(n-2) - \ln(\epsilon))/(x_1 - x_3)$ , we have

$$\left\| \text{Softmax}_{\beta}(x) - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_1 - \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_2 \right\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon.$$

The following technical lemma is used in the proof of **Theorem B.1**.

**Lemma B.2** (Refined Version of Lemma F.2 in [Hu et al., 2025a]: Cases of All Heads in Attn<sup>H</sup>). For  $a \in [\tilde{L}_0, \tilde{L}_{H(n-2)}]$ . For any  $h \in [H]$ , define three cases of the relationship between  $a$  and  $h$

- **Case 1:**  $a \in [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1}]$ ,
- **Case 2:**  $a \notin [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}]$ .
- **Case 3:**  $a \in [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}] \cup [\tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}]$ .

These cases includes all possible situation. Then for all  $h$ , only two cases exists

- $a$  falls in Case 1 for an  $h$  and Case 2 for all others.
- $a$  falls in Case 3 for two adjacent  $h$  and Case 2 for all others.

*Proof.* Because  $a \in [\tilde{L}_0, \tilde{L}_{H(n-2)}]$  and

$$[\tilde{L}_0, \tilde{L}_{H(n-2)}] = \cup_{h=1}^H [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}],$$

we have

$$a \in [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)}] \quad (\text{B.1})$$

for an arbitrary  $h_a$ .

This leads to only two possible cases

- Case 1\*:  $a \in [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)-1}]$ .
- Case 2\*:  $a \in [\tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)}]$ .

**Case 1\*:**  $a \in [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)-1}]$ . Because  $a \in [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)-1}]$ , for  $h \neq h_a$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-2}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)} &< \tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, & h < h_a \\ \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)+1}, \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1} &\geq \tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)-1}, & h > h_a. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)-1}] \cap [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}] &= \emptyset \\ [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)-1}] \cap [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}] &= \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

for all  $h \neq h_a$ .

This means that  $a$  does not fall into Case 1 nor Case 3 for other  $h \in [H]$ . Thus  $a$  has to fall into Case 2 for other  $h$ .

**Case 2\*:**  $a \in [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)+1}] \cup [\tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h_a(n-2)}]$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $a$  to be in the left half  $[\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)+1}]$ . Because

$$\begin{aligned} [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)+1}] &= [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}], & (\text{Case 3 of } h_a - 1) \\ [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)+1}] &= [\tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{(h_a-1)(n-2)}], & (\text{Case 3 of } h_a) \end{aligned}$$

this means  $a$  falls into Case 3 for  $h_a$  and  $h_a - 1$ .

This completes the proof. □

We are now ready to prove the refined version of [Hu et al., 2025a, Theorem 3.2].

**Theorem B.1** (Multi-Head Attention Approximate Truncated Linear Models In-Context). Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  be the input. Fix real numbers  $a < b$ , and let the truncation operator  $\text{Range}_{[a,b]}(\cdot)$  follow [Definition B.1](#). Let  $w_s$  denote the linear coefficient of the in-context truncated linear model. Define  $W_s$  as

$$W_s := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \cdot w_s & 1 \cdot w_s & \cdots & (n-1) \cdot w_s \\ w_s & w_s & \cdots & w_s \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times n}.$$

For a precision parameter  $p > n$  with  $\epsilon = O(1/p)$ , number of head  $H = p/(n-2)$ , there exists a single-layer,  $H$ -head self-attention  $\text{Attn}^H$  with a linear transformation  $A : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(3d+n) \times n}$ , such that  $\text{Attn}^H \circ A : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_o \times n}$  satisfies, for any  $i \in [n]$ ,

$$\|\text{Attn}^H \circ A(X)_{:,i} - \text{Range}_{[a,b]}(w_s^\top x_i) e_{\tilde{k}_i}\|_\infty \leq \underbrace{\max\{|a|, |b|\}}_{\text{finite-}\beta \text{ softmax error}} \cdot \epsilon_0 + \underbrace{\frac{b-a}{(n-2)H}}_{\text{interpolation error}}.$$

Here  $e_{\tilde{k}_i}$  is a one-hot vector with a value of 1 at the  $\tilde{k}_i$ -th index and 0 elsewhere,  $\epsilon_0 = O(e^{-\beta\delta})$  following [Lemma B.1](#), and  $\tilde{k}_i \in [d_o]$  is

$$k_i = \underset{k \in \{0,1,\dots,p-1\}}{\text{argmin}} (-2w_s^\top x_i + \tilde{L}_0 + \tilde{L}_k) \cdot k,$$

$$\tilde{k}_i = G(k_i).$$

Here  $G : [p] \rightarrow [d_o]$  denotes any set-to-constant function sending each selected interpolation index  $k_i$  into an appropriate integer  $k_i \in [d_o]$  for  $i \in [n]$ .

*Proof.* Define  $A : \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(3d+n) \times n}$  for the input sequence  $X$  as

$$A(X) := \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} I_{3d} \\ 0_{n \times 3d} \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{token-wise linear}} \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_s \end{bmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{3d \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{positional encoding}} = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_s \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(3d+n) \times n}.$$

Thus,  $A$  is a token-wise linear layer augmented with positional encoding, as it applies a linear projection to each token and then adds a unique per-token bias.

Let  $p$  be a precision parameter, without loss of generality, let it be divisible by  $n-2$  and denote  $p/(n-2)$  as  $H$ .

Now we define the multi-head attention  $\text{Attn}$  of  $H$  heads. Denote  $\ell_k := k(\tilde{L}_k + \tilde{L}_0)$  for  $k \in [p]$  following [Definition B.2](#). We denote the  $h$ -th head as  $\text{Attn}_h$ , and define the weight matrices as

$$W_K^{(h)} = -\beta \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times d} & -2I_d & -2[(h-1)(n-2)-1]I_d & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times d} & \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)-1} & \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)} & \cdots & \ell_{h(n-2)} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$W_Q^{(h)} = \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0_{d \times 2d} & 0_{d \times n} \\ 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times 2d} & 1_{1 \times n} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$W_V^{(h)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d_o \times (3d+1)} & \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)} e_{\tilde{k}_{(h-1)(n-2)}} & \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+1} e_{\tilde{k}_{(h-1)(n-2)+1}} & \cdots & \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1} e_{\tilde{k}_{h(n-2)-1}} & 0_{d_o} \end{bmatrix},$$

for every  $h \in [H]$ .

Here  $\beta > 0$  is a coefficient we use to control the precision of our approximation. The attention reaches higher precision as  $\beta$  gets larger.

With the construction of weights, we are also able to calculate the  $K$ ,  $Q$ ,  $V$  matrices in Attn

$$\begin{aligned} K^{(h)} &:= W_K^{(h)} A(X) \\ &= W_K^{(h)} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_s \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \\ &= W_K^{(h)} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ 0 \cdot w_s & 1 \cdot w_s & \cdots & (n-1) \cdot w_s \\ w_s & w_s & \cdots & w_s \\ e_1^{(n)} & e_2^{(n)} & \cdots & e_n^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= -\beta \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times d} & -2I_d & -2[(h-1)(n-2) - 1]I_d & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times d} & \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)-1} & \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)} & \cdots & \ell_{h(n-2)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ 0 \cdot w_s & 1 \cdot w_s & \cdots & (n-1) \cdot w_s \\ w_s & w_s & \cdots & w_s \\ e_1^{(n)} & e_2^{(n)} & \cdots & e_n^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= -\beta \begin{bmatrix} -2[(h-1)(n-2) - 1]w_s & -2(h-1)(n-2)w_s & \cdots & -2h(n-2)w_s \\ \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)-1} & \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)} & \cdots & \ell_{h(n-2)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times n}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

where the last equality comes from multiplying  $X$  with 0, thus this is a extraction of non-zero entries in  $W_K$ .

For  $Q$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{(h)} &:= W_Q^h A(X) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0_{d \times 2d} & 0_{d \times n} \\ 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times 2d} & 1_{1 \times n} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_s \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} I_d \cdot X + 0_{d \times 2d} \cdot W_s + 0_{d \times n} \cdot I_n \\ 0_{1 \times d} \cdot X + 0_{1 \times 2d} \cdot W_s + 1_{1 \times n} \cdot I_n \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} X \\ 1_{1 \times n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times n}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

For  $V$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{(h)} &:= W_V^{(h)} A(X) \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d_o \times (3d+1)} & \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)} e_{\tilde{k}_{(h-1)(n-2)}} & \cdots & \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1} e_{\tilde{k}_{h(n-2)-1}} & 0_{d_o} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_s \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \underbrace{0}_{d_o \times 3d} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_s \end{bmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{d_o} & \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)} e_{\tilde{k}_{(h-1)(n-2)}} & \cdots & \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1} e_{\tilde{k}_{h(n-2)-1}} & 0_{d_o} \end{bmatrix}}_{d_o \times n} \cdot I_n \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d_o} & \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)} e_{\tilde{k}_{(h-1)(n-2)}} & \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+1} e_{\tilde{k}_{(h-1)(n-2)+1}} & \cdots & \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1} e_{\tilde{k}_{h(n-2)-1}} & 0_{d_o} \end{bmatrix} \\
&\in \mathbb{R}^{d_o \times n}. \tag{B.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Given that all  $\tilde{k}_j$ , where  $j \in [p]$ , share the same number in  $[d_o]$ , we denote this number by  $k_G$ .

Hence we rewrite  $V^{(h)}$  as

$$V^{(h)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d_o} & \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)} e_{k_G} & \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+1} e_{k_G} & \cdots & \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1} e_{k_G} & 0_{d_o} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We define  $m_v$  as

$$m_v := \max\{|a|, |b|\}.$$

By the definition of  $V^{(h)}$ , we have

$$\|V\|_\infty \leq \max_{i \in [p]} \{\tilde{L}_i\} \leq m_v. \tag{B.5}$$

**Remark B.1** (Intuition of the Construction of  $V^{(h)}$ ). As previously mentioned,  $\tilde{L}_i$ , for  $i \in [p]$ , are all the interpolation points. In this context,  $V^{(h)}$  encompasses the  $(n-2)$  elements of these interpolations (i.e.,  $(h-1)(n-2)$  to  $h(n-2)-1$ ). Meanwhile, the value on the two ends of  $V^h$  are both set to  $0_{d_o}$ , because we suppress the head and let it output 0 when the input  $X$  is not close enough to the interpolations of the head.

Now we are ready to calculate the output of each  $\text{Attn}_h$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Attn}_h(A(X)) \\
&= V^{(h)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(h)})^\top Q^{(h)}) \\
&= V^{(h)} \text{Softmax} \left( -\beta \begin{bmatrix} -2[(h-1)(n-2)-1]w & -2(h-1)(n-2)w & \cdots & -2h(n-2)w \\ \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)-1} & \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)} & \cdots & \ell_{h(n-2)} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} X \\ 1_{1 \times n} \end{bmatrix} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where last line is by plug in (B.2) and (B.3). Note the  $i$ -th column of the attention score matrix (the Softmax nested expression) is equivalent to the following expressions

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Softmax}((K^{(h)})^\top Q^{(h)})_{:,i} \\
&= \text{Softmax} \left( -\beta \begin{bmatrix} -2[(h-1)(n-2)-1]w & -2(h-1)(n-2)w & \cdots & -2h(n-2)w \\ \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)-1} & \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)} & \cdots & \ell_{h(n-2)} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} X \\ \mathbf{1}_{1 \times n} \end{bmatrix} \right)_{:,i} \\
&= \text{Softmax} \left( -\beta \begin{bmatrix} -2[(h-1)(n-2)-1]w^\top x_i + \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)-1} \\ -2(h-1)(n-2)w^\top x_i + \ell_{(h-1)(n-2)} \\ \vdots \\ -2h(n-2)w^\top x_i + \ell_{h(n-2)} \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (\text{pick column } i) \\
&= \text{Softmax} \left( -\beta \begin{bmatrix} [(h-1)(n-2)-1](-2w^\top x_i + \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1} + \tilde{L}_0) - 2[(h-1)(n-2)-1]t \\ (h-1)(n-2)(-2w^\top x_i + \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)} + \tilde{L}_0) - 2(h-1)(n-2)t \\ \vdots \\ h(n-2)(-2w^\top x_i + \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)} + \tilde{L}_0) - 2h(n-2)t \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{By } \ell_k = k(\tilde{L}_k + \tilde{L}_0) - 2kt) \\
&= \text{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (-2x_i^\top w - 2t + \tilde{L}_0 + \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}) \cdot [(h-1)(n-2)-1]\Delta L \\ (-2x_i^\top w - 2t + \tilde{L}_0 + \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}) \cdot (h-1)(n-2)\Delta L \\ \vdots \\ (-2x_i^\top w - 2t + \tilde{L}_0 + \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}) \cdot h(n-2)\Delta L \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{By mutiplying and dividing by } \Delta L) \\
&= \text{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (-2x_i^\top w - 2t + \tilde{L}_0 + \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}) \cdot (\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1} - \tilde{L}_0) \\ (-2x_i^\top w - 2t + \tilde{L}_0 + \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}) \cdot (\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)} - \tilde{L}_0) \\ \vdots \\ (-2x_i^\top w - 2t + \tilde{L}_0 + \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}) \cdot (\tilde{L}_{h(n-2)} - \tilde{L}_0) \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{By } k\Delta L = \tilde{L}_k - \tilde{L}_0) \\
&= \text{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (-2x_i^\top w - 2t) \cdot \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1} + (\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1})^2 + (x_i^\top w + t)^2 \\ (-2x_i^\top w - 2t) \cdot \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)} + (\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)})^2 + (x_i^\top w + t)^2 \\ \vdots \\ (-2x_i^\top w - 2t) \cdot \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)} + (\tilde{L}_{h(n-2)})^2 + (x_i^\top w + t)^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&= \text{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (x_i^\top w + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1})^2 \\ (x_i^\top w + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)})^2 \\ \vdots \\ (x_i^\top w + t - \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)})^2 \end{bmatrix} \right). \tag{B.6}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the second-last equality arises from the fact that the softmax function is shift-invariant, allowing us to subtract and add a constant across all coordinates. To be more precise, we first

expand the product for  $k$ -th coordinate of the column vector

$$\begin{aligned}
& (-2x_i^\top w - 2t + \tilde{L}_0 + \tilde{L}_k)(\tilde{L}_k - \tilde{L}_0) \\
&= (-2x_i^\top w - 2t)L_k + L_0L_k + L_k^2 - (-2x_i^\top w - 2t)L_0 - L_0^2 - L_0L_k \\
&= (-2x_i^\top w - 2t)L_k + L_k^2 - \underbrace{(-2x_i^\top w - 2t)L_0 - L_0^2}_{\text{constant across the column vector}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, dropping the constant and adding another constant  $(x_i^\top w + t)^2$  across all coordinates, the above equation becomes

$$(-2x_i^\top w - 2t)L_k + L_k^2 + (x_i^\top w + t)^2 = (x_i^\top w + t - L_k)^2.$$

Hence we finish the derivation of (B.6). Thus we have

$$\text{Attn}_h(A(X))_{:,i} = V^{(h)} \text{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (x_i^\top w + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1})^2 \\ (x_i^\top w + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)})^2 \\ \vdots \\ (x_i^\top w + t - \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)})^2 \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (\text{B.7})$$

For a specific  $h$ , we calculate the result of (B.7) column by column. Let  $X_i$  denote any column (token) of the matrix  $X$ . We partition the situation at each column (token) into three distinct cases:

- **Case 1:**  $w^\top X_i + t$  is strictly within the interpolation range of  $\text{Attn}_h$  ( $X \in [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1}]$ ). This excludes the following range at the edge of the interpolation range of

$$[\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}] \cup [\tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}].$$

- **Case 2:**  $w^\top X_i + t$  is not within the interpolation range of  $\text{Attn}_h$ :

$$w^\top X_i + t \notin [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}].$$

- **Case 3:**  $w^\top X_i + t$  is on the edge (region) of the interpolation range of  $\text{Attn}_h$ :

$$w^\top X_i + t \in [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}] \cup [\tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}].$$

**Remark B.2** (Cases of a Single Head Attention). The  $H$  heads split the approximation of the truncated linear map across disjoint intervals. For head  $h$ ,

$$\|\text{Attn}_h(X) - \text{Range}_{[a+\frac{b-a}{p}((h-1)(n-2)-1), a+\frac{b-a}{p}h(n-2)]}(X)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_1,$$

where  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrarily small.

With this understanding,  $w^\top X_i + t$ :

- **Case 1:** falls into the interior of the interpolation range of the  $h$ -th head  $\text{Attn}_h$ , denoted as  $\text{Range}_{[a+(b-a)((h-1)(n-2)-1)/p, a+(b-a)h(n-2)/p]}$ .
- **Case 2:** remains outside of the interpolation range of the  $h$ -th head  $\text{Attn}_h$ .
- **Case 3:** falls on the boundary of the interpolation range of the  $h$ -th head  $\text{Attn}_h$ .

**Remark B.3** (Cases of All Attention Heads). According to [Lemma B.2](#), for all heads in  $\text{Attn}^H$ , there are two possible cases:

- **Case 1\*:**  $x$  falls into Case 1 for a head, and Case 2 for all other heads.
- **Case 2\*:**  $x$  falls into Case 3 for two heads with adjacent interpolation ranges, and Case 2 for other heads.

This also means that when Case 1 appears in  $\text{Attn}^H$ , the situation of all head in  $\text{Attn}^H$  falls into Case 1\*. And when Case 3 appears in  $\text{Attn}^H$ , the situation of all head in  $\text{Attn}^H$  falls into Case 2\*. Thus, We discuss Case 2\* in the discussion of Case 3.

**Case 1:**  $X_i \in [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1}]$ . In this case, our goal is to demonstrate this attention head outputs a value close to  $\text{Range}_{[a,b]}(w^\top X_i + t)$ .

Let  $\tilde{L}_s$  and  $\tilde{L}_{s+1}$  be the two interpolants such that

$$w^\top X_i + t \in [\tilde{L}_s, \tilde{L}_{s+1}]. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Then,  $s$  and  $s + 1$  are also the labels of the two largest entries in

$$-\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1})^2 \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)})^2 \\ \vdots \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)})^2 \end{bmatrix},$$

since

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{k \in \{(h-1)(n-2)-1, h(n-2)\}} -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_k)^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \operatorname{argmin}_{k \in \{(h-1)(n-2)-1, h(n-2)\}} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_k)^2 \\
&= \operatorname{argmin}_{k \in \{(h-1)(n-2)-1, h(n-2)\}} |w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_k|.
\end{aligned}$$

We also note that the distance of  $w^\top X_i + t$  to interpolants beside  $\tilde{L}_s$  and  $\tilde{L}_{s+1}$  differs from  $w^\top X_i + t$  for at least  $\tilde{L}_s - \tilde{L}_{s-1} = (b-a)/p$  or  $\tilde{L}_{s+1} - \tilde{L}_s = (b-a)/p$ .

This is equivalent to the occasion when  $x_1 - x_3$  in [Lemma B.1](#) is larger than

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max \left\{ \frac{\beta}{\Delta L} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{s-1})^2 - (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_s)^2, \frac{\beta}{\Delta L} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{s+2})^2 - (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{s+1})^2 \right\} \\
&\geq \frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \cdot \left( \frac{b-a}{p} \right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which is invariant to  $X_i$ .

Thus according to [Lemma B.1](#) and the fact that the  $s$  and  $s+1$  are the two largest entries in the  $i$ -th column of the attention score matrix, we have

$$\left\| \operatorname{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1})^2 \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)})^2 \\ \vdots \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)})^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} \underbrace{e_s}_{n \times 1} - \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} \underbrace{e_{s+1}}_{n \times 1} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_2,$$

for any  $\epsilon_2 > 0$ .

This yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| V \operatorname{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1})^2 \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)})^2 \\ \vdots \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)})^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - V \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_s - V \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{s+1} \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \left\| \operatorname{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1})^2 \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)})^2 \\ \vdots \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)})^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_s - \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{s+1} \right\|_\infty \cdot \|V\|_\infty \\
&\leq \|V\|_\infty \epsilon_2.
\end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to

$$\left\| V \operatorname{Softmax}(K^\top Q)_{:,i} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} e_{k_G} - \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} e_{k_G} \right\|_\infty$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|V\|_\infty \cdot \epsilon_2 && \text{(By } \|AB\| \leq \|A\| \cdot \|B\|) \\
&\leq m_v \epsilon_2, && \text{(B.9)}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line is by (B.5).

From (B.8), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta\delta}} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} + \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1+e^{-\beta\delta}} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} - (w^\top X_i + t) e_{k_G} \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta\delta}} (\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} - (w^\top X_i + t) e_{k_G}) \right\|_\infty + \left\| \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1+e^{-\beta\delta}} (\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} - (w^\top X_i + t)) \right\|_\infty \\
&\quad \text{(By convex combination of } (w^\top X_i + t) \text{ and triangle inequality)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta\delta}} \cdot \frac{b-a}{p} + \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1+e^{-\beta\delta}} \cdot \frac{b-a}{p} && \text{(By (B.8))} \\
&= \frac{b-a}{p}. && \text{(B.10)}
\end{aligned}$$

Combing (B.9) and (B.10) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|V \text{Softmax}(K^\top Q)_{:,i} - (w^\top X_i + t)\|_\infty \\
&\leq \|V \text{Softmax}(K^\top Q)_{:,i} - \frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta\delta}} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} - \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1+e^{-\beta\delta}} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s}\|_\infty \\
&\quad + \left\| \frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta\delta}} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} + \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1+e^{-\beta\delta}} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} - (w^\top X_i + t) e_{k_G} \right\|_\infty \\
&\quad \text{(By triangle inequality)} \\
&\leq m_v \epsilon_2 + \frac{b-a}{p}, && \text{(B.11)}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from adding and subtracting the interpolation points' convex combination and then applying triangle inequality.

**Case 2:**  $X \notin [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}]$ . In this case,  $X_i$  falls out of the range of interpolation covered by  $\text{Attn}_h$ .

Without loss of generality, suppose  $w^\top X_i + t$  to lie left to the range of interpolation of  $\text{Attn}_h$ .

This yields that  $\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}$  is the closest interpolant within  $\text{Attn}_h$  to  $w^\top X_i + t$ . Furthermore, the second closest interpolant  $\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}$  is at least further for at least  $(b-a)/p$ , which is a constant irrelevant to  $X_i$

Then by [Lemma B.1](#), we have

$$\left\| \text{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1})^2 \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)})^2 \\ \vdots \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)})^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - \underbrace{e_1}_{n \times 1} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_3,$$

for any  $\epsilon_3 > 0$ .

This yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| V \text{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1})^2 \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)})^2 \\ \vdots \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)})^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - V \underbrace{e_1}_{n \times 1} \right\|_\infty \\ & \leq \|V\|_\infty \cdot \epsilon_3 && \text{(By } \|AB\| \leq \|A\| \cdot \|B\|) \\ & \leq m_v \epsilon_3, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is by [\(B.5\)](#).

This is equivalent to

$$\left\| V \text{Softmax} \left( -\frac{\beta}{\Delta L} \begin{bmatrix} (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1})^2 \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)})^2 \\ \vdots \\ (w^\top X_i + t - \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)})^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - 0_{d_o} \right\|_\infty \leq m_v \epsilon_3. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

**Case 1\*.** According to [Lemma B.2](#), when Case 1 occurs for one head in the  $H$  heads of  $\text{Attn}^H$ , all other head will be in Case 2.

Combining with the result in Case 2, we have the output of all heads as

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\text{Attn}^H(A(X))_{:,i} - (w^\top X_i + t)e_{k_G}\|_\infty \\ & = \left\| \sum_{h_0 \in [H]/\{h\}} \text{Attn}_{h_0} \circ A(X)_{:,i} \right\|_\infty + \|\text{Attn}_h \circ A(X)_{:,i} - (w^\top X_i + t)e_{k_G}\|_\infty \\ & = (H-1)m_v \epsilon_3 + m_v \epsilon_2 + \frac{b-a}{p} && \text{(By (B.11) and (B.12))} \\ & = (H-1)m_v \epsilon_3 + m_v \epsilon_2 + \frac{b-a}{H(n-2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3$  to be

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_2 &= \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \\ \epsilon_3 &= \frac{\epsilon_0}{2(H-1)m}\end{aligned}$$

yields the final result.

**Case 3 (and Case 2\*):**  $X \in [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)}] \cup [\tilde{L}_{h(n-2)-1}, \tilde{L}_{h(n-2)}]$ . In this case,  $w^\top X_i + t$  is the boundary of the interpolation range of  $\text{Attn}_{h_0}$ . By **Lemma B.2**, it should also fall on the boundary of a head with neighboring interpolation range. Without loss of generality, we set it to be  $\text{Attn}_{h_0-1}$ . Furthermore, **Lemma B.2** indicates that  $w^\top X_i + t$  should fall on no other interpolation range of any heads beside  $\text{Attn}_{h_0}$  and  $\text{Attn}_{h_0-1}$ .

Combining this with case 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Attn}^H(A(X))_{:,i} &= \sum_{h=1}^H \text{Attn}_h \circ A(X)_{:,i} \\ &\in [(- (H-2)m_v \epsilon_3 + \text{Attn}_{h_0} \circ A(X)_{:,i} + \text{Attn}_{h_0-1} \circ A(X)_{:,i}), \\ &\quad ((H-2)m_v \epsilon_3 + \text{Attn}_{h_0} \circ A(X)_{:,i} + \text{Attn}_{h_0-1} \circ A(X)_{:,i})]. \quad (\text{By (B.12)})\end{aligned}$$

By **Lemma B.1**, let  $\delta$  denote

$$\delta = \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} - (w^\top X_i + t)e_{k_G} - [\tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} - (w^\top X_i + t)e_{k_G}],$$

we have

$$\left\| \text{Softmax}((K^{(h)})^\top Q^{(h)}) - \left( \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_1 + \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_2 \right) \right\| \leq \epsilon_4,$$

and

$$\left\| \text{Softmax}((K^{(h-1)})^\top Q^{(h-1)}) - \left( \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{n-1} + \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_n \right) \right\| \leq \epsilon_5,$$

for any  $\epsilon_4, \epsilon_5 > 0$ .

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \left\| V^{(h)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(h)})^\top Q^{(h)}) + V^{(h-1)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(h-1)})^\top Q^{(h-1)}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - V \left( \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_1 + \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_2 + \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{n-1} + \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_n \right) \right\|_\infty \\ & \leq \|V\|_\infty (\epsilon_4 + \epsilon_5).\end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \|V^{(h)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(h)})^\top Q^{(h)}) + V^{(h-1)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(h-1)})^\top Q^{(h-1)}) \\ & - \left( \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} \cdot 0 + \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} + \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} + \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \right) \cdot 0 \|_\infty \\ & \leq \|V\|_\infty \cdot (\epsilon_4 + \epsilon_5). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|V^{(h)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(h)})^\top Q^{(h)}) + V^{(h-1)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(h-1)})^\top Q^{(h-1)}) \\ & - \left( \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} + \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} \right) \|_\infty \\ & \leq \|V\|_\infty (\epsilon_4 + \epsilon_5), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{h=1}^H \text{Attn}_h(A(X))_{:,i} - \left( \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} + \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} \right) \right\|_\infty \\ & \leq (H - 2)m_v\epsilon_3 + \|V\|_\infty (\epsilon_4 + \epsilon_5). \end{aligned} \tag{B.13}$$

Finally, since

$$\left\| \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} + \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} - (w^\top X_i + t)e_{k_G} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{b - a}{p},$$

(By (B.10))

combining with (B.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{h=1}^H \text{Attn}_h(A(X))_{:,i} - (w^\top X_i + t)e_{k_G} \right\|_\infty \\ & \leq \left\| \sum_{h=1}^H \text{Attn}_h(A(X))_{:,i} - \left( \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} + \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} \right) \right\|_\infty \\ & \quad + \left\| \left( \frac{e^{-\beta\delta}}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s} + \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta\delta}} e_{k_G} \tilde{L}_{(h-1)(n-2)+s-1} \right) - (w^\top X_i + t)e_{k_G} \right\|_\infty \\ & \hspace{15em} \text{(By triangle inequality)} \\ & \leq \frac{b - a}{p} + (H - 2)m_v\epsilon_3 + \|V\|_\infty (\epsilon_4 + \epsilon_5) \\ & \leq \frac{b - a}{H(n - 2)} + (H - 2) \max\{|a|, |b|\}\epsilon_3 + \max\{|a|, |b|\}(\epsilon_4 + \epsilon_5). \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $\epsilon_3, \epsilon_4, \epsilon_5$  to be

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_3 &= \frac{\epsilon_0}{3(H-2)} \\ \epsilon_4 &= \epsilon_5 = \frac{\epsilon_0}{3}\end{aligned}$$

yields the final result.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma B.3** (Attention Prepended with Token-Wise Linear Transformation is Still a Transformer). For any attention  $\text{Attn}$  and any linear transformation  $A$ ,  $\text{Attn} \circ A$  is still an attention.

*Proof.* We denote the transformation matrix of  $A$  also as  $M_A$ . Denote the attention  $\text{Attn}$  as

$$\text{Attn}(Z) := W_V Z \text{Softmax}((W_K Z)^\top W_Q Z).$$

Then we have

$$\text{Attn} \circ A(Z) = W_V M_A Z \text{Softmax}((W_K M_A Z)^\top W_Q M_A Z).$$

It is a new attention with parameters  $W_K M_A, W_Q M_A$  and  $W_V M_A$ .  $\square$

**Lemma B.4** (Lemma 14 in [Bai et al., 2023]: Composition of Error for Approximating Convex GD). Suppose  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a convex function. Let  $w^* \in \arg\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(w)$ ,  $R \geq 2\|w^*\|_2$ , and assume that  $\nabla f$  is  $L_f$ -smooth on  $B_2^d(R)$ . Let sequences  $\{\widehat{w}^\ell\}_{\ell \geq 0} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\{w_{\text{GD}}^\ell\}_{\ell \geq 0} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be given by  $\widehat{w}^0 = w_{\text{GD}}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ ,

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{w}^{\ell+1} = \widehat{w}^\ell - \eta \nabla f(\widehat{w}^\ell) + \epsilon^\ell, & \|\epsilon^\ell\|_2 \leq \epsilon, \\ w_{\text{GD}}^{\ell+1} = w_{\text{GD}}^\ell - \eta \nabla f(w_{\text{GD}}^\ell), \end{cases}$$

for all  $\ell \geq 0$ . Then as long as  $\eta \leq 2/L_f$ , for any  $0 \leq L \leq R/(2\epsilon)$ , it holds that  $\|\widehat{w}^L - w_{\text{GD}}^L\|_2 \leq L\epsilon$  and  $\|\widehat{w}^L\|_2 \leq \frac{R}{2} + L\epsilon \leq R$ .

**Corollary B.1.1** (Corollary A.2 in [Bai et al., 2023]: Gradient Descent for Smooth and Strongly Convex Function). Suppose  $L : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $\alpha$ -strongly convex and  $\beta$ -smooth for some  $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$ . Then, the gradient descent iterates  $w_{\text{GD}}^{(t+1)} := w_{\text{GD}}^t - \eta \nabla L(w_{\text{GD}}^t)$  with learning rate  $\eta = 1/\beta$  and initialization  $w_{\text{GD}}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfies for any  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\|w_{\text{GD}}^t - w^*\|_2^2 &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\kappa}\right) \cdot \|w_{\text{GD}}^0 - w^*\|_2^2, \\ L(w_{\text{GD}}^t) - L(w^*) &\leq \frac{\beta}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\kappa}\right) \cdot \|w_{\text{GD}}^0 - w^*\|_2^2,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\kappa := \beta/\alpha$  is the condition number of  $L$ , and  $w^* := \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} L(w)$ .

## B.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

**Theorem B.2** (Restate of Theorem 2.1: In-Context Emulation of  $f(w^\top x - y)x$ ). Define

$$X := \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times n} \quad \text{and} \quad W := [w \ w \ \cdots \ w] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}.$$

Define the input as:

$$Z := \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_n \\ w & w & \cdots & w \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  are the input-output pairs.  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the linear coefficient to optimize. Suppose  $X$  and  $W$  are bounded by  $B$  in infinite norm. For any continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , There exists a single-layer attention  $\text{Attn}_s$  with linear connection such that:

$$\|\text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Linear}(Z) - [f(w^\top x_1 - y_1)x_1 \ \cdots \ f(w^\top x_n - y_n)x_n]\|_\infty \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{for any } \epsilon > 0.$$

*Proof.* We define the linear transformation of  $Z$  as

$$\text{Linear}(Z) := [\text{Linear}_x(X)] \parallel [\text{Linear}_w(W)] \in \mathbb{R}^{(2d+n+2) \times (n(P+1)+n)},$$

where  $\text{Linear}_x$  and  $\text{Linear}_w$  are defined as below.

$\text{Linear}_w$  is defined as:

$$\text{Linear}_w(W) := \begin{bmatrix} I_d \\ 0_{(d+n+2) \times d} \end{bmatrix} W + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times n} \\ -1_{1 \times n} \\ 0_{d \times n} \\ -1_{1 \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} W \\ -1_{1 \times n} \\ 0_{d \times n} \\ -1_{1 \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2d+n+2) \times n}.$$

$\text{Linear}_x$  is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Linear}_x(X) \\ := & \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} I_{d+1} \\ 0_{(d+1+n) \times (d+1)} \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+n+2) \times (d+1)} \underbrace{X}_{(d+1) \times n} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times (i-1)(P+1)} & 2L_0 e_i^{(n)} & 2L_1 e_i^{(n)} & \cdots & 2L_P e_i^{(n)} & 0_{n \times (n-i)(P+1)} \end{bmatrix}}_{n \times n(P+1)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{(d+1) \times d} & 0_{(d+1)} \\ I_d & 0_d \\ 0_{(n+1) \times d} & 0_{n+1} \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+n+2) \times (d+1)} X \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times (i-1)(P+1)} & f(L_0)e_i^{(i)} & f(L_1)e_i^{(i)} & \cdots & f(L_P)e_i^{(i)} & 0_{n \times (n-i)(P+1)} \end{bmatrix} \\
& + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{(2d+1) \times (P+1)} & \cdots & 0_{(2d+1) \times (P+1)} \\ S & \cdots & S \\ (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)e_1^{(n)} \mathbf{1}_{1 \times (P+1)} & \cdots & (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)e_n^{(n)} \mathbf{1}_{1 \times (P+1)} \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+n+2) \times n(P+1)} \\
& = [T_1 \quad T_2 \quad \cdots \quad T_n],
\end{aligned}$$

in which:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1}_{1 \times (P+1)} & := [1 \quad 1 \quad \cdots \quad 1] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (P+1)}, \\
S & := [-L_0^2 \quad -L_1^2 \quad \cdots \quad L_P^2] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (P+1)}, \\
T_i & := \begin{bmatrix} 2L_0x_i & 2L_1x_i & \cdots & 2L_Px_i \\ 2L_0y_i & 2L_1y_i & \cdots & 2L_Py_i \\ f(L_0)x_i & f(L_1)x_i & \cdots & f(L_P)x_i \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \\ (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)e_i^{(n)} & (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)e_i^{(n)} & \cdots & (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)e_i^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2d+n+2) \times (P+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here  $\epsilon_0$  is a parameter that we will designate later according to  $\epsilon$ .

Now construct  $W_K, W_Q, W_V$  to be:

$$\begin{aligned}
W_Q & := \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n(P+1) \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n(P+1)+n) \times n}, \\
W_K & := \begin{bmatrix} I_{n(P+1)} \\ 0_{n \times n(P+1)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n(P+1)+n) \times n(P+1)}, \\
W_V^\top & := [0_{d \times (d+1)} \quad I_d \quad 0_{d \times (n+1)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times (2d+n+2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Linear}(Z) = W_V \text{Linear}(Z) \text{Softmax}((\text{Linear}(Z)W_K)^\top \text{Linear}(Z)W_Q),$$

in which:

$$\text{Softmax}((\text{Linear}(Z)W_K)^\top \text{Linear}(Z)W_Q) = \text{Softmax}([T_1 \ T_2 \ \cdots \ T_n]^\top \begin{bmatrix} W \\ -\mathbf{1}_{1 \times n} \\ 0_{d \times n} \\ -\mathbf{1}_{1 \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}).$$

This is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} ((\text{Linear}(Z)W_K)^\top \text{Linear}(Z)W_Q)_{:,c} &= \begin{bmatrix} T_1^\top \\ T_2^\top \\ \vdots \\ T_n^\top \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w \\ -1 \\ 0_d \\ -1 \\ e_c^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} M_{1,c} \\ M_{2,c} \\ \vdots \\ M_{n,c} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

in which:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{i,c} &:= T_i^\top \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w \\ -1 \\ 0_d \\ -1 \\ e_i^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 2L_0 x_i^\top w - 2L_0 y_i - L_0^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c} \\ 2L_1 x_i^\top w - 2L_1 y_i - L_1^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c} \\ \dots \\ 2L_P x_i^\top w - 2L_P y_i - L_P^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $i \in [n]$  and  $c \in [n]$ , and  $\mathbf{1}_{i=c}$  represents the indicator function of  $i = c$ .

This means that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Softmax}((\text{Linear}(Z)W_K)^\top \text{Linear}(Z)W_Q)_{:,c} \\ &= \text{Softmax} \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{1,c} \\ M_{2,c} \\ \vdots \\ M_{n,c} \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_0^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i'=c}\}} e^{(nP)} e^{(i-1)P+j}.$$

Thus we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Linear}(Z)_{:,c} \\ &= W_V \text{Linear}(Z) \text{Softmax}((\text{Linear}(Z)W_K)^\top \text{Linear}(Z)W_Q)_{:,c} \\ & \quad \quad \quad (W_v \text{ only retrieves the } (d+2)\text{-th row in } T_i) \\ &= [F_1 \ \cdots \ F_n] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i'=c}\}} e^{(nP)} e^{(i-1)P+j} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i'=c}\}} f(L_j) x_i, \end{aligned}$$

in which  $F$  is:

$$F_i := [f(L_0)x_i \ f(L_1)x_i \ \cdots \ f(L_P)x_i].$$

For every  $i \in [n]$ , if  $i \neq c$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i'=c}\}} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i'=c}\}} \\ &< \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i'=c}\}} \quad (\text{only taking the } i' = c \text{ part}) \\ &< \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2dB^2 + B\}}{P \exp(2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)} = \epsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

For  $i = c$ , since

$$\sum_{i \neq c}^n \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i'=c}\}} \leq (n-1)\epsilon_0,$$

we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\sum_{j=0}^P \exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\mathbb{1}_{i=c}\}} \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\mathbb{1}_{i=c}\}} \\
&\geq 1 - (n-1)\epsilon_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus for the parts in the weighted sum output that corresponds to rows in  $M_{:,c}$  in the attention score matrix, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\mathbb{1}_{i=c}\}} f(L_j) x_c - f(x_c^\top w - y_c) x_c \right\|_\infty \\
&= \left\| \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}} (f(L_j) x_c - f(x_c^\top w - y_c) x_c) \right. \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^P \exp\{2L_k x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_k y_{i'} - L_k^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\mathbb{1}_{i=c}\}} \\
&\quad \left. - \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^P \exp\{2L_k x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_k y_{i'} - L_k^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\mathbb{1}_{i=c}\}}\right) f(x_c^\top w - y_c) x_c \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \cdot d \|x_c\|_\infty \\
&\quad - \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^P \exp\{2L_k x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_k y_{i'} - L_k^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\mathbb{1}_{i=c}\}}\right) |f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \|x_c\|_\infty \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}} |f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \|x_c\|_\infty \\
&\quad + (n-1)\epsilon_0 B_f \|x_c\|_\infty \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \|x_c\|_\infty + (n-1)\epsilon_0 B_f \|x_c\|_\infty \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_j)^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_{j'})^2\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \|x_c\|_\infty + (n-1)\epsilon_0 B_f \|x_c\|_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where we define  $B_f := |f|$  as the bound for  $f$ .

For any  $\epsilon_1 > 0$ , set  $\Delta L$  to be sufficiently small such that

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq \epsilon_1,$$

when  $|x - y| \leq \Delta L$ .

Then when  $\beta$  is sufficiently large, we have

$$\sum_{|L_i - (x_c^\top w - y_c)| > \Delta L} \frac{\exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_j)^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_{j'})^2\}} \leq \epsilon_2,$$

for any  $\epsilon_2 > 0$ .

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_j)^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_{j'})^2\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \\ &= \sum_{|L_i - (x_c^\top w - y_c)| > \Delta L} \frac{\exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_j)^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_{j'})^2\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \\ & \quad + \sum_{|L_i - (x_c^\top w - y_c)| \leq \Delta L} \frac{\exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_j)^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_{j'})^2\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \\ & \leq \epsilon_2 \cdot 2B_f + \epsilon_1. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## B.2 Proof of Corollary 2.1.2

**Corollary B.2.1** (Restate of **Corollary 2.1.2**: In-Context Emulation of Single Step GD). Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable loss function. Define  $\ell_i := \ell(w^\top x_i - y_i)$  for all  $i \in [n]$ , and  $\widehat{L}_n(w) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i$ . Then, for any  $\epsilon' > 0$ , there exists a single-layer Attention layer  $\text{Attn}_s$  with linear connection such that it gives output  $\widehat{w}$ , where  $\|\widehat{w} - (w - \eta \nabla \widehat{L}_n(w))\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$  and  $\eta$  is the learning rate.

*Proof.* From **Corollary 2.1.1**, we derive that  $\|(\text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Linear})_i - \nabla \ell(w^\top x_i - y_i) x_i\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$  for all  $i \in [n]$ .

Therefore,

$$\widehat{w} = w + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (\text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Linear})_j$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= w - \frac{\eta}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \nabla \ell(w^\top x_j - y_j) x_j + \epsilon' \\
&= w - \eta \nabla \widehat{L}_n(w) + \epsilon' \\
&= w_{\text{GD}} + \epsilon'
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

### B.3 Proof of Theorem 2.2

**Theorem B.3** (Restate of Theorem 2.2: In-Context Emulation of Linear Regression). For any input-output pair  $(x_i, y_i)$ , where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_i \in \mathbb{R}, i \in [n]$ , and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a single-layer Attention network with linear connection Attn such that:

$$\|\text{Attn} - w_{\text{linear}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon,$$

where  $w_{\text{linear}} := \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\langle w, x_i \rangle - y_i)^2$ .

*Proof.* From Corollary 2.1.2, we know that  $\|\widehat{w}^l - w_{\text{GD}}^l\|_\infty \leq \epsilon/2$  for all  $l \in [L]$ . Note that  $\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\langle w, x_i \rangle - y_i)^2$  is convex and smooth which satisfies the precondition for Corollary B.1.1. Therefore, from Corollary B.1.1, using  $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq \|\cdot\|_2$ , we derive that  $\|w_{\text{GD}}^l - w_{\text{linear}}^l\|_\infty \leq \epsilon/2$ . Thus,  $\|\text{Attn} - w_{\text{linear}}\|_\infty \leq \|\widehat{w}^l - w_{\text{GD}}^l\|_\infty + \|w_{\text{GD}}^l - w_{\text{linear}}^l\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$  by triangle inequality. This completes the proof.  $\square$

### B.4 Proof of Theorem 2.3

**Theorem B.4** (Restate of Theorem 2.3: In-Context Emulation of Ridge Regression). For any input-output pair  $(x_i, y_i)$ , where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_i \in \mathbb{R}, i \in [n]$ , and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a single-layer Attention network with linear connection Attn such that:

$$\|\text{Attn} - w_{\text{ridge}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon,$$

where  $w_{\text{ridge}} := \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\langle w, x_i \rangle - y_i)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|_2^2$  with regularization term  $\lambda \geq 0$ . This completes the proof.

*Proof.* From Corollary 2.1.2, we know that  $\|\widehat{w}^l - w_{\text{GD}}^l\|_\infty \leq \epsilon/2$  for all  $l \in [L]$ . Note that  $\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\langle w, x_i \rangle - y_i)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|_2^2$  is convex and smooth which satisfies the precondition for Corollary B.1.1. Therefore, from Corollary B.1.1, using  $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq \|\cdot\|_2$ , we derive that  $\|w_{\text{GD}}^l - w_{\text{ridge}}^l\|_\infty \leq \epsilon/2$ . Thus,  $\|\text{Attn} - w_{\text{ridge}}\|_\infty \leq \|\widehat{w}^l - w_{\text{GD}}^l\|_\infty + \|w_{\text{GD}}^l - w_{\text{ridge}}^l\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$  by triangle inequality. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## B.5 Proof of Theorem 3.1

**Theorem B.5** (Restate of **Theorem 3.1**: In-Context Emulation of Attention). Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  denote the input sequence. Let  $W_K \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d}$ ,  $W_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d}$ ,  $W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d}$  denote the parameter matrix of the *target* attention we wish to emulate in-context. Let  $X_p$  be as defined in **Definition 3.1**. There exists a layer of multi-head attention  $\text{Attn}_m$  connected with a layer of single-head attention  $\text{Attn}_s$  such that

$$\|\text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Attn}_m(X_p) - W_V X \text{Softmax}((W_K X)^\top W_Q X)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{for any } \epsilon > 0.$$

*Proof.* For the input, we first append it with the positional encoding  $I_n$ . This result is denoted as  $X_p$ . It writes out as

$$X_p := \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+6dd_h+n) \times n}.$$

Denote  $a$  and  $b$  to be the minimum and maximum values that the inner product  $w^\top x$  can take.

We separate the heads in  $\text{Attn}_m$  into three groups

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Attn}_j^K &:= \text{Attn}_j, & j \in [N], & \quad (\text{Responsible for calculating } K) \\ \text{Attn}_j^Q &:= \text{Attn}_{N+j}, & j \in [N], & \quad (\text{Responsible for calculating } Q) \\ \text{Attn}_j^V &:= \text{Attn}_{2N+j}, & j \in [N], & \quad (\text{Responsible for calculating } V) \end{aligned}$$

where  $N$  is defined as

$$N := \lceil \frac{2(b-a)}{(n-2)\epsilon_0} \rceil \cdot d_h.$$

For simplicity, we define

$$H := \lceil \frac{2(b-a)}{(n-2)\epsilon_0} \rceil.$$

We prove our claim by adopting **Theorem B.1** to construct heads to approximate in-context linear transformations  $(k_j^\top x, q_j^\top x, v_j^\top x, j \in [d_h])$ . We now construct linear transformations  $A_h$  attached before the attentions given by **Theorem B.1**. By **Lemma B.3**, when prepended with  $A_h$ , these attentions are still attentions. Thus we are able to use them to construct the heads in  $\text{Attn}_m$ .

Construct  $A_h$  as

$$A_h := \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0_{d \times 3d_h} & 0_{d \times 3d_h} & 0_{d \times n} \\ 0_{d \times d} & E_h & K_h E_h & 0_{d \times n} \\ 0_{n \times d} & 0_{n \times 3d_h} & 0_{n \times 3d_h} & I_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2d+n) \times (d+6dd_h+n)},$$

in which

$$E_h := [0_{d \times (d[h/H])} \quad I_d \quad 0_{d \times (3dd_h - d[h/H] - d)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 3d_h},$$

$$K_h := [(h \% H - 1)(n - 2) - 1].$$

Here  $h \% H$  is used to denote the remainder of dividing  $h$  by  $H$ . We define  $\%$  such that instead of the the common  $(kH) \% H = 0$ ,

$$kH \% H = H, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$

Applying  $A$  to the input yields

$$\begin{aligned} A_h \cdot X_p &:= \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0_{d \times 3d_h} & 0_{d \times 3d_h} & 0_{d \times n} \\ 0_{d \times d} & E_h & K_h E_h & 0_{d \times n} \\ 0_{n \times d} & 0_{n \times 3d_h} & 0_{n \times 3d_h} & I_n \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} X \\ [E_h \quad K_h E_h] \cdot W \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above equation,  $[E_h \quad K_h E_h] \cdot W$  is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} [E_h \quad K_h E_h] W &= [E_h \quad K_h E_h] \begin{bmatrix} 0 \cdot w & 1 \cdot w & 2 \cdot w & \cdots & (n-1) \cdot w \\ w & w & w & \cdots & w \end{bmatrix} \\ &= E_h [0 \cdot w \quad 1 \cdot w \quad 2 \cdot w \quad \cdots \quad (n-1) \cdot w] + K_h E_h [w \quad w \quad w \quad \cdots \quad w] \\ &= [K_h E_h w \quad (K_h + 1) E_h w \quad \cdots \quad (K_h + n - 1) E_h w], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E_h w &= [0_{d \times (d[h/H])} \quad I_d \quad 0_{d \times (3dd_h - d[h/H] - d)}] \begin{bmatrix} k \\ q \\ v \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{cases} k_{[h/H]}, & 1 \leq h \leq N \\ q_{[h/H] - N}, & N < h \leq 2N \\ v_{[h/H] - 2N}, & 2N \leq h \leq 3N \end{cases}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.14}$$

When  $1 \leq h \leq N$ , we compute  $A_h \cdot X_p$  as

$$A_h \cdot X_p = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ k_{\lceil h/H \rceil} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{1 \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

This means every  $h$  in  $\{jH + 1, \dots, jH + H\}$ , ( $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d_h\}$ ) has the same  $A_h \cdot X_p$ , which is

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ k_j \cdot \mathbf{1}_{1 \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

By **Theorem B.1**, there exists a multi-head attention  $\text{Attn}'_j$  of  $H$  heads that takes the input of the shape of  $A_h \cdot X_p$ , such that the output satisfies

$$\|\text{Attn}'_j(A_h \cdot X_p) - k_j^\top X e_j^{(3N)}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_0,$$

for any  $\epsilon_0 > 0$ .

We use  $\text{Attn}'_j{}^{(s)}$  to denote the  $s$ -th head of  $\text{Attn}'_j$ , and thus we define the  $h$ -th head for calculating  $K$  to be

$$\text{Attn}_h^K(Z) := \text{Attn}'_j{}^{(h-jH)}(A_h Z). \quad (Z \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+6dd_h+n) \times n} \text{ denotes any input})$$

By **Lemma B.3**,  $\text{Attn}_h^K(Z)$  is still an attention.

Thus, we have

$$\|\text{Attn}_j^K(X_p) - k_j^\top X e_j^{(3N)}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_0.$$

This means that

$$\left\| \sum_{j \in [N]} \text{Attn}_j^K(X_p) - \begin{bmatrix} K \\ 0_{n \times n} \\ 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_0. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Similarly for  $Q$ , by (B.14), we have

$$E_h w = q_j, \quad \text{where } j = \lceil h/H \rceil - N,$$

and

$$A_h \cdot X_p = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ q_j \cdot \mathbf{1}_{1 \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

By **Theorem B.1**, there exists a multi-head attention  $\text{Attn}_j''$  for each  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d_h - 1\}$  such that

$$\|\text{Attn}_j''(A_h \cdot X_p) - q_j^\top X e_{j+N}^{(3N)}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_0.$$

Then we construct  $\text{Attn}_j^Q$  in a way similar to  $\text{Attn}_j^K$ .

$$\text{Attn}_j^Q(Z) := \text{Attn}_j''(A_h \cdot Z).$$

By **Lemma B.3**,  $\text{Attn}_j^Q(Z)$  is an attention.

Thus, we have

$$\|\text{Attn}_j^Q(X_p) - q_j^\top X e_{j+N}^{(3N)}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_0.$$

This means that

$$\left\| \sum_{j \in [N]} \text{Attn}_j^Q(X_p) - \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times n} \\ Q \\ 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_0. \quad (\text{B.16})$$

Finally, for  $V$ , with completely analogous construction to that of  $K$  and  $Q$ , there exists a construction of  $\text{Attn}_j^V$ ,  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d_h - 1\}$  such that

$$\|\text{Attn}_j^V(X_p) - v_j^\top X e_{j+2N}^{(3N)}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_0.$$

This means that

$$\left\| \sum_{j \in [N]} \text{Attn}_j^V(X_p) - \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times n} \\ 0_{n \times n} \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_0. \quad (\text{B.17})$$

Combining (B.15), (B.16) and (B.17) we have

$$\left\| \sum_{j \in [3N]} \text{Attn}_j(X_p) - \begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_0.$$

**In-Context Calculation of Attention.** construct  $\text{Attn}_s$  to be

$$\text{Attn}_s(Z) := \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times 2n} & I_n \end{bmatrix}}_{W_V} Z \text{Softmax}\left(\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0_{n \times 2n} \end{bmatrix}}_{W_K} Z\right)^\top \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times n} & I_n & 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}}_{W_Q} Z.$$

We have

$$\text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right) = \underbrace{W_V X}_{d_h \times n} \text{Softmax} \left( \underbrace{\left( (W_K X)^\top W_Q X \right)}_{n \times n} \right).$$

Now we estimate the error due to the difference between the output of  $\sum_{j=1}^{3n} \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j \left( [X^\top \ W_K \ W_Q \ W_V]^\top \right)$  and  $[K^\top \ Q^\top \ V^\top]^\top$ .

Define

$$\begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix} := \sum_{j=1}^{3n} \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

This is the same as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^K \circ \text{Linear}_j^K \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \begin{bmatrix} K' \\ 0_{n \times n} \\ 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^Q \circ \text{Linear}_j^Q \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times n} \\ Q' \\ 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^V \circ \text{Linear}_j^V \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times n} \\ 0_{n \times n} \\ V' \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

In this definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix} \right) - \text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&= V' \text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q') - V \text{Softmax} (K^{\top} Q) \\
&= (V' - V) \text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q') + V (\text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q') - \text{Softmax} (K^{\top} Q)).
\end{aligned}$$

This yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix} \right) - \text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\|_{\infty} \\
&= \left\| (V' - V) \text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q') + V (\text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q') - \text{Softmax} (K^{\top} Q)) \right\|_{\infty} \\
&\leq \left\| (V' - V) \text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q') \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| V (\text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q') - \text{Softmax} (K^{\top} Q)) \right\|_{\infty} \\
&\hspace{20em} \text{(Triangle inequality)} \\
&\leq \epsilon_0 + n \|V\|_{\infty} \left\| \text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q') - \text{Softmax} (K^{\top} Q) \right\|_{\infty}. \tag{B.18}
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is because that  $\text{Softmax}(K'^{\top} Q')$  has each column summing up to 1, which means

$$(V' - V) \text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q')_{:,j}$$

is a weighted sum of the columns in  $V' - V$ .

Thus we have

$$\left\| (V' - V) \text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q')_{:,j} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \|V - V'\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon_0.$$

Because the average of columns has a smaller maximal entry than the original columns.

Since  $X, W_K, W_Q, W_V$  are all bounded in infinite norm, there multiplications are also bounded in infinite norm. We denote this bound as  $B_{KQV}$ .

Now we calculate the error of the last term in the above inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(\text{Softmax} (K'^{\top} Q') - \text{Softmax} (K^{\top} Q))_{i,j}| \\
&= \left| \frac{e^{K'_i \cdot Q'_j}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j}} - \frac{e^{K_i \cdot Q_j}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j}} \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{e^{K'_i \cdot Q'_j} - e^{K_i \cdot Q_j}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j}} \right| + \left| e^{K_i \cdot Q_j} \left( \frac{1}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j}} - \frac{1}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j}} \right) \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{e^{K'_i \cdot Q'_j}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j}} |1 - e^{K'_i \cdot Q'_j - K_i \cdot Q_j}| + e^{K_i Q_j} \frac{1}{(\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j})(\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j})} \left| \sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j} - \sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j} \right| \\
&\leq |1 - e^{\epsilon_0(K'_i + Q'_j) + \epsilon_0^2}| + \left| 1 - \frac{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j}} \right| \\
&\leq 2|1 - e^{\epsilon_0(K'_i + Q'_j) + \epsilon_0^2}| \quad (\text{the largest deviation ratio between } e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j} \text{ and } e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j} \text{ are invariant of } i) \\
&\leq 2|1 - e^{2\epsilon_0(B_{KQV} + \frac{1}{2})}|,
\end{aligned}$$

in which  $K'_i, Q'_i$  denote the columns in  $K'$  and  $Q'$  respectively.

Thus for any  $\epsilon_1 > 0$ , when  $\epsilon_0$  satisfies

$$\epsilon_0 \leq \frac{\ln(1 + \frac{\epsilon_1}{2})}{2B_{KQV} + 1},$$

We have

$$|(\text{Softmax}(K'^T Q') - \text{Softmax}(K^T Q))_{i,j}| \leq \epsilon_1.$$

Combining this with (B.18) yields

$$\left\| \text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix} \right) - \text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon_0 + nB_{KQV}\epsilon_1$$

When take  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_0$  to be infinitely small, this right hand side tends to 0.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## B.6 Proof of Theorem 3.2

**Theorem B.6** (Restate of Theorem 3.2). Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  denote the input sequence. Let  $W_K, W_Q, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  denote the parameter matrices of the *target* attention we wish to emulate in-context, bounded in infinite norm.

For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a self-attention  $\text{Attn}_s$  followed by multi-head attention with linear connections that satisfies:

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{3n} \text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) - \underbrace{W_V X}_{n \times n} \text{Softmax} \left( \underbrace{(W_K X)^\top W_Q X}_{n \times n} \right) \right\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon.$$

*Proof.* Denote  $W_K, W_Q, W_V$  as

$$W_K = [k_1, k_2 \cdots, k_n]^\top, \quad W_Q = [q_1, q_2 \cdots, q_n]^\top, \quad W_V = [v_1, v_2 \cdots, v_n]^\top.$$

We express the input as

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ k_1 & k_2 & \cdots & k_n \\ q_1 & q_2 & \cdots & q_n \\ v_1 & v_2 & \cdots & v_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{4d \times n},$$

where  $x_j, k_j, q_j$  and  $v_j$  are all  $d$  dimensional vectors for  $j \in [n]$ .

**Interpolations.** Let  $B$  denote the bound of  $X, W_K, W_Q, W_V$  in infinite norm

$$B = \max(\|X\|_\infty, \|W_K\|_\infty, \|W_Q\|_\infty, \|W_V\|_\infty).$$

Then all  $k_i^\top x_j, q_i^\top x_j, v_i^\top x_j$  are bounded by  $d \cdot B^2$ , for all  $i, j \in [n]$ .

Define  $L_0 := -dB^2, L_P := dB^2$  and

$$L_i := \frac{iL_P + (P - i)L_0}{P},$$

where  $P$  is the number of interpolation steps, meaning how many divisions are made between  $L_0$  and  $L_P$ , and is a parameter that decides attention size, thereby influencing the precision of approximation.

We use  $\Delta L$  to denote the length of the interval between two neighboring interpolations. Obviously, we have:

$$\Delta L := \frac{L_P - L_0}{P} = \frac{2dB^2}{P},$$

**In-Context Calculation of  $K$ .** The first layer of attention consists of  $3n$  heads. Among them, heads with labels from 1 to  $n$  are responsible for the calculation of  $K$ .

Label each head in the  $n$  heads as  $\text{Attn}_j^K$  for  $j \in [n]$  ( $j$  denotes the  $k_j^\top x$  that we are interpolating to obtain the value). This writes out as

$$\text{Attn}_j^K := \text{Attn}_j, \quad j \in [n]. \tag{B.19}$$

In addition, for clarity of structure, we also show what the other heads are used for

$$\text{Attn}_j^Q := \text{Attn}_{n+j}, \quad j \in [n], \quad (\text{Responsible for calculating } Q)$$

$$\text{Attn}_j^V := \text{Attn}_{2n+j}, \quad j \in [n]. \quad (\text{Responsible for calculating } V)$$

We define the linear transformation  $\text{Linear}_j : \mathbb{R}^{4d \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(2d+3) \times (P+1)}$  attached before  $\text{Attn}_j^K$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Linear}_j(Z) := & \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times 2d} \\ 0_{d \times d} & I_d & 0_{d \times 2d} \\ 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times 2d} \end{bmatrix} \underbrace{Z}_{4d \times n} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 2L_0 e_j^{(n)} & 2L_1 e_j^{(n)} & \cdots & 2L_P e_j^{(n)} \end{bmatrix}}_{n \times P} + \\ & \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times 2d} \\ 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times 2d} \\ 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times 2d} \end{bmatrix} Z \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0_{n \times (P+1-n)} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{2d \times (P+1)} \\ M_1 \\ M_L \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2d+3) \times (P+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

in which  $M_1, M_L$  are

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &:= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1_{1 \times n} & 0_{1 \times (P-n+1)} \end{bmatrix}}_{1 \times (P+1)}, \\ M_L &:= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} L_0 & L_1 & \cdots & L_P \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \end{bmatrix}}_{2 \times (P+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

The  $\text{Linear}_j^K$  layer outputs

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Linear}_j^K \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_d & 0_d & \cdots & 0_d \\ 2L_0 k_j & 2L_1 k_j & \cdots & 2L_P k_j \\ 0_3 & 0_3 & \cdots & 0_3 \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+3) \times (P+1)} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n & 0_d & \cdots & 0_d \\ 0_d & 0_d & \cdots & 0_d & 0_d & \cdots & 0_d \\ 0_3 & 0_3 & \cdots & 0_3 & 0_3 & \cdots & 0_3 \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+3) \times (P+1)} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{2d \times (P+1)} \\ M_1 \\ M_L \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+3) \times (P+1)} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n & 0_d & \cdots & 0_d \\ 2L_0 k_j & 2L_1 k_j & \cdots & 2L_{n-1} k_j & 2L_n k_j & \cdots & 2L_P k_j \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ L_0 & L_1 & \cdots & L_{n-1} & L_n & \cdots & L_P \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_{n-1}^2 & -L_n^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2d+3) \times (P+1)}. \quad (\text{B.20}) \end{aligned}$$

We now construct  $\text{Attn}_j^K$  which takes (B.20) as input. We denote the parameters of  $\text{Attn}_j^K$  as

$W_K^{(j;K)}$ ,  $W_Q^{(j;K)}$ ,  $W_V^{(j;K)}$  and  $W_O^{(j;K)}$ .

We construct the  $W_K^{(j;K)}$ ,  $W_Q^{(j;K)}$  to be

$$W_K^{(j;K)} := \beta \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times d} & I_d & 0_{d \times 1} & 0_{d \times 1} & 0_{d \times 1} \\ 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times d} & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (2d+3)},$$

$$W_Q^{(j;K)} := \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times 1} & 0_{d \times 1} & 0_{d \times 1} \\ 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times d} & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (2d+3)},$$

where  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  is a temperature coefficient of Softmax function.

This yields the  $K^{(j)}$ ,  $Q^{(j)}$  of  $\text{Attn}_j^K$  to be:

$$K^{(j)} := W_K^{(j;K)} \cdot \text{Linear}_j^K \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

$$= \beta \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times d} & I_d & 0_{d \times 1} & 0_{d \times 1} & 0_{d \times 1} \\ 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times d} & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n & \cdots & 0_d \\ 2L_0 k_j & 2L_1 k_j & \cdots & 2L_{n-1} k_j & \cdots & 2L_P k_j \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ L_0 & L_1 & \cdots & L_{n-1} & \cdots & L_P \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_{n-1}^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

(By (B.20))

$$= \beta \begin{bmatrix} 2L_0 k_j & 2L_1 k_j & \cdots & 2L_{n-1} k_j & \cdots & 2L_P k_j \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_{n-1}^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (P+1)},$$

and

$$Q^{(j)} := W_Q^{(j;K)} \text{Linear}_j^K \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times 1} & 0_{d \times 1} & 0_{d \times 1} \\ 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times d} & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n & \cdots & 0_d \\ 2L_0 k_j & 2L_1 k_j & \cdots & 2L_{n-1} k_j & \cdots & 2L_P k_j \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ L_0 & L_1 & \cdots & L_{n-1} & \cdots & L_P \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_{n-1}^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

(By (B.20))

$$= \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0_{1 \times (P-n+1)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (P+1)}.$$

Combining the above result of  $K^{(j)}$  and  $Q^{(j)}$ , we calculate  $\text{Softmax}((K^{(j)})^\top Q^{(j)})$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Softmax}((K^{(j)})^\top Q^{(j)}) \\
&= \text{Softmax}\left(\beta \begin{bmatrix} 2L_0 k_j & 2L_1 k_j & \cdots & 2L_{n-1} k_j & \cdots & 2L_P k_j \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_{n-1}^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0_{1 \times (P-n+1)} \end{bmatrix}\right) \\
&= \text{Softmax}\left(\beta \begin{bmatrix} 2L_0 k_j^\top x_1 - L_0^2 & 2L_0 k_j^\top x_2 - L_0^2 & \cdots & 2L_0 k_j^\top x_n - L_0^2 & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \\ 2L_1 k_j^\top x_1 - L_1^2 & 2L_1 k_j^\top x_2 - L_1^2 & \cdots & 2L_1 k_j^\top x_n - L_1^2 & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 2L_P k_j^\top x_1 - L_P^2 & 2L_P k_j^\top x_2 - L_P^2 & \cdots & 2L_P k_j^\top x_n - L_P^2 & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \end{bmatrix}\right) \\
&= \text{Softmax}\left(\beta \begin{bmatrix} -(k_j^\top x_1 - L_0)^2 + (k_j^\top x_1)^2 & \cdots & -(k_j^\top x_n - L_0)^2 + (k_j^\top x_n)^2 & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \\ -(k_j^\top x_1 - L_1)^2 + (k_j^\top x_1)^2 & \cdots & -(k_j^\top x_n - L_1)^2 + (k_j^\top x_n)^2 & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ -(k_j^\top x_1 - L_P)^2 + (k_j^\top x_1)^2 & \cdots & -(k_j^\top x_n - L_P)^2 + (k_j^\top x_n)^2 & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \end{bmatrix}\right) \\
&= \text{Softmax}\left(\beta \begin{bmatrix} -(k_j^\top x_1 - L_0)^2 & \cdots & -(k_j^\top x_n - L_0)^2 & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \\ -(k_j^\top x_1 - L_1)^2 & \cdots & -(k_j^\top x_n - L_1)^2 & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ -(k_j^\top x_1 - L_P)^2 & \cdots & -(k_j^\top x_n - L_P)^2 & 0_{d \times (P-n+1)} \end{bmatrix}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{(P+1) \times (P+1)},
\end{aligned} \tag{B.21}$$

where the last line is by the following property of  $\text{Softmax}$  over each column ( $C$  corresponds to  $(k_j^\top x_i)^2$  at each column)

$$\text{Softmax}(v) = \text{Softmax}(v + 1_{P+1} \cdot C),$$

for any vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{P+1}$  and  $C \in \mathbb{R}$ .

This yields

$$\text{Softmax}((K^{(j)})^\top Q^{(j)})_{r,c} = \frac{e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2}}{\sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2}},$$

for every  $r \in [P+1]$  and  $c \in [n]$ .

Construct  $W_V^{(j)}$  to be

$$W_V^{(j)} := e_j^{(3n)} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{1 \times (2d+1)} & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{3n \times (2d+3)}.$$

$W_V^{(j)}$  also writes as

$$W_V^{(j)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{3n \times d} & 0_{3n \times d} & 0_{3n} & e_j^{(3n)} & 0_{3n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus  $V^{(j)}$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
V &:= W_V^{(j)} \text{Linear}_j^K \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{3n \times d} & 0_{3n \times d} & 0_{3n} & e_j^{(3n)} & 0_{3n} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n & 0_d & \cdots & 0_d \\ 2L_0 k_j & 2L_1 k_j & \cdots & 2L_{n-1} k_j & 2L_n k_j & \cdots & 2L_P k_j \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ L_0 & L_1 & \cdots & L_{n-1} & L_n & \cdots & L_P \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_{n-1}^2 & -L_n^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} L_0 & L_1 & \cdots & L_{n-1} & L_n & \cdots & L_P \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbb{R}^{3n \times (P+1)}} e_j^{(3n)}. \tag{By (B.20)}
\end{aligned}$$

Combine the above equation with (B.21) we have:

$$V^{(j)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(j)})^\top Q^{(j)})_{:,c} = \sum_{r=0}^P \frac{e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2}}{\sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2}} L_r e_j^{(3n)}, \tag{B.22}$$

for every  $c \in [n]$ .

$V^{(j)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(j)})^\top Q^{(j)})_{:,c}$  is a weighted average of  $L_r e_j^{(3n)}$  where the weight of each element is determined by the distance between  $L_r$  and  $k_j^\top x_c$ .

We demonstrate this value is close to  $k_j^\top x_c$  by showing the elements in the weighted average far from  $k_j^\top x_c$  have negligible weight.

Specifically, we have the following calculations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|V^{(j)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(j)})^\top Q^{(j)})_{:,c} - k_j^\top x_c e_j^{(3n)}\|_\infty \\
&= \left\| \sum_{r=0}^P \frac{e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2}}{\sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2}} (L_r - k_j^\top x_c) e_j^{(3n)} \right\|_\infty \tag{By (B.22)} \\
&= \left| \sum_{r=0}^P \frac{e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2}}{\sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2}} (L_r - k_j^\top x_c) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \sum_{|L_r - k_j^\top x_c| \leq \Delta L} \frac{e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2}}{\sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2}} (L_r - k_j^\top x_c) \right| + \left| \sum_{|L_r - k_j^\top x_c| \geq \Delta L} \frac{e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2}}{\sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2}} (L_r - k_j^\top x_c) \right| \\
&\hspace{15em} \text{(Sperate the summation)} \\
&\leq \sum_{|L_r - k_j^\top x_c| \leq \Delta L} \frac{e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2}}{\sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2}} |L_r - k_j^\top x_c| + \sum_{|L_r - k_j^\top x_c| \geq \Delta L} \frac{e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2}}{\sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2}} |L_r - k_j^\top x_c|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{\sum_{|L_r - k_j^\top x_c| \leq \Delta L} e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2}}{\sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2}} \Delta L + \frac{\sum_{|L_r - k_j^\top x_c| \geq \Delta L} e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2}}{\sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2}} 2dB^2 \\
&\leq \Delta L + \frac{\sum_{|L_r - k_j^\top x_c| \geq \Delta L} e^{-\beta\Delta L^2}}{e^{-\beta\frac{\Delta L^2}{4}}} 2dB^2 \\
&\quad \text{(By } \sum_{|L_r - k_j^\top x_c| \leq \Delta L} e^{-\beta(L_r - k_j^\top x_c)^2} \text{ is part of } \sum_{s=0}^P e^{-\beta(L_s - k_j^\top x_c)^2} \text{)} \\
&= \Delta L + \sum_{|L_r - k_j^\top x_c| \geq \Delta L} e^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta\Delta L^2} 2dB^2 \\
&\leq \Delta L + Pe^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta\Delta L^2} 2dB^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The above calculations conclude the following result

$$\|V^{(j)} \text{Softmax}((K^{(j)})^\top Q^{(j)})_{:,c} - k_j^\top x_c e_j^{(3n)}\|_\infty \leq \Delta L + Pe^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta\Delta L^2} 2dB^2. \quad (\text{B.23})$$

For any  $\epsilon_1 > 0$ , configure  $P$  to be larger than  $4dB^2/\epsilon_1$ . This means

$$\Delta L = \frac{2dB^2}{P} \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}.$$

Then we set  $\beta$  to satisfy

$$\beta \geq \frac{4}{4} \ln\left(\frac{4dB^2P}{\epsilon_1}\right) B\Delta L.$$

This means

$$Pe^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta\Delta L^2} 2dB^2 \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}.$$

Thus by (B.23) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^K \circ \text{Linear}_j^K \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) - \begin{bmatrix} K \\ 0_{n \times n} \\ 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty &\leq \Delta L + Pe^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta\Delta L^2} 2dB^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} \\
&= \epsilon_1,
\end{aligned}$$

for any  $\epsilon_1 > 0$ .

**In-Context Calculation of  $Q$  and  $V$ .** Let  $\text{Linear}_j^Q$ ,  $\text{Linear}_j^V$  denote the linear layers preceding  $\text{Attn}_j^Q$  and  $\text{Attn}_j^V$ . These layers are constructed similarly to those of  $K$ . We define  $\text{Linear}_j^Q$ ,  $\text{Linear}_j^V$  as

$$\text{Linear}_j^Q(Z) := \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} \\ 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & I_d & 0_{d \times d} \\ 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times d} \end{bmatrix} Z \begin{bmatrix} L_0 e_j^{(n)} & L_1 e_j^{(n)} & \cdots & L_P e_j^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times 2d} \\ 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times 2d} \\ 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times 2d} \end{bmatrix} Z \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0_{n \times (P+1-n)} \end{bmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{2d \times (P+1)} \\ M_1 \\ M_L \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+3) \times (P+1)},$$

and

$$\text{Linear}_j^V(Z) := \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} \\ 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & I_d \\ 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times d} \end{bmatrix} Z \begin{bmatrix} L_0 e_j^{(n)} & L_1 e_j^{(n)} & \cdots & L_P e_j^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times 2d} \\ 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times 2d} \\ 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times d} & 0_{3 \times 2d} \end{bmatrix} Z \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0_{n \times (P+1-n)} \end{bmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{2d \times (P+1)} \\ M_1 \\ M_L \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+3) \times (P+1)}.$$

Similar to  $\text{Linear}_j^K$ , they output

$$\text{Linear}_j^Q(Z) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n & 0_d & \cdots & 0_d \\ 2L_0 q_j & 2L_1 q_j & \cdots & 2L_{n-1} q_j & 2L_n q_j & \cdots & 2L_P q_j \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ L_0 & L_1 & \cdots & L_{n-1} & L_n & \cdots & L_P \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_{n-1}^2 & -L_n^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{Linear}_j^V(Z) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n & 0_d & \cdots & 0_d \\ 2L_0 v_j & 2L_1 v_j & \cdots & 2L_{n-1} v_j & 2L_n v_j & \cdots & 2L_P v_j \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ L_0 & L_1 & \cdots & L_{n-1} & L_n & \cdots & L_P \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_{n-1}^2 & -L_n^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \end{bmatrix},$$

which only replaces the output of  $k_j$  in  $\text{Linear}_j^K$  to  $q_j$  and  $v_j$  respectively.

The attention in the in-context calculation of  $Q$  and  $V$  are the same with that in  $K$  except for the  $W_V^{(j)}$  part. Denote them as  $W_V^{(j;Q)}$  and  $W_V^{(j;V)}$ .

For  $Q$ , we have:

$$W_V^{(j;Q)} := e_{j+n}^{(3n)} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times d} & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For  $V$ , we have:

$$W_V^{(j;V)} := e_{j+2n}^{(3n)} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{1 \times d} & 0_{1 \times d} & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In the occasion of  $K$ , we have

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^K \circ \text{Linear}_j^K \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) - \begin{bmatrix} K \\ 0_{n \times n} \\ 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_1,$$

Similarly, the outputs of  $\sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^Q \circ \text{Linear}_j^Q$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^V \circ \text{Linear}_j^V$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^Q \circ \text{Linear}_j^Q \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) - \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times n} \\ Q \\ 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_1 \\ & \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^V \circ \text{Linear}_j^V \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) - \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times n} \\ 0_{n \times n} \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_1. \end{aligned}$$

As previously stated in (B.19),  $\text{Attn}_j$ ,  $\text{Attn}_{n+j}$  and  $\text{Attn}_{2n+j}$  denote  $\text{Attn}_j^K$ ,  $\text{Attn}_j^Q$  and  $\text{Attn}_j^V$  respectively.

Then the output of the complete network satisfies

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{3n} \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) - \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix}}_{3n \times n} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_1.$$

(notice the non-zero parts of the three counterparts do not intersect)

**In-Context Calculation of Attention.** We construct  $\text{Attn}_s$  to be

$$\text{Attn}_s(Z) := \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times 2n} & I_n \end{bmatrix}}_{W_V} Z \text{Softmax} \left( \left( \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0_{n \times 2n} \end{bmatrix}}_{W_K} Z \right)^\top \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times n} & I_n & 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}}_{W_Q} Z \right).$$

We have

$$\text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right) = \underbrace{W_V X}_{n \times n} \text{Softmax} \left( \underbrace{(W_K X)^\top W_Q X}_{n \times n} \right).$$

Now we estimate the error due to the difference between the output of  $\sum_{j=1}^{3n} \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j \left( [X^\top \ W_K \ W_Q \ W_V]^\top \right)$  and  $[K^\top \ Q^\top \ V^\top]^\top$ .

Define

$$\begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix} := \sum_{j=1}^{3n} \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

This is the same as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^K \circ \text{Linear}_j^K \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \begin{bmatrix} K' \\ 0_{n \times n} \\ 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^Q \circ \text{Linear}_j^Q \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times n} \\ Q' \\ 0_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_j^V \circ \text{Linear}_j^V \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^\top \\ W_Q^\top \\ W_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times n} \\ 0_{n \times n} \\ V' \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

In this definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix} \right) - \text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= V' \text{Softmax} (K'^\top Q') - V \text{Softmax} (K^\top Q) \\ &= (V' - V) \text{Softmax} (K'^\top Q') + V (\text{Softmax} (K'^\top Q') - \text{Softmax} (K^\top Q)). \end{aligned}$$

This yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K' \\ Q' \\ V' \end{bmatrix} \right) - \text{Attn}_s \left( \begin{bmatrix} K \\ Q \\ V \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\|_\infty \\
&= \left\| (V' - V) \text{Softmax}(K'^\top Q') + V(\text{Softmax}(K'^\top Q') - \text{Softmax}(K^\top Q)) \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \left\| (V' - V) \text{Softmax}(K'^\top Q') \right\|_\infty + \left\| V(\text{Softmax}(K'^\top Q') - \text{Softmax}(K^\top Q)) \right\|_\infty \\
&\hspace{15em} \text{(Triangle inequality)} \\
&\leq \epsilon_1 + n \|V\|_\infty \left\| \text{Softmax}(K'^\top Q') - \text{Softmax}(K^\top Q) \right\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds true because  $\text{Softmax}(K'^\top Q')$  has each column summing up to 1, which means

$$(V' - V) \text{Softmax}(K'^\top Q')_{:,j}$$

is a weighted sum of the columns in  $V' - V$ .

Thus we have

$$\|(V' - V) \text{Softmax}(K'^\top Q')_{:,j}\|_\infty \leq \|V - V'\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_1.$$

because the average of columns has a smaller maximal entry than the original columns.

Since  $X, W_K, W_Q, W_V$  are all bounded in infinite norm, the multiplication among them is also bounded in infinite norm. We denote this bound as  $B_{KQV}$ .

Now we calculate the error of the last term in the above inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(\text{Softmax}(K'^\top Q') - \text{Softmax}(K^\top Q))_{i,j}| \\
&= \left| \frac{e^{K'_i \cdot Q'_j}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j}} - \frac{e^{K_i \cdot Q_j}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j}} \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{e^{K'_i \cdot Q'_j} - e^{K_i \cdot Q_j}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j}} \right| + \left| e^{K_i \cdot Q_j} \left( \frac{1}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j}} - \frac{1}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j}} \right) \right| \\
&\leq \frac{e^{K'_i \cdot Q'_j}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j}} |1 - e^{K'_i \cdot Q'_j - K_i \cdot Q_j}| + e^{K_i \cdot Q_j} \frac{1}{(\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j})(\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j})} \left| \sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j} - \sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j} \right| \\
&\leq |1 - e^{\epsilon_1(K'_i + Q'_j) + \epsilon_1^2}| + \left| 1 - \frac{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j}} \right| \\
&\leq 2|1 - e^{\epsilon_1(K'_i + Q'_j) + \epsilon_1^2}| \hspace{10em} \text{(the largest deviation ratio between } e^{K_{i'} \cdot Q_j} \text{ and } e^{K'_{i'} \cdot Q'_j} \text{ are invariant of } i) \\
&\leq 2|1 - e^{2\epsilon_1(B_{KQV} + \frac{1}{2})}|,
\end{aligned}$$

in which  $K'_i$  and  $Q'_i$  denote the columns in  $K'$  and  $Q'$  respectively.

Thus  $\epsilon_1$  satisfies

$$\epsilon_1 \leq \frac{\ln(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2})}{2B_{KQV} + 1}.$$

This completes the proof. □

## B.7 Proof of Corollary 3.2.1

**Theorem B.7** (Restate of **Corollary 3.2.1**: In-Context Emulation of Statistical Methods). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the set of all the in-context algorithms that a one-layer single-layer attention is able to approximate. For an  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  (that is, a specific algorithm), let  $W_K^a, W_Q^a, W_V^a$  denote the weights of the attention that implements this algorithm. For any  $\epsilon > 0$  and any finite set  $\mathcal{A}_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ , there exists a 2-layer attention  $\text{Attn} \circ \text{Attn}_m$  such that:

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{3n} \text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W^a \end{bmatrix} \right) - a(X) \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}_0,$$

where  $W^a$  is the  $W$  defined as **Definition 3.1** using  $W_K^a, W_Q^a, W_V^a$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume all  $W_K^a, W_Q^a, W_V^a$  to be of the same hidden dimension since we are always able to pad them to the same size. According to **Theorem 3.2**, there exists a network  $\sum_{j=1}^n \text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j$  that approximate  $a(X)$  with an error no larger than  $\epsilon > 0$  when given input of the form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^{a\top} \\ W_Q^{a\top} \\ W_V^{a\top} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then for a set of  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , define  $P_m := \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_0} P_\epsilon^{(a)}$ .

By **Theorem 3.2**, there exists a network consisting of a self-attention followed by a multi-head attention with a linear layer and parameter  $P$  equals to  $P_m$ , such that for any  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , we have:

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{3n} \text{Attn}_s \circ \text{Attn}_j \circ \text{Linear}_j \left( \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_K^{a\top} \\ W_Q^{a\top} \\ W_V^{a\top} \end{bmatrix} \right) - a(X) \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}_0.$$

This completes the proof. □

## C In-Context Application of Statistical Methods by Modern Hopfield Network

**Definition C.1** (Modern Hopfield Network). Define  $Y = (y_1, \dots, y_N)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times N}$  as the raw stored pattern,  $R = (r_1, \dots, r_S)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{R_r \times S}$  as the raw state pattern, and  $W_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_r}$ ,  $W_K \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_y}$ ,  $W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v \times d}$  as the projection matrices. A Hopfield layer Hopfield is defined as:

$$\text{Hopfield}(R; Y, W_Q, W_K, W_V) := \underbrace{W_V}_{d_v \times d} \underbrace{W_K Y}_{d \times N} \text{Softmax}(\underbrace{\beta(W_K Y)^\top W_Q R}_{N \times S}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v \times S}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where  $\beta$  is a temperature parameter.

With  $K \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$  denoting  $W_K Y$ ,  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times S}$  denoting  $W_Q R$  and  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v \times N}$  denoting  $W_V W_K Y$ , (C.1) writes out as:

$$\text{Hopfield}(R; Y, W_Q, W_K, W_V) := V \text{Softmax}(\beta \cdot K^\top Q) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v \times S}.$$

**Theorem C.1.** Let  $Z = [z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$  denote the input from a compact input domain. For any linear transformation  $l(z) = a^\top z + b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and any continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^o$  where  $o$  is the output dimension, there exists a Hopfield network Hopfield such that:

$$\|\text{Hopfield}(Z) - [f(l(z_1)) \quad f(l(z_2)) \quad \dots \quad f(l(z_n))]\|_\infty \leq \epsilon,$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .

*Proof.* We first perform a simple token-wise linear transformation on the input:

$$\text{Linear}(Z) := \begin{bmatrix} I_{d \times d} \\ 0_{1 \times d} \end{bmatrix} Z + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times n} \\ 1_{1 \times n} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ 1_{1 \times n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times n}.$$

We then construct  $W_Q$  to be:

$$W_Q := I_{(d+1)},$$

which is an identity matrix of dimension  $\mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (d+1)}$ .

This yields that:

$$Q := W_Q \text{Linear}(Z) = \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ 1_{1 \times n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times n}.$$

Following the definition of *Interpolations* in [Appendix B.6](#),  $K, V$  are constructed as (here we omit

$Y$  since it's not the input):

$$K := \begin{bmatrix} 2L_0a & 2L_1a & \cdots & 2L_Pa \\ 2L_0b - L_0^2 & 2L_1b - L_1^2 & \cdots & 2L_Pb - L_P^2 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$V := [f(L_0) \ f(L_1) \ \cdots \ f(L_P)].$$

By **Definition C.1**, we have:

$$\text{Hopfield}(Z)$$

$$= [f(L_0) \ f(L_1) \ \cdots \ f(L_P)] \text{Softmax} \left( \beta \begin{bmatrix} 2l(z_1)L_0 - L_0^2 & 2l(z_2)L_0 - L_0^2 & \cdots & 2l(z_n)L_0 - L_0^2 \\ 2l(z_1)L_1 - L_1^2 & 2l(z_2)L_1 - L_1^2 & \cdots & 2l(z_n)L_1 - L_1^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 2l(z_1)L_P - L_P^2 & 2l(z_2)L_P - L_P^2 & \cdots & 2l(z_n)L_P - L_P^2 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

This is equivalent to:

$$\text{Hopfield}(Z)$$

$$= [f(L_0) \ f(L_1) \ \cdots \ f(L_P)] \text{Softmax} \left( -\beta \begin{bmatrix} (l(z_1) - L_0)^2 & (l(z_2) - L_0)^2 & \cdots & (l(z_n) - L_0)^2 \\ (l(z_1) - L_1)^2 & (l(z_2) - L_1)^2 & \cdots & (l(z_n) - L_1)^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (l(z_1) - L_P)^2 & (l(z_2) - L_P)^2 & \cdots & (l(z_n) - L_P)^2 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

For any column  $c \in [n]$  in  $\text{Hopfield}(Z)$ , we have:

$$\text{Hopfield}(Z)_{:,c} = [f(L_0) \ f(L_1) \ \cdots \ f(L_P)] \text{Softmax} \left( -\beta \begin{bmatrix} (l(z_c) - L_0)^2 \\ (l(z_c) - L_1)^2 \\ \vdots \\ (l(z_c) - L_P)^2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{r=1}^P \frac{e^{-\beta(l(z_c) - L_r)^2}}{\sum_{r'=1}^P e^{-\beta(l(z_c) - L_{r'})^2}} f(L_r).$$

When  $\beta$  is large enough, we have:

$$\sum_{(l(z_c) - L_r)^2 \geq \Delta L} \frac{e^{-\beta(l(z_c) - L_r)^2}}{\sum_{r'=1}^P e^{-\beta(l(z_c) - L_{r'})^2}} \leq \sum_{(l(z_i) - L_r)^2 \geq \Delta L} \frac{e^{-\beta \Delta L}}{e^{-\beta \frac{\Delta L}{2}}} \leq P e^{-\frac{\beta \Delta L}{2}} \leq \epsilon_1,$$

for any  $\epsilon_1 > 0$ .

This means that the proportion of the  $f(L_r)$  in  $\text{Hopfield}(Z)_{:,c}$  that deviates from  $l(z_c)$  is no larger

than  $\epsilon_1$ .

Since  $f$  and  $l$  are continuous, and  $Z$  comes from a compact domain,  $l(z_i)$  comes from a compact domain for all  $i \in [n]$ . Thus  $f$  is uniformly continuous on its input domain. This means that for any  $\epsilon_2 > 0$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that when  $(x - y)^2 \leq \delta$ ,  $\|f(x) - f(y)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_2$ .

Configuring  $\Delta L \leq \delta$  yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\text{Hopfield}(Z)_{:,c} - f(l(z_c))\|_\infty \\
& \leq \sum_{r=1}^P \frac{e^{-\beta(l(z_c)-L_r)^2}}{\sum_{r'=1}^P e^{-\beta(l(z_c)-L_{r'})^2}} \|f(L_r) - f(l(z_c))\|_\infty \\
& = \sum_{(l(z_c)-L_r)^2 \geq \Delta L} \frac{e^{-\beta(l(z_c)-L_r)^2}}{\sum_{r'=1}^P e^{-\beta(l(z_c)-L_{r'})^2}} \|f(L_r) - f(l(z_c))\|_\infty \\
& \quad + \sum_{(l(z_c)-L_r)^2 \leq \Delta L} \frac{e^{-\beta(l(z_c)-L_r)^2}}{\sum_{r'=1}^P e^{-\beta(l(z_c)-L_{r'})^2}} \|f(L_r) - f(l(z_c))\|_\infty \\
& \leq \epsilon_1 \cdot 2B + (1 - \epsilon_1)\epsilon_2,
\end{aligned}$$

in which  $B := \|f\|_{L_\infty}$  is the bound of  $f$  in infinite norm.

We set  $\epsilon_2 \leq \epsilon/2$ ,  $\epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon/(4B)$ . This yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\text{Hopfield}(Z)_{:,c} - f(l(z_c))\|_\infty & \leq \epsilon_1 \cdot 2B + (1 - \epsilon_1)\epsilon_2 \\
& \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4B} \cdot 2B + 1 \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

**Theorem C.2.** Define

$$X := \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times n} \quad \text{and} \quad W := [w \quad w \quad \cdots \quad w] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n},$$

where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  are the input-output pairs.  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the linear coefficient to optimize. Suppose  $x_i, y_i$  and  $w$  are bounded by  $B$  in infinite norm.

For any continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a Hopfield layer Hopfield with linear connections such that:

$$\|\text{Hopfield}(W; X) - [f(w^\top x_1 - y_1)x_1 \quad f(w^\top x_2 - y_2)x_2 \quad \cdots \quad f(w^\top x_n - y_n)x_n]\|_\infty \leq \epsilon,$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .

*Proof.* Before plugging input  $W$  to the Hopfield layer, we pass it through a linear transformation

Linear<sub>w</sub>:

$$\text{Linear}_w(W) := \begin{bmatrix} I_d \\ 0_{(d+n+2) \times d} \end{bmatrix} W + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times n} \\ -1_{1 \times n} \\ 0_{d \times n} \\ -1_{1 \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} W \\ -1_{1 \times n} \\ 0_{d \times n} \\ -1_{1 \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2d+n+2) \times n}.$$

We also pass  $X$  through a linear transformation Linear<sub>x</sub>:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Linear}_x(X) \\ := & \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} I_{d+1} \\ 0_{(d+1+n) \times (d+1)} \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+n+2) \times (d+1)} \underbrace{X}_{(d+1) \times n} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times (i-1)(P+1)} & 2L_0 e_i^{(n)} & 2L_1 e_i^{(n)} & \cdots & 2L_P e_i^{(n)} & 0_{n \times (n-i)(P+1)} \end{bmatrix}}_{n \times n(P+1)} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{(d+1) \times d} & 0_{(d+1)} \\ I_d & 0_d \\ 0_{(n+1) \times d} & 0_{n+1} \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+n+2) \times (d+1)} X \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times (i-1)(P+1)} & f(L_0) e_i^{(i)} & f(L_1) e_i^{(i)} & \cdots & f(L_P) e_i^{(i)} & 0_{n \times (n-i)(P+1)} \end{bmatrix} \\ & + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0_{(2d+1) \times (P+1)} & \cdots & 0_{(2d+1) \times (P+1)} \\ S & \cdots & S \\ (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) e_1^{(n)} 1_{1 \times (P+1)} & \cdots & (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) e_n^{(n)} 1_{1 \times (P+1)} \end{bmatrix}}_{(2d+n+2) \times n(P+1)} \\ = & [T_1 \quad T_2 \quad \cdots \quad T_n], \end{aligned}$$

in which:

$$\begin{aligned} 1_{1 \times (P+1)} &:= [1 \quad 1 \quad \cdots \quad 1] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (P+1)}, \\ S &:= [-L_0^2 \quad -L_1^2 \quad \cdots \quad L_P^2] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (P+1)}, \\ T_i &:= \begin{bmatrix} 2L_0 x_i & 2L_1 x_i & \cdots & 2L_P x_i \\ 2L_0 y_i & 2L_1 y_i & \cdots & 2L_P y_i \\ f(L_0) x_i & f(L_1) x_i & \cdots & f(L_P) x_i \\ -L_0^2 & -L_1^2 & \cdots & -L_P^2 \\ (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) e_i^{(n)} & (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) e_i^{(n)} & \cdots & (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) e_i^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2d+n+2) \times (P+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\epsilon_0$  is a parameter that we will designate later according to  $\epsilon$ .

Now construct  $W_K, W_Q, W_V$  to be:

$$\begin{aligned} W_Q &:= I_{2d+n+2}, \\ W_K &:= I_{2d+n+2}, \end{aligned}$$

$$W_V^\top := \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d \times (d+1)} & I_d & 0_{d \times (n+1)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times (2d+n+2)}.$$

Therefore, by **Definition C.1**, the output becomes:

$$\text{Hopfield}(\text{Linear}_w(W); \text{Linear}_x(X)) = W_V \text{Linear}_x(X) \text{Softmax}(\beta \text{Linear}_x(X)^\top \text{Linear}_w(W)),$$

in which:

$$\text{Softmax}(\text{Linear}_x(X)^\top \text{Linear}_w(W)) = \text{Softmax}(\beta \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & T_2 & \cdots & T_n \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} W \\ -\mathbf{1}_{1 \times n} \\ 0_{d \times n} \\ -\mathbf{1}_{1 \times n} \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}).$$

This is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Linear}_x(X)^\top \text{Linear}_w(W))_{:,c} &= \begin{bmatrix} T_1^\top \\ T_2^\top \\ \vdots \\ T_n^\top \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w \\ -1 \\ 0_d \\ -1 \\ e_c^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} M_{1,c} \\ M_{2,c} \\ \vdots \\ M_{n,c} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

in which:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{i,c} &:= T_i^\top \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w \\ -1 \\ 0_d \\ -1 \\ e_i^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 2L_0 x_i^\top w - 2L_0 y_i - L_0^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c} \\ 2L_1 x_i^\top w - 2L_1 y_i - L_1^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c} \\ \cdots \\ 2L_P x_i^\top w - 2L_P y_i - L_P^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $i \in [n]$  and  $c \in [n]$ , and  $\mathbf{1}_{i=c}$  represents the indicator function of  $i = c$ .

This means that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Softmax}(\beta \text{Linear}_x(X)^\top \text{Linear}_w(W))_{:,c} \\
&= \text{Softmax}\left(\beta \begin{bmatrix} M_{1,c} \\ M_{2,c} \\ \vdots \\ M_{n,c} \end{bmatrix}\right) \\
&= \beta \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}} e^{(nP)} e^{(i-1)P+j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have (without loss of generality, we ignore the  $\beta$  parameter in Softmax):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Hopfield}(\text{Linear}_w(W); \text{Linear}_x(X))_{:,c} \\
&= W_V \text{Linear}_x(X) \text{Softmax}(\text{Linear}_x(X)^\top \text{Linear}_w(W))_{:,c} \\
& \hspace{15em} (W_v \text{ only retrieves the } (d+2)\text{-th row in } T_i) \\
&= [F_1 \ \cdots \ F_n] \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}} e^{(nP)} e^{(i-1)P+j} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}} f(L_j) x_i,
\end{aligned}$$

in which  $F$  is:

$$F_i := [f(L_0)x_i \quad f(L_1)x_i \quad \cdots \quad f(L_P)x_i].$$

For every  $i \in [n]$ , if  $i \neq c$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}} \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}} \\
&< \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}} \quad (\text{only taking the } i' = c \text{ part}) \\
&< \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2dB^2 + B\}}{P \exp(2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)} = \epsilon_0.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $i = c$ , since

$$\sum_{i \neq c} \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_i^\top w - 2L_j y_i - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}} \leq (n-1)\epsilon_0,$$

we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{j=0}^P \exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}} \\ &\geq 1 - (n-1)\epsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for the parts in the weighted sum output that corresponds to rows in  $M_{:,c}$  in the attention score matrix, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_{i'} - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}} f(L_j) x_c - f(x_c^\top w - y_c) x_c \right\|_\infty \\ &= \left\| \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}} (f(L_j) x_c - f(x_c^\top w - y_c) x_c) \right. \\ & \quad \cdot \frac{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^P \exp\{2L_k x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_k y_{i'} - L_k^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}} \\ & \quad \left. - \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^P \exp\{2L_k x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_k y_{i'} - L_k^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}\right) f(x_c^\top w - y_c) x_c \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \cdot d \|x_c\|_\infty \\ & \quad - \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^P \exp\{2L_k x_{i'}^\top w - 2L_k y_{i'} - L_k^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}_{i=c}\}}\right) |f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \|x_c\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2 + (2dB^2 + B - \ln \epsilon_0)\}} |f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \|x_c\|_\infty \\ & \quad + (n-1)\epsilon_0 B_f \|x_c\|_\infty \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{2L_j x_c^\top w - 2L_j y_c - L_j^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{2L_{j'} x_c^\top w - 2L_{j'} y_c - L_{j'}^2\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \|x_c\|_\infty + (n-1)\epsilon_0 B_f \|x_c\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_j)^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_{j'})^2\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \|x_c\|_\infty + (n-1)\epsilon_0 B_f \|x_c\|_\infty,$$

where we define  $B_f := |f|$  as the bound for  $f$ .

For any  $\epsilon_1 > 0$ , set  $\Delta L$  to be sufficiently small such that

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq \epsilon_1,$$

when  $|x - y| \leq \Delta L$ .

Then when  $\beta$  is sufficiently large, we have

$$\sum_{|L_i - (x_c^\top w - y_c)| > \Delta L} \frac{\exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_j)^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_{j'})^2\}} \leq \epsilon_2,$$

for any  $\epsilon_2 > 0$ .

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^P \frac{\exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_j)^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_{j'})^2\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \\ &= \sum_{|L_i - (x_c^\top w - y_c)| > \Delta L} \frac{\exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_j)^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_{j'})^2\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \\ & \quad + \sum_{|L_i - (x_c^\top w - y_c)| \leq \Delta L} \frac{\exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_j)^2\}}{\sum_{j'=0}^P \exp\{-\beta(x_c^\top w - y_c - L_{j'})^2\}} |f(L_j) - f(x_c^\top w - y_c)| \\ & \leq \epsilon_2 \cdot 2B_f + \epsilon_1. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary C.2.1** (In-Context GD of Hopfield Layer). Define

$$X := \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \\ y_1 & y_2 & \cdots & y_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times n} \quad \text{and} \quad W := [w \ w \ \cdots \ w] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n},$$

where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  are the input-output pairs.  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the linear coefficient we aim to optimize. For any differentiable loss function  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , There exists a Hopfield layer Hopfield with linear connections such that:

$$\|\text{Hopfield}(W; X) - [\nabla \ell(w^\top x_1 - y_1)x_1 \quad \nabla \ell(w^\top x_2 - y_2)x_2 \quad \cdots \quad \nabla \ell(w^\top x_n - y_n)x_n]\|_\infty \leq \epsilon,$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .

*Proof.* Replacing the continuous function  $f$  in **Theorem C.2** with  $\nabla\ell$  completes the proof.  $\square$

## References

- Jacob Abernethy, Alekh Agarwal, Teodor Vanislavov Marinov, and Manfred K Warmuth. A mechanism for sample-efficient in-context learning for sparse retrieval tasks. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 3–46. PMLR, 2024.
- Ekin Akyürek, Dale Schuurmans, Jacob Andreas, Tengyu Ma, and Denny Zhou. What learning algorithm is in-context learning? investigations with linear models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Yu Bai, Fan Chen, Huan Wang, Caiming Xiong, and Song Mei. Transformers as statisticians: Provable in-context learning with in-context algorithm selection. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:57125–57211, 2023.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Dean De Cock. Ames, iowa: Alternative to the boston housing data as an end of semester regression project. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 19(3):1–13, 2011.
- Shivam Garg, Dimitris Tsipras, Percy S Liang, and Gregory Valiant. What can transformers learn in-context? a case study of simple function classes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30583–30598, 2022.
- Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Hude Liu, Hong-Yu Chen, Weimin Wu, and Han Liu. Universal approximation with softmax attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.15956*, 2025a.
- Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Wei-Po Wang, Ammar Gilani, Chenyang Li, Zhao Song, and Han Liu. Fundamental limits of prompt tuning transformers: Universality, capacity and efficiency. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025b.
- Tokio Kajitsuka and Issei Sato. Are transformers with one layer self-attention using low-rank weight matrices universal approximators? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2021.
- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2021.
- Hude Liu, Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Zhao Song, and Han Liu. Attention mechanism, max-affine partition, and universal approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.19901*, 2025.

- Sheng Liu, Haotian Ye, Lei Xing, and James Zou. In-context vectors: Making in context learning more effective and controllable through latent space steering. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Xiao Liu, Kaixuan Ji, Yicheng Fu, Weng Tam, Zhengxiao Du, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. P-tuning: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning across scales and tasks. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 61–68, 2022.
- Sewon Min, Xinxi Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work? In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11048–11064, 2022.
- Hubert Ramsauer, Bernhard Schöfl, Johannes Lehner, Philipp Seidl, Michael Widrich, Thomas Adler, Lukas Gruber, Markus Holzleitner, Milena Pavlović, Geir Kjetil Sandve, et al. Hopfield networks is all you need. 2021.
- Yuji Tachikawa. On gauging finite subgroups. *SciPost Physics*, 8(1):015, 2020.
- Johannes Von Oswald, Eyvind Niklasson, Ettore Randazzo, João Sacramento, Alexander Mordvintsev, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Max Vladymyrov. Transformers learn in-context by gradient descent. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 35151–35174. PMLR, 2023.
- Weimin Wu, Maojiang Su, Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Zhao Song, and Han Liu. In-context deep learning via transformer models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2025.
- Chulhee Yun, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Ankit Singh Rawat, Sashank J Reddi, and Sanjiv Kumar. Are transformers universal approximators of sequence-to-sequence functions? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Ruiqi Zhang, Spencer Frei, and Peter L Bartlett. Trained transformers learn linear models in-context. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(49):1–55, 2024.
- Yufan Zhuang, Chandan Singh, Liyuan Liu, Jingbo Shang, and Jianfeng Gao. Vector-icl: In-context learning with continuous vector representations. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.