

Course Trajectory						
When	What					
Weeks 1-3	Basics of three architectures (DAM, perceptron, MLP)					
Weeks 4-6	Cognitive science of DAMs and perceptrons					
Week 7	Connectionism and Cognitive Psychology					
Weeks 8-10	Interpreting MLPs					
Weeks 11-13	Case studies (interpretations, applications, architectures)					



Hebb's Cell Assembly In his 1949 The Organization Of . Behavior, Canadian neuroscientist Donald Hebb developed a neural theory of perceptual learning His core idea was the cell assembly A cell assembly is a dynamic . network of multiple neurons Activity reverberates and persists in the assembly over a Donald Olding Hebb period of time The activity pattern can be dynamic – there is a temporal flow of activity through an assembly

Biology Of Cell Assemblies

- Hebb provided a neurophysiological postulate to explain how cell assemblies developed
- His postulate: "When an axon of cell A is near enough to excite a cell B and repeatedly or persistently takes place in firing it, some growth process or metabolic change takes place in one or both cells such that A's efficiency, as one of the cells firing B, is increased" (Hebb, 1949, p. 62)





Early Simulation #FAIL

- Rochester, Holland, Haibt and Duda (1956) attempted to bring Hebb's cell assembly theory to life as a computer simulation 69 different neurons, with random connections from each neuron to 10 others
 - Connections were updated according to Hebb's 1949 theory
- Rochester et al. (1956) witnessed "weak reverberation" in which there was a tendency for larger numbers of simulated neurons were simultaneously active
- However, many elements of Hebb's theory did not clearly emerge!
- "This kind of investigation cannot prove how the brain works. It can, however, show that some models are unworkable and provide clues as to how to revise the models to make them work" (Rochester et al, 1956, p. 88)



An example neuron from the Rochester et al. simulation

Figure 1: The standard

pattern associator

Inhibitory Revision Peter Milner revised Hebb's theory with his "Mark II" cell assembly published in Psychological Review in 1957 Peter the Maler Milner's key contribution was to add inhibitory signals to Hebb's theory "The model differs from Hebb's in that an inhibitory regulatory system is postulated which limits (to a minute fraction of the total) the number of cortical neurons that can fire simultaneously, and insures that those firing are dispersed as widely as possible" (Milner, 1957, p. 252

Distributed Associative Memory

- From 1956 on there was a great deal of simulation research that explored the standard pattern associator
- the standard pattern associator "Versions of Figure 1 have a long history (e.g. Taylor, 1956, Figs 9 & 10; Steinbuch, 1961, Fig. 2; Kohonen, 1977, Fig. 1.9; Rumelhart et al, 1986c, Chap. 1, Fig. 12, Chap. 9 Fig. 18, Chap. 12 Fig. 1, Chap. 18 Fig. 3; Schneider, 1987, Fig. 1; McClelland & Rumelhart, 1988, Cap. 4, Fig. 3). Physiological analogs of this figure have appeared in sources ranging from Anderson et al. (1977, Fig. 1) to James (1890/1950, Fig. 40)" (Dawson & Schopflocher, 1992, p. 205)
- Inhibition is a general characteristic of this model, particularly if processor activity can be negative

Die Lernmatrix	
 One of the first distributed memories was Steinbuch's (1961) lernmatrix 	
 It consisted of a set of input binary switches and an output set of switches (pairs, excitatory and inhibitory) 	Karl Steinburg
 The learning matrix associated patterns of input switch positions with output switch positions, permitting the system to associate input/output responses 	

Steinbuch

25





CHARM: Correlation

- Recall in CHARM is accomplished by the holographic operation of correlation
- In essence, correlation involves taking the outer product of a cue with the memory trace
- Then, all of the longest diagonals are summed to produce the retrieved vector



	CHARMe	d Behavi	or			
•	CHARM simulates a	Table 13 Predictions and Applications of Cou	au			
	number of regularities			First	mble	
	that govern human	Prediction or phenomenon	Simulation	Yes	No	Evidence
	associative memory	Interaction between correct most and intralist intrusions depending on whether paired- associate has conside entirely of similar or of unrelated items		x		Experiment 1
•	"Nearly all of the predictions	Equal frequency of atmulus- and response-term intralist intrusions		х		Experiment 1
	and applications depend on	Creater proportion of one intruston when our and target items are similar than when they are usediated	3	×		Experiment 2
	the interactive nature of the	Stimulus generalization		х		Experiment 4;
	holographic association and	Extudies item similar to target rockes moail of our rather than	3	x		Experiment 4
	events stored in such a	Responses of a particular pair learned loss well in a homogeneous than in a heterogeneous last	-	x		Tulving, Note 3
	memory combine and interfere with one another so	Interaction between number of outgory exemptan preamind and one efficacy of prototype as compared to exemption	•	×		Homa, Oron, Contell, Ooldman, and Schwartz, 197
	that the output from memory	Prototype more resistant to forgetting than presented excerptions	,		x	Poster and Keel 1970; Strange, Kattery, Keen and Jethins, 1970
	it" (Eich, 1982, p. 657)	Non-anociation-specific interference: A-B C-D given worw recall than A-B alone	Metcalle and Mundock, 1981	х		McGovern, 1964
		Trade-off between B and D moall in A-B A-D paradigm with MMFR testing	•	х		Barnes and Underwood, 1959
		Independence of 8 and D responses in the A-B A-D paradigm	*	ж		Martin, 1971
		All of the transfer or retroaction relations given in the Osgood surface	,	x		Oupool, 1948; Martin, 1965

Holography And Hebb Learning

- Pike (1984) developed a proof that established the formal equivalence of holographic associative memories and distributed associative memories that use Hebb-style learning
- Pike went on to claim that holographic memories had a number of properties that made them biologically implausible
- He argued that Hebb-style learning is more consistent with the neuroscience of memory

1-4	-							~	~	
÷.	,	۰	٠		٠	,	٠	٠	ø	•
	۰		۰	0	۰	0	۰	0	0	•
**			۰	۲	٠		0		0	• 1
	ь,	b ₂	ь,	b,	ь,	۰,	۰,	۰,	۰,	-
1		<u>þ.</u> ,	ι. e,	1.6	(0,1	1.1	0,1	١.		
	b -	į,	0, 0,	1.1	ų,	R. 1.	4,0	ŧ.		
r gives r -minorating the biblication is a single manifold of the dimension rank. In the density and the dimension rank. In the density are biblication, while the dimension rank, the density are biblication rank, the dimension rank is the dimension rank is a subscript of the dimension rank is a subscr										
	ndiry of a soling management of a pice of	sense offer our i e and our i e and our i facto and our i and our i and our i i and our i i i and our i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	and and and and and and and and and and	to the second se	the second secon		of a topp to the second	the second secon	d an clem trice is an is a bit of r pair trice tria	extantes exet by all from extense peel to income in that, informa- ing an all informa- ing an all informa- ing an all informa- ing an all informa-

110100

The Rise Of Associative Memory Minsky and Papert's publication of *Perceptrons* in 1969 led to the demise of old connectionism Very little research on artificial neural networks was being published in the 1970s However, in the early 1980s there had been enough developments in the study of distributed associative memory to open the door for the connectionist revolution Hinton and Anderson's 1981 book on such memories has become a classic, and led the charge of the connectionist revolution

Biological Mechanisms Of Association

- Hebb made specific proposals concerning the biological mechanisms that caused cell assemblies to form
- "The most probable suggestion concerning the way in which one cell could become more capable in firing another is that synaptic knobs develop and increase the area of contact between the afferent axon and the efferent soma" (Hebb, 1949, p. 62)





The Hippocampus And Memory

- After surgery that resulted in the bilateral removal of his hippocampus, Henry Molaison was unable to form new memories, though existing memories were intact
 - Dr. MILNER: Do you know what you did yesterday?
 - H.M.: No, I don't.
 - Dr. MILNER: How about this morning?
 - H.M.: I don't even remember that.
 - Dr. MILNER: Could you tell me what you had for lunch today?
 - H.M.: I don't know, to tell you the truth









Neural Mechanism Of Hebb Learning

- With low frequency presynaptic activity, then LTP does not occur because NMDA receptors are blocked High frequency
- resynaptic activity coupled with postsynaptic activity (contiguity!) removes the block, allowing NMDA receptors to function, and allowing synaptic efficacy to be modified







Producing LTD

- Stanton and Sejnowski (1989) presented two trains of inputs to locations in the hippocampus
- When the trains were in phase, LTP was produced
- When they were out of phase, the result was LTD
 LTD does not involve
- LTD does not involve NMDA receptors – it is not disrupted by AP5



Positively correlated (in-phase)
 Test input
 Impatively correlated (out-of-phase)
 Test input
 Imput
 Imput
 Imput
 Imput
 Imput



Hebb's Legacy

 "Stemming from the postulate, Hebb's name is increasingly used as an adjective, so that we have the Hebb synapse, Hebbian synaptic plasticity,Hebbian learning rules, Hebbian neural networks and even anti-Hebbian learning. The postulate forms part of Hebb's neural theory of perception, and much of our current nderstanding of functional neural connections is based on Hebbian concepts" (Brown & Milner, 2003)

