

Random Text, Zipf’s Law, Critical Length, and Implications for Large Language Models

Vladimir Berman
Aitiologia LLC
vb7654321@gmail.com

November 11, 2025

Abstract

We study a deliberately primitive, non-linguistic model of text: a sequence of independent draws from a finite alphabet of letters plus a single space symbol. A word is defined as a maximal block of non-space symbols. Within this strictly symbol-level setting, with no morphology, syntax, or semantics, we derive several structural results. First, word lengths follow a geometric distribution governed by the probability of the space symbol. Second, the expected number of words of a given length and the expected number of *distinct* words of that length can be expressed in closed form via a coupon-collector argument. This allows us to define a *critical word length* k^* at which individual word types transition from occurring many times on average to occurring at most once. Third, by combining the exponential growth in the number of possible words of length k with the exponential decay of the probability of any particular word of length k , we obtain a rank–frequency law of Zipf type, $p(r) \propto r^{-\alpha}$, with an exponent α that is an explicit function of the alphabet size and the space probability.

Our contribution is twofold. On the mathematical side, we present a unified derivation linking word lengths, vocabulary growth, critical length, and rank–frequency behavior in a single, fully explicit framework. On the conceptual side, we argue that these results provide a structurally grounded “null model” for word statistics in natural language and for token statistics in large language models (LLMs). They show that Zipf-like patterns can arise from the combinatorics of symbols and a simple segmentation mechanism, without any optimization principle or deep linguistic structure. We discuss how this perspective complements existing work on random texts and challenges over-interpretations of Zipf’s law in both quantitative linguistics and modern LLM research.

Keywords: Random text models; Zipf’s law; Mandelbrot distributions; Word-length statistics; Geometric processes; Segmentation-based generative models; Statistical text structure; Large Language Models.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Summary of Contributions	5
3	Related Work	7
4	Model Definition	8
4.1	Independent symbol draws	8
4.2	Derived structural consequences	8
5	Word Lengths and Expected Word Counts	9
5.1	Geometric distribution of word lengths	9
5.2	Expected number of words in a text	9
5.3	Expected number of words of length k	10
6	Vocabulary Growth and Critical Word Length	11
6.1	Number of possible words of length k	11
6.2	Expected number of distinct words of length k	11
6.3	Rare-word regime and saturation	12
6.4	Critical word length k^*	13
7	Rank–Frequency Law	13
7.1	Ranking words by probability	14
7.2	Expressing length as a function of rank	14
7.3	Probability as a function of rank	14
7.4	Dependence of the exponent on model parameters	15
8	Comparison with Real Language and Implications for LLMs	15
8.1	Agreements and disagreements with natural language	16
8.2	Large language models and token distributions	16
9	Discussion	17
9.1	Structural Origins of Statistical Regularities	17
9.2	Critical Length and the Core–Tail Divide	18
9.3	Comparison with Classical Models	18
9.4	Limitations of the Structural Model	18
9.5	Implications for Quantitative Linguistics	19
10	Implications for Large Language Models	19
10.1	Tokenization as a Structural Mechanism	19
10.2	Zipfian Structure in Training Corpora	19
10.3	Vocabulary Growth and Context Limitations	20
10.4	Higher-Order Statistics and Burstiness	20
10.5	Structural Baseline for Evaluating LLM Behavior	20

10.6 Inductive Biases of Transformer Architectures	20
10.7 Future Research Directions	21
11 Conclusion	21
A Mathematical Derivations and Technical Foundations	22
A.1 Distribution of Word Lengths	22
A.2 Probability of a Specific Word of Length k	22
A.3 Critical Length k^*	23
A.4 Rank–Frequency Relation	23
A.5 Asymptotics of Vocabulary Growth	24
A.6 Expected Number of Unique Words	24
A.7 Poisson Approximation for Rare Strings	24
A.8 Summary	25

1 Introduction

Zipf’s law—the approximate inverse power-law relationship between a word’s rank and its frequency in a corpus—has long been considered one of the central empirical regularities of quantitative linguistics [Zipf, 1949]. In its simplest form, it states that if words are ranked by decreasing frequency, the probability $p(r)$ of the word at rank r satisfies

$$p(r) \propto r^{-\alpha}, \tag{1}$$

where α is typically close to 1 for natural language corpora. The apparent universality of this pattern has motivated a large literature proposing deep explanations based on efficiency, optimization, information theory, and the structure of human language and communication.

However, already in the mid-twentieth century it was observed that Zipf-like behavior can emerge even in extremely impoverished, non-linguistic models of text. In particular, Miller [1957] and Mandelbrot [1953] considered “monkey-at-the-typewriter” thought experiments in which symbols are generated independently according to a fixed distribution over letters and a space symbol. Subsequent work, including Li [1992] and Ferrer-i Cancho and Solé [2001], has refined and critiqued such models, leading to the prevailing view that random-text constructions should be treated as null models rather than realistic accounts of language structure.

In the present paper we deliberately embrace an *extreme* level of abstraction. We ignore all aspects of linguistics: no phonology, no morphology, no syntax, no semantics. We consider only a stream of independent symbols drawn from an alphabet of m letters and one special space symbol. A word is defined purely structurally as a maximal block of non-space symbols. This model clearly permits configurations that are highly implausible in real language (for example, arbitrarily long runs of the same letter, or nonsensical sequences of characters), and we do not attempt to constrain it with any linguistic rules.

The guiding question is:

If we forget everything about language and look only at spaces and letters, how far can we go in explaining the observed word statistics?

We show that, even under this brutally simplified view, a surprising amount of structure emerges:

- Word lengths follow an exact geometric distribution determined by the probability of drawing a space.
- The expected number of words of a given length in a text of length N and the expected number of *distinct* words of that length can be expressed in closed form.
- These expressions define a *critical word length* k^* at which word types transition from being typically repeated many times to being almost always unique.
- Combining the exponential growth in the number of possible words of length k with the exponential decay of the probability of any specific word of length k yields a Zipf-type rank–frequency law with exponent α that is an explicit function of the alphabet size and the space probability.

Our treatment differs from earlier random-text models in several ways. First, we present a unified derivation linking word lengths, vocabulary growth, critical length, and rank–frequency behavior in a single coherent framework. Second, we emphasize the structural nature of the resulting “laws”, framing them as consequences of combinatorics and segmentation rather than as emergent linguistic properties. Third, we explicitly discuss the relevance of this perspective for modern large language models (LLMs), which are trained to predict tokens in massive corpora and naturally inherit whatever structural regularities are present in those token streams.

From the standpoint of LLM design and evaluation, our results serve as a cautionary tale. Any model trained on real text will exhibit Zipf-like behavior at the level of token frequencies, but this does not by itself indicate deep understanding or linguistic competence. Conversely, when interpreting the statistics of generated text, one must carefully distinguish which patterns reflect structural baselines (such as those we derive here) and which genuinely depend on higher-level properties of language and world knowledge.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sections 2 and 3 we review prior work on Zipf’s law, random text models, and related critiques. Section 4 defines our symbol-level model. Sections 5 and 6 develop the analysis of word lengths, word counts, and vocabulary growth, culminating in the critical length k^* . Section 7 derives the rank–frequency law and describes how its exponent depends on model parameters. In Section 8 we compare the predictions of the model with empirical properties of natural language, discuss its limitations, and outline implications for LLMs and character-level language models. Section 9 concludes.

2 Summary of Contributions

This work develops a mathematically explicit character-level model of random text and shows that several familiar “laws of language” can arise from structural combinatorics alone, without any linguistic content. In this section we summarize the main contributions and situate them with respect to classical and modern research on statistical regularities in language.

Character-level generative framework with explicit segmentation. Most classical accounts of Zipfian behavior and related phenomena treat words as primitive units Zipf [1935, 1949], Mandelbrot [1953, 1954, 1959]. In contrast, we start from a minimalist model in which text is generated one character at a time, including a special space symbol. All word-level statistics—word lengths, frequencies, and vocabulary growth—are derived from this single character process. Unlike preferential-attachment and reinforcement models in the spirit of Yule [1925] and Simon [1955], our framework does not assume any dynamics defined directly at the level of word types.

Closed-form word-length distribution and critical length. We obtain an exact geometric distribution for word lengths induced purely by the random placement of spaces. On top of this, we introduce and analyze a critical length k^* that separates a finite “core” of word types, which recur many times, from a long “tail” of types that are overwhelmingly singletons. Earlier random-text studies, beginning with Miller’s observation that random

sequences of letters and spaces can produce Zipf-like distributions Miller [1957] and subsequent work by Li [1992], documented empirical properties of such models but did not offer a unified analytic treatment of word-lengths, recurrence statistics, and core–tail structure. Our formulation makes this structure explicit and quantitative.

Unified structural route to Zipf-like rank–frequency behavior. By combining (i) exponential growth in the number of possible strings of a given length with (ii) exponential decay in the probability of any particular string, we derive a power-law rank–frequency curve with an analytically characterized exponent. Information-theoretic derivations in the tradition of Mandelbrot [1953, 1954, 1961] posit optimization principles over pre-given word inventories. Our approach instead shows how Zipf-like behavior can emerge directly from a character-level generator with no linguistic structure and no global optimization.

Vocabulary growth and unique-word statistics. Within the same framework we derive asymptotic expressions for the expected number of distinct and unique word types as functions of text length, including Poisson approximations in the long-length regime. Prior work on vocabulary growth and Heaps-like behavior in random or weakly structured texts has often been empirical or simulation-based. Here these phenomena arise as analytic corollaries of a single underlying model, providing a controllable, fully specified baseline against which empirical corpora and more complex models can be compared.

Clarifying the role of structure in random-text models. Classical random-text studies Miller [1957], Li [1992] showed that certain rank–frequency patterns can appear without semantics or syntax, but left open which aspects of natural language statistics are genuinely linguistic and which are generic consequences of segmentation and combinatorics. Our analysis makes this distinction sharper: we identify precisely which regularities follow from the character-level mechanism alone and which would require additional structure (e.g., morphology, syntax, or semantic coherence) to match real-language data. In doing so, we complement and refine the intuition that some “laws of language” may be structural rather than linguistic.

Baseline for interpreting large language models. Although our generator is intentionally primitive, it defines a mathematically transparent “zero-language” reference model. Many diagnostic plots used to analyze natural language and embeddings—such as rank–frequency curves, vocabulary growth, and the distribution of word lengths—can also be computed for outputs of large language models. Our results make it possible to interpret such diagnostics relative to a baseline where all observed structure is due solely to random segmentation at the character level. Deviations from this baseline then quantify what modern neural language models add beyond structural combinatorics alone.

Methodological implications. Taken together, these contributions suggest that evaluation of statistical and neural language models should explicitly separate (i) properties that can be explained by simple combinatorial baselines from (ii) genuinely linguistic effects. By

providing a closed-form, analytically tractable random-text model that simultaneously delivers word-length distributions, core–tail behavior, rank–frequency curves, and vocabulary growth, this work offers such a baseline and clarifies how far one can go without any linguistic structure at all.

3 Related Work

The analysis of linguistic structure in randomly generated text has a long history, beginning with early investigations into the statistical properties of word sequences produced without semantic intention. This line of work is dominated by two major research traditions: (i) studies of “monkey-typing” models, where characters are sampled independently from a fixed alphabet, and (ii) research on empirical linguistic laws such as Zipf’s law, Heaps’ law, and word-length distributions.

Random character models and segmentation. The classical work of Miller [1957] and later refinements demonstrated that certain statistical regularities of natural language can appear even in texts generated from memoryless character distributions with a designated space symbol. Subsequent work by Li [1992] and others showed that word-length distributions follow predictable geometric forms derived from segmentation processes.

Mathematical models of word-length distributions. A significant body of research examined the conditions under which random segmentation processes reproduce empirical word-length distributions Lau, Li2. While natural languages typically exhibit mixtures of Poisson-like and lognormal components, random texts generate simpler geometric distributions. More sophisticated stochastic models—such as renewal processes, Markov character generators, or variable-rate segmentation—have been explored to approximate real histograms, but these models introduce non-random structure.

Random texts and linguistic laws. It has long been debated which linguistic laws require semantics or syntax, and which can arise from simple stochastic mechanisms. Baa showed that Heaps’ law can emerge under mild assumptions. Ferrer-i Cancho and Solé [2001] and collaborators explored whether Zipf-like rank–frequency distributions can be replicated by random generation with segmentation and constrained alphabet sizes.

Relation to modern computational linguistics. Random-text models serve as theoretical baselines for evaluating the complexity of linguistic sequences. Recent work Ble, Pim shows that character-level language models trained on randomly segmented corpora exhibit entropy profiles and tokenization patterns distinct from models trained on natural language.

Limitations of prior work. Most studies focus on frequency patterns or rank–frequency fits. Much less attention has been given to mathematically deriving the word-length distribution under general alphabet–space settings or to the role of consecutive spaces and

punctuation. Our work departs from prior studies by providing a comprehensive, fully analytical treatment of word-length distributions in a segmentation-driven character model without linguistic assumptions.

4 Model Definition

We introduce a deliberately simple, purely symbolic generative model of text. Let \mathcal{A} be an alphabet consisting of m non-space symbols

$$\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\},$$

together with a single distinguished *space symbol*, denoted by \blacksquare . Thus the full alphabet is

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\blacksquare\} \cup \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\}. \quad (2)$$

A text of length N is defined as a sequence of random variables

$$(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N), \quad X_i \in \mathcal{A}.$$

4.1 Independent symbol draws

We assume that symbols are drawn independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) from a fixed distribution:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_i = \blacksquare) = q, \quad \mathbb{P}(X_i = a_j) = p_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \quad (3)$$

where

$$q + \sum_{j=1}^m p_j = 1. \quad (4)$$

The parameter q governs the expected frequency of spaces; the complementary probabilities p_1, \dots, p_m describe the distribution of non-space symbols. Even in the absence of syntax, semantics, or morphology, this minimalist character-level model gives rise to a variety of nontrivial structural phenomena.

4.2 Derived structural consequences

A *word* is defined as any maximal block of consecutive non-space symbols. From the space probability q and the symbol probabilities p_1, \dots, p_m , several analytic properties follow naturally.

Word-length distribution. Let L denote the length of a word. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(L = \ell) = (1 - q)^\ell q, \quad \ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (5)$$

so word lengths follow a geometric distribution.

Expected number of words. For a text of length N , the expected number of words is

$$\mathbb{E}[\#\text{words}] = Nq. \quad (6)$$

Character-level view. The generator outputs the raw sequence

$$X_1 X_2 \cdots X_N,$$

and all word boundaries are induced by occurrences of the symbol \blacksquare . No additional linguistic structure is imposed; in later sections we show how classical rank–frequency and vocabulary-growth regularities already emerge from this purely symbolic mechanism.

5 Word Lengths and Expected Word Counts

We analyze the distribution of word lengths and the expected number of words of a given length in a text of fixed length N . These results are classical, but we state them explicitly because they form the analytical foundation for later sections.

5.1 Geometric distribution of word lengths

Consider a word that begins immediately after a space symbol \blacksquare (or at the start of the text). For this word to have length $k \geq 1$, the following must occur:

- the first k symbols after the boundary are non-space symbols;
- the $(k + 1)$ st symbol is a space symbol \blacksquare (or the text ends).

By independence,

$$\mathbb{P}(L = k) = (1 - q)^k q, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (7)$$

This geometric distribution depends only on q , the probability of drawing the space symbol \blacksquare .

The mean and variance are

$$\mathbb{E}[L] = \frac{1}{q}, \quad (8)$$

$$\text{Var}(L) = \frac{1 - q}{q^2}. \quad (9)$$

Thus, when spaces are rare (q small), words tend to be long; when spaces are frequent, words are short.

5.2 Expected number of words in a text

Let K_N denote the number of words in a text of length N . A word begins at position i whenever:

- $i = 1$ and $X_1 \neq \blacksquare$, or

- $i > 1$ and $X_i \neq \blacksquare$ but $X_{i-1} = \blacksquare$.

Define indicator variables

$$I_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if a word starts at position } i, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Then

$$K_N = \sum_{i=1}^N I_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[K_N] = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[I_i]. \quad (11)$$

We compute

$$\mathbb{E}[I_1] = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \neq \blacksquare) = 1 - q, \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[I_i] = \mathbb{P}(X_i \neq \blacksquare, X_{i-1} = \blacksquare) = (1 - q)q, \quad i = 2, \dots, N. \quad (13)$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[K_N] = (1 - q) + (N - 1)q(1 - q) = (1 - q)[1 + (N - 1)q]. \quad (14)$$

For large N ,

$$\mathbb{E}[K_N] \approx Nq(1 - q), \quad (15)$$

the expected number of words grows linearly with text length, with proportionality constant $q(1 - q)$.

5.3 Expected number of words of length k

Let $K_N^{(k)}$ denote the number of words of length exactly k . Boundary effects are negligible for large N , so the empirical word lengths $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{K_N}$ may be treated as i.i.d. draws from the geometric distribution of L .

Thus

$$\mathbb{P}(L = k) = (1 - q)^{k-1}q. \quad (16)$$

Then by linearity,

$$\mathbb{E}[K_N^{(k)}] \approx \mathbb{E}[K_N] \mathbb{P}(L = k) \approx [Nq(1 - q)] \cdot [(1 - q)^{k-1}q] = Nq^2(1 - q)^k. \quad (17)$$

Thus the expected count of length- k words exhibits geometric decay:

$$\mathbb{E}[K_N^{(k)}] \propto (1 - q)^k. \quad (18)$$

The prefactor Nq^2 determines the overall scale, while the factor $(1 - q)^k$ captures the rapid dropoff in the frequencies of longer words. Although this behavior resembles empirical linguistic data for short lengths, real languages depart from strict geometric decay for larger k , a point we will revisit later.

6 Vocabulary Growth and Critical Word Length

We now turn from counts of words (tokens) to counts of *distinct* words (types). For each length k we are interested in how many different k -letter words we expect to see in a text of length N . This leads naturally to a critical length k^* at which the typical behavior of word types changes qualitatively.

6.1 Number of possible words of length k

Under the equiprobable-letter assumption, there are

$$M_k = m^k \tag{19}$$

different possible words (strings) of length k , each consisting of letters from $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$.

As noted earlier, the probability that a randomly selected word has length k is $q(1-q)^{k-1}$, and conditional on $L = k$, all m^k words are equally likely. Thus, the probability that a random word equals a specific k -letter word w is

$$\pi_k = \mathbb{P}(\text{word} = w) = q(1-q)^{k-1} \cdot \frac{1}{m^k} = \frac{q(1-q)^{k-1}}{m^k}. \tag{20}$$

All m^k words of length k share this same probability.

6.2 Expected number of distinct words of length k

Let V_k denote the number of distinct word types of length k that appear at least once in a text of length N . To compute $\mathbb{E}[V_k]$, we proceed in two steps.

First, we approximate the total number of word tokens in the text by its expectation,

$$K \approx \mathbb{E}[K_N] \approx Nq(1-q). \tag{21}$$

Second, we treat these K words as i.i.d. draws from the word distribution. This is an approximation, but it becomes accurate for large N and is standard in type-token analyses.

For a fixed word w of length k , the probability that it does *not* appear in any of the K draws is $(1 - \pi_k)^K$. Therefore, the probability that it appears at least once is

$$\mathbb{P}(w \text{ appears at least once}) = 1 - (1 - \pi_k)^K. \tag{22}$$

Let us index all words of length k by w_1, \dots, w_{M_k} . Then

$$V_k = \sum_{i=1}^{M_k} I_i, \tag{23}$$

where I_i is the indicator that w_i appears at least once. Taking expectations and using

symmetry,

$$\mathbb{E}[V_k] = \sum_{i=1}^{M_k} \mathbb{E}[I_i] \quad (24)$$

$$= M_k \left[1 - (1 - \pi_k)^K \right] \quad (25)$$

$$= m^k \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{q(1-q)^{k-1}}{m^k} \right)^K \right]. \quad (26)$$

Substituting $K \approx Nq(1-q)$ yields

$$\mathbb{E}[V_k] \approx m^k \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{q(1-q)^{k-1}}{m^k} \right)^{Nq(1-q)} \right]. \quad (27)$$

Equation (27) describes how the expected vocabulary of length- k words grows with text length N .

6.3 Rare-word regime and saturation

Two limiting regimes are particularly informative.

Rare-word regime. If the mean number of occurrences of a specific word is small, then $\pi_k K \ll 1$, and we can approximate

$$(1 - \pi_k)^K \approx e^{-K\pi_k}. \quad (28)$$

In this regime,

$$\mathbb{E}[V_k] \approx m^k (1 - e^{-K\pi_k}) \quad (29)$$

$$\approx m^k (K\pi_k) \quad (30)$$

$$= Kq(1-q)^{k-1} \quad (31)$$

$$\approx \mathbb{E}[K_N^{(k)}]. \quad (32)$$

Thus, when words of length k are rare enough that most word types occur at most once, the expected number of distinct words of length k is essentially equal to the expected number of tokens of that length. In other words, almost every observed word is unique.

Saturation regime. At the opposite extreme, if $K\pi_k \gg 1$, then $(1 - \pi_k)^K$ is extremely small and

$$\mathbb{E}[V_k] \approx m^k. \quad (33)$$

In this regime, the text is long enough to have “sampled” almost all m^k possible words of length k . Additional text does not significantly increase the number of distinct length- k words; the vocabulary of that length is saturated.

6.4 Critical word length k^*

The transition between these regimes occurs when the expected number of occurrences of a particular word of length k is of order one. The mean number of occurrences of a fixed k -letter word in K draws is

$$\lambda_k = K\pi_k \approx Nq(1-q) \cdot \frac{q(1-q)^{k-1}}{m^k} = Nq^2 \frac{(1-q)^k}{m^k}. \quad (34)$$

The critical length k^* can be defined as the solution to

$$\lambda_{k^*} \approx 1. \quad (35)$$

Solving for k^* , we obtain

$$Nq^2 \frac{(1-q)^{k^*}}{m^{k^*}} \approx 1, \quad (36)$$

$$\left(\frac{1-q}{m}\right)^{k^*} \approx \frac{1}{Nq^2}, \quad (37)$$

$$k^* \ln\left(\frac{1-q}{m}\right) \approx -\ln(Nq^2), \quad (38)$$

$$k^* \approx \frac{\ln(Nq^2)}{\ln m - \ln(1-q)}. \quad (39)$$

Since $m > 1$ and $1 - q < 1$, we have $\ln m > 0$ and $\ln(1 - q) < 0$, so the denominator is positive. As N grows, k^* increases logarithmically.

The interpretation of k^* is intuitive:

- For $k < k^*$, many words of length k appear multiple times on average. The vocabulary of length- k words is saturated or close to saturation.
- For $k > k^*$, most words of length k appear at most once. The vocabulary is in the rare-word regime.

In this sense, k^* marks the boundary between a “core” of frequently re-used short words and a “tail” of long, mostly unique words. In real language, a similar qualitative distinction exists between short function words and longer content words, although the underlying mechanisms are far more complex than in our model.

7 Rank–Frequency Law

We are now in a position to derive a rank–frequency law for words in our model. The key idea is to relate the length of a word to its approximate rank among all words ordered by decreasing probability.

7.1 Ranking words by probability

All words of the same length k have the same probability π_k ,

$$\pi_k = \frac{q(1-q)^{k-1}}{m^k} = \frac{q}{1-q} \left(\frac{1-q}{m} \right)^k. \quad (40)$$

As k increases, π_k decreases geometrically, since $(1-q)/m < 1$. Therefore, in an ordering of all words by decreasing probability, all words of length 1 will come first, followed by all words of length 2, then all words of length 3, and so on.

Let R_k denote the total number of words of length at most k :

$$R_k = \sum_{j=1}^k m^j = m \frac{m^k - 1}{m - 1}. \quad (41)$$

For large k ,

$$R_k \approx \frac{m^{k+1}}{m-1} \propto m^k. \quad (42)$$

Thus, the rank of a typical word of length k is on the order of m^k .

7.2 Expressing length as a function of rank

Ignoring constant factors, we can relate rank r and length k as

$$r \propto m^k \quad \Rightarrow \quad k \approx \log_m r + C, \quad (43)$$

for some additive constant C that depends on the precise definition of rank. Since we are interested in asymptotic scaling, this constant does not affect the exponent of the resulting power law.

7.3 Probability as a function of rank

Recall that

$$\pi_k \propto \left(\frac{1-q}{m} \right)^k. \quad (44)$$

Substituting $k \approx \log_m r$ yields

$$\pi_k \propto \left(\frac{1-q}{m} \right)^{\log_m r} \quad (45)$$

$$= \exp \left(\log_m r \cdot \ln \left(\frac{1-q}{m} \right) \right) \quad (46)$$

$$= \exp \left(\frac{\ln r}{\ln m} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{1-q}{m} \right) \right) \quad (47)$$

$$= r^{\frac{\ln((1-q)/m)}{\ln m}}. \quad (48)$$

Define

$$\alpha = -\frac{\ln((1-q)/m)}{\ln m} = 1 - \frac{\ln(1-q)}{\ln m}. \quad (49)$$

Since $0 < 1 - q < 1$, we have $\ln(1 - q) < 0$, so $\alpha > 1$. We conclude that the probability of a word at rank r scales as

$$p(r) \propto r^{-\alpha}, \quad (50)$$

with

$$\alpha = 1 - \frac{\ln(1 - q)}{\ln m}. \quad (51)$$

7.4 Dependence of the exponent on model parameters

Equation (51) expresses the Zipf exponent α as a function of the alphabet size m and the space probability q . Some qualitative observations are straightforward:

- As m increases, the denominator $\ln m$ grows and α decreases, approaching 1 from above. Large alphabets thus produce flatter rank–frequency curves.
- As q increases (spaces become more frequent), $1 - q$ decreases, $\ln(1 - q)$ becomes more negative, and α increases. More frequent word boundaries lead to steeper rank–frequency decay.
- For moderate values of m and q (e.g., m between 20 and 50, q between 0.1 and 0.3), the exponent α lies close to 1, consistent with empirical observations for many natural languages.

The key conceptual point is that the power-law exponent arises from the combination of two exponential effects:

- the exponential growth in the number of possible strings of length k , $M_k = m^k$;
- the exponential decay in the probability of any particular string of length k , $\pi_k \propto ((1 - q)/m)^k$.

When words are ranked by probability, these exponential dependencies combine to produce a power law in rank. This mechanism is structurally simple and does not invoke any optimization principle, communicative efficiency, or complex language dynamics.

8 Comparison with Real Language and Implications for LLMs

Our random-text model is intentionally extreme: symbols are independent, words are mere blocks of non-space characters, and any sequence of letters is permitted. Nevertheless, the model reproduces several high-level properties of word statistics that are often highlighted in discussions of natural language and large language models. In this section we discuss where the model aligns with empirical data, where it diverges, and what this tells us about interpreting Zipf-like patterns in modern LLMs.

8.1 Agreements and disagreements with natural language

On the positive side, the model correctly predicts that:

- shorter words are far more frequent than longer words;
- the number of distinct word types grows with corpus size in a sublinear fashion, with a long tail of rare and unique words;
- the rank–frequency curve follows an approximate power law over a wide range of ranks, with an exponent α in a realistic range for suitable parameter choices (m, q) .

These properties are often cited as signatures of “complexity” or “organization” in language, yet here they arise from symbol combinatorics and a single separator mechanism.

On the negative side, the model fails badly on many finer-grained statistics:

- It predicts that, for a given length k , all m^k words are a priori equally likely, which is dramatically false in real language.
- It generates highly implausible strings (e.g., very long runs of the same letter) with non-negligible probability, whereas natural language strongly constrains such patterns.
- It implies a specific exponential relationship between word length and frequency that does not hold exactly in corpora [Piantadosi, 2014].
- It ignores all syntactic and semantic structure, and therefore cannot account for co-occurrence patterns, topical clustering, or grammaticality.

These discrepancies underscore that the presence of Zipf-like patterns alone is not sufficient evidence of linguistic structure or meaningful communication. Random symbol sequences are enough to generate such patterns under the right segmentation scheme.

8.2 Large language models and token distributions

Modern large language models (LLMs) are trained to predict the next token in massive corpora. The tokenization scheme is usually based on subword units (e.g., byte-pair encoding or unigram language models), but the resulting token frequency distribution is still typically Zipf-like or Zipf–Mandelbrot-like.

Our analysis suggests that part of this behavior should be expected a priori from the mere fact that tokens are (1) finite strings over an underlying alphabet (bytes or characters), and (2) segmented by a discrete tokenization mechanism. Even if the underlying texts were generated by a purely random process of the kind studied here, the token distribution would exhibit a power-law tail.

This has several implications:

1. **Baseline patterns.** When evaluating LLMs, Zipf-like frequency curves should be treated as baseline structural patterns, not as evidence of sophisticated linguistic competence. Any model trained on real corpora will inherit these patterns as long as it roughly reproduces the marginal token statistics.

2. **Beyond Zipf.** To probe genuine linguistic or semantic understanding, one must look beyond first-order token frequencies to phenomena that cannot be explained by random-text baselines: syntactic well-formedness, long-range dependencies, consistent world knowledge, and so on.
3. **Character-level models (CLLMs).** Character-level language models (CLLMs) operate closer to the level studied in this paper: sequences of characters with an emergent notion of word boundaries. For such models, our results provide a natural null hypothesis for the statistics of character sequences and word-like segments. Any deviation from the predictions of the random model (for example, a sharper constraint on repeated characters or a non-geometric tail of word lengths) can be interpreted as evidence that the model has learned nontrivial structure.
4. **Design of synthetic benchmarks.** Random-text constructions of the kind analyzed here can be used to design synthetic benchmarks where the structure is fully known and controllable. LLMs can be tested on their ability to distinguish between true language and random symbol sequences that nevertheless share similar Zipf-like statistics. This can help separate sensitivity to shallow frequency patterns from sensitivity to deeper linguistic constraints.

Overall, our results reinforce the idea that Zipf’s law and related frequency distributions should be interpreted with care in the context of LLM development. They are necessary consequences of very simple symbol-level assumptions and therefore cannot, by themselves, be taken as indicators of intelligence or understanding.

9 Discussion

This section provides an expanded and rigorous discussion of the implications, limitations, and interpretive framework surrounding the structural random-text model introduced in this work. The model operates at a deliberately low level of abstraction: it assumes no linguistic structure, no morphology, no syntax, and no semantics. Instead, it considers only a finite alphabet of characters, a space symbol, and segmentation induced by maximal contiguous runs of non-space characters. Despite this radical simplicity, the model reproduces several empirical phenomena that are widely regarded as “linguistic laws.” The purpose of this section is to analyze this contrast.

9.1 Structural Origins of Statistical Regularities

Many well-known statistical patterns of natural language—including Zipf-like rank–frequency distributions, heavy-tailed vocabulary structure, and realistic vocabulary growth curves—arise in the model without invoking any linguistic mechanisms. This indicates that such patterns may emerge from combinatorial properties of strings rather than from linguistic or cognitive principles.

Two fundamental forces drive this behavior: (1) exponential growth in the number of possible strings of length k , and (2) exponential decay in the probability of any specific string

of that length. When the strings are ranked by probability, these exponentials interact to create a power-law distribution matching those seen in empirical corpora. Crucially, this mechanism is general and does not depend on language-specific structure.

9.2 Critical Length and the Core–Tail Divide

A central contribution of the model is the identification of the critical length k^* , which separates two regimes of lexical behavior:

- For $k < k^*$, the vocabulary is effectively saturated: most possible strings of length k appear multiple times.
- For $k > k^*$, the expected count of any specific string falls below one, and the observed vocabulary is dominated by unique items.

This structural transition mirrors empirical distinctions between function words and long content words, but here it emerges solely from probabilistic structure.

9.3 Comparison with Classical Models

Early work by Miller, Mandelbrot, and Simon demonstrated that power laws can arise from non-linguistic mechanisms. Our model extends these insights by linking word lengths, probabilities, rank–frequency structure, and vocabulary growth into a uniform framework. The explicit derivation of k^* provides a distinct advantage, offering a quantitatively interpretable threshold not present in earlier models.

9.4 Limitations of the Structural Model

The model is intentionally unrealistic as a linguistic model. Limitations include:

- no morphological or phonotactic constraints;
- no syntactic or semantic structure;
- independence assumptions that eliminate burstiness or clustering;
- implausible surface patterns relative to natural language.

These are intentional: removing linguistic constraints isolates the contributions of pure structure and segmentation, enabling direct comparison between structural baselines and linguistic phenomena.

9.5 Implications for Quantitative Linguistics

A key interpretive consequence is that rank–frequency distributions alone cannot serve as evidence for linguistic optimization, semantic organization, or cognitive structure. If such patterns emerge even in random-text models, then stronger criteria are needed when evaluating linguistic hypotheses.

The section concludes by motivating the analysis in Section 10, where the structural baseline is compared with observable behaviors of modern large language models.

10 Implications for Large Language Models

This section analyzes how the structural random-text model relates to statistical properties observed in modern large language models (LLMs). The objective is to clarify which behaviors in LLM outputs arise from linguistic training data and which emerge from structural constraints inherent to tokenization, probability distributions, and sequence prediction.

10.1 Tokenization as a Structural Mechanism

Contemporary LLMs rely on subword tokenization schemes such as Byte-Pair Encoding (BPE), WordPiece, and unigram language models. These schemes compress frequent short sequences into single tokens while decomposing rare or unpredictable sequences into smaller units. This process parallels the division created by the critical length k^* in the structural model:

- high-frequency short patterns behave like saturated short strings with $k < k^*$;
- long or low-frequency patterns resemble strings with $k > k^*$, often appearing only once and lacking stable token-level representation.

Thus, the structural model provides a conceptual basis for understanding how LLM vocabularies become heavily skewed toward short, frequent units.

10.2 Zipfian Structure in Training Corpora

LLMs are trained on corpora that exhibit Zipf-like rank–frequency distributions. The structural random-text model demonstrates that such rank–frequency behavior arises even without linguistic content. Consequently, when an LLM aligns with Zipfian frequency patterns, this alignment may reflect a structural adaptation to corpus statistics rather than evidence of learned linguistic principles.

This distinction is critical when interpreting LLM behavior. Frequency-based regularities in model outputs cannot be assumed to indicate semantic or syntactic understanding unless supported by independent evidence.

10.3 Vocabulary Growth and Context Limitations

LLMs operate within fixed context windows, limiting the effective vocabulary accessible at any generation step. This constraint mirrors the structural mechanism in which only short strings with sufficiently high probability appear frequently.

As a result:

- short, frequent tokens are easily retrieved from context;
- long or rare tokens may fall outside the context window and effectively behave as unseen events.

The structural model therefore helps explain why LLMs preferentially reuse common short tokens and rarely produce long rare sequences.

10.4 Higher-Order Statistics and Burstiness

Both random-text models and LLM outputs exhibit burstiness, long tails in n-gram distributions, and multi-scale statistical organization. These patterns can emerge without linguistic structure, implying that some higher-order regularities in LLM behavior may arise from autoregressive prediction dynamics rather than from learning human linguistic patterns.

10.5 Structural Baseline for Evaluating LLM Behavior

The structural model provides a baseline for distinguishing between behaviors that require linguistic training and those that emerge from architecture, tokenization, or generic sequence modeling.

This has methodological implications:

1. LLM evaluations should compare outputs not only to human baselines but also to structural baselines.
2. Structural distortions—such as over-reliance on short tokens—can be detected by contrasting model performance with predictions of the structural model.
3. Synthetic datasets approximating structural randomness can be used to probe which regularities are architectural rather than learned.

These applications are essential for interpreting LLM performance in tasks involving reasoning, understanding, or semantic inference.

10.6 Inductive Biases of Transformer Architectures

Transformer-based LLMs possess inherent inductive biases. Self-attention prefers local, frequent patterns; positional encodings favor short-range structure; and probability mass concentrates on high-frequency tokens during training. These biases align with forces identified in the structural model.

Specifically:

- attention mechanisms disproportionately favor stable short tokens;
- rare long tokens receive limited specialization because of their low empirical frequency;
- tokenization boundaries reinforce the effective critical-length phenomenon.

Thus, several aspects of LLM behavior may stem from architectural constraints rather than semantic learning.

10.7 Future Research Directions

The structural parallels between simple random-text models and LLM behavior motivate several research avenues:

- studying how different tokenization schemes alter the effective critical length k^* ;
- examining LLM performance on corpora engineered to violate typical Zipfian structure;
- designing architectures that reduce structural biases inherited from tokenization;
- using structural baselines to quantify genuine semantic understanding.

Overall, the structural random-text model offers a framework for separating architectural and statistical effects from true linguistic learning. This provides a foundation for more rigorous interpretation and evaluation of modern language models.

11 Conclusion

This section summarizes the main findings of the structural random-text framework and its implications for quantitative linguistics and large language models (LLMs). By formulating text generation as a probabilistic character process with segmentation induced solely by space symbols, the model isolates a minimal structural baseline from which several classical linguistic regularities emerge.

The analysis demonstrates that Zipf-like rank–frequency distributions, heavy-tailed vocabularies, and realistic vocabulary growth curves do not necessarily require linguistic mechanisms; instead, they may arise from fundamental combinatorial properties of strings. A key element of this behavior is the presence of a critical length k^* separating frequent short strings from rare long ones. This threshold provides structural insight into empirical distinctions between core and tail vocabulary.

The comparison with LLMs highlights that several statistical features observed in modern foundation models—including frequency biases, burstiness, and instability of long rare sequences—can arise from tokenization, context-window limitations, and autoregressive prediction rather than linguistic learning. Consequently, any interpretation of LLM behavior must account for the structural baseline provided by simple string models.

The structural framework therefore serves two purposes: it clarifies the minimal conditions under which linguistic-like regularities appear, and it provides a reference model for

evaluating which aspects of LLM behavior reflect genuine linguistic competence. Future developments may involve more refined structural baselines, alternative tokenization schemes, and synthetic datasets designed to separate architectural effects from learned representations.

A Mathematical Derivations and Technical Foundations

This appendix provides the formal derivations, asymptotic estimates, and technical results underlying the structural random-text model presented in the main sections of the article. The goal is to maintain conceptual clarity in the main text while presenting complete mathematical detail here.

Throughout, we consider a finite alphabet \mathcal{A} of size $A \geq 2$ and a distinguished space symbol ‘ ‘. A “word” is defined as any maximal contiguous sequence of non-space characters. Characters are generated independently with probability p of being a space and $q = 1 - p$ of being a non-space character.

A.1 Distribution of Word Lengths

A word of length k is generated when a run of exactly k consecutive non-space characters occurs between two spaces. Because characters are independent, the probability that a word has length exactly k is

$$\Pr(L = k) = p q^k p = p^2 q^k. \quad (52)$$

This geometric distribution is the foundation for several subsequent results. The expected word length is

$$\mathbb{E}[L] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k p^2 q^k = \frac{q}{p}. \quad (53)$$

The expected number of words in a text of length N characters is therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[W_N] = N \cdot p, \quad (54)$$

to first order, since each space initiates a new word.

A.2 Probability of a Specific Word of Length k

Fix a specific string $w = (c_1, \dots, c_k) \in \mathcal{A}^k$. The probability that any given position in the text begins the word w is

$$\Pr(w) = q^k A^{-k}, \quad (55)$$

since each character must be non-space and independently chosen from A symbols. A word must also be bounded on both sides by spaces. The full probability of the segment “ w ” occurring at a fixed location is thus

$$p \cdot q^k A^{-k} \cdot p = p^2 (q/A)^k. \quad (56)$$

For large N , occurrences of w behave (approximately) like a Bernoulli process. The expected number of occurrences is

$$\mathbb{E}[X_w] = (N - k - 1) p^2 (q/A)^k \approx N p^2 (q/A)^k. \quad (57)$$

A.3 Critical Length k^*

The critical length k^* is defined as the solution to

$$\mathbb{E}[X_w] = 1. \quad (58)$$

Using (57) we solve

$$N p^2 \left(\frac{q}{A} \right)^{k^*} = 1. \quad (59)$$

Taking logarithms:

$$k^* = \frac{\log(N p^2)}{\log(A/q)}. \quad (60)$$

This threshold separates the “core” regime (strings with $k < k^*$, likely to repeat) from the “tail” regime (strings with $k > k^*$, unlikely to repeat).

A.4 Rank–Frequency Relation

For each length k , the number of possible strings is A^k . Their probabilities are all equal and given by (56). When ordered by decreasing probability, all strings of length 1 precede those of length 2, and so on. Thus the rank of strings of length k is approximately

$$R_k \approx A^k. \quad (61)$$

Substituting into the probability expression yields

$$f(R) \asymp R^{-\alpha}, \quad (62)$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{\log(A/q)}{\log A}. \quad (63)$$

This is a power law, matching the form of Zipf’s law.

A.5 Asymptotics of Vocabulary Growth

A word of length k appears with probability at least once if

$$\mathbb{P}(X_w \geq 1) = 1 - \exp\left(-Np^2(q/A)^k\right). \quad (64)$$

The expected number of distinct words of length k is therefore

$$V_k = A^k \left(1 - e^{-Np^2(q/A)^k}\right). \quad (65)$$

Summing over all lengths:

$$V(N) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} V_k. \quad (66)$$

The sum splits naturally:

- for $k < k^*$, $V_k \approx A^k$ (all strings appear);
- for $k > k^*$, $V_k \approx Np^2q^k$ (almost all strings appear at most once).

This leads to a vocabulary growth curve combining exponential and geometric regimes, consistent with empirical observations.

A.6 Expected Number of Unique Words

For $k > k^*$, the expected number of distinct words equals the expected number of occurrences:

$$U_k = A^k e^{-Np^2(q/A)^k} \approx Np^2q^k. \quad (67)$$

Summing over $k > k^*$ gives

$$U(N) = Np^2 \sum_{k > k^*} q^k, \quad (68)$$

which converges and remains proportional to N . Hence the fraction of unique words tends to a constant depending only on p and q .

A.7 Poisson Approximation for Rare Strings

For $k > k^*$ the expected number of occurrences is small. Standard arguments show that X_w is asymptotically Poisson with mean $\lambda = Np^2(q/A)^k$.

Thus:

$$\Pr(X_w = m) = e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^m}{m!}. \quad (69)$$

This justifies the approximation used in evaluating vocabulary growth and the expected number of unique words.

A.8 Summary

This appendix establishes the formal probabilistic and combinatorial foundations supporting the main results. These derivations clarify the structural origin of Zipf-like distributions, vocabulary growth patterns, and the core–tail transition captured by the critical length k^* . They also provide the basis for comparing structural baselines with empirical linguistic patterns and with statistical behaviors observed in modern language models.

References

- Ramon Ferrer-i Cancho and Ricard V. Solé. Two regimes in the frequency of words and the origins of complex lexicons. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 8(3):165–173, 2001.
- Wentian Li. Random texts exhibit zipf’s-law-like word frequency distribution. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 38(6):1842–1845, 1992.
- Benoit Mandelbrot. An informational theory of the statistical structure of language. *Communication Theory*, pages 486–502, 1953.
- Benoit Mandelbrot. Structure formelle des textes et communication. *Word*, 10:1–27, 1954.
- Benoit Mandelbrot. A note on a class of skew distributions. *Information and Control*, 2: 90–97, 1959.
- Benoit Mandelbrot. Word frequencies and markovian models of text. *Proceedings of the Symposium on Applied Mathematics*, 12:190–219, 1961.
- George A. Miller. Some effects of intermittent silence. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 70(2):311–314, 1957.
- Steven T. Piantadosi. Zipf’s law in natural language: A critical review and future directions. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 21(5):1112–1130, 2014. doi: 10.3758/s13423-014-0585-6.
- Herbert A. Simon. On a class of skew distribution functions. *Biometrika*, 42(3/4):425–440, 1955.
- George Udny Yule. A mathematical theory of evolution: Based on the conclusions of dr. j. c. willis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 213:21–87, 1925.
- George Kingsley Zipf. *The Psycho-Biology of Language*. Houghton Mifflin, 1935.
- George Kingsley Zipf. *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort*. Addison-Wesley, 1949.